
FROM SHADOWS and SYMBOLS to the TRUTH
Cor ad
Cor loquitur
MARYGROVE COLLEGE
EX LIBRIS

R
203
C25
1913
v.5
cop.

The Catholic Encyclopedia

VOLUME FIVE

Diocese—Fathers

The Catholic Encyclopedia

VOLUME FIVE

Diocesan—Fathers











CINCINNATI

CHURCH OF THE ASSUMPTION
CONVENT OF THE GOOD SHEPHERD
ST. LAWRENCE'S CHURCH (WEST FRONT)
ST. PETER'S CATHEDRAL
ST. LAWRENCE'S CHURCH (INTERIOR)
ST. FRANCIS XAVIER'S CHURCH

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA

AN INTERNATIONAL WORK OF REFERENCE ON THE CONSTITUTION, DOCTRINE, DISCIPLINE, AND HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

EDITED BY
CHARLES G. HERBERMANN, PH.D., LL.D.
EDWARD A. PACE, PH.D., D.D. CONDÉ B. PALLEN, PH.D., LL.D.
THOMAS J. SHAHAN, D.D. JOHN J. WYNNE, S.J.
ASSISTED BY NUMEROUS COLLABORATORS

FIFTEEN VOLUMES AND INDEX
VOLUME V

SPECIAL EDITION
UNDER THE AUSPICES OF
THE KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS CATHOLIC TRUTH COMMITTEE

New York
THE ENCYCLOPEDIA PRESS, INC.

Nihil Obstat, May 1, 1909

REMY LAFORT, S.T.D.

CENSOR

Imprimatur

✠JOHN CARDINAL FARLEY

ARCHBISHOP OF NEW YORK

Copyright, 1909

BY ROBERT APPLETON COMPANY

Copyright, 1913

BY THE ENCYCLOPEDIA PRESS, INC.

The articles in this work have been written specially for The Catholic Encyclopedia and are protected by copyright. All rights, including the right of translation and reproduction, are reserved.

Contributors to the Fifth Volume

AHERNE, CORNELIUS, Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Rector, St. Joseph's College, Mill Hill, London: Est (Estius), Willem Hessels van.

ALSTON, G. CYPRIAN, O.S.B., Downside Abbey, Bath, England: Dissentis, Abbey of; Donnan, Saint; Drostan, Saint; Echternach, Abbey of; Einsiedeln, Abbey of; Emmeram, Abbey of Saint; Engelberg, Abbey of; Estiennot de la Serre, Claude; Evesham Abbey.

ARENDZEN, J. P., Ph.D., S.T.D., M.A. (Cantab.), Professor of Holy Scripture, St. Edmund's College, Ware, England: Docetæ; Dositheans; Druzes; Ebionites; Egyptian Church Ordinance; Encratites; Etschmiadzin.

AVELING, FRANCIS, S.T.D., Chelsea, London: Essence and Existence.

BACCHUS, FRANCIS JOSEPH, B.A., The Oratory, Birmingham, England: Eusebius, Chronicle of; Eusebius of Cæsarea.

BANDELIER, AD. F., Hispanic Society of America, New York: Ecuador, Republic of.

BARNES, ARTHUR STAPYLTON, M.A. (Oxon. and Cantab.), Cambridge, England: Discipline of the Secret; Dolphin; Dove; Elvira, Council of; Eulogia.

BAUMGARTEN, Mgr. PAUL MARIA, J.U.D., S.T.D., Domestic Prelate, Rome: Döllinger, Johann Joseph Ignaz von.

BENIGNI, U., Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Pont. Collegio Urbano di Propaganda, Rome: Domnus Apostolicus; Fabriano and Matelica, Diocese of; Faenza, Diocese of; Fano, Diocese of; Farnese, Alessandro.

BESSE, J. M., O.S.B., Director, "Revue Mabillon", Chevetogne, Belgium: Eutropius of Valencia.

BESSON, JULES, S.J., Professor of Canon Law, University of Toulouse, Director, "Nouvelle Revue Théologique" (Tournai), Toulouse, France: Dispensation.

BIHL, MICHAEL, O.F.M., Lector of Ecclesiastical History, Collegio San Bonaventura, Quaracchi, near Florence: Elizabeth of Hungary, Saint; Faber, Philip.

BOUDINHON, AUGUSTE-MARIE, D.D., D.C.L., Director, "Canoniste Contemporain", Professor of Canon Law, Institut Catholique, Paris: Discipline, Ecclesiastical; Domicile; Dower, Religious; Election; Excommunication; Faithful, The.

BOWDEN, SEBASTIAN, The Oratory, London: Faber, Frederick William.

BRAUN, JOSEPH, S.J., Luxemburg: Embroidery, Ecclesiastical; Fanon.

BRÉHIER, LOUIS-RENÉ, Professor of Ancient and Medieval History, University of Clermont-Ferrand, Puy-de-Dôme, France: Doria, Andrea.

BROCK, HENRY M., S.J., Professor of Physics, Holy Cross College, Worcester, Massachusetts: Dumont, Hubert-André; Elie de Beaumont, Jean-Baptiste; Epping, Joseph; Eusebius of Alexandria.

BURKE, EDMUND, A.B., Instructor in Latin, College of the City of New York: Facciolati, Jacopo.

BURTON, EDWIN, D.D., St. Edmund's College, Ware, England: Dorman, Thomas; Drane, Augusta Theodosia; Durham, Ancient Catholic Diocese of; Easton, Adam; Egbert, King; Ellis, Philip Michael; Ely, Ancient Diocese of; Englefield, Felix; Englefield, Sir Henry Charles; Erdeswicke, Sampson; Errington, William; Erskine, Charles; Ethelbert, Archbishop of York; Eustace, John Chetwode; Evangelical Alliance, The; Exeter, Ancient Diocese of; Eyre, Thomas; Eyston, Charles; Falkner, Thomas.

CAMM, BEDE, O.S.B., B.A. (Oxon.), Erdington Abbey, Birmingham, England: Drury, Robert, Venerable; Duckett, James, Venerable, and John, Venerable; Dymoke, Robert.

CAMPBELL, THOMAS J., S.J., St. Mary's College, Montreal: Drechsel, Jeremias; Druillettes, Gabriel; Druzbicki, Gaspar.

CAPES, FLORENCE MARY, London: Elizabeth of Portugal, Saint.

CARR, EDWARD J., Fall River, Massachusetts: Fall River, Diocese of.

CARR, GREGORY, O.F.M., Washington: Elzéar of Sabran, Saint.

CATHREIN, VICTOR, S.J., Professor of Moral Philosophy, St. Ignatius College, Valkenburg, Holland: Duel; Ethics.

CHAINE, MARIUS, S.J., Rome: Ethiopia.

CHAMBON, CÉLESTIN M., Ph.B., Litt.B., New Orleans, Louisiana: Dubourg, Louis-Guillaume-Valentin.

CHAPMAN, JOHN, O.S.B., B.A. (Oxon.), Prior of St. Thomas's Abbey, Erdington, Birmingham, England: Diodorus of Tarsus; Diognetus, Epistle to; Dionysius, Saint, Bishop of Corinth; Dionysius of Alexandria; Dioscurus, Bishop of Alexandria; Doctors of the Church; Doctrine of Addai; Donatists; Elcesaites; Ephesus, Council of; Ephesus, Robber Council of; Eusebius of Nicomedia; Eutyches; Eutychianism; Evodius.

CLEARY, HENRY W., Editor, "New Zealand Tablet", Dunedin, New Zealand: Dunedin, Diocese of.

CLUGNET, JOSEPH-LÉON-TIBURCE, Litt.Lic., Paris: Emmeram, Saint; Eucherius, Saint.

COGHLAN, DANIEL, D.D., Professor of Dogmatic Theology, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, Dublin: Dogma; Dogmatic Facts.

COLEMAN, AMBROSE, O.P., M.R.I.A., St. Saviour's Priory, Dublin: Dixon, Joseph; Dowdall, George.

COPPENS, CHARLES, S.J., Professor of Philosophy, St. Louis University, Missouri: Direction, Spiritual; Examination of Conscience.

COPPIETERS, HONORÉ, S.T.D., Professor of Hebrew and Holy Scripture, Collège du Pape, Louvain: Evangeliaria (First Part).

CORBETT, JOHN, S.J., New York: Embroidery in Scripture.

CRONIN, Mgr. CHARLES JOHN, D.D., Vice-Rector, English College, Rome: English College, The, in Rome.

CULLEN, JOHN BAPTIST, Dublin: Eimhin, Saint; Eithene, Saint; Eithne, Saint; Eustace, Saint; Eustace, Maurice.

D'ALTON, E. A., M.R.I.A., Athenry, Ireland: Donlevy, Andrew; Down and Connor, Diocese of; Doyle, James Warren; Duffy, Sir Charles Gavan; Egan, Boetius.

DEASY, TIMOTHY J., D.D., Ph.D., Ellenora, Ohio: Elder, William Henry.

DEBUCHY, PAUL, S.J., Litt.L., Enghien, Belgium: Discernment of Spirits.

DELAMARRE, LOUIS N., Ph.D., Instructor in French, College of the City of New York: Dupin, Pierre-Charles-François; Estaing, Jean-Baptiste, Comte d'.

DELANY, JOSEPH F., New York: Distraction; Error; Euthanasia.

DEPPEN, LOUIS G., Louisville, Kentucky: Durbin, Elisha John.

DEVINE, ARTHUR, C.P., Professor of Theology, St. Saviour's Retreat, Broadway, Worcestershire, England: Dominic of the Mother of God.

DOMANIG, KARL, Ph.D., Honorary Imperial Councillor, Chief Director of the Imperial Collection of Coins, Klosterneuburg, Austria: Eckhel, Joseph Hilarius.

DONNELLY, NICHOLAS, Titular Bishop of Canea, Dublin: Dublin, Archdiocese of.

DONOHUE, JAMES, S.P.M., New York: Fathers of Mercy.

DONOVAN, STEPHEN M., O.F.M., Franciscan Monastery, Washington: Discalced.

DRISCOLL, JAMES F., D.D., President of St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, New York: Euthalius; Eve (in Scripture); Ezechias.

DRISCOLL, JOHN THOMAS, A.M., S.T.L., Fonda, New York: Dongan, Thomas.

DUBRAY, C. A., S.T.B., Ph. D., Professor of Philosophy, Marist College, Washington: Duhamel, Jean-Baptiste; Duperron, Jacques-Davy; Dynamism; Emanationism; Encyclopedists; Epistemology; Espence, Claude d'; Faculties of the Soul.

DUFFY, DANIEL P., S.S., A.M., S.T.L., J.C.L., Professor of Holy Scripture, St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore: Eleazar; Eliseus; Esau.

DUFFY, P. L., A.B., A.M., LL.D., Auditor, Diocesan Curia, Charleston, South Carolina: England, John.

DUNN, Mgr. JAMES J., Meadville, Pennsylvania: Erie, Diocese of.

DUNN, JOSEPH, Ph.D., Professor of Celtic Languages and Literature, Catholic University of America, Washington: Druidism.

EDMONDS, COLUMBA, O.S.B., Fort Augustus, Scotland: Edmund Rich, Saint; Erconwald, Saint; Ernan, Saints; Ewald, Saints.

ENGELHARDT, ZEPHYRIN, O.F.M., Watsonville, California: Dolores Mission; Dumetz, Francisco; Duran, Narcisco.

EWING, JOHN GILLESPIE, A.M., San Juan, Porto Rico: Ewing, Thomas.

FANNING, WILLIAM H. W., S.J., Professor of Church History and Canon Law, St. Louis University, Missouri: Distributions.

FENLON, JOHN F., S.S., S.T.D., President of St. Austin's College, Brookland, D.C.; Professor of Sacred Scripture, St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore: Emery, Jacques-André.

FITA Y COLOMER, FIDEL, S.J., Member of the Royal Academy of History, Madrid: Eulalia of Barcelona, Saint; Eulogius of Cordova, Saint; Evora, Archdiocese of.

FITZPATRICK, MALLICK J., New York: Drumgoole, John C.

FORTESCUE, ADRIAN, Ph.D., D.D., Letchworth, Herts, England: Doxology; Durandus, William; Durandus, William, the Younger; Durham Rite; Eastern Churches; Elias of Jerusalem; Eparchy; Ephesus, The Seven Sleepers of; Ephraim of Antioch; Epiklesis; Epiphanius of Constantinople; Etherianus, Hugh and Leo; Euchologion; Eudocia; Euphemius of Constantinople; Eusebius of Laodicea; Eustathius of Sebaste; Eutychius I (Patriarch of Constantinople); Eutychius (Melchite Patriarch of Alexandria); Exarch.

FOX, JAMES J., S.T.D., B.A., Professor of Philosophy, St. Thomas's College, Washington: Duty; Egoism.

FOX, WILLIAM, B.S., M.E., Associate Professor of Physics, College of the City of New York: Divisch, Procopius.

FUENTES, VENTURA, A.B., M.D., Instructor, College of the City of New York: Encina, Juan de la; Enciso, Diego Ximenez de; Enciso, Martín Fernández de; Ercilla y Zúñiga, Alonso de; Espinel, Vicente; Espinosa, Alonso de.

GERARD, JOHN, S.J., F.L.S., London: Dionysius Exiguus.

GEUDENS, FRANCIS MARTIN, O.Præm., Abbot Titular of Barlings, Corpus Christi Priory, Manchester, England: Druys, Jean.

GIETMANN, GERARD, S.J., Teacher of Classical Languages and Æsthetics, St. Ignatius College, Valkenburg, Holland: Dürer, Albrecht; Ecclesiastes, Book of; Erwin of Steinbach.

GIGOT, FRANCIS E., S.T.D., Professor of Sacred Scripture, St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, N.Y.: Ecclesiasticus, Book of.

GILLET, LOUIS, Paris: Duccio di Buoninsegna; Eyck, Hubert and Jan van; Farinato, Paolo.

GODRYCZ, JOHN, S.T.D., Ph.D., J.U.D., Shenandoah, Pennsylvania: Dlugosz, Jan.

GOYAU, GEORGES, Associate Editor, "Revue des Deux Mondes", Paris: Evreux, Diocese of; Falloux du Coudray, Vicomte de; Farfa, Abbey of.

GRAHAM, EDWARD P., A.M., Sandusky, Ohio: Divination; Emmerich, Anne Catherine; Escobar, Marina de, Venerable; Essenes.

GRATTAN-FLOOD, W. H., M.R.I.A., Mus.D., Rosemount, Enniscorthy, Ireland: Disibod, Saint; Dowdall, James; Eoghan, Saints.

GÜERECA, REGINALDO, Durango, Mexico: Durango, Archdiocese of.

GUINAN, JOSEPH, C.C., Ferbane, Ireland: Edgeworth, Henry Essex.

GUINEY, LOUISE IMOGEN, Oxford, England: Edmund Campion, Blessed.

GURDON, EDMUND, O.Cart., Barcelona, Spain: Dissen, Heinrich von.

HANDLEY, M. L., New York: Donatello; Donner, Georg Raphael; Duquesnoy, François.

HARTIG, OTTO, Assistant Librarian of the Royal Library, Munich: Europe.

HASSETT, MAURICE M., S.T.D., Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Encolpion; Eucharist, Early Symbols of the.

HAYES, Mgr. PATRICK J., D.D., Chancellor of the Archdiocese of New York, President, Cathedral College, New York: Dubois, John.

HEALY, Most Reverend JOHN, D.D., LL.D., M.R.I.A., Senator of the Royal University of Ireland, Archbishop of Tuam: Durrow, School of.

HEALY, PATRICK J., S.T.D., Assistant Professor of Church History, Catholic University of America, Washington: Facundus of Hermiane.

HIND, GEORGE ELPHEGE, O.S.B., Glamorganshire, Wales: Eanbald; Easterwine; Egbert, Archbishop of York; Ellwangen Abbey.

HOLLWECK, JOSEF, J.C.D., S.T.D., Professor of Canon Law, Seminary, Eichstätt, Germany: Eichstätt, Diocese of.

HOLWECK, FREDERICK G., St. Louis: Dispersion of the Apostles; Easter; Embolism; Espousals of the Blessed Virgin Mary; Eve of a Feast; Expectation of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

HORGAN, S. H., Morristown, New Jersey: Egloffstein, Frederick W. von.

HOWARD, FRANCIS W., Columbus, Ohio: Educational Association, The Catholic.

HUDLESTON, GILBERT ROGER, O.S.B., Downside Abbey, Bath, England: Downside Abbey.

HUNT, LEIGH, Professor of Art, College of the City of New York: Dolci, Carlo; Domenichino; Drevet Family, The; Edelinck.

HUNTER-BLAIR, D. O., Bart., O.S.B., M.A., Oxford, England: Dorchester, Abbey of; Douglas, Gavin; Dryburgh Abbey; Dunbar, William; Dundrennan, Abbey of; Dunfermline, Abbey of; Dunkeld, Diocese of; Edinburgh.

HYVERNAT, HENRY, D.D., Catholic University of America, Washington: Egypt; Elishé; Eznik.

JOUVE, ODORIC-M., O.F.M., Candiac, Canada: Dolbeau, Jean.

KELLY, JAMES J., D.D., V.G., Athlone, Ireland: Elphin, Diocese of.

KELLY, LEO A., Ph.B., Rochester, New York: Exuperius, Saint.

KENDAL, JAMES, S.J., Bulawayo, Rhodesia, South Africa: Fate.

KENNEDY, THOMAS, B.A. (R.U.I.), London: Epact.

KETTENBURG, PHILIPP BARON, Chaplain at St. Ansgar's Church, Copenhagen, Denmark: Eskil.

KIRSCH, Mgr. J. P., Professor of Patrology and Christian Archæology, University of Fribourg, Switzerland: Dionysius, Saint, Pope; Donation of Constantine; Dympna, Saint; Ebendorfer, Thomas; Eck (Eckius), Johann; Egbert, Archbishop of Trier; Ekkehard (monks); Eleutherius, Saint, Pope; Emerentiana, Saint; Euphrasia, Saint; Euphrosyne, Saint; Eusebius, Saint, Pope; Eutychianus, Pope; Evaristus, Saint, Pope; Eymeric, Nicolas; Fabiola, Saint; Farlati, Daniele.

KURTH, GODEFROID, Director, Belgian Historical Institute, Rome: Egmont, Lamoral, Count of.

LABOURT, JERÔME, S.T.D., Litt.D., Member of the Asiatic Society of Paris, Paris: Ephraem, Saint.

LADEUZE, P., S.T.D., Professor of Sacred Scripture and of Ancient Christian Literature, University of Louvain; President, Collège du Saint Esprit, Louvain: Ephesians, Epistle to the.

LALANDE, LOUIS, S.J., Montreal: Faber, Matthias.

† LE BARS, JEAN, B.A., Litt.D., Member of the Asiatic Society of Paris: Epée, Charles-Michel de l'.

LEBRUN, CHARLES, C.J.M., S.T.D., Superior, Holy Heart Seminary, Halifax, Nova Scotia: Eudes, Jean, Venerable; Eudists.

LEHMKUHL, AUGUSTINUS, S.J., St. Ignatius College, Valkenburg, Holland: Divorce (in Moral Theology).

† Deceased.

LEJAY, PAUL, Fellow of the University of France, Professor, Institut Catholique, Paris: Dracontius, Blossius Æmilius; Duc, Fronton du; Du Cange, Charles Dufresne; Dupin, Louis-Ellies; Ennodius, Magnus Felix; Epiphanius (Scholasticus); Evagrius (Scholasticus).

LETELLIER, A., S.S.S., Superior, Fathers of the Blessed Sacrament, New York: Eymard, Pierre-Julien, Venerable.

LILLY, WILLIAM SAMUEL, LL.M., Honorary Fellow of Peterhouse, Cambridge, London: England Since the Reformation.

LIMBROCK, EBERHARD, S.V.D., Prefect Apostolic of German New Guinea: Divine Word, Society of the.

LINDSAY, LIONEL ST. GEORGE, B.Sc., Ph.D., Editor-in-Chief, "La Nouvelle France", Quebec: Dosquet, Pierre-Herman; Duvernay, Ludger; Esglis, Louis-Philippe Mariauchau d'; Faillon, Etienne-Michel; Faribault, George-Barthélemy.

LINEHAN, PAUL H., B.A., Instructor, College of the City of New York: Faa di Bruno, Francesco.

LINS, JOSEPH, Freiburg, Germany: Dresden.

LOUGHLIN, Mgr. JAMES F., S.T.D., Philadelphia: Disciples of Christ; Discussions, Religious; Drexel, Francis Anthony; Egan, Michael; Eugene III, Blessed, Pope; Eugene IV, Pope; Faith, Protestant Confessions of.

LOWTH, CATHERINE MARY, R.S.H., Mistress of Studies, Convent of the Sacred Heart, Manhattanville, New York: Duchesne, Philippine-Rose.

LUCAS, HERBERT, S.J., Stonyhurst College, Blackburn, England: Ecclesiastical Architecture.

LUZIO, SALVATORE, D.D., Ph.D., J.U.D., Professor of Canon Law, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, Dublin: Exequatur.

MAAS, A. J., S.J., Rector, Woodstock College, Maryland: Editions of the Bible; Elect; Elohim; Emmanuel; Engaddi; Ephod; Epistle (in Scripture); Esch, Nicolaus van; Evagrius (Ponticus); Exegesis; Fabri, Honoré.

McDONALD, WALTER, D.D., Prefect of the Dunboyne Establishment, Maynooth College, Dublin: Eternity.

McMAHON, ARTHUR L., O.P., St. Dominic's Priory, San Francisco: Eckhart, Johann, Meister; Esther; Faber, Felix; Faber, Johann Augustanus.

McNEAL, J. PRESTON, A.B., LL.B., Baltimore: Eccleston, Samuel.

McNEAL, MARK J., S.J., Woodstock College, Maryland: Eugenius I and II, Archbishops of Toledo; Eugenius of Carthage, Saint; Eulogius of Alexandria, Saint.

MACPHERSON, EWAN, New York: Dominican Republic; Eata, Saint; Egwin, Saint; Ethelbert, Saint; Etheldreda, Saint.

MAERE, R., D.D., Professor of Christian Archæology, University of Louvain: Diptych; Evangeliaria, Ornamentation of.

MAGNIER, JOHN, C.SS.R., Rome: Donders, Peter.

MAHER, MICHAEL, S.J., D.Litt., M.A. (London), Director of Studies and Professor of Pedagogics, St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst, Blackburn, England: Dualism; Energy, The Law of the Conservation of; Fatalism.

MANN, HORACE K., Headmaster, St. Cuthbert's Grammar School, Newcastle-on-Tyne, England: Eugene I, Saint, Pope; Eugene II, Pope.

MARTINDALE, CYRIL C., S.J., B.A. (Oxon.), Professor of Classics, Manresa House, Roehampton, London: Epiphany.

MARY CAMILLUS, SISTER, Directress of Studies, Academy of Notre Dame of Providence, Newport, Kentucky: Divine Providence, Sisters of.

MARY PHILOMENA, SISTER, St. Joseph's Convent of the Faithful Companions of Jesus, Fitchburg, Massachusetts: Faithful Companions of Jesus, Society of the.

MARY THERESIA, MOTHER, Provincial Superior, Sisters of Divine Providence, Mt. Immaculate Convent, Pittsburg, Pennsylvania: Divine Providence, Sisters of.

MEEHAN, ANDREW B., Ph.D., S.T.D., Professor of Canon Law and Liturgy, St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester, New York: Endowment; Examination; Examiners, Apostolic; Examiners, Synodal; Executor, Apostolic; Expeditors, Apostolic; Faculties, Canonical.

MEEHAN, THOMAS F., New York: Directories, Catholic (United States); Donahoe, Patrick; Dornin, Bernard and Thomas Aloysius; Ducoudray, Philippe-Charles; Duluth, Diocese of; Emigrant Aid Societies; Eucharistic Congresses; Faro, Diocese of.

MEIER, GABRIEL, O.S.B., Einsiedeln, Switzerland: Dorothea, Saint; Engelbert of Cologne, Saint; Erhard of Ratisbon, Saint; Eucharius, Saint; Eugendus, Saint; Fabian, Saint, Pope.

MERSHMAN, FRANCIS, O.S.B., S.T.D., Professor of Moral Theology, Canon Law, and Liturgy, St. John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota: Döring, Matthias; Elizabeth of Reute, Blessed; Elizabeth of Schönau, Saint; Ember-Days; Eusebius, Saint (Presbyter at Rome); Eustachius and Companions, Saints; Faldstool.

MINGES, PARTHENIUS, O.F.M., S.T.L., Ph.D., Prefect, Collegio San Bonaventura, Quaracchi, near Florence, Italy: Duns Scotus, John.

MOELLER, FERDINAND A., S.J., Chicago: Education of the Deaf and Dumb.

MOONEY, JAMES, United States Ethnologist, Washington: Domenech, Emmanuel-Henri-Dieudonné; Duponceau, Peter Stephen; Eskimo; Espejo, Antonio.

MORICE, A. G., O.M.I., St. Boniface, Manitoba: Fabre, Joseph; Faraud, Henri.

MORRISROE, PATRICK, Dean and Professor of Liturgy, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, Dublin: Dominus Vobiscum.

MOUGEL, AMBROSE, O.Cart., Charterhouse of St. Hugh, Parkminster, England: Dominic of Prussia.

MUCKERMANN, H., S.J., Professor of Biology St. Ignatius College, Valkenburg, Holland: Evolution (History and Scientific Foundations).

MURPHY, JOHN F. X., S.J., Woodstock College, Maryland: Faith, Hope, and Charity, Saints.

MYERS, EDWARD, M.A. (Cantab.), Professor of Dogmatic Theology and of Patrology, St. Edmund's College, Ware, England: Dominis, Marco Antonio De; Ethelhard; Eunomianism.

NUGENT, PETER, O.S.B., Master of Novices, Erdington Abbey, Birmingham, England: Erdington Abbey.

O'CONNOR, JOHN B., O.P., Assistant Editor, "Rosary Magazine", Somerset, Ohio: Dominic, Saint.

OESTREICH, THOMAS, O.S.B., Professor of Church History and Sacred Scripture, Maryhelp Abbey, Belmont, North Carolina: Dioscorus, Antipope; Donus, Pope.

O'NEILL, JAMES D., A.M., S.T.D., Highland Park, Illinois: Escobar y Mendoza, Antonio; Falsity; Familiars; Fast.

OTT, MICHAEL, O.S.B., Ph.D., Professor of the History of Philosophy, St. John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota: Dithmar; Droste-Vischering, Clemens August von; Durand Ursin; Ebbo; Edesius and Frumentius; Eisengrein, Martin; Ems, Congress of; Engelbert (Abbot); Erthal, Franz Ludwig von; Erthal, Friedrich Karl Joseph, Freiherr von; Eusebius, Saint, Bishop of Vercelli; Eusebius, Saint, Bishop of Samosata; Eustathius, Saint; Eustochium, Julia, Saint; Euthymius, Saint.

PACE, EDWARD A., Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Psychology, Catholic University of America, Washington: Doctor; Dulia; Education; Ex Cathedra.

PALLEN, CONDÉ BENOIST, A.M., Ph.D., LL.D., New Rochelle, New York: Donoso Cortés.

PETIT, L., A.A., Constantinople: Durazzo, Archdiocese of.

PÉTRIDÈS, S., A.A., Constantinople: Dioclea; Diocletianopolis; Dionysias; Docimium; Doliche; Domitiopolis; Drusipara; Echinus; Elæa; Eucarpia; Eudoxias; Eumenia; Eurœa.

PHILLIPS, EDWARD C., S.J., Ph.D., Professor of Physics, Boston College, Boston, Massachusetts: Fagnano, Giulio Carlo de' Toschi di.

PHILLIPS, G. E., Professor of Philosophy and Church History, St. Cuthbert's College, Ushaw, Durham, England: Edmund the Martyr, Saint; Edward the Confessor, Saint; Edward the Martyr, Saint; Edwin, Saint; Egbert, Saint; Elined, Saint.

POHLE, JOSEPH, S.T.D., Ph.D., Licentiate of Canon Law. Breslau, Germany: Eucharist.

POLLEN, JOHN HUNGERFORD, S.J., London: Eadmer; English Confessors and Martyrs.

POOLE, THOMAS H., New York: Dome; Entablature; Ernulf; Escorial, The; Exedra; Façade.

POPE, HUGH, O.P., Hawkesyard Priory, Rugeley, England: Faith; Faith, The Rule of.

POULAIN, AUGUSTIN, S.J., Paris: Ecstasy.

QUINN, ARTHUR HOBSON, Assistant Professor of English, University of Pennsylvania: Dryden, John and Charles.

QUINN, STANLEY J., New York: Edwy; Egfrid.

REILLY, W. S., S.S., S.T.D., St. Stephen's Biblical School, Jerusalem: Dives; Drusilla.

REINHOLD, GREGOR, Freiburg, Germany: Elba; Elizabeth Associations; Ermland.

REMY, ARTHUR F. J., A.M., Ph.D., Adjunct Professor of Germanic Philology, Columbia University, New York: Edda; Eyb, Albrecht von; Ezzo.

ROBINSON, PASCHAL, O.F.M., Rome: Eccleston, Thomas of; Elias of Cortona.

ROCK, P. M. J., Louisville, Kentucky: Disparity of Worship; Elder, George.

ROMPEL, JOSEF HEINRICH, S.J., Ph.D., Stella Matutina College, Feldkirch, Austria: Endlicher, Stephan Ladislaus.

ROY, J. EDMOND, Litt.D., F.R.S.C., Officer of the French Academy, Director, "Notarial Review", Lévis, Quebec: Du Lhut, Daniel Greysolon; Esnambuc, Pierre Bélain Sieur d'.

RUDGE, FLORENCE MARIE, M.A., Youngstown, Ohio: Divine Charity, Society of; Divine Providence, Sisters of; Divine Redeemer, Daughters of the; Divine Saviour, Society of the.

RUSSELL, MATTHEW, S.J., Dublin: Dromore, Diocese of.

RYAN, JOHN A., S.T.D., Professor of Moral Theology, The St. Paul Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota: Family.

RYAN, MICHAEL JAMES, Ph.D., S.T.D., Professor of Logic and of the History of Philosophy, St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester, New York: Epicureanism.

RYAN, PATRICK, S.J., London: Edmund Arrowsmith, Venerable; Elphege, Saint; Ethelbert, Saint (King of the East Angles); Ethelwold, Saint.

SÄGMÜLLER, JOHANNES BAPTIST, Professor of Theology, University of Tübingen, Würtemberg, Germany: Drey, Johann Sebastian von; Emancipation, Ecclesiastical; Exclusion, Right of; Exemption.

SALMON, Very Rev. ERNEST M., President of St. Michael's College, Winooski Park, Vermont: Edmund, Congregation of Saint.

SALTET, LOUIS, Professor of Church History, Institut Catholique, Toulouse, France: False Decretals.

SAUER, JOSEPH, S.T.D., Editor, "Rundschau", Professor of Theology, University of Freiburg, Germany: Encyclopedia; Ensingen; Erasmus, Desiderius.

SAUVAGE, G. M., C.S.C., S.T.D., Ph.D., Professor of Dogmatic Theology, Holy Cross College, Washington: Eclecticism.

SCANNELL, T. B., S.T.D., Weybridge, England: Diocletian; Doctrine, Christian; Domitian.

SCHAEFER, FRANCIS J., S.T.D., Ph.D., Professor of Church History, The St. Paul Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota: Dobmayer, Marian; Dunin, Martin von; Eckebert; Eusebius Bruno; Eustathius (Archbishop of Thessalonica); Faribault, Jean-Baptiste.

SCHEID, N., S.J., Stella Matutina College, Feldkirch, Austria: Drach, David-Paul; Dreves, Lebrecht Blücher; Eichendorff, Freiherr von.

SCHETS, JOSEPH, Etten near Breda, Holland: Ezechiel.

SCHLAGER, HEINRICH PATRICIUS, O.F.M., Harreveld near Lichtenvoorde, Holland: Dudik, Breda Franciscus; Eberhard, Matthias; Eberhard of Ratisbon; Echter von Mespelbrunn, Julius; Eckhart, Johann Georg von; Einhard; Ekkehard of Aura.

SCHROEDER, JOSEPH, O.P., Immaculate Conception College, Washington: Erbermann, Veit; Ernst of Hesse-Rheinfels; Faber, Johann (of Heilbronn).

SCHUMACHER, MATTHEW, C.S.C., Ph.D., S.T.B., Director of Studies, University of Notre Dame, Indiana: Faber, Johann (of Leutkirch).

SCHWERTNER, THOMAS M., O.P., Immaculate Conception College, Washington: Dominici, Giovanni, Blessed; Doré, Pierre; Durandus of Saint-Pourçain; Ebner; Echard, Jacques; Emser, Hieronymus.

SELINGER, JOSEPH, S.T.D., Jefferson City, Missouri: Espousals.

SHANLEY, JOHN, D.D., Bishop of Fargo, North Dakota: Fargo, Diocese of.

SHARPE, ALFRED BOWYER, M.A. (Oxon.), Saffron Walden, Essex, England: Doubt; Eusebius of Dorylæum; Evil.

SIEGFRIED, FRANCIS PATRICK, Professor of Philosophy, St. Charles's Seminary, Overbrook, Pennsylvania: Empiricism; Extension.

SLOANE, CHARLES WILLIAM, New York: Donation (in Civil Jurisprudence); Dower.

SLOANE, THOMAS O'CONOR, A.M., E.M., Ph.D., New York: Dumas, Jean-Baptiste; Elhuyar y de Suvisa, Fausto de.

SMITH, WALTER GEORGE, A.M., LL.B. (U. of P.), Philadelphia: Divorce (in Civil Jurisprudence).

SOLLIER, JOSEPH FRANCIS, S.M., S.T.D., San Francisco: Donnet, Ferdinand-François-Auguste; Dubois, Guillaume; Dupanloup, Félix-Antoine; Duprat, Antoine; Durandus of Troarn; Duvergier de Hauranne, Jean.

SOUVAY, CHARLES L., C.M., LL.B., S.T.D., Ph.D., Professor of Holy Scripture and Hebrew, Kenrick Seminary, St. Louis: Disciple; Dreams, Interpretation of; Elias; Elizabeth; Esdras; Evangelist.

SPILLANE, EDWARD P., S.J., Associate Editor, "America", New York: Dobrizhoffer, Martin; Doutreleau, Stephen; Dubois, Jean-Antoine; Ducrue, Francis Bennon; Eckart, Anselm.

STADELMAN, JOSEPH M., S.J., New York: Education of the Blind.

STIGLMAYR, JOSEPH, S.J., Professor of Latin, Greek, and German, Stella Matutina College, Feldkirch, Austria: Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite.

STONE, J. M., London: Downes, Thomas.

STUART, J. C., St. Joseph's College, Dubuque, Iowa: Dubuque, Archdiocese of.

TAAFFE, THOMAS GAFFNEY, Ph.D., Instructor in English Literature, College of the City of New York: Dolman, Charles.

THURSTON, HERBERT, S.J., London: Diplomatics, Papal; Directories, Catholic (First Part); Domesday Book; Dominical Letter; Easter Controversy; Elevation, The; Encyclical; England Before the Reformation; Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament.

TOKE, LESLIE ALEXANDER ST. LAWRENCE, B.A., Stratton-on-the-Fosse, near Bath, England: Dubric, Saint; Dunchadh, Saint; Dunstan, Saint.

TONER, PATRICK J., D.D., Professor of Dogmatic Theology, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, Dublin: Eschatology; Exorcism; Exorcist; Extreme Unction.

TURNER, WILLIAM, B.A., S.T.D., Professor of Logic and of the History of Philosophy, Catholic University of America, Washington: Donatus of Fiesole; Dungal; Eriugena, John Scotus; Exul Hibernicus.

URQUHART, FRANCIS FORTESCUE, M.A., Lecturer in Modern History, Balliol College, Oxford: Fabyan, Robert.

VAILHÉ, SIMÉON, A.A., Member of the Russian Archæological Institute of Constantinople, Professor of Sacred Scripture and History at the Theological Seminary of Kadi-Keui, Constantinople: Dora; Dorylæum; Edessa; Eleutheropolis; Elusa; Emesa; Emmaus; Eperies, Diocese of; Ephesus; Epiphania; Erythræ; Erzerum, Diocese of; Euaria; Europus; Famagusta.

VAN CLEEF, AUGUSTUS, New York: Echave, Baltasar de.

VAN DEN BIESEN, C., S.T.D., Cloakham, Axminster, England: Drachma.

VAN DER ESSEN, LÉON, Litt.D., Ph.D., Collège du Pape. Louvain, Belgium: Eleutherius, Saint, Bishop of Tournai; Eligius, Saint.

VAN HOVE, A., D.C.L., Professor of Church History and of Canon Law, University of Louvain: Diocese; Donation (in Canon Law); Dumoulin, Charles; Engel, Ludwig; Enthronization; Espen, Zeger Bernhard van; Expectative; Extravagantes; Fabrica Ecclesiæ; Fagnani, Prospero.

WAGGAMAN, MARY TERESA, Georgetown, D. C.: Dorsey, Anne Hanson.

WALKER, CHARLTON BENEDICT, B.A., Oxford: Exultet.

WALSH, JAMES J., M.D., Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of the History of Medicine, Fordham University, New York: Dupuytren, Guillaume; Eustachius, Bartolomeo; Fabricius, Hieronymus; Fallopio, Gabriello.

WARD, Mgr. BERNARD, President, St. Edmund's College, Ware, England: Douai, Town and University of; Douay Bible; Erastus and Erastianism; Establishment, The.

WARREN, KATE MARY, Lecturer in English Literature under University of London at Westfield College, Hampstead, London: English Literature.

WASMANN, ERIC, S.J., Luxemburg: Evolution, Attitude of Catholics towards.

WILHELM, J., S.T.D., Ph.D., Battle, Sussex, England: Evangelical Church (in Prussia).

WILLIAMS, THOMAS LEIGHTON, B.A. (Cantab.), St. Edmund's College, Ware, England: Edward III.

WILLIAMSON, GEORGE CHARLES, Litt.D., London: Dossi, Giovanni; Doyle, John; Doyle, Richard; Dyck, Antoon van; Ecclesiastical Art; Engelbrechtsen, Cornelis; Eycken, Jean Baptiste van; Falco, Juan Conchillos.

WITTMANN, PIUS, Ph.D., Reichsarchivrat, Munich: Faroe Islands.

Tables of Abbreviations

The following tables and notes are intended to guide readers of THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA in interpreting those abbreviations, signs, or technical phrases which, for economy of space, will be most frequently used in the work. For more general information see the article ABBREVIATIONS, ECCLESIASTICAL.

I.—General Abbreviations.

a. . . . article.
ad an. . . . at the year (Lat. *ad annum*).
an., ann. . . . the year, the years (Lat. *annus, anni*).
ap. . . . in (Lat. *apud*).
art. . . . article.
Assyr. . . . Assyrian.
A. S. . . . Anglo-Saxon.
A. V. . . . Authorized Version (i.e. tr. of the Bible authorized for use in the Anglican Church—the so-called "King James", *or* "Protestant Bible").
b. . . . born.
Bk. . . . Book.
Bl. . . . Blessed.
C., c. . . . about (Lat. *circa*); canon; chapter; *compagnie*.
can. . . . canon.
cap. . . . chapter (Lat. *caput*—used only in Latin context).
cf. . . . compare (Lat. *confer*).
cod. . . . codex.
col . . . column.
concl. . . . conclusion.
const., constit. . . . Lat. *constitutio*.
curâ. . . . by the industry of.
d. . . . died.
dict. . . . dictionary (Fr. *dictionnaire*).
disp. . . . Lat. *disputatio*.
diss. . . . Lat. *dissertatio*.
dist. . . . Lat. *distinctio*.
D. V. . . . Douay Version.
ed., edit. . . . edited, edition, editor.
Ep., Epp. . . . letter, letters (Lat. *epistola*).
Fr. . . . French.
gen. . . . genus.
Gr. . . . Greek.
H. E., Hist. Eccl. . Ecclesiastical History.
Heb., Hebr. . . . Hebrew.
ib., ibid. . . . in the same place (Lat. *ibidem*).
Id. . . . the same person, *or* author (Lat. *idem*).
inf. . . . below (Lat. *infra*).
It. . . . Italian.
l. c., loc. cit. . . . at the place quoted (Lat. *loco citato*).
Lat. . . . Latin.
lat. . . . latitude.
lib. . . . book (Lat. *liber*).
long. . . . longitude.
Mon. . . . Lat. *Monumenta*.
MS., MSS. . . . manuscript, manuscripts.
n., no. . . . number.
N. T. . . . New Testament.
Nat. . . . National.
Old Fr., O. Fr. . . . Old French.
op. cit. . . . in the work quoted (Lat. *opere citato*).
Ord. . . . Order.
O. T. . . . Old Testament.
p., pp. . . . page, pages, *or* (in Latin references) *pars* (part).
par. . . . paragraph.
passim. . . . in various places.
pt. . . . part.
Q. . . . Quarterly (a periodical), e.g. "Church Quarterly".
Q., QQ., quæst. . . . question, questions (Lat. *quæstio*).
q. v. . . . which [title] see (Lat. *quod vide*).
Rev. . . . Review (a periodical).
R. S. . . . Rolls Series.
R. V. . . . Revised Version.
S., SS. . . . Lat. *Sanctus, Sancti*, "Saint", "Saints"—used in this Encyclopedia only in Latin context.
Sept. . . . Septuagint.
Sess. . . . Session.
Skt. . . . Sanskrit.
Sp. . . . Spanish.
sq., sqq. . . . following page, *or* pages (Lat. *sequens*).
St., Sts. . . . Saint, Saints.
sup. . . . Above (Lat. *supra*).
s. v. . . . Under the corresponding title (Lat. *sub voce*).
tom . . . volume (Lat. *tomus*).

tr. . . . . translation *or* translated. By itself it means "English translation", *or* "translated into English by". Where a translation is into any other language, the language is stated.

tr., tract. . . . . tractate.

v. . . . . see (Lat. *vide*).

Ven. . . . . Venerable.

Vol. . . . . Volume.

II.—Abbreviations of Titles.

Acta SS. . . . . *Acta Sanctorum* (Bollandists).

Ann. pont. cath. . . . . Battandier, *Annuaire pontifical catholique.*

Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath. Gillow, Bibliographical Dictionary of the English Catholics.

Dict. Christ. Antiq. . . Smith and Cheetham (ed.), Dictionary of Christian Antiquities.

Dict. Christ. Biog. . . Smith and Wace (ed.), Dictionary of Christian Biography.

Dict. d'arch. chrét. . . Cabrol (ed.), *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie.*

Dict. de théol. cath. . Vacant and Mangenot (ed.), *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique.*

Dict. Nat. Biog. . . . . Stephen and Lee (ed.), Dictionary of National Biography.

Hast., Dict. of the Bible . . . . . Hastings (ed.), A Dictionary of the Bible.

Kirchenlex. . . . . Wetzer and Welte, *Kirchenlexicon.*

P. G. . . . . Migne (ed.), *Patres Græci.*

P. L. . . . . Migne (ed.), *Patres Latini.*

Vig., Dict. de la Bible. Vigouroux (ed.), *Dictionnaire de la Bible.*

Note I.—Large Roman numerals standing alone indicate volumes. Small Roman numerals standing alone indicate chapters. Arabic numerals standing alone indicate pages. In other cases the divisions are explicitly stated. Thus "Rashdall, Universities of Europe, I, ix" refers the reader to the ninth chapter of the first volume of that work; "I, p. ix" would indicate the ninth page of the preface of the same volume.

Note II.—Where St. Thomas (Aquinas) is cited without the name of any particular work the reference is always to "Summa Theologica" (not to "Summa Philosophiæ"). The divisions of the "Summa Theol." are indicated by a system which may best be understood by the following example: "I-II, Q. vi, a. 7, ad 2 um" refers the reader to the *seventh* article of the *sixth* question in the *first* part of the *second* part, in the response to the *second* objection.

Note III.—The abbreviations employed for the various books of the Bible are obvious. Ecclesiasticus is indicated by *Ecclus.*, to distinguish it from Ecclesiastes (*Eccles.*). It should also be noted that I and II Kings in D. V. correspond to I and II Samuel in A. V.; and I and II Par. to I and II Chronicles. Where, in the spelling of a proper name, there is a marked difference between the D. V. and the A. V., the form found in the latter is added, in parentheses.

Full Page Illustrations in Volume V

	PAGE
Frontispiece in Colour	
Ivory Diptychs	22
The Madonna and Four Doctors of the Church—Moretto	74
Domes	102
The Communion of St. Jerome—Domenichino	103
St. Dominic—Titian	108
St. George—Donatello	116
The Court Church, Dresden	158
Dryburgh Abbey	166
Glendalough, County Wicklow, Ireland	170
Durham Cathedral	212
Charles I, Henrietta Maria, and Their Children—Van Dyck	220
Complutensian Polyglot	288
Natives Drawing Water on the Nile, etc.	340
The Tables of Abydos, etc.	341
St. Elizabeth of Hungary	390
Ely Cathedral	396
St. Albans Abbey	450
The Adoration of the Magi—Ghirlandajo	506
Erasmus—Holbein	512
The Escorial	534
Multiplication of the Loaves and Fishes	592
Exeter Cathedral	708
Façades	746

Maps

Sees of the Oriental Rites	240
Ancient Egypt	352
Ecclesiastical Map of North Africa	362
England and Wales—The Ecclesiastical Province of Westminster	444
England from the 12th Century to the Schism of Henry VIII	456
Christendom A.D. 622	612

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA

D

Diocese (Lat. *diœcesis*), the territory or churches subject to the jurisdiction of a bishop (q. v.).

I. Origin of Term.—Originally the term *diocese* (Gr. διοίκησις) signified management of a household, thence administration or government in general. This term was soon used in Roman law to designate the territory dependent for its administration upon a city (*civitas*). What in Latin was called *ager*, or *territorium*, namely a district subject to a city, was habitually known in the Roman East as a *diœcesis*. But as the Christian bishop generally resided in a *civitas*, the territory administered by him, being usually conterminous with the juridical territory of the city, came to be known ecclesiastically by its usual civil term, *diocese*. This name was also given to the administrative subdivision of some provinces ruled by legates (*legati*) under the authority of the governor of the province. Finally, Diocletian designated by this name the twelve great divisions which he established in the empire, and over each of which he placed a *vicarius* (Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Stuttgart, 1903, V, 1, 716 sqq.). The original term for local groups of the faithful subject to a bishop was ἐκκλησία (church), and at a later date, παροικία, i. e. the neighbourhood (Lat. *parœcia, parochia*). The Apostolic Canons (xiv, xv), and the Council of Nicæa in 325 (can. xvi) applied this latter term to the territory subject to a bishop. This term was retained in the East, where the Council of Constantinople (381) reserved the word *diocese* for the territory subject to a patriarch (can. ii). In the West also *parochia* was long used to designate an episcopal see. About 850 Leo IV, and about 1095 Urban II, still employed *parochia* to denote the territory subject to the jurisdiction of a bishop. Alexander III (1159–1181) designated under the name of *parochiani* the subjects of a bishop (c. 4, C. X, qu. 1; c. 10, C. IX, qu. 2; c. 9, X, De testibus, II, 20). On the other hand, the present meaning of the word *diocese* is met with in Africa at the end of the fourth century (cc. 50, 51, C. XVI, qu. 1), and afterwards in Spain, where the term *parochia*, occurring in the ninth canon of the Council of Antioch, held in 341, was translated by "diocese" (c. 2, C. IX, qu. 3). See also the ninth canon of the Synod of Toledo, in 589 (Hefele, ad h. an. and c. 6, C. X, qu. 3). This usage finally became general in the West, though *diocese* was sometimes used to indicate parishes in the present sense of the word (see Parish). In Gaul, the words *terminus, territorium, civitas, pagus*, are also met with.

II. Historical Origin.—It is impossible to determine what rules were followed at the origin of the Church in limiting the territory over which each bishop exercised his authority. Universality of ecclesiastical jurisdiction was a personal prerogative of the Apostles; their successors, the bishops, enjoyed only a jurisdiction limited to a certain territory: thus Ignatius was Bishop of Antioch, and Polycarp, of Smyrna. The first Christian communities, quite like the Jewish, were established in towns. The converts who lived in the neighbourhood naturally joined with the community of the town for the celebration of the Sacred Mysteries. Exact limitations of episcopal territory could not have engrossed much attention at the beginning of Christianity; it would have been quite impracticable. As a matter of fact, the extent of the diocese was determined by the domain itself over which the bishop exercised his influence. It seems certain, on the other hand, that, in the East at any rate, by the middle of the third century each Christian community of any importance had become the residence of a bishop and constituted a diocese. There were bishops in the country districts as well as in the towns. The chorepiscopi (ἐν χώρᾳ ἐπίσκοποι), or rural bishops, were bishops, it is generally thought, as well as those of the towns; though from about the second half of the third century their powers were little by little curtailed, and they were made dependent on the bishops of the towns. To this rule Egypt was an exception; Alexandria was for a long time the only see in Egypt. The number of Egyptian dioceses, however, multiplied rapidly during the third century, so that in 320 there were about a hundred bishops present at the Council of Alexandria. The number of dioceses was also quite large in some parts of the Western Church, i. e. in Southern Italy and in Africa. In other regions of Europe, either Christianity had as yet a small number of adherents, or the bishops reserved to themselves supreme authority over extensive districts. Thus, in this early period but few dioceses existed in Northern Italy, Gaul, Germany, Britain, and Spain. In the last, however, their number increased rapidly during the third century. The increase of the faithful in small towns and country districts soon made it necessary to determine exactly the limits of the territory of each church. The cities of the empire, with their clearly defined suburban districts, offered limits that were easily acceptable. From the fourth century on it was generally admitted that every city ought to have its bishop, and that his territory was bounded by that of the neighbouring city. This rule was stringently applied in the East. Although Innocent I declared in 415 that the Church was not bound to conform itself to all the civil divisions which the imperial government chose to introduce, the Council of Chalcedon ordered (451) that if a *civitas* were dismembered by imperial authority, the ecclesiastical organization ought also to be modified (can. xvii). In the West, the Council of Sardica (344) forbade in its sixth canon the establishment of dioceses in towns not populous enough to render desirable their elevation to the dignity of episcopal residences. At the same time many Western sees included the territories of several *civitates*.

From the fourth century we have documentary evidence of the manner in which the dioceses were created. According to the Council of Sardica (can. vi);

this belonged to the provincial synod; the Council of Carthage, in 407, demanded moreover the consent of the primate and of the bishop of the diocese to be divided (canons iv and v). The consent of the pope or the emperor was not called for. In 446, however, Pope Leo I ruled that dioceses should not be established except in large towns and populous centres (c. 4, Dist. lxxx). In the same period the Apostolic See was active in the creation of dioceses in the Burgundian kingdom and in Italy. In the latter country many of the sees had no other metropolitan than the pope, and were thus more closely related to him. Even clearer is his rôle in the formation of the diocesan system in the northern countries newly converted to Christianity. After the first successes of St. Augustine in England, Gregory the Great provided for the establishment of two metropolitan sees, each of which included two dioceses. In Ireland, the diocesan system was introduced by St. Patrick, though the diocesan territory was usually coextensive with the tribal lands, and the system itself was soon peculiarly modified by the general extension of monasticism (see IRELAND). In Scotland, however, the diocesan organization dates only from the twelfth century. To the Apostolic See also was due the establishment of dioceses in that part of Germany which had been evangelized by St. Boniface. In the Frankish Empire the boundaries of the dioceses followed the earlier Gallo-Roman municipal system, though the Merovingian kings never hesitated to change them by royal authority and without pontifical intervention. In the creation of new dioceses no mention is made of papal authority. The Carlovingian kings and their successors, the Western emperors, notably the Ottos (936–1002), sought papal authority for the creation of new dioceses. Since the eleventh century it has been the rule that the establishment of new dioceses is peculiarly a right of the Apostolic See. St. Peter Damian proclaimed (1059–60) this as a general principle (c. 1, Dist. xxii), and the same is affirmed in the well-known "Dictatus" of Gregory VII (1073–1085). The papal decretals (see DECRETALS, PAPAL) consider the creation of a new diocese as one of the *causæ majores*, i. e. matters of special importance, reserved to the pope alone (c. 1, X, De translatione episcopi, I, 7; c. 1, X, De officio legati, I, 30) and of which he is the sole judge (c. 5, Extrav. communes, De præbendis et dignitatibus, III, 2). A word of mention is here due to the missionary or regionary bishops, *episcopi gentium*, *episcopi* (*archiepiscopi*) *in gentibus*, still found in the eleventh century. They had no fixed territory or diocese, but were sent into a country or district for the purpose of evangelizing it. Such were St. Boniface in Germany, St. Augustine in England, and St. Willibrord in the Netherlands. They were themselves the organizers of the diocese, after their apostolic labours had produced happy results. The bishops met with in some monasteries of Gaul in the earlier Middle Ages, probably in imitation of Irish conditions, had no administrative functions (see Bellesheim, Gesch. d. kath. Kirche in Irland, I, 226–30, and Löning, below).

III. CREATION AND MODIFICATION OF DIOCESES.—We have noticed above that after the eleventh century the sovereign pontiff reserved to himself the creation of dioceses. In the actual discipline, as already stated, all that touches the diocese is a *causa major*, i. e. one of those important matters in which the bishop possesses no authority whatever and which the pope reserves exclusively to himself. Since the episcopate is of Divine institution, the pope is obliged to establish dioceses in the Catholic Church, but he remains sole judge of the time and manner, and alone determines what flock shall be entrusted to each bishop. Generally speaking, the diocese is a territorial circumscription, but sometimes the bishop possesses authority only over certain classes of persons residing in the territory; this is principally the case in districts where both the Western and the Eastern Rite are followed. Whatever, therefore, pertains to the creation or suppression of dioceses, changes in their boundaries, and the like is within the pope's exclusive province. As a general rule, the preparatory work is done by the Congregation of the Consistory, by Propaganda when the question relates to territories subject to this congregation, and by the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs when the establishment of a diocese is governed by concordats (q. v.), or when the civil power of the country has the right to intervene in their creation. We shall take up successively (1) the creation of new dioceses; (2) the various modifications to which they are subject, included by canonists under the term *Innovatio*.

(1) *Creation of Dioceses.*—Strictly speaking, it is only in missionary countries that there can be question of the creation of a diocese, either because the country was never converted to Christianity or because its ancient hierarchy was suppressed, owing to conquest by infidels or the progress of heresy. Regularly, before becoming a diocese, the territory is successively a mission, a prefecture Apostolic, and finally a vicariate Apostolic. The Congregation of Propaganda makes a preliminary study of the question and passes judgment on the opportuneness of the creation of the diocese in question. It considers principally whether the number of Catholics, priests, and religious establishments, i. e. churches, chapels, schools, is sufficiently large to justify the establishment of the proposed diocese. These matters form the subject of a report to Propaganda, to which must be added the number of towns or settlements included in the territory. If there is a city suitable for the episcopal see, the fact is stated, also the financial resources at the disposal of the bishop for the works of religion. There is added, finally, a sketch, if possible accompanied by a map, indicating the territory of the future diocese. As a general rule, a diocese should not include districts whose inhabitants speak different languages or are subject to distinct civil powers (see Instructions of Propaganda, 1798, in Collectanea S. C. de P. F., Rome, 1907, no. 645). Moreover, the general conditions for the creation of a diocese are the same as those required for dividing or "dismembering" a diocese. Of this we shall speak below.

(2) *Modification* (*Innovatio*) *of Dioceses.*—Under this head come the division (*dismembratio*) of dioceses, their union, suppression, and changes of their respective limits.

(a) Division or Dismemberment of a Diocese.—This is reserved to the Holy See. Since the pope is the supreme power in the Church, he is not bound to act in conformity with the canonical enactments which regulate the dismemberment of ecclesiastical benefices. The following rules, however, are those which he generally observes, though he is free to deviate from them.—First, to divide a diocese, a sufficient reason must exist (*causa justa*). The necessity, or at least the utility, of the division must be demonstrated. There is sufficient reason for the subdivision of a diocese if it be too extensive, or the number of the faithful too great, or the means of communication too difficult, to permit the bishop to administer the diocese properly. The benefit which would result to religion (*incrementum cultus divini*) may also be brought forward as a reason for the change. In the main, these reasons are summed up in the one: the hope of forwarding the interests of Catholicism. Dissensions between inhabitants of the same diocese, or the fact that they belong to different nations, may also be considered a sufficient reason. Formerly, the mere fact that the endowment of a diocese was very large —a case somewhat rare at the present day—formed a legitimate reason for its division.

The second condition is suitability of place (*locus congruus*). There should exist in the diocese to be cre-

ated a city or town suitable for the episcopal residence; the ancient discipline which rules that sees should be established only in important localities is still observed.

Third, a proper endowment (*dos congrua*) is requisite. The bishop should have at his disposal the resources necessary for his own maintenance and that of the ecclesiastics engaged in the general administration of the diocese, and for the establishment of a cathedral church, the expenses of Divine worship, and the general administration of the diocese. Formerly it was necessary that in part, at least, this endowment should consist in lands; at present this is not always possible. It suffices if there is a prospect that the new bishop will be able to meet the necessary expenses. In some cases, the civil government grants a subsidy to the bishop; in other cases, he must depend on the liberality of the faithful and on a contribution from the parishes of the diocese, known as the cathedraticum (q. v.).

Fourth, generally for the division of a diocese the consent of the actual incumbent of the benefice is requisite; but the pope is not bound to observe this condition. John XXII ruled that the pope had the right to proceed to the division of a diocese in spite of the opposition of the bishop (c. 5, Extrav. commun., De præbendis, III, 2). As a matter of fact, the pope asks the advice of the archbishop and of all the bishops of the ecclesiastical province in which the diocese to be divided is situated. Often, indeed, the division takes place at the request of the bishop himself.

Fifth, theoretically the consent of the civil power is not required; this would be contrary to the principles of the distinction and mutual independence of the ecclesiastical and civil authority. In many countries, however, the consent of the civil authority is indispensable, either because the Government has pledged itself to endow the occupants of the episcopal sees, or because concordats have regulated this matter, or because a suspicious government would not permit a bishop to administer the new diocese if it were created without civil intervention (see Nussi, Conventiones de rebus ecclesiasticis, Rome, 1869, pp. 19 sqq.). At present, the creation or division of a diocese is done by a pontifical Brief, forwarded by the Secretary of Briefs. As an example, we may mention the Brief of 11 March, 1904, which divided the Diocese of Providence and established the new Diocese of Fall River. The motive prompting this division was the *incrementum religionis* and the *majus bonum animarum;* the Bishop of Providence himself requested the division, and this request was approved by the Archbishop of Boston and by all the bishops of that ecclesiastical province. The examination of the question was submitted to Propaganda and to the Apostolic Delegate at Washington. The pope then created, *motu proprio*, the new diocese, indicated its official title in Latin and in English, and determined its boundaries, which correspond to political divisions, and, finally, fixed the revenues of the bishop. In the case before us these consist in a moderate cathedraticum to be determined by the bishop (*discreto arbitrio episcopi imponendum*). According to the practice of Propaganda, all the priests who at the time of the division exercised the ministry in the dismembered territory belong to the clergy of the new diocese (Rescript of 13 April, 1891, in Collectanea S. C. de P. F., new ed., no. 1751).

(b) Union of Dioceses.—As in the case of the division of a diocese, the union of several dioceses ought to be justified by motives of public utility, e. g. the small number of the faithful, the loss of resources. As in the case of division, the pope is influenced by the advice of persons familiar with the situation; sometimes he asks the advice of the Government, etc. It is a generally recognized principle in the union of benefices, that such union takes effect only after the death of the actual occupant of the see which is to be united to another; at least when he has not given his consent to this union. Though the pope is not bound by this rule, in practice it must be taken into account. The union of dioceses takes place in several ways. There is, first, the *unio æque principalis* or *æqualis* when the two dioceses are entrusted for the purpose of administration to a single bishop, though they remain in all other respects distinct; each of them has its own cathedral chapter, revenues, rights, and privileges, but the bishop of one see becomes the bishop of the other by the mere fact of appointment to one of the two. He cannot resign one without *ipso facto* resigning the other. This situation differs from that in which a bishop administers for a time, or even perpetually, another diocese; in this case there is no union between the two sees. It is in reality a case of plurality of ecclesiastical benefices; the bishop holds two distinct sees, and his nomination must take place according to the rules established for each of the two dioceses. On the contrary, in the case of two or more united dioceses, the election or designation of the candidate must take place by the agreement of those persons in both dioceses who possess the right of election or of designation. Moreover, in the case of united dioceses, the pope sometimes makes special rules for the residence of the bishop, e. g. that he shall reside in each diocese for a part of the year. If the pope makes no decision in this matter, the bishop may reside in the more important diocese, or in that which seems more convenient for the purposes of administration, or even in the diocese which he prefers as a residence. If the bishop resides in one of his dioceses he is considered as present in each of them for those juridical acts which demand his presence. He may also convoke at his discretion two separate diocesan synods for each of the two dioceses or only one for both of them. In other respects the administration of each diocese remains distinct. There are two classes of unequal unions of dioceses (*uniones inæquales*): the *unio subjectiva* or *per accessorium*, seldom put into practice, and the *unio per confusionem*. In the former case, the one diocese retains all its rights and the other loses its rights, obtains those of the principal diocese, and thus becomes a dependency. When a diocese is thus united to another there can be no question of right of election or designation, because such a dependent diocese is conferred by the very fact that the principal diocese possesses a titular. But the administration of the property of each diocese remains distinct and the titular of the principal diocese must assume all the obligations of the united diocese. The second kind of union (*per confusionem*) suppresses the two pre-existing dioceses in order to create a new one; the former dioceses simply cease to exist. To perpetuate the names of the former sees the new bishop sometimes assumes the titles of both, but in administration no account is taken of the fact that they were formerly separate sees. Such a union is equivalent to the suppression of the dioceses.

(c) Suppression of Dioceses.—Suppression of dioceses, properly so called, in a manner other than by union, takes place only in countries where the faithful and the clergy have been dispersed by persecution, the ancient dioceses becoming missions, prefectures, or vicariates Apostolic. This has occurred in the Orient, in England, the Netherlands, etc. Changes of this nature are not regulated by canon law.

(d) Change of Boundaries.—This last mode of *innovatio* is made by the Holy See, generally at the request of the bishops of the two neighbouring dioceses. Among the sufficient reasons for this measure are the difficulty of communication, the existence of a high mountain or of a large river, disputes between the inhabitants of one part of the diocese, also the fact that they belong to different countries. Sometimes a resettlement of the boundaries of two dioceses is necessary because the limits of each are not clearly defined. Such a settlement is made by a Brief, sometimes also

by a simple *decretum* or decision of the Congregation of the Consistory approved by the pope, without the formality of a Bull or Brief.

IV. Different Classes of Dioceses.—There are several kinds of dioceses. There are dioceses properly so called and archdioceses (q. v.). The diocese is the territorial circumscription administered by a bishop; the archdiocese is placed under the jurisdiction of an archbishop. Considered as a territorial circumscription, no difference exists between them; the power of their pastors alone is different. Generally, several dioceses are grouped in an ecclesiastical province and are subject to the authority of the metropolitan archbishop. Some, however, are said to be exempt, i. e. from any archiepiscopal jurisdiction, and are placed directly under the authority of the Holy See. Such are the dioceses of the ecclesiastical province of Rome, and several other dioceses or archdioceses, especially in Italy, also in other countries. The exempt archbishops are called titular archbishops, i. e. they possess only the title of archbishop, have no suffragan bishops, and administer a diocese. The term "titular archbishop", it is to be noted, is also applied to bishops who do not administer a diocese, but who have received with the episcopal consecration a titular archbishopric. For the better understanding of this it must be remembered that archdioceses and dioceses are divided into titular and residential. The bishop of a residential see administers his diocese personally and is bound to reside in it, whereas the titular bishops have only an episcopal title; they are not bound by any obligations to the faithful of the dioceses whose titles they bear. These were formerly called bishops or archbishops *in partibus infidelium*, i. e. of a diocese or archdiocese fallen into the power of infidels; but since 1882 they are called titular bishops or archbishops. Such are the vicars Apostolic, auxiliary bishops, administrators Apostolic, nuncios, Apostolic delegates, etc. (see Titular Bishop). Mention must also be made of the suburbicarian dioceses (*diœceses suburbicariæ*), i. e. the six dioceses situated in the immediate neighbourhood of Rome and each of which is administered by one of the six cardinal-bishops. These form a special class of dioceses, the titulars or occupants of which possess certain special rights and obligations (see Suburbicarian Dioceses).

V. Nomination, Translation, Renunciation, and Deposition of a Bishop.—The general rules relating to the nomination of a residential bishop will be found in the article Bishop. They are applicable whatever may have been the cause of the vacancy of the diocese, except in the case of a contrary order of the Holy See. The Church admits the principle of the perpetuity of ecclesiastical benefices. Once invested with a see the bishop continues to hold it until his death. There are, however, exceptions to this rule. The bishop may be allowed by the pope to resign his see when actuated by motives which do not spring from personal convenience, but from concern for the public good. Some of these reasons are expressed in the canon law; for instance, if a bishop has been guilty of a grave crime (*conscientia criminis*), if he is in failing health (*debilitas corporis*), if he has not the requisite knowledge (*defectus scientiæ*), if he meets with serious opposition from the faithful (*malitia plebis*), if he has been a cause of public scandal (*scandalum populi*), if he is irregular (*irregularitas*)—c. 10, X, De renuntiatione, I, 9; c. 18, X, De regularibus, III, 32. The pope alone can accept this renunciation and judge of the sufficiency of the alleged reasons. Pontifical authorization is also necessary for an exchange of dioceses between two bishops, which is not allowed except for grave reasons. The same principles apply to the transfer (*translatio*) of a bishop from one diocese to another. Canonical legislation compares with the indissoluble marriage tie the bond which binds the bishop to his diocese. This comparison, however, must not be understood literally. The pope has the power to sever the mystical bond which unites the bishop to his church, in order to grant him another diocese or to promote him to an archiepiscopal see. A bishop may also be deposed from his functions for a grave crime. In such a case the pope generally invites the bishop to resign of his own accord, and deposes him only upon refusal. As the Holy See alone is competent to try the crime of a bishop, it follows that the pope alone, or the congregation to which he has committed the bishop's trial (Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, the Propaganda, sometimes the Inquisition), can inflict this penalty or pronounce the declaratory sentence required when the law inflicts deposition as the sanction of a specified delinquency. Finally, the pope has always the right, strictly speaking, to deprive a bishop of his diocese, even if the latter is not guilty of crime; but for this act there must be grave cause. After the conclusion of the Concordat of 1801 (q. v.) with France, Pius VII removed from their dioceses all the bishops of France. It was, of course, a very extraordinary measure, but was justified by the gravity of the situation.

VI. Administration of the Diocese.—The bishop is the general ruler of the diocese, but in his administration he must conform to the general laws of the Church (see Bishop). According to the Council of Trent he is bound to divide the territory of his diocese into parishes, with ordinary jurisdiction (q. v.) for their titulars (Sess. XXIV, c. xiii, De ref.), unless circumstances render impossible the creation of parishes or unless the Holy See has arranged the matter otherwise (Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, nos. 31–33). The bishop needs also some auxiliary service in the administration of a diocese. It is customary for each diocese to possess a chapter (q. v.) of canons in the cathedral church; they are the counsellors of the bishop. The cathedral itself is the church where the bishop has his seat (*καθέδρα*). The pope reserves to himself the right of authorizing its establishment as well as that of a chapter of canons. In many dioceses, principally outside of Europe, the pope does not establish canons, but gives as auxiliaries to the bishop other officials known as *consultores cleri diœcesani*, i. e. the most distinguished members of the diocesan clergy, chosen by the bishop, often in concert with his clergy or some members of it. The bishop is bound to ask the advice of those counsellors, canons or consultors in the most important matters. The canons possess in some cases, the right to nullify episcopal action taken without their consent. The *consultores cleri diœcesani*, however, possess but a consultative voice (Third Plen. Council of Baltimore, nos. 17–22; Plen. Conc. Americæ Latinæ, no. 246.—See Consultors, Diocesan). After the bishop, the principal authority in a diocese is the vicar-general (*vicarius generalis in spiritualibus*); he is the bishop's substitute in the administration of the diocese. The office dates from the thirteenth century. Originally the vicar-general was called the "official" (*officialis*); even yet *officialis* and *vicarius generalis in spiritualibus* are synonymous. Strictly speaking, there should be in each diocese only one vicar-general. In some countries, however, local custom has authorized the appointment of several vicars-general. The one specially charged with the canonical lawsuits (*jurisdictio contentiosa*), e. g. with criminal actions against ecclesiastics or with matrimonial cases, is still known as the "official"; it must be noted that he is none the less free to exercise the functions of vicar-general in other departments of diocesan administration. A contrary custom prevails in certain dioceses of Germany, where the "official" possesses only the *jurisdictio contentiosa*, but this is a derogation from the common law. For the temporal administration of the church the bishop may appoint an *œconomus*, i. e. an administrator. As such functions do not require ecclesiastical jurisdiction, this administrator may be a layman. The choice of a layman fully acquainted

TABLE OF THE DIOCESAN SYSTEM OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Latin Rite

Europe	Patriarchates	Archdioceses	Dioceses	Exempt Dioceses	Apostolic Delegations	Vicariates Apostolic	Prefectures Apostolic	Prelatures and Abbeys Nullius
Austria-Hungary		11	40	1				2
Belgium		1	5					
Bosnia-Herzegovina		1	3					
Bulgaria				1		1		
Denmark						1		
England		1	15					
France		17	67					
Germany		5	14	6		3	2	
Greece		2	6	1	1			
Ireland		4	25					
Italy	2*	37	156†	75				11
Luxemburg				1				
Malta				2				
Monaco				1				
Montenegro				1				
Netherlands		1	4					
Norway						1		
Portugal	1	2	9					
Rumania		1		1				
Russia		2	14‡					
Scotland		1	4	1				
Servia			1					
Spain	1§	9	47			1		1
Sweden						1		
Switzerland				5			2	2
Turkey		1	4	2	1	1		1
Total	4	96	414	98	2	9	4	17

* Also three titular patriarchs of the Latin Rite reside in Rome.
† The six suburbicarian dioceses must be added to these.
‡ The Russian Government has suppressed three of these.
§ Titular Patriarchate of the West Indies.

America	Archdioceses	Dioceses	Exempt Dioceses	Apostolic Delegations	Vicariates Apostolic	Prefectures Apostolic	Prelatures and Abbeys Nullius
Argentine Republic	1	7			1	1	
Bolivia	1	3					
Brazil	4	20					2
Canada	8	20		1	4		
Lesser Antilles	1	3			1		
Chile	1	3			1	1	
Colombia	4	10			2	3	
Greater Antilles	2	7	2	1	1		
Ecuador	1	6			4		
Central America	1	4			1		
Guianas					2	1	
Mexico	8	22		1	1		
Newfoundland	1	2					
Paraguay		1					
Peru	1	8			1*	3	
Saint-Pierre and Miquelon Islands						1	
United States	14	76		1	2	1	
Uruguay	1	2†					
Venezuela	1	5					
Total	50	199	2	4	21	11	2

* Includes also some Chilean territory.
† Bulls have been issued but these dioceses have not been erected.

Asia	Patriarchates	Archdioceses	Dioceses	Exempt Dioceses	Apostolic Delegations	Vicariates Apostolic	Prefectures Apostolic
China			1			36	4
Corea						1	
India and Indo-China	1	7	22	1	1	15	4
Japan		1	3				1
Persia				1	1		
Turkey	1	1	1	1	3*	3	1
Total	2	9	27	3	5	55	10

* The Apostolic Delegation of Arabia also includes Egypt.

Oceanica	Archdioceses	Dioceses	Exempt Dioceses	Apostolic Delegations	Vicariates Apostolic	Prefectures Apostolic	Prelatures and Abbeys Nullius
Australia	4	14	1		3		1
Malay Archipelago					1	3	
New Zealand	1	3					
Philippine Islands and Hawaii	1	8*		1	1	1	
Polynesia					11	5	
Total	6	25	1	1	16	9	1

* Though Bulls have been issued four of these dioceses have not been erected.

Africa	Archdioceses	Dioceses	Exempt Dioceses	Apostolic Delegations	Vicariates Apostolic	Prefectures Apostolic	Prelatures and Abbeys Nullius
	2	10*	2	1†	36	24	1

* The Diocese of Ceuta is not enumerated, as it belongs to Cadiz, Spain.
† Delegation of Arabia and Egypt. See above, foot-note to Asia.

Oriental Rites

	Patriarchates	Archdioceses	Dioceses	Exempt Dioceses	Vicariates Apostolic
Armenian Rite:—					
Austria		1			
Russia			1		
Asia	1	3	13		
Africa			1		
Coptic Rite:—					
Africa	1		2		
Greek Bulgarian Rite:—					
Macedonia					1
Thrace					1
Greek Melchite Rite:—					
Asia	1	3	9		
Greek Rumanian Rite:—					
Austria		1	3		
*Greek Ruthenian Rite:—					
Austria		1	6		
Russia			1	2†	
Syrian Rite:—					
Asia	1	3	5		
Syro-Chaldean Rite:—					
Asia	1	2	9		
Syro-Malabar Rite:—					
Asia					3
Syro-Maronite Rite:—					
Asia	1	6	2		
Total	6	20	52	2	5

* The Ruthenian bishop for the United States has neither diocese, properly so called, nor ordinary jurisdiction.
† One of these dioceses has been suppressed by the Russian Government.

with the civil law of the country may sometimes offer many advantages (Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, no. 75). In certain very extensive dioceses the pope appoints a *vicarius generalis in pontificalibus*, or auxiliary bishop, whose duty is to supply the place of the diocesan bishop in the exercise of those functions of the sacred ministry which demand episcopal order. In the appointment of this bishop the pope is not bound to observe the special rules for the appointment of a residential bishop. These titular bishops possess no jurisdiction by right of their office; the diocesan bishop, however, can grant them, e. g., the powers of a vicar-general.

The common ecclesiastical law contains no enactments relating to the rights and powers of the chancellor, an official met with in many dioceses (see DIOCESAN CHANCERY). The Second Plenary Council of Baltimore (no. 71) advises the establishment of a chancery in every diocese of the United States. The chancellor is specially charged with the affixing of the episcopal seal to all acts issued in the name of the bishop, in order to prove their authenticity. He appears also in the conduct of ecclesiastical lawsuits, e. g. in matrimonial cases, to prove the authenticity of the alleged documents, to vouch for the depositions of witnesses, etc. Because of the importance of his functions, the chancellor sometimes holds the office of vicar-general *in spiritualibus*. By episcopal chancery is sometimes understood the office where are written the documents issued in the name of the bishop and to which is addressed the correspondence relating to the administration of the diocese; sometimes also the term signifies the persons employed in the exercise of these functions. The taxes or dues which the episcopal chancery may claim for the issuing of documents were fixed by the Council of Trent (Sess. XXI, c. i, De ref.); afterwards by Innocent XI (hence their name *Taxa Innocentiana*), 8 Oct., 1678; finally by Leo XIII, 10 June, 1896. The fiscal of the bishop, also known as *promotor* or *procurator fiscalis*, is the ecclesiastic charged with attending to the interests of the diocese in all trials and especially with endeavouring to secure the punishment of all offences cognizable in the ecclesiastical tribunals. An assistant, who is called fiscal advocate (*advocatus fiscalis*), may be appointed to aid this officer.

Formerly the diocese was divided into a number of archdeaconries, each administered by an archdeacon, who possessed considerable authority in that part of the diocese placed under his jurisdiction. The Council of Trent restricted very much their authority, and since then the office of the archdeacon has gradually disappeared. It exists at the present day only as an honorary title, given to a canon of the cathedral chapter (see ARCHDEACON). On the other hand, the ancient office of *vicarii foranei, decani rurales*, or *archipresbyteri* still exists in the Church (see ARCHPRIEST; DEAN). The division of the diocese into deaneries is not obligatory, but in large dioceses the bishop usually entrusts to certain priests known as deans or vicars forane the oversight of the clergy of a portion of his diocese, and generally delegates to them special jurisdictional powers (Third Plen. Council of Baltimore, nos. 27–30). Finally, by means of the diocesan synod all the clergy participates in the general administration of the diocese. According to the common law, the bishop is bound to assemble a synod every year, to which he must convoke the vicar-general, the deans, the canons of the cathedral, and at least a certain number of parish priests. Here, however, custom and pontifical privileges have departed in some points from the general legislation. At this meeting, all questions relating to the moral and the ecclesiastical discipline of the diocese are publicly discussed and settled. In the synod the bishop is the sole legislator; the members may, at the request of the bishop, give their advice, but they have only a deliberative voice in the choice of the *examinatores cleri diœcesani*, i. e. the ecclesiastics charged with the examination of candidates for the parishes (Third Plen. Council of Baltimore, nos. 23–26). It is because the diocesan statutes are generally elaborated and promulgated in a synod that they are sometimes known as *statuta synodalia*. In addition to the general laws of the Church and the enactments of national or plenary and provincial synods, the bishop may regulate by statutes, that are often real ecclesiastical laws, the particular discipline of each diocese, or apply the general laws of the Church to the special needs of the diocese. Since the bishop alone possesses all the legislative power, and is not bound to propose in a synod these diocesan statutes, he may modify them or add to them on his own authority.

VII. VACANCY OF THE DIOCESE.—We have already explained how a diocese becomes vacant (see V above); here it will suffice to add a few words touching the administration of the diocese during such vacancy. In dioceses where there is a coadjutor bishop with right of succession, the latter, by the fact of the decease of the diocesan bishop, becomes the residential bishop or ordinary (q. v.) of the diocese. Otherwise the government of the diocese during the vacancy belongs regularly to the chapter of the cathedral church. The chapter must choose within eight days a vicar capitular, whose powers, although less extensive, are in kind like those of a bishop. If the chapter does not fulfil this obligation, the archbishop appoints *ex officio* a vicar capitular. In dioceses where a chapter does not exist, an administrator is appointed, designated either by the bishop himself before his death, or, in case of his neglect, by the metropolitan or by the senior bishop of the province (see ADMINISTRATOR).

VIII. CONSPECTUS OF THE DIOCESAN SYSTEM OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.—The accompanying table of the diocesan system of the Church shows that there are at present throughout the world: 9 patriarchates of the Latin, 6 of the Oriental Rites; 6 suburbicarian dioceses; 163 (or 166 with the Patriarchates of Venice, Lisbon, and Goa, in reality archdioceses) archdioceses of the Latin, and 20 of the Oriental Rites; 675 dioceses of the Latin, and 52 of the Oriental Rites; 137 vicariates Apostolic of the Latin, and 5 of the Oriental Rites; 58 prefectures Apostolic of the Latin Rite; 12 Apostolic delegations; 21 abbeys or prelatures *nullius diœcesis*, i. e. exempt from the jurisdiction of the diocesan bishop. There are also 89 titular archdioceses and 432 titular dioceses.

THOMASSIN, *Vetus et nova disciplina ecclesiæ*, etc. (Paris, 1691), Part. I, Bk. I, nos. 54–59; LÖNING, *Gesch. des deutschen Kirchenrechts* (Strasburg, 1878), I, 410; II, 129 sqq.; HARNACK, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (Leipzig, 1907), 319 sqq.; DUCHESNE, *Origines du culte chrétien* (Paris, 1902), 11 sqq.; IDEM, *Hist. ancienne de l'Eglise* (Paris, 1906), I, 524; IDEM, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule* (Paris, 1907); SAVIO, *Gli antichi vescovi d'Italia* (Turin, 1899), I; WERMINGHOFF, *Gesch. der Kirchenverfassung Deutschl. im M. A.* (Leipzig, 1905); HAUCK, *Kirchengesch. Deutschl.* (Leipzig, 1896–1903); LINGARD, *Hist. and Antiq. of the Anglo-Saxon Church* (reprint, London, 1899); LANIGAN, *Eccl. History of Ireland* (Dublin, 1829); BELLESHEIM, *Gesch. der kathol. Kirche in Irland* (Mainz, 1890–91); IDEM, *Gesch. der kathol. Kirche in Schottland* (Mainz, 1883); tr. HUNTER-BLAIR, *History of the Catholic Church in Scotland* (London, 1889); HINSCHIUS, *System des kathol. Kirchenrechts* (Berlin, 1878), II, 378 sqq.; VON SCHERER, *Handbuch des Kirchenrechts* (Graz, 1886), I, 553 sqq.; WERNZ, *Jus Decretalium* (Rome, 1899), II, 348 sqq.; SÄGMÜLLER, *Lehrbuch des kathol. Kirchenrechts* (Freiburg, 1900–1904), 231, 346, and bibliography under *Bischof;* BATTANDIER, *Ann. pont. cath.* (Paris, 1908); *La Gerarchia Cattolica* (Rome, 1908); *Missiones Catholicæ* (Rome, 1907); BAUMGARTEN AND SWOBODA, *Die kathol. Kirche auf dem Erdenrund* (Munich, 1907). For a catalogue of all known Catholic dioceses to 1198, with names and regular dates of occupants, see GAMS, *Series episc. eccl. Cath.* (Ratisbon, 1873–86), and his continuator EUBEL, *Hierarchia Catholica Medii Ævi, 1198–1431* (Münster, 1899). Cf. also the alphabetical list of all known dioceses, ancient and modern, in MAS-LATRIE, *Trésor de chronol. d'hist: et de géog.* (Paris, 1889), and the descriptive text of WERNER, *Orbis terrar. Catholicus* (Freiburg, 1890). For the dioceses, etc. in the missionary territories of the Catholic Church see STREIT, *Katholischer Missionsatlas* (Steyl, 1906). For details of dioceses in English-speaking countries see *Catholic Directories* for United States, England, Ireland, Australia, Canada, India.

A. VAN HOVE.

Dioclea, a titular see of Phrygia in Asia Minor. Diocleia is mentioned by Ptolemy (V, ii, 23), where the former editions read Dokela; this is probably the native name, which must have been hellenized at a later time; in the same way Doclea in Dalmatia is more commonly called Dioclea. The autonomous rights of Dioclea are proved by its coins struck in the reign of Elagabalus (Head, Hist. Num., 562). It figures in the "Synecdemus" of Hierocles, in Parthey, "Notitiæ Episcopatuum" (III, X, XIII), and in Gelzer, "Nova Tactica", i. e. as late as the twelfth or thirteenth century, as a bishopric in Phrygia Pacatiana, the metropolis of which was Laodicea. Only two bishops are known, in 431 and 451 (Lequien, Or. Christ., I, 823). An inscription found near Doghla, or Dola, a village in the vilayet of Smyrna, shows that it must be the site of Dioclea, though there are no ruins.

RAMSAY, *Hist. Geogr. of Asia Minor*, 139; IDEM, *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, 632, 652, 660, 663.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Diocletian (VALERIUS DIOCLETIANUS), Roman Emperor and persecutor of the Church, b. of parents who had been slaves, at Dioclea, near Salona, in Dalmatia, A. D. 245; d. at Salona, A. D. 313. He entered the army and by his marked abilities attained the offices of Governor of Mœsia, consul, and commander of the guards of the palace. In the Persian war, under Carus, he especially distinguished himself. When the son and successor of Carus, Numerian, was murdered at Chalcedon, the choice of the army fell upon Diocletian, who immediately slew with his own hand the murderer Aper (17 Sept., 284). His career as emperor belongs to secular history. Here only a summary will be given. The reign of Diocletian (284–305) marked an era both in the military and political history of the empire. The triumph which he celebrated together with his colleague Maximian (20 Nov., 303) was the last triumph which Rome ever beheld. Britain, the Rhine, the Danube, and the Nile furnished trophies; but the proudest boast of the conqueror was that Persia, the persistent enemy of Rome, had at last been subdued. Soon after his accession to power Diocletian realized that the empire was too unwieldy and too much exposed to attack to be safely ruled by a single head. Accordingly, he associated with himself Maximian, a bold but rude soldier, at first as Cæsar and afterwards as Augustus (286). Later on, he further distributed his power by granting the inferior title of Cæsar to two generals, Galerius and Constantius (292). He reserved for his own portion Thrace, Egypt, and Asia; Italy and Africa were Maximian's provinces, while Galerius was stationed on the Danube, and Constantius had charge of Gaul, Spain, and Britain. But the supreme control remained in Diocletian's hands. None of the rulers resided in Rome, and thus the way was prepared for the downfall of the imperial city. Moreover, Diocletian undermined the authority of the Senate, assumed the diadem, and introduced the servile ceremonial of the Persian court. After a prosperous reign of nearly twenty-one years, he abdicated the throne and retired to Salona, where he lived in magnificent seclusion until his death.

Diocletian's name is associated with the last and most terrible of all the ten persecutions of the early Church. Nevertheless it is a fact that the Christians enjoyed peace and prosperity during the greater portion of his reign. Eusebius, who lived at this time, describes in glowing terms "the glory and the liberty with which the doctrine of piety was honoured", and he extols the clemency of the emperors towards the Christian governors whom they appointed, and towards the Christian members of their households. He tells us that the rulers of the Church "were courted and honoured with the greatest subserviency by all the rulers and governors". He speaks of the vast multitudes that flocked to the religion of Christ, and of the spacious and splendid churches erected in the place of the humbler buildings of earlier days. At the same time he bewails the falling from ancient fervour "by reason of excessive liberty" (Hist. Eccl., VIII, i). Had Diocletian remained sole emperor, he would probably have allowed this toleration to continue undisturbed. It was his subordinate Galerius who first induced him to turn persecutor. These two rulers of the East, at a council held at Nicomedia in 302, resolved to suppress Christianity throughout the empire. The cathedral of Nicomedia was demolished (24 Feb., 303). An edict was issued "to tear down the churches to the foundations, and to destroy the Sacred Scriptures by fire; and commanding also that those who were in honourable stations should be degraded if they persevered in their adherence to Christianity" (Euseb., op. cit., VIII, ii). Three further edicts (303–304) marked successive stages in the severity of the persecution: the first ordering that the bishops, presbyters, and deacons should be imprisoned; the second that they should be tortured and compelled by every means to sacrifice; the third including the laity as well as the clergy. The atrocious cruelty with which these edicts were enforced, and the vast numbers of those who suffered for the Faith are attested by Eusebius and the Acts of the Martyrs. We read even of the massacre of the whole population of a town because they declared themselves Christians (Euseb., loc. cit., xi, xii; Lactant., "Div. Instit.", V, xi). The abdication of Diocletian (1 May, 305) and the subsequent partition of the empire brought relief to many provinces. In the East, however, where Galerius and Maximian held sway, the persecution continued to rage. Thus it will be seen that the so-called Diocletian persecution should be attributed to the influence of Galerius; it continued for seven years after Diocletian's abdication. (See PERSECUTIONS.)

EMPEROR DIOCLETIAN
(Capitoline Museum, Rome)

EUSEBIUS, *Hist. Eccl.* in *P. G.*, XX; *De Mart. Palæstinæ*, *P. G.*, XX, 1457–1520; LACTANTIUS, *Divinæ Institutiones*, V, in *P. L.*, VI; *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, *P. L.*, VII; GIBBON, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, xiii, xvi; ALLARD, *La persécution de Dioclétien et le triomphe de l'église* (Paris, 1890); IDEM, *Le christianisme et l'empire romain* (Paris, 1898); IDEM, *Ten Lectures on the Martyrs*, tr. (London, 1907); DUCHESNE, *Histoire ancienne de l'église* (Paris, 1907), II.

T. B. SCANNELL.

Diocletianopolis, a titular see of Palæstina Prima. This city is mentioned by Hierocles (Synecdemus, 719, 2), Georgius Cyprius (ed. Gelzer, 1012), and in some "Notitiæ Episcopatuum", as a suffragan of Cæsarea. Its native name is unknown, and its site has not been identified. One bishop is known, Elisæus, in 359 (Lequien, Oriens Christianus, III, 646). (2) Another Diocletianopolis was a suffragan see of Philippopolis in Thrace. Its site is unknown. Two bishops are mentioned, Cyriacus in 431, and Epictetus in 451 and 458. A third, Elias, in 553, is doubtful (Lequien, op. cit., I, 1161). (3) Still another Diocletianopolis was a suffragan of Ptolemais in Thebais Secunda (Parthey, Notit. Episc., I). This city is also mentioned by Hierocles (op. cit., 732, 3), and by

Georgius Cyprius, 772. Gelzer thinks that Diocletianopolis is a later name of Apollinopolis Minor, the Coptic Kōs Berbir, and the Arabian Kûs, still existing near Keft (Coptus). (Amélineau, "Géographie de l'Egypte", 490, 573, 576.) One bishop of Apollinopolis Minor is known, Pabiscus, mentioned in 431 (Lequien, II, 603).

S. Pétridès.

Diodorus of Tarsus, date of birth uncertain; d. about A. D. 392. He was of noble family, probably of Antioch. St. Basil calls him a "nursling" of Silvanus, Bishop of Tarsus, but whether this discipleship was at Antioch or at Tarsus is not known. He studied at Athens, then embraced the monastic state. He became head of a monastery in or near Antioch, and St. Chrysostom was his disciple. When Antioch groaned under Arian bishops, he did not join the small party of irreconcilables headed by Paulinus, yet when Bishop Leontius made Aetius a deacon, Diodorus and Flavian threatened to leave his communion and retire to the West, and the bishop yielded. These two holy men, though not priests, taught the people to sing the Psalms in alternate choirs (a practice which quickly spread throughout the Church), at first in the chapels of the martyrs, then, at Leontius's invitation, in the churches. When at length, in 361, the Arian party appointed an orthodox bishop in the person of St. Meletius, Diodorus was made priest. He seems to have written some of his works against the pagans as early as the reign of Julian, for that emperor declared that Diodorus had used the learning and eloquence of Athens against the immortal gods, who had punished him with sickness of the throat, emaciation, wrinkles, and a hard and bitter life. In the persecution of Valens (364–78), Flavian and Diodorus, now priests, during the exile of Meletius kept the Catholics together, assembling them on the northern bank of the Orontes, since the Arian emperor did not permit Catholic worship within the city. Many times banished, Diodorus, in 372, made the acquaintance of St. Basil in Armenia, whither that saint had come to visit Meletius. On the return of the latter to his flock, he made Diodorus Bishop of Tarsus and Metropolitan of Cilicia. Theodosius soon after, in a decree, named Diodorus and St. Pelagius of Laodicea as norms of orthodoxy for the whole East. Diodorus was at the Councils of Antioch in 379 and of Constantinople in 381. Sozomen makes him responsible at the latter council for the proposal of Nectarius as bishop of that city, and represents him as one of the chief movers in the appointment of St. Flavian as successor to Meletius, by which the unhappy schism at Antioch was prolonged.

Diodorus came to Antioch in 386 or later, when St. Chrysostom was already a priest. In a sermon he spoke of Chrysostom as a St. John the Baptist, the Voice of the Church, the Rod of Moses. Next day Chrysostom ascended the pulpit and declared that when the people had applauded, he had groaned; it was Diodorus, his father, who was John the Baptist; the Antiochenes could bear witness how he had lived without possessions, having his food from alms, and persevering in prayer and preaching; like the Baptist he had taught on the other side of the river, often he had been imprisoned—nay, he had been often beheaded, at least in will, for the Faith. In another sermon he likens Diodorus to the martyrs: "See his mortified limbs, his face, having the form of a man, but the expression of an Angel!"

St. Basil in 375 asked Diodorus to disown a fictitious letter circulated in his name, permitting marriage with a deceased wife's sister. In the following year he criticizes the rhetorical style of the longer of two treatises sent him by Diodorus, but gives warm praise to the shorter. Diodorus's style is praised by Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Photius, but of his very numerous writings only a few unimportant fragments have been preserved, chiefly in Catenæ (q. v.). He wrote against some of the heresies and still more against heathen philosophy. Photius gives a detailed summary of his eight books "de Fato"; they were evidently very dull from a modern point of view. According to Leontius he composed commentaries on the whole Bible. St. Jerome says that these were imitations of those of Eusebius of Emesa, but less distinguished by secular learning. Diodorus rejected the allegorical interpretation of the Alexandrians, and adhered to the literal sense. In this he was followed by his disciple Theodore of Mopsuestia, and by Chrysostom in his unequalled expositions. The Antiochene School of which he was the leader was discredited by the subsequent heresies of Nestorius, of whom his disciple Theodore of Mopsuestia was the precursor. Theodoret wrote to exculpate Diodorus, but St. Cyril declared him a heretic. The damning passages cited by Marius Mercator and Leontius seem, however, to belong to a work of Theodore, not of Diodorus: nor was the latter condemned when Theodore and passages of Theodoret and Ibas (the Three Chapters) were condemned by the Fifth General Council (553). It seems certain that Diodorus went too far in his opposition to (the younger) Apollinarius of Laodicea, according to whom the rational soul in Christ was supplied by the Logos. Diodorus, in emphasizing the completeness of the Sacred Humanity, appears to have asserted two hypostases, not necessarily in a heretical sense. If the developments by Theodore throw a shade on the reputation of Diodorus, the praise of all his contemporaries and especially of his disciple Chrysostom tend yet more strongly to exculpate him. It will be best to look upon Diodorus as the innocent source of Nestorianism (q. v.) only in the sense that St. Cyril of Alexandria is admittedly the unwilling origin of Monophysitism through some incorrect expressions. Against this view are Jülicher [in Theol. lit. Z. (1902), 82–86] and Funk [in "Rev. d'hist. eccl.", III (1902), 947–71; reprinted with improvements in "Kirchengesch. Abhandl." (Paderborn, 1907), III, 323].

The fragments of his Commentaries on the Old Testament are collected in Migne, P. G., XXXIII, from the Catena of Nicephorus and that published by Corderius (Antwerp, 1643–6), also from Mai, "Nova Patrum Bibl.", VI. A few more are found in Pitra, "Spicilegium Solesmense" (Paris, 1852), I. A long list of the lost works is in Fabricius, "Bibl. Gr.", V, 24 (reprinted in Migne, loc. cit.). Some Syriac dogmatic fragments are in Lagarde, "Analecta Syriaca" (Leipzig and London, 1858). Four treatises of Pseudo-Justin Martyr have been attributed to Diodorus by Harnack ("Texte und Unters.", N. F., VI, 4, 1901).

For his life, see Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vol. VIII, and Venables in *Dict. of Christ. Biogr.*, s. v. On Diodorus as an exegete: Turner in Hastings, *Dict. of the Bible*, V, 500; Kihn, *Die Bedeutung der antiochenischen Schule* (Weissenburg, 1866, Ingolstadt, 1867); *Ueber Theoria und Allegoria nach verlorenen hermeneutischen Schriften der Antiochener* in *Th. Quartalsch.* (1880), LXII, 553; Ermoni, *Diodore de Tarse et son rôle doctrinal* in *Muséon*, nouv. série (1901), II, 431; Idem, *Ecole théol. d'Antioche* in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, II, 1435 sqq.; see also Vigouroux, *Ecole exégétique d'Antioche* in *Dict. de la Bible*, I, 683 sqq. On the School of Antioch in general see bibliography of article *Antioche* by Leclercq in *Dict. d'Arch. chrét.*

John Chapman.

Diognetus, Epistle to (Epistola ad Diognetum). —This beautiful little apology for Christianity is cited by no ancient or medieval writer, and came down to us in a single MS. which perished in the siege of Strasburg (1870). The identification of Diognetus with the teacher of Marcus Aurelius, who bore the same name, is at most plausible. The author's name is unknown, and the date is anywhere between the Apostles and the age of Constantine. It was clearly composed during a severe persecution. The manu-

script attributed it with other writings to Justin Martyr; but that earnest philosopher and hasty writer was quite incapable of the restrained eloquence, the smooth flow of thought, the limpid clearness of expression, which mark this epistle as one of the most perfect compositions of antiquity. The last two chapters (xi, xii) are florid and obscure, and bear no relation to the rest of the letter. They seem to be a fragment of a homily of later date. The writer of this addition describes himself as a "disciple of the Apostles"; and through a misunderstanding of these words the epistle has, since the eighteenth century, been classed with the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. The letter breaks off at the end of chapter x; it may have originally been much longer.

The writer addresses the "most excellent Diognetus", a well-disposed pagan, who desires to know what is the religion of Christians. Idol-worship is ridiculed, and it is shown that Jewish sacrifices and ceremonies cannot cause any pleasure to the only God and Creator of all. Christians are not a nation nor a sect, but are diffused throughout the world, though they are not of the world, but citizens of heaven; yet they are the soul of the world. God, the invisible Creator, has sent His Child, by whom He made all things, to save man, after He has allowed man to find out his own weakness and proneness to sin and his incapacity to save himself. The last chapter is an exposition, "first" of the love of the Father, evidently to be followed "secondly" by another on the Son; but this is lost. The style is harmonious and simple. The writer is a practised master of classical eloquence, and a fervent Christian. There is no resemblance to the public apologies of the second century. A closer affinity is with the "Ad Donatum" of St. Cyprian, which is similarly addressed to an inquiring pagan. The writer does not refer to Holy Scripture, but he uses the Gospels, I Peter, and I John, and is saturated with the Epistles of St. Paul. Harnack seems to be right in refusing to place the author earlier than Irenæus. One might well look for him much later, in the persecutions of Valerian or of Diocletian. He cannot be an obscure person, but must be a writer otherwise illustrious; and yet he is certainly not one of those writers whose works have come down to us from the second or third centuries. The name of Lucian the Martyr would perhaps satisfy the conditions of the problem; and the loss of that part of the letter where it spoke more in detail of the Son of God would be explained, as it would have been suspected or convicted of the Arianism of which Lucian is the reputed father. The so-called letter may be in reality the apology presented to a judge.

The *editio princeps* is that of Stephanus (Paris, 1592), and the epistle was included among the works of St. Justin by Sylburg (Heidelberg, 1593) and subsequent editors; the best of such editions is in Otto, "Corpus Apologetarum Christ." (3d ed., Jena, 1879), III. Tillemont followed a friend's suggestion in attributing it to an earlier date, and Gallandi included it in his "Bibl. Vett. PP.", I, as the work of an anonymous Apostolic Father. It has been given since then in the editions of the Apostolic Fathers, especially those of Hefele, Funk (2d ed., 1901), Gebhardt, Harnack, and Zahn (1878), Lightfoot and Harmer (London, 1891, with English tr.). Many separate editions have appeared in Germany. There is an English translation in the Ante-Nicene Library (London, 1892), I. The dissertations on this treatise are too numerous to catalogue; they are not as a rule of much value. Baratier and Gallandi attributed the letter to Clement of Rome, Böhl to an Apostolic Father, and he was followed by the Catholic editors or critics, Möhler, Hefele, Permaneder, Alzog; whereas Grossheim, Tzschirner, Semisch, placed it in the time of Justin; Dorner referred it to Marcion; Zeller to the end of the second century, while Ceillier, Hoffmann, Otto, defended the MS. attribution to Justin; Fessler held for the first or second century. These definite views are now abandoned, likewise the suggestions of Krüger that Aristides was the author, of Dräseke that it is by Apelles, of Overbeck that it is post-Constantinian, and of Donaldson that it is a fifteenth-century rhetorical exercise (the MS. was thirteenth- or fourteenth-century). Zahn has sensibly suggested 250–310. Harnack gives 170–300.

References to all these writers will be found in *Patres Apostolici*, ed. FUNK. See also BARDENHEWER, *Gesch. der altkirchl. Lit.*, I, and bibliography in RICHARDSON, *Bibliogr. Synopsis*, and CHEVALIER, *Bio.-bibl.* On the MS. see *Texte und Untersuchungen*, I (1882, HARNACK), and II (1883, GEBHARDT), and HARNACK, *Gesch. der alt-chr. Lit.*, I, 757. The concluding chapters are attributed to Hippolytus by DI PAULI in *Theol. Quartalschrift*, LXXXVIII (1906), i, 28.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

Dionysias, a titular see in Arabia. This city, which figures in the "Synecdemos" of Hierocles (723, 3) and Georgius Cyprius (1072), is mentioned only in Parthey's "Prima Notitia", about 840, as a suffragan of Bostra. Lequien (Or. christ., II, 865) gives the names of three Greek bishops, Severus, present at Nicæa in 325, Elpidius at Constantinople in 381, and Maras at Chalcedon in 451. Another, Peter, is known by an inscription (Waddington, Inscriptions . . . de Syrie, no. 2327). Fifteen or sixteen titular Latin bishops are known throughout the fifteenth century (Lequien, op. cit., III, 1309; Eubel, I, 232, II, 160). Waddington (op. cit., 529 sqq.) identifies Dionysias with Soada, now es-Sûwêda, the chief town of a caza in the vilayet of Damascus, where many inscriptions have been found. Soada, though an important city, is not alluded to in ancient authors under this name; inscriptions prove that it was built by a "lord builder Dionysos" and that it was an episcopal see. Nöldeke admits this view. Gesenius identifies Dionysias with Shohbâ (Philippopolis), but this is too far from Damascus.

GELZER, ed., *Georgii Cyprii descriptio orbis Romani*, 206.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Dionysius, SAINT, POPE, date of birth unknown; d. 26 or 27 December, 268. During the pontificate of Pope Stephen (254–57) Dionysius appears as a presbyter of the Roman Church and as such took part in the controversy concerning the validity of heretical baptism (see BAPTISM under sub-title *Rebaptism*). This caused Bishop Dionysius of Alexandria to write him a letter on baptism in which he is described as an excellent and learned man (Eusebius, Hist. eccl., VII, vii). Later, in the time of Pope Sixtus II (257–58), the same Bishop of Alexandria addressed Dionysius a letter concerning Lucianus (ibid., VII, ix); who this Lucianus was is not known. After the martyrdom of Sixtus II (6 August, 258) the Roman See remained vacant for nearly a year, as the violence of the persecution made it impossible to elect a new head. It was not until the persecution had begun to subside that Dionysius was raised (22 July, 259) to the office of Bishop of Rome. Some months later the Emperor Gallienus issued his edict of toleration, which brought the persecution to an end and gave a legal existence to the Church (Eusebius, Hist. eccl., VII, xiii). Thus the Roman Church came again into possession of its buildings for worship, its cemeteries, and other properties, and Dionysius was able to bring its administration once more into order. About 260 Bishop Dionysius of Alexandria wrote his letter to Ammonius and Euphranor against Sabellianism in which he expressed himself with inexactness as to the Logos and its relation to God the Father (see DIONYSIUS OF ALEXANDRIA). Upon this an accusation against him was laid before Pope Dionysius who called a synod at Rome about 260 for the settlement of the matter. The pope issued, in his own name and that of the council, an important doctrinal letter in which, first, the erroneous

doctrine of Sabellius was again condemned and, then, the false opinions of those were rejected who, like the Marcionites, in a similar manner separate the Divine monarchy into three entirely distinct hypostases, or who represent the Son of God as a created being, while the Holy Scriptures declare Him to have been begotten; passages in the Bible, such as Deut., xxxii, 6, Prov., viii, 22, cannot be cited in support of false doctrines such as these. Along with this doctrinal epistle Pope Dionysius sent a separate letter to the Alexandrian Bishop in which the latter was called on to explain his views. This Dionysius of Alexandria did in his "Apologia" (Athanasius, De sententiâ Dionysii, V, xiii; De decretis Nicænæ synodi, xxvi). According to the ancient practice of the Roman Church Dionysius also extended his care to the faithful of distant lands. When the Christians of Cappadocia were in great distress from the marauding incursions of the Goths, the pope addressed a consolatory letter to the Church of Cæsarea and sent a large sum of money by messengers for the redemption of enslaved Christians (Basilius, Epist. lxx, ed. Garnier). The great synod of Antioch which deposed Paul of Samosata sent a circular letter to Pope Dionysius and Bishop Maximus of Alexandria concerning its proceedings (Eusebius, Hist. eccl., VII, xxx). After death the body of Dionysius was buried in the papal crypt in the catacomb of Callistus.

Liber Pont., ed. DUCHESNE, I, ccxlviii, 157; LANGEN, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche* (Bonn, 1881), I, 352 sqq.; HAGEMANN, *Die römische Kirche* (Freiburg im Br., 1864), 344 sqq., 432 sqq.; HEFELE, *Konziliengeschichte*, 2nd ed., I, 255 sqq.; BARDENHEWER, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur* (Freiburg im Br., 1903), II, 581 sq.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Dionysius, SAINT, Bishop of Corinth about 170. The date is fixed by the fact that he wrote to Pope Soter (c. 168 to 176; Harnack gives 165–7 to 173–5). Eusebius in his Chronicle placed his "floruit" in the eleventh year of Marcus Aurelius (171). When Hegesippus was at Corinth in the time of Pope Anicetus, Primus was bishop (about 150–5), while Bacchyllus was Bishop of Corinth at the time of the Paschal controversy (about 190–8). Dionysius is only known to us through Eusebius, for St. Jerome (De viris ill., xxvii) has used no other authority. Eusebius knew a collection of seven of the "Catholic Letters to the Churches" of Dionysius, together with a letter to him from Pinytus, Bishop of Cnossus, and a private letter of spiritual advice to a lady named Chrysophora, who had written to him.

Eusebius first mentions a letter to the Lacedæmonians, teaching orthodoxy, and enjoining peace and union. A second was to the Athenians, stirring up their faith exhorting them to live according to the Gospel, since they were not far from apostasy. Dionysius spoke of the recent martyrdom of their bishop, Publius (in the persecution of Marcus Aurelius), and says that Dionysius the Areopagite was the first Bishop of Athens. To the Nicomedians he wrote against Marcionism. Writing to Gortyna and the other dioceses of Crete, he praised the bishop, Philip, for his aversion to heresy. To the Church of Amastris in Pontus he wrote at the instance of Bacchylides and Elpistus (otherwise unknown), mentioning the bishop's name as Palmas; he spoke in this letter of marriage and continence, and recommended the charitable treatment of those who had fallen away into sin or heresy. Writing to the Cnossians, he recommended their bishop, Pinytus, not to lay the yoke of continence too heavily on the brethren, but to consider the weakness of most. Pinytus replied, after polite words, that he hoped Dionysius would send strong meat next time, that his people might not grow up on the milk of babes. This severe prelate is mentioned by Eusebius (IV, xxi) as an ecclesiastical writer, and the historian praises the tone of his letter.

But the most important letter is that to the Romans, the only one from which extracts have been preserved. Pope Soter had sent alms and a letter to the Corinthians:—"For this has been your custom from the beginning, to do good to all the brethren in many ways, and to send alms to many Churches in different cities, now relieving the poverty of those who asked aid, now assisting the brethren in the mines by the alms you send, Romans keeping up the traditional custom of Romans, which your blessed bishop, Soter, has not only maintained, but has even increased, by affording to the brethren the abundance which he has supplied, and by comforting with blessed words the brethren who came to him, as a father his children." Again: "You also by this instruction have mingled together the Romans and Corinthians who are the planting of Peter and Paul. For they both came to our Corinth and planted us, and taught alike; and alike going to Italy and teaching there, were martyred at the same time." Again: "To-day we have kept the holy Lord's day, on which we have read your letter, which we shall ever possess to read and to be admonished, even as the former one written to us through Clement." The testimony to the generosity of the Roman Church is carried on by the witness of Dionysius of Alexandria in the third century; and Eusebius in the fourth declares that it was still seen in his own day in the great persecution. The witness to the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul, *κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρόν*, is of first-rate importance, and so is the mention of the Epistle of Clement and the public reading of it. The letter of the pope was written "as a father to his children".

Dionysius's own letters were evidently much prized, for in the last extract he says that he wrote them by request, and that they have been falsified "by the apostles of the devil". No wonder, he adds, that the Scriptures are falsified by such persons.

The extracts are in EUSEBIUS, *Hist. Eccl.*, IV, xxiii, also II, xxv (Routh, *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, I). See HARNACK, *Gesch. der Altchr. Litt.*, I, 236 [on p. 785 are mentioned two fragments attributed to Origen, which may be from Dionysius's letter to the Cnossians; they will be found in HOLL, *Fragmenta vornicänischer Kirchenväter aus den Sacra Parallela* (Leipzig, 1899), 28]; *ibid.*, II, i, 313. BARDENHEWER, *Gesch. der altkirchl. Litt.*, I, 532.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

Dionysius Exiguus, the surname EXIGUUS, or "The Little", adopted probably in self-depreciation and not because he was small of stature, flourished in the earlier part of the sixth century, dying before the year 544. According to his friend and fellow-student, Cassiodorus (De divinis Lectionibus, c. xxiii), though by birth a Scythian, he was in character a true Roman and thorough Catholic, most learned in both tongues —i. e. Greek and Latin—and an accomplished Scripturist. Much of his life was spent in Rome, where he governed a monastery as abbot. His industry was very great and he did good service in translating standard works from Greek into Latin, principally the "Life of St. Pachomius", the "Instruction of St. Proclus of Constantinople" for the Armenians, the "De opificio hominis" of St. Gregory of Nyssa, the history of the discovery of the head of St. John the Baptist. The translation of St. Cyril of Alexandria's synodal letter against Nestorius, and some other works long attributed to Dionysius, are now acknowledged to be earlier and are assigned to Marius Mercator.

Of great importance were the contributions of Dionysius to the science of canon law, the first beginnings of which in Western Christendom were due to him. His "Collectio Dionysiana" embraces (1) a collection of synodal decrees, of which he has left two editions:—(*a*) "Codex canonum Ecclesiæ Universæ". This contains canons of Oriental synods and councils only in Greek and Latin, including those of the four œcumenical councils from Nicæa (325) to Chalcedon (451). —(*b*) "Codex canonum ecclesiasticarum". This is in Latin only; its contents agree generally with the other, but the Council of Ephesus (431) is omitted, while the so-called "Canons of the Apostles" and those of Sardica are included, as well as 138 canons of the

African Council of Carthage (419).—(*c*) Of another bilingual version of Greek canons, undertaken at the instance of Pope Hormisdas, only the preface has been preserved. (2) A collection of papal Constitutions (Collectio decretorum Pontificum Romanorum) from Siricius to Anastasius II (384–498).

In chronology Dionysius has left his mark conspicuously, for it was he who introduced the use of the Christian Era (see CHRONOLOGY) according to which dates are reckoned from the Incarnation, which he assigned to 25 March, in the year 754 from the foundation of Rome (A. U. C.). By this method of computation he intended to supersede the "Era of Diocletion" previously employed, being unwilling, as he tells us, that the name of an impious persecutor should be thus kept in memory. The Era of the Incarnation, often called the Dionysian Era, was soon much used in Italy and, to some extent, a little later in Spain; during the eighth and ninth centuries it was adopted in England. Charlemagne is said to have been the first Christian ruler to employ it officially. It was not until the tenth century that it was employed in the papal chancery (Lersch, Chronologie, Freiburg, 1899, p. 233). Dionysius also gave attention to the calculation of Easter, which so greatly occupied the early Church. To this end he advocated the adoption of the Alexandrian Cycle of nineteen years, extending that of St. Cyril for a period of ninety-five years in advance. It was in this work that he adopted the Era of the Incarnation.

DIONYSIUS, works in *P. L.*, LXVII, and the testimony of CASSIODORUS, *ibid.*, LXX. See also MAASEN, *Quellen der Lit. des. can. Rechts im Abendlande* (Graz, 1870); BARDENHEWER, *Gesch. der altkirch. Lit.* (Freiburg im Br., 1902).

JOHN GERARD.

Dionysius of Alexandria (bishop from 247–8 to 264–5), called "the Great" by Eusebius, St. Basil, and others, was undoubtedly, after St. Cyprian, the most eminent bishop of the third century. Like St. Cyprian he was less a great theologian than a great administrator. Like St. Cyprian his writings usually took the form of letters. Both saints were converts from paganism; both were engaged in the controversies as to the restoration of those who had lapsed in the Decian persecution, about Novatian, and with regard to the iteration of heretical baptism; both corresponded with the popes of their day. Yet it is curious that neither mentions the name of the other. A single letter of Dionysius has been preserved in Greek canon law. For the rest we are dependent on the many citations by Eusebius, and, for one phase, to the works of his great successor St. Athanasius.

Dionysius was an old man when he died, so that his birth will fall about 190, or earlier. He is said to have been of distinguished parentage. He became a Christian when still young. At a later period, when he was warned by a priest of the danger he ran in studying the books of heretics, a vision—so he informs us—assured him that he was capable of proving all things, and that this faculty had in fact been the cause of his conversion. He studied under Origen. The latter was banished by Demetrius about 231, and Heraclas took his place at the head of the catechetical school. On the death of Demetrius very soon afterwards, Heraclas became bishop, and Dionysius took the headship of the famous school. It is thought that he retained this office even when he himself had succeeded Heraclas as bishop. In the last year of Philip, 249, although the emperor himself was reported to be a Christian, a riot at Alexandria, roused by a popular prophet and poet, had all the effect of a severe persecution. It is described by Dionysius in a letter to Fabius of Antioch. The mob first seized an old man named Metras, beat him with clubs when he would not deny his faith, pierced his eyes and face with reeds, dragged him out of the city, and stoned him. Then a woman named Quinta, who would not sacrifice, was drawn along the rough pavement by the feet, dashed against millstones, scourged, and finally stoned in the same suburb. The houses of the faithful were plundered. Not one, so far as the bishop knew, apostatized. The aged virgin, Apollonia, after her teeth had been knocked out, sprang of her own accord into the fire prepared for her rather than utter blasphemies. Serapion had all his limbs broken, and was dashed down from the upper story of his own house. It was impossible for any Christian to go into the streets, even at night, for the mob was shouting that all who would not blaspheme should be burnt. The riot was stopped by the civil war, but the new Emperor Decius instituted a legal persecution in January, 250. St. Cyprian describes how at Carthage the Christians rushed to sacrifice, or at least to obtain false certificates of having done so. Similarly Dionysius tells us that at Alexandria many conformed through fear, others on account of official position, or persuaded by friends; some pale and trembling at their act, others boldly asserting that they had never been Christians. Some endured imprisonment for a time; others abjured only at the sight of tortures; others held out until the tortures conquered their resolution. But there were noble instances of constancy. Julian and Kronion were scourged through the city on camels, and then burnt to death. A soldier, Besas, who protected them from the insults of the people, was beheaded. Macar, a Libyan, was burnt alive. Epimachus and Alexander, after long imprisonment and many tortures, were also burnt, with four women. The virgin Ammonarion also was long tortured. The aged Mercuria and Dionysia, a mother of many children, suffered by the sword. Heron, Ater, and Isidore, Egyptians, after many tortures were given to the flames. A boy of fifteen, Dioscorus, who stood firm under torture, was dismissed by the judge for very shame. Nemesion was tortured and scourged, and then burnt between two robbers. A number of soldiers, and with them an old man named Ingenuus, made indignant signs to one who was on his trial and about to apostatize. When called to order they cried out that they were Christians with such boldness that the governor and his assessors were taken aback; they suffered a glorious martyrdom. Numbers were martyred in the cities and villages. A steward named Ischyrion was pierced through the stomach by his master with a large stake because he refused to sacrifice. Many fled, wandered in the deserts and the mountains, and were cut off by hunger, thirst, cold, sickness, robbers, or wild beasts. A bishop named Chæremon escaped with his *σύμβιος* (wife?) to the Arabian mountain, and was no more heard of. Many were carried off as slaves by the Saracens and some of these were later ransomed for large sums.

Some of the lapsed had been readmitted to Christian fellowship by the martyrs. Dionysius urged upon Fabius, Bishop of Antioch, who was inclined to join Novatian, that it was right to respect this judgment delivered by blessed martyrs "now seated with Christ, and sharers in His Kingdom and assessors in His judgment". He adds the story of an old man, Serapion, who after a long and blameless life had sacrificed, and could obtain absolution from no one. On his death-bed he sent his grandson to fetch a priest. The priest was ill, but he gave a particle of the Eucharist to the child, telling him to moisten it and place it in the old man's mouth. Serapion received it with joy, and immediately expired. Sabinus, the prefect, sent a *frumentarius* (detective) to search for Dionysius directly the decree was published; he looked everywhere but in Dionysius's own house, where the saint had quietly remained. On the fourth day he was inspired to depart, and he left at night, with his domestics and certain brethren. But it seems that he was soon made prisoner, for soldiers escorted the whole party to Taposiris in the Mareotis. A certain Timotheus, who had not been taken with the others, informed a passing

countryman, who carried the news to a wedding-feast he was attending. All instantly rose up and rushed to release the bishop. The soldiers took to flight, leaving their prisoners on their uncushioned litters. Dionysius, believing his rescuers to be robbers, held out his clothes to them, retaining only his tunic. They urged him to rise and fly. He begged them to leave him, declaring that they might as well cut off his head at once, as the soldiers would shortly do so. He let himself down on the ground on his back; but they seized him by the hands and feet and dragged him away, carrying him out of the little town, and setting him on an ass without a saddle. With two companions, Gaius and Peter, he remained in a desert place in Libya until the persecution ceased in 251. The whole Christian world was then thrown into confusion by the news that Novatian claimed the Bishopric of Rome in opposition to Pope Cornelius. Dionysius at once took the side of the latter, and it was largely by his influence that the whole East, after much disturbance, was brought in a few months into unity and harmony. Novatian wrote to him for support. His curt reply has been preserved entire: Novatian can easily prove the truth of his protestation that he was consecrated against his will by voluntarily retiring; he ought to have suffered martyrdom rather than divide the Church of God; indeed it would have been a particularly glorious martyrdom on behalf of the whole Church (such is the importance attached by Dionysius to a schism at Rome); if he can even now persuade his party to make peace, the past will be forgotten; if not, let him save his own soul. St. Dionysius also wrote many letters on this question to Rome and to the East; some of these were treatises on penance. He took a somewhat milder view than Cyprian, for he gave greater weight to the "indulgences" granted by the martyrs, and refused forgiveness in the hour of death to none.

After the persecution the pestilence. Dionysius describes it more graphically than does St. Cyprian, and he reminds us of Thucydides and Defoe. The heathen thrust away their sick, fled from their own relatives, threw bodies half dead into the streets; yet they suffered more than the Christians, whose heroic acts of mercy are recounted by their bishop. Many priests, deacons, and persons of merit died from succouring others, and this death, writes Dionysius, was in no way inferior to martyrdom. The baptismal controversy spread from Africa throughout the East. Dionysius was far from teaching, like Cyprian, that baptism by a heretic rather befouls than cleanses; but he was impressed by the opinion of many bishops and some councils that repetition of such a baptism was necessary, and it appears that he besought Pope Stephen not to break off communion with the Churches of Asia on this account. He also wrote on the subject to Dionysius of Rome, who was not yet pope, and to a Roman named Philemon, both of whom had written to him. We know seven letters from him on the subject, two being addressed to Pope Sixtus II. In one of these he asks advice in the case of a man who had received baptism a long time before from heretics, and now declared that it had been improperly performed. Dionysius had refused to renew the sacrament after the man had so many years received the Holy Eucharist; he asks the pope's opinion. In this case it is clear that the difficulty was in the nature of the ceremonies used, not in the mere fact of their having been performed by heretics. We gather that Dionysius himself followed the Roman custom, either by the tradition of his Church, or else out of obedience to the decree of Stephen. In 253 Origen died; he had not been at Alexandria for many years. But Dionysius had not forgotten his old master, and wrote a letter in his praise to Theotecnus of Cæsarea.

An Egyptian bishop, Nepos, taught the Chiliastic error that there would be a reign of Christ upon earth for a thousand years, a period of corporal delights; he founded this doctrine upon the Apocalypse in a book entitled "Refutation of the Allegorizers". It was only after the death of Nepos that Dionysius found himself obliged to write two books "On the Promises" to counteract this error. He treats Nepos with great respect, but rejects his doctrine, as indeed the Church has since done, though it was taught by Papias, Justin, Irenæus, Victorinus of Pettau, and others. The diocese proper to Alexandria was still very large (though Heraclas is said to have instituted new bishoprics), and the Arsinoite nome formed a part of it. Here the error was very prevalent, and St. Dionysius went in person to the villages, called together the priests and teachers, and for three days instructed them, refuting the arguments they drew from the book of Nepos. He was much edified by the docile spirit and love of truth which he found. At length Korakion, who had introduced the book and the doctrine, declared himself convinced. The chief interest of the incident is not in the picture it gives of ancient Church life and of the wisdom and gentleness of the bishop, but in the remarkable disquisition, which Dionysius appends, on the authenticity of the Apocalypse. It is a very striking piece of "higher criticism", and for clearness and moderation, keenness and insight, is hardly to be surpassed. Some of the brethren, he tells us, in their zeal against Chiliastic error, repudiated the Apocalypse altogether, and took it chapter by chapter to ridicule it, attributing the authorship of it to Cerinthus (as we know the Roman Gaius did some years earlier). Dionysius treats it with reverence, and declares it to be full of hidden mysteries, and doubtless really by a man called John. (In a passage now lost, he showed that the book must be understood allegorically.) But he found it hard to believe that the writer could be the son of Zebedee, the author of the Gospel and of the Catholic Epistle, on account of the great contrast of character, style, and "what is called working out". He shows that the one writer calls himself John, whereas the other only refers to himself by some periphrasis. He adds the famous remark, that "it is said that there are two tombs in Ephesus, both of which are called that of John". He demonstrates the close likeness between the Gospel and the Epistle, and points out the wholly different vocabulary of the Apocalypse; the latter is full of solecisms and barbarisms, while the former are in good Greek. This acute criticism was unfortunate, in that it was largely the cause of the frequent rejection of the Apocalypse in the Greek-speaking Churches, even as late as the Middle Ages. Dionysius's arguments appeared unanswerable to the liberal critics of the nineteenth century. Lately the swing of the pendulum has brought many, guided by Bousset, Harnack, and others, to be impressed rather by the undeniable points of contact between the Gospel and the Apocalypse, than by the differences of style (which can be explained by a different scribe and interpreter, since the author of both books was certainly a Jew), so that even Loisy admits that the opinion of the numerous and learned conservative scholars "no longer appears impossible". But it should be noted that the modern critics have added nothing to the judicious remarks of the third-century patriarch.

The Emperor Valerian, whose accession was in 253, did not persecute until 257. In that year St. Cyprian was banished to Curubis, and St. Dionysius to Kephro in the Mareotis, after being tried, together with one priest and two deacons, before Æmilianus, the prefect of Egypt. He himself relates the firm answers he made to the prefect, writing to defend himself against a certain Germanus, who had accused him of a disgraceful flight. Cyprian suffered in 258, but Dionysius was spared, and returned to Alexandria directly toleration was decreed by Gallienus in 260. But not to peace, for in 261–2 the city was in a state of tumult little less dangerous than a persecution. The great

thoroughfare which traversed the town was impassable. The bishop had to communicate with his flock by letter, as though they were in different countries. It was easier, he writes, to pass from East to West, than from Alexandria to Alexandria. Famine and pestilence raged anew. The inhabitants of what was still the second city of the world had decreased so that the males between fourteen and eighty were now scarcely so numerous as those between forty and seventy had been not many years before. A controversy arose in the latter years of Dionysius of which the half-Arian Eusebius has been careful to make no mention. All we know is from St. Athanasius. Some bishops of the Pentapolis of Upper Libya fell into Sabellianism and denied the distinctness of the Three Persons of the Blessed Trinity. Dionysius wrote some four letters to condemn their error, and sent copies to Pope Sixtus II (257–8). But he himself fell, so far as words go, into the opposite error, for he said the Son is a *ποίημα* (something made) and distinct in substance, *ξένος κατ' οὐσίαν*, from the Father, even as is the husbandman from the vine, or a shipbuilder from a ship. These words were seized upon by the Arians of the fourth century as plain Arianism. But Athanasius defended Dionysius by telling the sequel of the history. Certain brethren of Alexandria, being offended at the words of their bishop, betook themselves to Rome to Pope St. Dionysius (259–268), who wrote a letter, in which he declared that to teach that the Son was made or was a creature was an impiety equal, though contrary, to that of Sabellius. He also wrote to his namesake of Alexandria informing him of the accusation brought against him. The latter immediately composed books entitled "Refutation" and "Apology"; in these he explicitly declared that there never was a time when God was not Father, that Christ always was, being Word and Wisdom and Power, and coeternal, even as brightness is not posterior to the light from which it proceeds. He teaches the "Trinity in Unity and the Unity in Trinity"; he clearly implies the equality and eternal procession of the Holy Ghost. In these last points he is more explicit than St. Athanasius himself is elsewhere, while in the use of the word *consubstantial*, *ὁμοούσιος*, he anticipates Nicæa, for he bitterly complains of the calumny that he had rejected the expression. But however he himself and his advocate Athanasius may attempt to explain away his earlier expressions, it is clear that he had been incorrect in thought as well as in words, and that he did not at first grasp the true doctrine with the necessary distinctness. The letter of the pope was evidently explicit and must have been the cause of the Alexandrian's clearer vision. The pope, as Athanasius points out, gave a formal condemnation of Arianism long before that heresy emerged. When we consider the vagueness and incorrectness in the fourth century of even the supporters of orthodoxy in the East, the decision of the Apostolic See will seem a marvellous testimony to the doctrine of the Fathers as to the unfailing faith of Rome.

We find Dionysius issuing yearly, like the later bishops of Alexandria, festal letters announcing the date of Easter and dealing with various matters. When the heresy of Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch, began to trouble the East, Dionysius wrote to the Church of Antioch on the subject, as he was obliged to decline the invitation to attend a synod there, on the score of his age and infirmities. He died soon afterwards. St. Dionysius is in the Roman Martyrology on 17 Nov., but he is also intended, with the companions of his flight in the Decian persecution, by the mistaken notice on 3 Oct.: Dionysius, Faustus, Gaius, Peter, and Paul, Martyrs(!). The same error is found in Greek menologies.

The principal remains of Dionysius are the citations in EUSEBIUS, *H. E.*, VI–VII, a few fragments of the books *On Nature* in IDEM, *Præp. Evang.*, xiv, and the quotations in ATHANASIUS, *De Sententiâ Dionysii*, etc. A collection of these and other fragments is in GALLANDI, *Bibl. Vett. Patrum*, III XIV, reprinted in *P. G.*, X. The fullest ed. is by SIMON DE MAGISTRIS, *S. Dion. Al. Opp. omnia* (Rome, 1796); also ROUTH, *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, III–IV. Syriac and Armenian fragments in PITRA, *Analecta Sacra*, IV. A complete list of all the fragments is in HARNACK, *Gesch. der altchr. Litt.*, I, 409–27, but his account of the passages from the *Catena* on Luke (probably from a letter to Origen, *On Martyrdom*) needs completing from SICKENBERGER, *Die Lucaskatene des Niketas von Heracleia* (Leipzig, 1902). For the life of Dionysius see TILLEMONT, IV; *Acta SS.*, 3 Oct.; DITTRICH, *Dionysius der Grosse, eine Monographie* (Freiburg im Br., 1867); MORIZE, *Denys d'Alexandrie* (Paris, 1881). DOM MORIN tried unsuccessfully to identify the *Canons of Hippolytus* with DIONYSIUS' Ἐπιστόλη διακονικὴ διὰ Ἱππολύτου (EUSEB., *H. E.*, VI, 45–6) in *Revue Bénédictine* (1900), XVII, 241. Also MERCATI, *Note di letteratura bibl. et crist. ant.: Due supposte lettere di Dionigi Aless.* (Rome, 1901). For chronology see HARNACK, *Chronol.*, I, 202, II, 57. A very good account, with full bibliography, is in BARDENHEWER, *Gesch. der altkirchl. Litt.*, II. On the Chiliastic question see GRY, *Le Millénarisme* (Paris, 1904), 101.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite.—By "Dionysius the Areopagite" is usually understood the judge of the Areopagus who, as related in Acts, xvii, 34, was converted to Christianity by the preaching of St. Paul, and according to Dionysius of Corinth (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., III, iv) was Bishop of Athens. In the course of time, however, two errors of far-reaching import arose in connexion with this name. In the first place, a series of famous writings of a rather peculiar nature was ascribed to the Areopagite and, secondly, he was popularly identified with the holy martyr of Gaul, Dionysius, the first Bishop of Paris. It is not our purpose to take up directly the latter point; we shall concern ourselves here (1) with the person of the Pseudo-Areopagite; (2) with the classification, contents, and characteristics of his writings; (3) with their history and transmission; under this head the question as to the genuineness, origin, first acceptance, and gradual spread of these writings will be answered.

Deep obscurity still hovers about the person of the Pseudo-Areopagite. External evidence as to the time and place of his birth, his education, and later occupation is entirely wanting. Our only source of information regarding this problematic personage is the writings themselves. The clues furnished by the first appearance and by the character of the writings enable us to conclude that the author belongs at the very earliest to the latter half of the fifth century, and that, in all probability, he was a native of Syria. His thoughts, phrases, and expressions show a great familiarity with the works of the neo-Platonists, especially with Plotinus and Proclus. He is also thoroughly versed in the sacred books of the Old and the New Testament, and in the works of the Fathers as far as Cyril of Alexandria. (Passages from the Areopagitic writings are indicated by title and chapter. In this article D. D. N. stands for "De divinis nominibus"; C. H. for "Cælestis hierarchia"; E. H. for "Ecclesiastica hierarchia"; Th. M. for "Theologia mystica", which are all found in Migne, P. G., vol. III.) In a letter to Polycarp (Ep. vii; P. G., III, 1080 A) and in "Cæl. hier." (ix, 3; P. G., III, 260 D) he intimates that he was formerly a pagan, and this seems quite probable, considering the peculiar character of his literary work. But one should be more cautious in regard to certain other personal references, for instance that he was chosen teacher of the "newly-baptized" (D. D. N., iii, 2; P. G., III, 681 B); that his spiritual father and guide was a wise and saintly man, Hierotheus by name; that he was advised by the latter and ordered by his own superiors to compose these works (ibid., 681 sq.). And it is plainly for the purpose of deceiving that he tells of having observed the solar eclipse at Christ's Crucifixion (Ep., vii, 2; P. G., III, 1081 A) and of having, with Hierotheus, the Apostles (Peter and James), and other hierarchs, looked upon "the Life-Begetting, God-Receiving body, i. e. of the Blessed Virgin" (D. D. N., iii, 2; P. G., III, 681 C). The former of these accounts is based on Matt., xxvii, 45,

and Mark, xv, 33; the latter refers to apocryphal descriptions of the "Dormitio Mariæ". For the same purpose, i. e. to create the impression that the author belonged to the times of the Apostles and that he was identical with the Areopagite mentioned in the Acts, different persons, such as John the Evangelist, Paul, Timothy, Titus, Justus, and Carpus, with whom he is supposed to be on intimate terms, figure in his writings.

The doctrinal attitude of the Pseudo-Areopagite is not clearly defined. A certain vagueness, which was perhaps intended, is characteristic of his Christology, especially in the question concerning the two natures in Christ. We may well surmise that he was not a stranger to the later, and rather modified, form of Monophysitism and that he belonged to that conciliatory group which sought, on the basis of the Henoticon issued in 482 by the Emperor Zeno (Evagrius, Hist. Eccl., III, xiv), to reconcile the extremes of orthodoxy and heresy. This reserved, indefinite attitude of the author explains the remarkable fact that opposite factions claimed him as an adherent. As to his social rank, a careful comparison of certain details scattered through his works shows that he belonged to the class of scholars who were known at the time as *σχολαστικοί*.

The writings themselves form a collection of four treatises and ten letters. The first treatise, which is also the most important in scope and content, presents in thirteen chapters an explanation of the Divine names. Setting out from the principle that the names of God are to be learned from Scripture only, and that they afford us but an imperfect knowledge of God, Dionysius discusses, among other topics, God's goodness, being, life, wisdom, power, and justice. The one underlying thought of the work, recurring again and again under different forms and phrases, is: God, the One Being (*τὸ ἕν*), transcending all quality and predication, all affirmation and negation, and all intellectual conception, by the very force of His love and goodness gives to beings outside Himself their countless gradations, unites them in the closest bonds (*πρόοδος*), keeps each by His care and direction in its appointed sphere, and draws them again in an ascending order to Himself (*ἐπιστροφή*). While he illustrates the inner life of the Trinity by metaphors of blossom and light applied to the Second and Third Persons (D. D. N., ii, 7 in P. G., III, 645 B), Dionysius represents the procession of all created things from God by the exuberance of being in the Godhead (*τὸ ὑπερπλῆρες*), its outpouring and overflowing (D. D. N., ix, 9 in P. G., III, 909 C; cf. ii, 10 in P. G., III, 648 C; xiii, 1 in P. G., III, 977 B), and as a flashing forth from the sun of the Deity (D. D. N., iv, 6 in P. G., III, 701 A; iv, 1 in P. G., III, 693 B). Exactly according to their physical nature created things absorb more or less of the radiated light, which, however, grows weaker the farther it descends (D. D. N., xi, 2 in P. G., III, 952 A; i, 2 in P. G., III, 588 C). As the mighty root sends forth a multitude of plants which it sustains and controls, so created things owe their origin and conservation to the All-Ruling Deity (D. D. N., x, 1 in P. G., III, 936 D). Patterned upon the original of Divine love, righteousness, and peace, is the harmony that pervades the universe (D. D. N., chapters iv, viii, xi). All things tend to God, and in Him all are merged and completed, just as the circle returns into itself (D. D. N., iv, 14 in P. G., III, 712 D), as the radii are joined in the centre, or as the numbers are contained in unity (D. D. N., v, 6 in P. G., III, 820 sq.). These and many similar expressions have given rise to frequent charges of Pantheism against the author. He does not, however, assert a necessary emanation of things from God, but admits a free creative act on the part of God (D. D. N., iv, 10 in P. G., III, 708 B; cf. C. H., iv, 1 in P. G., III, 177 C); still the echo of neo-Platonism is unmistakable.

The same thoughts, or their applications to certain orders of being, recur in his other writings. The second treatise develops in fifteen chapters the doctrine of the celestial hierarchy, comprising nine angelic choirs which are divided into closer groupings of three choirs each (triads). The names of the nine choirs are taken from the canonical books and are arranged in the following order. First triad: seraphim, cherubim, thrones; second triad: virtues, dominations, powers; third triad: principalities, archangels, angels (C. H., vi, 2 in P. G., III, 200 D). The grouping of the second triad exhibits some variations. From the etymology of each choir-name the author labours to evolve a wealth of description, and, as a result, lapses frequently into tautology. Quite characteristic is the dominant idea that the different choirs of angels are less intense in their love and knowledge of God the farther they are removed from Him, just as a ray of light or of heat grows weaker the farther it travels from its source. To this must be added another fundamental idea peculiar to the Pseudo-Areopagite, namely, that the highest choirs transmit the light received from the Divine Source only to the intermediate choirs, and these in turn transmit it to the lowest. The third treatise is but a continuation of the other two, inasmuch as it is based on the same leading ideas. It deals with the nature and grades of the "ecclesiastical hierarchy" in seven chapters, each of which is subdivided into three parts (*πρόλογος, μυστήριον, θεωρία*). After an introduction which discusses God's purpose in establishing the hierarchy of the Church, and which pictures Christ as its Head, holy and supreme, Dionysius treats of three sacraments (baptism, the Eucharist, extreme unction), of the three grades of the Teaching Church (bishops, priests, deacons), of three grades of the "Learning Church" (monks, people, and the class composed of catechumens, energumens, and penitents), and, lastly, of the burial of the dead [C. H., iii, (3), 6 in P. G., III, 432 sq.; vi in P. G., III, 529 sq.]. The main purpose of the author is to disclose and turn to the uses of contemplation the deeper mystical meaning which underlies the sacred rites, ceremonies, institutions, and symbols. The fourth treatise is entitled "Mystical Theology", and presents in five chapters guiding principles concerning the mystical union with God, which is entirely beyond the compass of sensuous or intellectual perception (*ἐποπτεία*). The ten letters, four addressed to a monk, Caius, and one each to a deacon, Dorotheus, to a priest, Sopater, to the bishop Polycarp, to a monk, Demophilus, to the bishop Titus, and to the Apostle John, contain, in part, additional or supplementary remarks on the above-mentioned principal works, and in part, practical hints for dealing with sinners and unbelievers. Since in all these writings the same salient thoughts on philosophy and theology recur with the same striking peculiarities of expression and with manifold references, in both form and matter, from one work to another, the assumption is justified that they are all to be ascribed to one and the same author. In fact, at its first appearance in the literary world the entire *corpus* of these writings was combined as it is now. An eleventh letter to Apollophanes, given in Migne, P. G., III, 1119, is a medieval forgery based on the seventh letter. Apocryphal, also, are a letter to Timothy and a second letter to Titus.

Dionysius would lead us to infer that he is the author of still other learned treatises, namely: "Theological Outlines" (D. D. N., ii, 3 in P. G., III, 640 B); "Sacred Hymns" (C. H., vii, 4 in P. G., III, 212 B); "Symbolic Theology" (C. H., xv, 6 in P. G., III, 336 A), and treatises on "The Righteous Judgment of God" (D. D. N., iv, 35 in P. G., III, 736 B), on "The Soul" (D. D. N., iv, 2 in P. G., III, 696 C), and on "The Objects of Intellect and Sense" (E. H., i, 2 in P. G., III, 373 B). No reliable trace, however, of any of these writings has ever been discovered, and in his references to them Dionysius is uncontrollable as in

his citations from Hierotheus. It may be asked if these are not fictions pure and simple, designed to strengthen the belief in the genuineness of the actually published works. This suspicion seems to be more warranted because of other discrepancies, e. g. when Dionysius, the priest, in his letter to Timothy, extols the latter as a *θεοειδής, ἔνθεος, θεῖος ἱεράρχης*, and nevertheless seeks to instruct him in those sublime secret doctrines that are for bishops only (E. H., i, 5 in P. G., III, 377 A), doctrines, moreover, which, since the cessation of the Disciplina Arcani, had already been made public. Again, Dionysius points out (D. D. N., iii, 2 in P. G., III, 681 B; cf. E. H., iv, 2 in P. G., III, 476 B) that his writings are intended to serve as catechetical instruction for the newly-baptized. This is evidently another contradiction of his above-mentioned statement.

We may now turn to the history of the Pseudo-Dionysian writings. This embraces a period of almost fifteen hundred years, and three distinct turning points in its course have divided it into as many distinct periods: first, the period of the gradual rise and settlement of the writings in Christian literature, dating from the latter part of the fifth century to the Lateran Council, 649; second, the period of their highest and universally acknowledged authority, both in the Western and in the Eastern Church, lasting till the beginning of the fifteenth century; third, the period of sharp conflict waged about their authenticity, begun by Laurentius Valla, and closing only within recent years.

The Areopagitica were formerly supposed to have made their first appearance, or rather to have been first noticed by Christian writers, in a few pseudo-epigraphical works which have now been proved to be the products of a much later period; as, for instance, in the following: Pseudo-Origenes, "Homilia in diversos secunda"; Pseudo-Athanasius, "Quæstiones ad Antiochum ducem", Q. viii; Pseudo-Hippolytus, against the heretic Beron; Pseudo-Chrysostom, "Sermo de pseudo-prophetis". Until quite recently more credit was given to other lines of evidence on which Franz Hipler endeavoured to support his entirely new thesis, to the effect that the author of the writings lived about the year 375 in Egypt, as Abbot of Rhinokorura. Hipler's attempts, however, at removing the textual difficulties, *ἔκλειψις, ἀδελφόθεος, σῶμα*, proved to be unsuccessful. In fact, those very passages in which Hipler thought that the Fathers had made use of the Areopagite (e. g. in Gregory of Nazianzus and Jerome) do not tell in favour of his hypothesis; on the contrary, they are much better explained if the converse be assumed, namely, that Pseudo-Dionysius drew from them. Hipler himself, convinced by the results of recent research, has abandoned this opinon. Other events also, both historical and literary, evidently exerted a marked influence on the Areopagite: (1) the Council of Chalcedon (451), the Christological terminology of which was studiously followed by Dionysius; (2) the writings of the neo-Platonist Proclus (411–485), from whom Dionysius borrowed to a surprising extent; (3) the introduction (c. 476) of the Credo into the liturgy of the Mass, which is alluded to in the "Ecclesiastical Hierarchy" [iii, 2, in P. G., III, 425 C, and iii, (3), 7 in P. G., III, 436 C; cf. the explanation of Maximus in P. G., IV, 144 B]; (4) the Henoticon of the Emperor Zeno (482), a formula of union designed for the bishops, clerics, monks, and faithful of the Orient, as a compromise between Monophysitism and orthodoxy. Both in spirit and tendency the Areopagitica correspond fully to the sense of the Henoticon; and one might easily infer that they not only originated in the same sphere, but that they were made to further the purpose of the Henoticon.

The result of the foregoing data is that the first appearance of the pseudo-epigraphical writings cannot be placed earlier than the latter half, in fact at the close, of the fifth century.

Having ascertained a *terminus post quem*, it is possible by means of evidence taken from Dionysius himself to fix a *terminus ante quem*, thus narrowing to about thirty years the period within which these writings must have originated. The earliest reliable citations from the writings of Dionysius are from the end of the fifth and the beginning of the sixth century. The first is by Severus, the head of a party of moderate Monophysites named after him, and Patriarch of Antioch (512–518). In a letter addressed to a certain abbot, John (Mai, Script. vett. nov. coll., VII, i, 71), he quotes in proof of his doctrine of the *μία σύνθετος φύσις* in Christ the Dionysian Ep. iv (P. G., III, 1072 C), where a *καινὴ θεανδρικὴ ἐνέργεια* is mentioned. Again, in the treatise "Adversus anathem. Juliani Halicarn." (Cod. Syr. Vat. 140, fol. 100 b), Severus cites a passage from D. D. N., ii, 9, P. G., III, 648 A (*ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ πάσης—θεσμῷ διεπλάττετο*), and returns once more to Ep. iv. In the Syrian "History of the Church" of Zacharias (ed. Ahrens-Krüger, 134–5) it is related that Severus, a man well-versed in the writings of Dionysius (Areop.), was present at the Synod in Tyre (513). Andreas, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, wrote (about 520) a commentary on the Apocalypse wherein he quotes the Areopagite four times and makes use of at least three of his works (Migne, P. G., CVI, 257, 305, 356, 780; cf. Diekamp in "Hist. Jahrb.", XVIII, 1897, pp. 1–36). Like Severus, Zacharias Rhetor and, in all probability, also Andreas of Cappadocia, inclined to Monophysitism (Diekamp, ibid., pp. 33, 34). It must be mentioned here that a "Book of Hierotheus"—Hierotheus had come to be regarded as the teacher of Dionysius—existed in the Syrian literature of that time and exerted considerable influence in the spread of Dionysian doctrines. Frothingham (Stephen Bar Sudaili, p. 63 sq.) considers the pantheist Stephen Bar Sudaili as its author. Jobius Monachus, a contemporary of the writers just mentioned, published against Severus a polemical treatise which has since been lost, but claims the Areopagite as authority for the orthodox teaching (P. G., CIII, 765). So also Ephræm, Archbishop of Antioch (527–545), interprets in a right sense the well-known passage from D. D. N., i, 4, P. G., III, 529 A: *ὁ ἁπλοῦς Ἰησοῦς συνετέθη*, by distinguishing between *σύνθετος ὑπόστασις* and *σύνθετος οὐσία*. Between the years 532–548, if not earlier, John of Scythopolis in Palestine wrote an interpretation of Dionysius (Pitra, "Analect. sacr.", IV, Proleg., p. xxiii; cf. Loofs, "Leontius of Byzantium", p. 270 sqq.) from an anti-Severian standpoint. In Leontius of Byzantium (485–543) we have another important witness. This eminent champion of Catholic doctrine in at least four passages of his works builds on the *μέγας Διονύσιος* (P. G., LXXXVI, 1213 A; 1288 C; 1304 D; Canisius-Basnage, "Thesaur. monum. eccles.", Antwerp, 1725, I, 571). Sergius of Resaina in Mesopotamia, archiater and presbyter (d. 536), at an early date translated the works of Dionysius into Syriac. He admitted their genuineness, and for their defence also translated into Syriac the already current "Apologies" (Brit. Mus. cod. add. 1251 and 22370; cf. Zacharias Rhetor in Ahrens-Krüger, p. 208). He himself was a Monophysite.

By far the most important document in the case is the report given by Bishop Innocent of Maronia of the religious debate held at Constantinople in 533 between seven orthodox and seven Severian speakers (Hardouin, II, 1159 sqq.). The former had as leader and spokesman Hypatius, Bishop of Ephesus, who was thoroughly versed in the literature of the subject. On the second day the "Orientals" (Severians) alleged against the Council of Chalcedon, that it had by a novel and erroneous expression decreed two natures in Christ. Besides Cyril of Alexandria, Athanasius, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and Felix and Julius of Rome, they also quoted Dionysius the Areopagite as an exponent of the doctrine of one nature. Hypatius re-

jected as spurious all these citations, and showed that Cyril never made the slightest use of them, though on various occasions they would have served his purpose admirably. He suspects that these falsifiers are Apollinarists. When the Severians rejoined that they could point out in the polemical writings of Cyril against Diodorus and Theodore the use made of such evidence, Hypatius persisted in the stand he had taken: "sed nunc videtur quoniam et in illis libris [Cyrilli] hæretici falsantes addiderunt ea". The references to the archives at Alexandria had just as little weight with him, since Alexandria, with its libraries, had long been in the hands of the heretics. How could an interested party of the opposition be introduced as a witness? Hypatius refers again especially to Dionysius and successfully puts down the opposition: "Illa enim testimonia quæ vos Dionysii Areopagitæ dicitis, unde potestis ostendere vera esse, sicut suspicamini? Si enim eius erant, non potuissent latere beatum Cyrillum. Quid autem de beato Cyrillo dico, quando et beatus Athanasius, si pro certo scisset eius fuisse, ante omnia in Nicæno concilio de consubstantiali Trinitate eadem testimonia protulisset adversus Arii diversæ substantiæ blasphemias". Indeed, as to the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son the Areopagite has statements that leave no room for misinterpretation; and had these come from a disciple of the Apostles, they would have been all the more valuable. Hereupon the Severians dropped this objection and turned to another.

The fact must, indeed, appear remarkable that these very writings, though rejected outright by such an authority as Hypatius, were within little more than a century looked upon as genuine by Catholics, so that they could be used against the heretics during the Lateran Council in 649 (Hardouin, III, 699 sqq.). How had this reversion been brought about? As the following grouping will show, it was chiefly heterodox writers, Monophysites, Nestorians, and Monothelites, who during several decades appealed to the Areopagite. But among Catholics also there were not a few who assumed the genuineness, and as some of these were persons of consequence, the way was gradually paved for the authorization of his writings in the above-mentioned council. To the group of Monophysites belonged: Themistius, deacon in Alexandria about 537 (Hardouin, III, 784, 893 sq., 1240 sq.); Colluthus of Alexandria, about 540 (Hardouin, III, 786, 895, 898); John Philoponus, an Alexandrian grammarian, about 546–549 (W. Reichardt, "Philoponus, de opificio mundi"); Petrus Callinicus, Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch, in the latter half of the sixth century, cited Dionysius in his polemic against the Patriarch Damianus of Alexandria (II, xli and xlvii; cf. Frothingham, op. cit., after Cod. Syr. Vat., 108, f. 282 sqq.). As examples of the Nestorian group may be mentioned Joseph Huzaja, a Syrian monk, teacher about 580 at the school of Nisibis (Assemani, Bibl. orient., vol. III, pt. I, p. 103); also Ischojeb, catholicos, from 580 or 581 to 594 or 595 (Braun, "Buch der Synhados", p. 229 sq.); and John of Apamea, a monk in one of the cloisters situated on the Orontes, belonging most probably to the sixth century (Cod. Syr. Vat., 93). The heads of the Monothelites, Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople (610–638), Cyrus, Patriarch of Alexandria (630–643), Pyrrhus, the successor of Sergius in Constantinople (639–641), took as the starting point in their heresy the fourth letter of Dionysius to Caius, wherein they altered the oft-quoted formula, *θεανδρικὴ ἐνέργεια* into *μία θεανδρικὴ ἐνέργεια*.

To glance briefly at the Catholic group we find in the "Historia Euthymiaca", written about the middle of the sixth century, a passage taken, according to a citation of John Damascene (P. G., XCVI, 748), from D. D. N., iii, 2, P. G., III, 682 D: *παρῆσαν δὲ—ἐπακούσας*. Another witness, who at the same time leads over to the Latin literature, is Liberatus of Carthage (Breviarium causæ Nestor. et Eutych., ch. v). Joannes Malalas, of Antioch, who died about 565, narrates, in his "Universal Chronicle", the conversion of the judge of the Areopagus through St. Paul (Acts, xvii, 34), and praises our author as a powerful philosopher and antagonist of the Greeks (P. G., XCVII, 384; cf. Krumbacher, Gesch. d. byz. Lit.", 3rd ed., p. 112 sq.). Another champion was Theodore, presbyter. Though it is difficult to locate him chronologically he was, according to Le Nourry (P. G., III, 16), an "auctor antiquissimus" who flourished, at all events, before the Lateran Council in 649 and, as we learn from Photius (P. G., CIII, 44 sq.), undertook to defend the genuineness of the Areopagitic writings. The repute, moreover, of these writings was enhanced in a marked degree by the following eminent churchmen: Eulogius, Patriarch of Alexandria (580–607), knew and quoted, among others, the D. D. N., xiii, 2, verbatim (P. G., CIII, 1061; cf. Der Katholik, 1897, II, p. 95 sq.). From Eulogius we naturally pass to Pope Gregory the Great, with whom he enjoyed a close and honourable friendship. Gregory the Great (590–604), in his thirty-fourth Homily on Luke, xv, 1–10 (P. L., LXXVI, 1254), distinctly refers to the Areopagite's teaching regarding the Angels: "Fertur vero Dionysius Areopagita, antiquus videlicet et venerabilis Pater, dicere" etc. (cf. C. H., vii, ix, xiii). As Gregory admits that he is not versed in Greek (Ewald, Reg., I, 28; III, 63; X, 10, 21), he uses *fertur* not to express his doubt of the genuineness, but to imply that he had to rely on the testimony of others, since at the time no Latin version existed. It is, indeed, most probable that Eulogius directed his attention to the work.

About the year 620, Antiochus Monachus, a member of the Sabas monastery near Jerusalem, compiled a collection of moral "sentences" designed for the members of his order (P. G., LXXXIX, 1415 sqq.). In the "Homilia (capitulum) LII" we discover a number of similar expressions and Biblical examples which are borrowed from the eighth letter of Dionysius "ad Demophilum" (P. G., III, 1085 sq.). In other passages frequent reference is made to the D. D. N. In the following years, two Patriarchs of Jerusalem, both from monasteries, defend Dionysius as a time-honoured witness of the true doctrines. The first is the Patriarch Modestus (631–634), formerly abbot of the Theodosius monastery in the desert of Juda. In a panegyric on the *Assumptio Mariæ* (P. G., LXXXVI, 3277 sq.) he quotes sentences from the D. D. N., i, 4; ii, 10; from the "Theologia Mystica", i, 1; and from Ep. ii. The second, a still brighter luminary in the Church, is the Patriarch Sophronius (634–638), formerly a monk of the Theodosius monastery near Jerusalem. Immediately after his installation he published an *epistula synodica*, "perhaps the most important document in the Monothelitic dispute". It gives, among other dogmas, a lengthy exposition of the doctrine of two energies in Christ (Hefele, Conciliengesch., 2nd ed., III, 140 sqq.). Citing from "Ep. iv ad Caium" (*θεανδρικὴ ἐνέργεια*), he refers to our author as a man through whom God speaks and who was won over by the Divine Paul in a Divine manner (P. G., LXXXVII, 3177). Maximus Confessor evidently rests upon Sophronius, whose friendship he had gained while abbot of the monastery of Chrysopolis in Alexandria (633). In accordance with Sophronius he explains the Dionysian term *θεανδρικὴ ἐνέργεια* in an orthodox sense, and praises it as indicating both essences and natures in their distinct properties and yet in closest union (P. G., XCI, 345). Following the example of Sophronius, Maximus also distinguishes in Christ three kinds of actions (*θεοπρεπεῖς*, *ἀνθρωποπρεπεῖς* and *μικταί*) (P. G., IV, 536). Thus the Monothelites lost their strongest weapon, and the Lateran Council found the saving word (Hefele, op. cit., 2nd ed., III, 129). In other regards also Maximus plays an important part in the

authorization of the Areopagitica. A lover of theologico-mystical speculation, he showed an uncommon reverence for these writings, and by his glosses (P. G., IV), in which he explained dubious passages of Dionysius in an orthodox sense, he contributed greatly towards the recognition of Dionysius in the Middle Ages. Another equally indefatigable champion of Dyophysitism was Anastasius, a monk from the monastery of Sinai, who in 640 began his chequered career as a wandering preacher. Not only in his "Guide" (ὁδηγός), but also in the "Quæstiones" and in the seventh book of the "Meditations on the Hexæmeron", he unhesitatingly makes use of different passages from Dionysius (P. G., LXXXIX). By this time a point had been reached at which the official seal, so to speak, could be put upon the Dionysian writings. The Lateran Council of 649 solemnly rejected the Monothelite heresy (Hardouin, III, 699 sqq.). Pope Martin I quotes from the D. D. N., ii, 9; iv, 20 and 23; and the "Ep. ad Caium"; speaks of the author as "beatæ memoriæ Dionysius", "Dionysius egregius, sanctus, beatus", and vigorously objects to the perversion of the text: *una* instead of *nova dei et viri operatio*. The influence which Maximus exerted by his personal appearance at the council and by his above-mentioned explanation of θεανδρικὴ ἐνέργεια is easily recognized ("Dionysius duplicem [operationem] duplicis naturæ compositivo sermone abusus est"—Hardouin, III, 787). Two of the testimonies of the Fathers which were read in the fifth session are taken from Dionysius. Little wonder, then, that thenceforth no doubt was expressed concerning the genuineness of the Areopagitica. Pope Agatho, in a dogmatic epistle directed to the Emperor Constantine (680) cites among other passages from the Fathers also the D. D. N., ii, 6. The Sixth Œcumenical Council of Constantinople (680) followed in the footsteps of the Lateran Synod, again defended "Ep. iv ad. Caium" against the falsification of Pyrrhus, and rejected the meaning which the Monothelite Patriarch Macarius assigned to the passage (Hardouin, III, 1099, 1346, 1066). In the second Council of Nicæa (787) we find the "Celestial Hierarchy" of the "deifer Dionysius" cited against the Iconoclasts (Hardouin, IV, 362). This finishes the first and darkest period in the history of the Areopagitica; and it may be summarized as follows. The Dionysian writings appeared in public for the first time in the Monophysite controversies. The Severians made use of them first and were followed by the orthodox. After the religious debate at Constantinople in 533 witnesses for the genuineness of the Areopagitica began to increase among the different heretics. Despite the opposition of Hypatius, Dionysius did not altogether lose his authority even among Catholics, which was due chiefly to Leontius and Ephræm of Antioch. The number of orthodox Christians who defended him grew steadily, comprising high ecclesiastical dignitaries who had come from monasteries. Finally, under the influence of Maximus, the Lateran Council (649) cited him as a competent witness against Monothelism.

As to the second period, universal recognition of the Areopagitic writings in the Middle Ages, we need not mention the Greek Church, which is especially proud of him; but neither in the West was a voice raised in challenge down to the first half of the fifteenth century; on the contrary, his works were regarded as exceedingly valuable and even as sacred. It was believed that St. Paul, who had communicated his revelations to his disciple in Athens, spoke through these writings (Histor.-polit. Blätter, CXXV, 1900, p. 541). As there is no doubt concerning the fact itself, a glance at the main divisions of the tradition may suffice. Rome received the original text of the Areopagitica undoubtedly through Greek monks. The oppressions on the part of Islam during the sixth and seventh centuries compelled many Greek and Oriental monks to abandon their homes and settle in Italy. In Rome itself, a monastery for Greek monks was built under Stephen II and Paul I. It was also Paul I (757–767) who in 757 sent the writings of Dionysius, together with other books, to Pepin in France. Adrian I (772-795) also mentioned Dionysius as a *testis gravissimus* in a letter accompanying the Latin translation of the Acts of the Nicæan Council (787) which he sent to Charlemagne. During the first half of the ninth century the facts concerning Dionysius are mainly grouped around the Abbot Hilduin of Saint-Denys at Paris. Through the latter the false idea that the Gallic martyr Dionysius of the third century, whose relics were preserved in the monastery of Saint-Denys, was identical with the Areopagite rose to an undoubted certainty, while the works ascribed to Dionysius gained in repute. Through a legation from Constantinople, Michael II had sent several gifts to the Frankish Emperor Louis the Pious (827), and among them were the writings of the Areopagite, which gave particular joy and honour to Hilduin, the influential arch-chaplain of Louis. Hilduin took care to have them translated into Latin and he himself wrote a life of the saint (P. L., CVI, 13 sq.). About the year 858 Scotus Eriugena, who was versed in Greek, made a new Latin translation of the Areopagite, which became the main source from which the Middle Ages obtained a knowledge of Dionysius and his doctrines. The work was undertaken at the instance of Charles the Bald, at whose court Scotus enjoyed great influence (P. L., CXXII, 1026 sq.; cf. Traube, "Poet. lat. æv. Carol.", II, 520, 859 sq.). Compared with Hilduin's, this second translation marks a decided step in advance. Scotus, with his keen dialectical skill and his soaring speculative mind, found in the Areopagite a kindred spirit. Hence, despite many errors of translation due to the obscurity of the Greek original, he was able to grasp the connexions of thought and to penetrate the problems. As he accompanied his translations with explanatory notes and as, in his philosophical and theological writings, particularly in the work "De divisione naturæ" (P. L., CXXII), he recurs again and again to Dionysius, it is readily seen how much he did towards securing recognition for the Areopagite.

The works of Dionysius, thus introduced into Western literature, were readily accepted by the medieval Scholastics. The great masters of Saint-Victor at Paris, foremost among them the much-admired Hugh, based their teaching on the doctrine of Dionysius. Peter Lombard and the greatest Dominican and Franciscan scholars, Alexander of Hales, Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure, adopted his theses and arguments. Master poets, e. g. Dante, and historians, e. g. Otto of Freising, built on his foundations. Scholars as renowned as Robert Grosseteste of Lincoln and Vincent of Beauvais drew upon him freely. Popular religious books, such as the "Legenda aurea" of Giacomo da Varagine and the "Life of Mary" by Brother Philip, gave him a cordial welcome. The great mystics, Eckhardt, Tauler, Suso, and others, entered the mysterious obscurity of the writings of Dionysius with a holy reverence. In rapid succession there appeared a number of translations: Latin translations by Joannes Sarrazenus (1170), Robert Grosseteste (about 1220), Thomas Vercellensis (1400), Ambrosius Camaldulensis (1436), Marsilius Ficinus (1492); in the sixteenth century those of Faber Stapulensis, Perionius, etc. Among the commentaries that of Hugh of Saint-Victor is notable for its warmth, that of Albertus Magnus for its extent, that of St. Thomas for its accuracy, that of Denys the Carthusian for its pious spirit and its masterly inclusion of all previous commentaries.

It was reserved for the period of the Renaissance to break with the time-honoured tradition. True, some of the older Humanists, as Pico della Mirandola, Mar-

silius Ficinus, and the Englishman John Colet, were still convinced of the genuineness of the writings; but the keen and daring critic, Laurentius Valla (1407–1457), in his glosses to the New Testament, expressed his doubts quite openly and thereby gave the impulse, at first for the scholarly Erasmus (1504) and later on for the entire scientific world, to take sides either with or against Dionysius. The consequence was the formation of two camps; among the adversaries were not only Protestants (Luther, Scultetus, Dallæus, etc.) but also prominent Catholic theologians (Beatus Rhenanus, Cajetan, Morinus, Sirmond, Petavius, Lequien, Le Nourry); among the defenders of Dionysius were Baronius, Bellarmine, Lansselius, Corderius, Halloix, Delrio, de Rubeis, Lessius, Alexander Natalis, and others. The literary controversy assumed such dimensions and was carried on so vehemently that it can only be compared to the dispute concerning the Pseudo-Isidorian decretals and the Pseudo-Constantinian donation. In the nineteenth century the general opinion inclined more and more towards the opposition; the Germans especially, Möhler, Fessler, Döllinger, Hergenröther, Alzog, Funk, and others made no reserve of their decision for the negative. At this juncture the scholarly professor Franz Hipler came forward and attempted to save the honour of Dionysius. He finds in Dionysius not a falsifier, but a prominent theologian of the fourth century who, through no fault of his own, but owing to the misinterpretation of some passages, was confounded with the Areopagite. Many Catholics, and many Protestants as well, voiced their approval. Finally, in 1895 there appeared almost simultaneously two independent researches, by Hugo Koch and by Joseph Stiglmayr, both of whom started from the same point and arrived at the same goal. The conclusion reached was that extracts from the treatise of the neo-Platonist Proclus, "De malorum subsistentiâ" (handed down in the Latin translation of Morbeka, Cousin ed., Paris, 1864), had been used by Dionysius in the treatise "De div. nom." (c. iv, §§19–35). A careful analysis brought to light an astonishing agreement of both works in arrangement, sequence of thought, examples, figures, and expressions. It is easy to point out many parallelisms from other and later writings of Proclus, e. g. from his "Institutio theologica", "Theologia Platonica", and his commentary on Plato's "Parmenides", "Alcibiades I", and "Timæus" (these five having been written after 462).

Accordingly, the long-standing problem seems to be solved in its most important phase. As a matter of fact this is the decision pronounced by the most competent judges, such as Bardenhewer, Ehrhard, Funk, Diekamp, Rauschen, De Smedt, S. J., Duchesne, Batiffol; and the Protestant scholars of early Christian literature, Gelzer, Harnack, Krüger, Bonwetsch. The chronology being thus determined, an explanation was readily found for the various objections hitherto alleged, viz. the silence of the earlier Fathers, the later dogmatic terminology, a developed monastic, ceremonial, and penitential system, the echo of neo-Platonism, etc. On the other hand it sets at rest many hypotheses which had been advanced concerning the author and his times and various discussions—whether, e. g., a certain Apollinaris, or Synesius, or Dionysius Alexandrinus, or a bishop of Ptolemais, or a pagan hierophant was the writer.

A critical edition of the text of the Areopagite is urgently needed. The Juntina (1516), that of Basle (1539), of Paris (1562 and 1615), and lastly the principal edition of Antwerp (1634) by Corderius, S.J., which was frequently reprinted (Paris, 1644, 1755, 1854) and was included in the Migne collection (P. G., III and IV with Lat. trans. and additions), are insufficient because they make use of only a few of the numerous Greek manuscripts and take no account of the Syriac, Armenian, and Arabic translations. The following translations have thus far appeared in modern languages: English, by Lupton (London, 1869) and Parker (London, 1894), both of which contain only the "Cæl. Hierarchia" and the "Eccles. Hier."; German, by Engelhardt (Sulzbach, 1823) and Storf, "Kirchliche Hierarchie" (Kempten, 1877); French, by Darboy (Paris, 1845) and Dulac (Paris, 1865).

For the older literature, cf. Chevalier, *Bio. bibl.* (Paris, 1905). Recent works treating of Dionysius: Hipler, *Dionysius der Areopagite, Untersuchungen* (Ratisbon, 1861); Idem in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; Schneider, *Areopagitica, Verteidigung ihrer Echtheit* (Ratisbon, 1886); Frothingham, *Stephen Bar Sudaili* (Leyden, 1886); Stiglmayr, *Der Neuplatoniker Proklus als Vorlage des sog. Dionysius Areopagita in der Lehre vom Uebel* in *Hist. Jahrb. der Görres-Gesellschaft* (1895), pp. 253–273 and 721–748; Idem, *Das Aufkommen der pseudo-dionysischen Schriften und ihr Eindringen in die christliche Literatur bis zum Laterankonzil* (Feldkirch, Austria, 1895); Koch, *Der pseudepigraphische Charakter der dionysischen Schriften* in *Theol. Quartalschrift* (Tübingen, 1895), pp. 353–420; Idem, *Proklus, als Quelle des Pseudo-Dionysius Areop. in der Lehre vom Bösen* in *Philologus* (1895), pp. 438–454; Stiglmayr, Controversy with Draseke, Langen, and Nirschl in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* (1898), pp. 91–110, and (1899), pp. 263–301, and *Histor.-polit. Blätter* (1900), CXXV, pp. 541–550 and 613–627; Idem, *Die Lehre von den Sakramenten und der Kirche nach Pseudo-Dionysius* in *Zeitschrift für kath. Theol.* (Innsbruck, 1898), pp. 246–303; Idem, *Die Eschatologie des Pseudo-Dionysius, ibid.* (1899), pp. 1–21; Koch, *Ps.-Dionysius Areop. in seinen Beziehungen zum Neoplatonismus und Mysterienwesen* (Mainz, 1900). See also the articles on Dionysius the Areopagite in the *Patrologie* of Bardenhewer (Freiburg, 1901), in the *Realencyk. für prot. Theol.*, and in the *Dict. of Christian Biography*.

Jos. Stiglmayr.

Dioscorus, Antipope, b. at Alexandria, date unknown; d. 14 October, 530. Originally a deacon of the Church of Alexandria, he was adopted into the ranks of the Roman clergy, and by his commanding abilities soon acquired considerable influence in the Church of Rome. Under Pope St. Symmachus he was sent to Ravenna on an important mission to Theodoric the Goth, and later, under Pope Hormisdas, served with great distinction as papal apocrisiarius, or legate, to the court of Justinian at Constantinople. During the pontificate of Felix IV he became the recognized head of the Byzantine party—a party in Rome which opposed the growing influence and power of a rival faction, the Gothic, to which the pope inclined. To prevent a possible contest for the papacy, Pope Felix IV, shortly before his death, had taken the unprecedented step of appointing his own successor in the person of the aged Archdeacon Boniface, his trusted friend and adviser. When, however, on the death of Felix (Sept., 530) Boniface II succeeded him, the great majority of the Roman priests—sixty out of sixty-seven—refused to accept the new pope and elected in his stead the Greek Dioscorus (17 Sept., 530). Both popes were consecrated on the same day (22 Sept., 530), Dioscorus in the basilica of Constantine (the Lateran) and Boniface in an *aula* (hall) of the Lateran Palace, known as the *basilica Julii*. Fortunately for the Roman Church, the schism which followed was but of short duration, for in less than a month (14 Oct., 530) Dioscorus died, and the presbyters who had elected him wisely submitted to Boniface. In December, 530, Boniface convened a synod at Rome and issued a decree anathematizing Dioscorus as an intruder. He at the same time (it is not known by what means) secured the signatures of the sixty presbyters to his late rival's condemnation, and caused the document to be deposited in the archives of the Church. The anathema against Dioscorus was, however, subsequently removed, and the document solemnly burned by Pope Agapetus I (535). (See Boniface II.)

Liber Pontificalis, ed. Duchesne (Paris, 1886), I, 281 sq.; Jaffé, *Regesta Romanorum Pontificum* (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1885), I, 111–12. In 1883 Amelli discovered the documents bearing on the election of 530, in the chapter library of Novara, and published them with his comments in *Scuola Cattolica* (Milan), XXI, fascic. 123; Creagh in *The Amer. Eccl. Rev.*, XXVIII (Jan., 1903), 41–50; *Theologische Quartalschrift* (1903), 91 sq.; Grisar, *Gesch. Roms und der Päpste* (Freiburg im Br., 1901), I, 494 sq.; Wurm, *Papstwahl* (Cologne, 1902), 12 sq.

Thomas Oestreich.

Dioscurus, Bishop of Alexandria (also written Dioscorus; *Dioscurus* from the analogy of *Dioscuri*), date of birth unknown; d. at Gangra, in Asia Minor, 11 Sept., 454. He had been archdeacon under St. Cyril, whom he succeeded in 444. Soon afterwards Theodoret, who had been on good terms with Cyril since 433, wrote him a polite letter, in which he speaks of the report of Dioscurus's virtues and his modesty. In such a letter no contrary report would be mentioned, and we cannot infer much from these vague expressions. The peace established between John of Antioch and Cyril seems to have continued between their successors until 448, when Domnus, the successor and nephew of John, had to judge the case of Ibas, Bishop of Edessa, who was accused of heresy and many crimes by the Cyrillian party. Domnus acquitted Ibas. The Cyrillian monks of Osrhoene were furious, and betook themselves to Dioscurus as their natural protector. Dioscurus wrote to Domnus, complaining that he championed the Nestorian Ibas and Theodoret. Domnus and Theodoret both replied defending themselves, and showing their perfect orthodoxy. The accusers of Ibas went to the court at Constantinople, where the feeble Theodosius II was only too ready to mix in ecclesiastical quarrels. From him the Cyrillians obtained a decree against the Nestorians, and in particular against Irenæus, who had befriended the Nestorians at the Council of Ephesus, where he was in authority as imperial representative; he was now deposed from the Bishopric of Tyre which he had obtained. Theodoret was forbidden to leave his Diocese of Cyrrhus. In September a new Bishop of Tyre was appointed, and the Patriarch Domnus, feeling that Dioscurus was about to triumph, wrote to Flavian of Constantinople in order to get his support. Alexandria had of old been the first see of the East and was now only surpassed in power by the imperial city. The Egyptian patriarch had vast civil and political influence, as well as an almost autocratic sway over a hundred bishops and a great army of monks, who were heart and soul devoted to the memory of Cyril, and rather fervent than discriminating in their orthodoxy. Constantinople had been granted the next dignity after Rome by the great Council of 381, and this humiliation of Alexandria had embittered the long-standing rivalry between the two sees. Antioch had always tended to support Constantinople, and Domnus was now ready to grant precedence to Flavian. Dioscurus, he said, had already complained that he, Domnus, was betraying the rights of Antioch and Alexandria in admitting the canon of 381, which had never been accepted by Alexandria or Rome. But Flavian was not a helpful ally, for he had neglected to obtain the favour of the eunuch Chrysaphius, who was all-powerful at court. An unforeseen incident was now to set the world in a blaze. At a council held by Flavian in November of the same year, 448, Eusebius of Dorylæum accused the Archimandrite Eutyches of teaching one nature only in Christ. He was treated with all consideration, but his obstinacy made it unavoidable that he should be deposed and excommunicated. Now Eutyches was godfather to Chrysaphius, and "one nature" was precisely the unfortunate expression of St. Cyril, which his followers were already interpreting in a heretical sense. Eutyches therefore at once became the martyr of Cyrillianism; and though he was not a writer nor a theologian, he has given his name to the Monophysite heresy, into which the whole Cyrillian party now plunged once for all.

The Cyrillians were further incensed by the failure of their second attempt to convict Ibas. They had procured an order from the emperor, 25 Oct., 448, for a fresh trial. The bishops who met for this purpose at Tyre in Feb., 449, were obliged by the violence of the Eastern monks to transfer some of their sittings to Berytus. At the end of the month Ibas was exculpated, though the emperor was known to be against him. Dioscurus and his party replied by an unexpected stroke; in March they induced the emperor to issue an invitation to all the greater bishops to attend with their suffragans a general council to be held at Ephesus in August. It was indeed not unreasonable to desire some permanent settlement of the intermittent war, and the pope, St. Leo I, warmly accepted the emperor's proposition, or rather order. Eutyches had written to him, pretending that he had appealed at the time of his condemnation, and promising to abide by his judgment. He wrote also to other bishops, and we still possess the reply sent to him by St. Peter Chrysologus, Bishop of Ravenna, where the court of Valentinian III, the Western emperor, had its head-quarters. St. Peter tells him to await the decision of the pope, who alone can judge a case concerning the Faith. St. Leo at first complained that the matter had not at once been referred to him, then, on finding that a full account sent by St. Flavian had been accidentally delayed, wrote a compendious explanation of the whole doctrine involved, and sent it to St. Flavian as a formal and authoritative decision of the question. He reproves Flavian's council for want of severity to an expression of Eutyches, but adds that the archimandrite may be restored if he repent. This letter, the most famous of all Christian antiquity, is known as "St. Leo's Tome". He sent as legates to the council a bishop named Julius, a priest, Renatus (he died on the way), and the deacon Hilarus, afterwards pope. St. Leo expresses his regret that the shortness of the notice must prevent the presence of any other bishop of the West. It is probable that this difficulty had been anticipated by Dioscurus, who had answered an appeal from Eutyches in a different strain. He regarded him as a down-trodden disciple of the great Cyril, persecuted by the Nestorian Flavian. As his predecessor Peter had appointed a bishop for Constantinople, and as Theophilus had judged St. Chrysostom, so Dioscurus, with the air of a superior, actually declared Eutyches absolved and restored. In April Eutyches obtained a slight revision of the Acts of the council which had condemned him. In the same month the case of Ibas was again examined, by the emperor's order, this time at Edessa itself, and by a lay inquisitor, Cheræas, the Governor of Osrhoene. The people received him with shouts against Ibas. No defence was heard. On the arrival of Cheræas's report, the emperor wrote commanding the presence of Ibas's most furious accuser, the monk Bar Tsaouma (Barsumas), and other monks at the approaching council. In all this we see the influence of Dioscurus dominant. In March Theodosius had prohibited Theodoret from coming to the council. On 6 August he shows some fear that his order may be disregarded, in a letter in which he constitutes Dioscurus president of the synod.

The council met at Ephesus on 8 Aug., 449. It was to have been œcumenical in authority, but it was dubbed by St. Leo a *latrocinium*, and "The Robber Council" has been its title ever since. A full history of it would be out of place here (see Ephesus, Robber Council of). It is only necessary to say that the assembly was wholly dominated by Dioscurus. Flavian was not allowed to sit as a bishop, but was on his trial. When Stephen, Bishop of Ephesus, wished to give Communion to Flavian's clergy, he was attacked by soldiers and monks of Eutyches, 300 in number, who cried out that Stephen was the enemy of the emperor, since he received the emperor's enemies. Eutyches was admitted to defend himself, but the other side was only so far heard that the Acts of the council which had condemned him were read in full. Not content with restoring Eutyches, Dioscurus proceeded to the deposition of Flavian. This bold measure could only be carried by terrorism. The soldiers and monks were brought into the council, and many

bishops were forced to sign a blank paper. The papal legate Hilarus uttered the protest *Contradicitur*, and saved himself by flight. Flavian and Eusebius of Dorylæum (q. v.) appealed to the pope, and their letters, only lately discovered, were probably taken by Hilarus to Rome, which he reached by a devious route. St. Flavian was thrown into prison, and died in three days of the blows and ill usage he had received. The bishops who were present gave their testimony, when the Acts were publicly read at the Council of Chalcedon, to the violence used at Ephesus. No doubt they exaggerated somewhat, in order to excuse their own base compliance. But there were too many witnesses to allow them to falsify the whole affair; and we have also the witness of the letters of Hilarus, of Eusebius, and of Flavian, and the martyrdom of the latter, to confirm the charges against Dioscurus.

No more was read at Chalcedon of the Acts. But at this point begin the Syriac Acts of the Robber Council, which tell us of the carrying out by Dioscurus of a thoroughgoing but short-sighted policy. The papal legates came no more to the council, and Domnus excused himself through illness. A few other bishops withdrew or escaped, leaving 101 out of the original 128, and some nine new-comers raised the total to 110. The deposition of Ibas was voted with cries, such as "Let him be burned in the midst of Antioch". The accused was not present, and no witnesses for the defence were heard. Daniel, Bishop of Haran, nephew of Ibas, was degraded. Irenæus of Tyre, already deposed, was anathematized. Then it was the turn of the leaders of the Antiochene party. Ibas had been accused of immorality and a misuse of ecclesiastical property, as well as of heresy; no such charges could be made against the great Theodoret; his character was unblemished, and his orthodoxy had been admitted by St. Cyril himself. Nevertheless his earlier writings, in which he had incautiously and with incorrect expressions attacked St. Cyril and defended Nestorius, were now raked up against him. None ventured to dissent from the sentence of deposition pronounced by Dioscurus, which ordered his writings to be burnt. If we may believe the Acts, Domnus, from his bed of real or feigned sickness, gave a general assent to all that the council had done. But this could not save him from the accusation of favouring Nestorians. He was deposed without a word of defence being heard, and a new patriarch, Maximus, was set up in his place.

So ended the council. Dioscurus proceeded to Constantinople, and there made his own secretary, Anatolius, bishop of the city. One foe remained. Dioscurus had avoided reading the pope's letter to the Council of Ephesus, though he promised more than once to do so. He evidently could not then venture to contest the pope's ruling as to the Faith. But now, with his own creatures on the thrones of Antioch and Constantinople, and sure of the support of Chrysaphius, he stopped at Nicæa, and with ten bishops launched an excommunication against St. Leo himself. It would be vain to attribute all these acts to the desire of his own aggrandizement. Political motives could not have led him so far. He must have known that in attacking the pope he could have no help from the bishops of the West or from the Western emperor. It is clear that he was genuinely infatuated with his heresy, and was fighting in its interests with all his might.

The pope, on hearing the report of Hilarus, immediately annulled the Acts of the council, absolved all those whom it had excommunicated, and excommunicated the hundred bishops who had taken part in it. He wrote to Theodosius II insisting on the necessity of a council to be held in Italy, under his own direction. The emperor, with the obstinacy of a weak man, supported the council, and paid no attention to the intervention of his sister, St. Pulcheria, nor to that of his colleague, Valentinian III, who, with his mother Galla Placidia, and his wife, the daughter of Theodosius, wrote to him at St. Leo's suggestion. The reasons given to the pope by Theodosius for his conduct are unknown, for his letters to Leo are lost. In June or July, 450, he died of a fall from his horse, and was succeeded by his sister Pulcheria, who took for her colleague and nominal husband the excellent general Marcian. St. Leo, now sure of the support of the rulers of the East, declared a council unnecessary; many bishops had already signed his Tome, and the remainder would do so without difficulty. But the new emperor had already taken steps to carry out the pope's wish, by a council not indeed in Italy, which was outside his jurisdiction, but in the immediate neighbourhood of Constantinople, where he could himself watch its proceedings and ensure its orthodoxy. St. Leo therefore agreed, and sent legates who this time were to preside.

The council, in the intention of both pope and emperor, was to accept and enforce the definition given long since from Rome. Anatolius was ready enough to please the emperor by signing the Tome; and at Pulcheria's intercession he was accepted as bishop by St. Leo. The latter permitted the restoration to communion of those bishops who repented their conduct at the Robber Council, with the exception of Dioscurus and of the leaders of that synod, whose case he first reserved to the Apostolic See, and then committed to the council. The synod met at Chalcedon, and its six hundred bishops made it the largest of ancient councils (see CHALCEDON, ŒCUMENICAL COUNCIL OF). The papal legates presided, supported by lay commissioners appointed by the emperor, who were in practice the real presidents, since the legates did not speak Greek. The first point raised was the position of Dioscurus. He had taken his seat, but the legates objected that he was on his trial. The commissioners asked for the charge against him to be formulated, and it was replied that he had held a council without the permission of the Apostolic See, a thing which had never been permitted. This statement was difficult to explain, before the discovery of the Syriac Acts; but we now know that Dioscurus had continued his would-be general council for many sessions after the papal legates had taken their departure. The commissioners ordered him to sit in the midst as accused. (A sentence in this passage of the Acts is wrongly translated in the old Latin version; this was carelessly followed by Hefele, who thus led Bright into the error of supposing that the commissioners addressed to the legates a rebuke they meant in reality for Dioscurus.) The Alexandrian patriarch was now as much deserted by his own party as his victims had been deserted at Ephesus by their natural defenders. Some sixty bishops, Egyptian, Palestinian, and Illyrian, were on his side, but were afraid to say a word in his defence, though they raised a great commotion at the introduction into the assembly of Theodoret, who had been especially excluded from the Council of Ephesus. The Acts of the first session of the Robber Council were read, continually interrupted by the disclaimers of the bishops. The leaders of that council, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Thalassius of Cæsarea, Maximus of Antioch, now declared that Flavian was orthodox; Anatolius had long since gone over to the winning side. Dioscurus alone stood his ground. He was at least no time-server, and he was a convinced heretic. After this session he refused to appear. At the second session (the third, according to the printed texts and Hefele, but the Ballerini are right in inverting the order of the second and third sessions) the case of Dioscurus was continued. Petitions against him from Alexandria were read. In these he was accused of injustice and cruelty to the family of Cyril and of many other crimes, even against the emperor and the State. How much of this was true it is impossible to say,

Dioscurus refused to appear or to make any defence. The accusations were dropped, and judgment must necessarily go against Dioscurus, if only for contempt of court. The bishops therefore repeatedly demanded that the legates should deliver judgment. Paschasinus, therefore, the senior legate, recited the crimes of Dioscurus—he had absolved Eutyches contrary to the canons, even before the council; he was still contumacious when others asked for pardon; he had not had the pope's letter read; he had excommunicated the pope; he had been thrice formally cited and had refused to appear—"Wherefore the most holy and blessed Archbishop of elder Rome, Leo, by us and the present most holy council, together with the thrice blessed and praiseworthy Peter the Apostle, who is the rock and base of the Catholic Church and the foundation of the orthodox Faith, has stripped him of the episcopal and of all sacerdotal dignity. Wherefore this most holy and great council will decree that which is in accordance with the canons against the aforesaid Dioscurus." All the bishops signified their agreement in a few words, and then all signed the papal sentence. A short notice of his deposition was sent to Dioscurus. It is taken almost word for word from that sent to Nestorius by the Council of Ephesus twenty years before. With the rest of the council—its definition of the Faith imposed upon it by Pope Leo, its rehabilitation of Theodoret and of Ibas, etc.—we have nothing to do. Dioscurus affected to ridicule his condemnation, saying that he should soon be restored. But the council decreed that he was incapable of restoration, and wrote in this sense to the emperors, reciting his crimes. He was banished to Gangra in Paphlagonia, where he died three years later. The whole of Egypt revered him as the true representative of Cyrillian teaching, and from this time forth the Patriarchate of Alexandria was lost to the Church. Dioscurus has been honoured in it as its teacher, and it has remained Eutychian to the present day.

The chief authority for the events which preceded the Robber Council (besides some letters of Theodoret) is the Syriac version of the Acts of that council, published from a codex of 535 in the Brit. Mus.; *Secundam Synodum Ephesinam necnon excerpta quæ ad eam pertinent . . .*, PERRY ed. (Oxford, 1875); *The second Synod of Ephesus, from Syriac MSS.*, tr. by PERRY (Dartford, 1881); German tr. by HOFFMANN, *Verhandlungen der Kirchenversammlung zu Ephesus am xxii. August CDXLIX aus einer syrischen HS.* (Kiel, 1873); the best dissertations on it are MARTIN, *Le Pseudo-Synode connu dans l'histoire sous le nom de brigandage d'Ephèse, étudié d'après ses actes, en syriaque* (Paris, 1875), and articles by the same in *Rev. des Qu. Hist.*, XVI (1874), and in *Rev. des Sciences Eccl.*, IX–X; also LARGENT in *Rev. des Qu. Hist.*, XXVII (1880); RIVINGTON, *The Roman Primacy, 450–451* (London, 1899). Dr. Rivington has well noted the mistakes of Bright, but he has fallen into some himself, e. g. when he calls Dioscurus the nephew of St. Cyril or blames him for ignoring the so-called Constantinopolitan Creed. The appeals of Flavian and Eusebius were first published by AMELLI, *San Leone Magno e l'Oriente* (Rome, 1882, and Montecassino, 1890) and with other documents in his *Spicileg. Cassin.* (Montecassino, 1893); also by MOMMSEN, in *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, XI (1886). The older historians, who wrote before the discovery of the Syriac Acts, are antiquated as regards Dioscurus, including Hefele (but we await the next volume of the new French edition by Leclercq), and Bright, with the exception of his posthumous *The Age of the Fathers* (London, 1903). For more general literature see CHALCEDON; a fragment of a letter of Dioscurus written from Gangra to the Alexandrians is found in the *Antirrhetica* of NICEPHORUS in PITRA, *Spicileg. Solesm.*, IV. 380. A panegyric on Macarius of Tkhoû, preserved in Coptic, is not genuine [published by AMÉLINEAU, *Monum. pour servir à l'hist. de l'Egypte chr. au 4me et 5me siècles* (Paris, 1888), see REVILLOUT in *Rev. Egyptol.*, 1880–2]. A Coptic life has been published in French and Syriac by F. NAU, *Histoire de Dioscore . . . par son disciple* **Théophiste**, in *Journal Asiatique*, Xme série (1903) 5,241; Coptic fragments of the paneg. and the life pub. by CRUM, in *Proceedings of Soc. of Bibl. Archæol.* (1907), XXV, 267. A letter to Dioscurus from ST. LEO, 21 June, 445 (Ep. xi), is interesting. The pope, politely but peremptorily, orders all ordinations of priests and deacons to be in the night between Saturday and Sunday; also that on festivals when there is a great concourse the Sacrifice is to be repeated as often as the basilica is refilled, that none may be deprived of his devotion.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

Diospolis, DIOCESE OF. See SEBASTE.

Diospolis, SYNOD OF. See PELAGIANISM.

Diplomatics, PAPAL.—The word *diplomatics*, following a Continental usage which long ago found recognition in Mabillon's "De Re Diplomaticâ", has of late come to denote also in English the science of ancient official documents, more especially of those emanating from the chanceries of popes, kings, emperors, and other authorities possessing a recognized jurisdiction. Etymologically *diplomatics* should mean the science of diplomas, and *diploma*, in its classical acceptation, signified only a permit to use the *cursus publicus* (i. e. the public posting-service), or else a discharge accorded to veteran soldiers and imparting certain privileges. But the scholars of the Renaissance erroneously supposed that *diploma* was the correct classical term for any sort of charter, and from them the word came into use among jurists and historians and obtained general currency.

HISTORY OF DIPLOMATICS.—There is abundant evidence that during the Middle Ages a certain watchfulness, necessitated unfortunately by the prevalence of forgeries of all kinds, was exercised over the authenticity of papal Bulls, royal charters, and other instruments. In this control of documents and in the precautions taken against forgery the Chancery of the Holy See set a good example. Thus we find Gregory VII refraining even from attaching the usual leaden seal to a Bull for fear it should fall into unscrupulous hands and be used for fraudulent purposes (Dubitavimus hic sigillum plumbeum ponere ne si illud inimici caperent de eo falsitatem aliquam facerent.—Jaffé-Löwenfeld, "Regesta", no. 5225; cf. no. 5242); while we owe to Innocent III various rudimentary instructions in the science of diplomatics with a view to the detection of forgeries (see Migne, P. L., CCXIV, 202, 322, etc.). Seeing that even an ecclesiastic of the standing of Lanfranc has been seriously accused of conniving at the fabrication of Bulls (H. Böhmer, "Die Fälschungen Erzbischof Lanfranks", 1902; cf. Liebermann's review in "Deutsche Literaturzeitung", 1902, p. 2798, and the defence of Lanfranc by L. Saltet in "Bulletin de litt. eccl.", Toulouse, 1907, 227 sqq.), the need of some system of tests is obvious. But the medieval criticism of documents was not very satisfactory even in the hands of a jurist like Alexander III (see his comments on two pretended privileges of Popes Zacharias and Leo, Jaffé-Löwenfeld, "Regesta", no. 11,896), and though Laurentius Valla, the humanist, was right in denouncing the Donation of Constantine, and though the Magdeburg Centuriator, Matthias Flacius, was right in attacking the Forged Decretals, their methods, in themselves, were often crude and inconclusive. The true science of diplomatics dates, in fact, only from the great Benedictine Mabillon (1632–1707), whose fundamental work, "De Re Diplomaticâ" (Paris, 1681), was written to correct the misleading principles advocated in the criticism of ancient documents by the Bollandist Father Papenbroeck (Papebroch). To the latter's credit be it said that he at once publicly recognized the value of his rival's work and adopted his system. Other scholars were not so discerning, and assailants, like Germon and Hardouin in France, and, in less degree, George Hickes in England, rejected Mabillon's criteria; but the verdict of posterity is entirely in his favour, so that M. Giry quotes with approval the words of Dom Toustain: "His system is the true one. Whoever follows any other road cannot fail to lose his way. Whoever seeks to build on any other foundation will build upon the sand." In point of fact, all that has been done since Mabillon's time has been to develop his methods and occasionally to modify his judgments upon some point of detail. After the issue of a "Supplement" in 1704, a second, enlarged and improved edition of the "De Re Diplomaticâ" was prepared by Mabillon himself and published in 1709, after his death, by his pupil,

Dom Ruinart. Seeing, however, that this pioneer work had not extended to any documents later than the thirteenth century and had taken no account of certain classes of papers, such as the ordinary letters of the popes and privileges of a more private character, two other Benedictines of St-Maur, Dom Toustain and Dom Tassin, compiled a work in six large quarto volumes, with many facsimiles etc., known as the "Nouveau Traité de Diplomatique" (Paris, 1750–1765), which, though it marks but a small advance on Mabillon's own treatise, has been widely used, and has been presented in a more summary form by Dom Vaines and others.

With the exception of some useful works specially consecrated to particular countries (e. g. Maffei, "Istoria diplomatica", Mantua, 1727, unfinished; and Muratori, "De Diplomatibus Antiquis", included in his "Antiquitates Italicæ", 1740, vol. III), as also the treatise of G. Marini on papyrus documents (I papiri diplomatici, Rome, 1805), no great advance was made in the science for a century and a half after Mabillon's death. The "Dictionnaire raisonné de diplomatique chrétienne", by M. Quentin, which forms part of Migne's "Encyclopedia", is a rather unskilful digest of older works, and the sumptuous "Eléments de paléographie" of de Wailly (2 vols., 4to, 1838) has little independent merit. But within the last fifty years immense progress has been made in all diplomatic knowledge, and not least of all in the study of papal documents. In the bibliography appended to the articles Bulls and Briefs and Bullarium, the reader will find references to the more important works. Amongst the pioneers of this revival the names of Léopold Delisle, the chief librarian of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, and of M. de Mas-Latrie, professor at the Ecole de Chartres, as well as that of Julius von Pflugk-Harttung, the editor of a magnificent series of facsimiles of papal Bulls, deserve to occupy a foremost place; but their work has been carried on in Germany and elsewhere, often by those who are not themselves Catholics. It must be obvious that the photographic reproductions of documents which can now be procured so easily and cheaply have enormously facilitated that process of minute comparison of documents which forms the basis of all palæographic studies. Further, the improvement in the cataloguing and the extension of facilities under Pope Leo XIII in such great libraries as that of the Vatican have made their contents much more accessible and have rendered possible such a calendar of early papal Bulls as has been appearing since 1902, being the results of the researches of Messrs. P. Kehr, A. Brackmann, and W. Wiederhold, in "Nachrichten der Göttingen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften". Of the series of papal *regesta* now being published by various scholars, especially by members of the Ecole Française de Rome, a sufficient account has been given in the second part of the article Bullarium. Still greater progress in the study of diplomatics is no doubt to be looked for from the facilities afforded by the recently founded journal, "Archiv für Urkundenforschung" (Leipzig, 1907), edited by Messrs. Karl Brandi, H. Bresslau, and M. Tangl, all acknowledged masters in this subject.

Subject-Matter of Papal Diplomatics.—As this topic has already been treated in part in the article Bulls and Briefs, it will be sufficient here to recall the principal elements in the process of expediting ancient papal documents, all of which need special attention. We have first of all the officials who are concerned in the preparation of such instruments and who collectively form the "Chancery". The constitution of the Chancery, which in the case of the Holy See seems to date back to a *schola notariorum*, with a *primicerius* at its head, of which we hear under Pope Julius I (337–352), varied from period to period, and the part played by the different officials composing it necessarily varied also. Besides the Holy See, each bishop also had some sort of chancery for the issue of his own episcopal Acts. An acquaintance with the procedure of the Chancery is clearly only a study preparatory to the examination of the document itself. Secondly, we have the text of the document. As the position of the Holy See became more fully recognized, the business of the Chancery increased, and we note a marked tendency to adhere strictly to the forms prescribed by traditional usage. Various collections of these formulæ, of which the "Liber Diurnus" is one of the most ancient, were compiled at an early date. Many others will be found in the "Receuil général des formules" by de Rozière (Paris, 1861–1871), though these, like the series published by Zeumer (Formulæ Merovingici et Karolini ævi, Hanover, 1886), are mainly secular in character. After the text of the document, which of course varies according to its nature, and in which not merely the wording but also the rhythm (the so-called *cursus*) has often to be considered, attention must be paid (1) to the manner of dating, (2) to the signatures, (3) to the attestations of witnesses etc., (4) to the seals and the attachment of the seals, (5) to the material upon which it is written and to the manner of folding, as well as (6) to the handwriting—under this last heading the whole science of palæography may be said to be involved.

All these matters fall within the scope of diplomatics, and all offer different tests for the authenticity of any given document. There are other details which often need to be considered, for example the Tironian (or shorthand) notes, which are of not infrequent occurrence in primitive *Urkunden*, both papal and imperial, and which have only begun of late years to be adequately investigated (see Tangl, "Die tironischen Noten", in "Archiv für Urkundenforschung", 1907, I, 87–166). A special section in any comprehensive study of diplomatics is also likely to be devoted to spurious documents, of which, as already stated, the number is surprisingly great.

Besides the books referred to in the course of this article see the bibliography of the article Bulls and Briefs. A larger selection of authorities may be found in such treatises as those of Giry, *Manuel de Diplomatique* (Paris, 1894); and Bresslau, *Handbuch der Urkundenlehre* (Leipzig, 1889), I. One very useful work for the study of papal diplomatics, the *Practica Cancellariæ Apostolicæ*, ed. Schmitz-Kallenberg (Munich, 1904), though confined to the working of the Chancery at the close of the fifteenth century, is valuable for the indirect light thrown on other periods. Consult also the important work of Tangl, *Die päpstlichen Kanzlei-Ordnungen von 1200–1500* (Innsbruck, 1894); Erben, *Urkundenlehre* (Munich, 1907); and Rosenmund, *Die Fortschritte der Diplomatik seit Mabillon* (Munich, 1897), though these last two books have little directly to do with papal documents. In A. Meister's important work on early ciphers, *Die Anfänge der modernen diplomatischen Geheimschrift* (Paderborn, 1902), the papal Chancery is hardly mentioned (see, however, p. 34). Finally, the best summary account of papal diplomatics is to be found in the section contributed by Schmitz-Kallenberg to the *Grundriss der Geschichtswissenschaft* (Leipzig, 1906), vol. I, pp. 172–230.

Herbert Thurston.

Diptych (or Diptychon, Gr. *δίπτυχον* from *δίς*, twice, and *πτύσσειν*, to fold), a sort of notebook, formed by the union of two tablets, placed one upon the other and united by rings or by a hinge. These tablets were made of wood, ivory, bone, or metal. Their inner surfaces had ordinarily a raised frame and were covered with wax, upon which characters were scratched by means of a stylus. Diptychs were known among the Greeks from the sixth century before Christ. They served as copy-books for the exercise of penmanship, for correspondence, and various other uses. The Roman military certificates, *privilegia militum*, were a kind of diptych. Between the two tablets others were sometimes inserted, and the diptych would then be called a triptych, polyptych, etc. The term diptych is often restricted to a highly ornamented type of notebooks. They were generally made out of ivory with carved work, and were sometimes from twelve to sixteen inches in height. In the fourth and fifth centuries a distinction

IVORY DIPTYCH, X CENTURY THE LOUVRE
IVORY DIPTYCH (LEGEND OF S. DENIS), XIV CENTURY, MUSÉE DE CLUNY

arose between profane and ecclesiastical (liturgical) diptychs, the former being frequently given as presents by high-placed persons. It was customary to commemorate in this way one's elevation to a public office, or any event of personal importance, e. g. a marriage. The consuls, on the day of the installation, were wont to offer diptychs to their friends and even to the emperor. Those presented to the latter often had a border of gold and were quite large. Their tablets often exhibited on a central plate the portrait of the sovereign, surrounded by four other plates. The (undated) Barberini ivory at the Louvre is thus constructed and once served as an ecclesiastical diptych (see below). Some believe it to be the binding of a book offered to the emperor. Strzygowski holds it to be of Egyptian origin and thinks that the portrait is that of Constantine the Great, defender of the Faith. The oldest dated consular diptych is that of Probus (406); it is kept in the treasury of the cathedral of Aosta, Piedmont. The latest is that of the Eastern consul, Basilius (541), one tablet of which is at the Uffizi Museum in Florence and the other at the Brera in Milan. The Theodosian Code (384) forbade the offering of ivory diptychs to any but the regular (i. e. not honorary) consuls. The tablet at the Mayer Museum in Liverpool, bearing the image of Marcus Aurelius (d. 180), is prior to this enactment. The consular diptychs are recognizable by their inscriptions or by the figure of the consul which they bear. On the diptych of Boetius at Brescia (487) and several others of the same type, the consul is clad in a *trabea* (a kind of toga); he holds in his left hand the *scipio* (consular sceptre) and in his right the *mappa circensis*, or white cloth which he used to wave as the signal for the games in the circus. These games (*ludi*) or other liberalities offered to the people by the consul were frequently represented on the tablets of the diptychs.

There is less certainty concerning the diptychs of officials other than consuls, e. g. prætors, quæstors, etc. The diptych of Rufius Probianus V. C. (i. e. *vir clarissimus*) *vicarius urbis Romæ*, in the Berlin Museum, is the most precious relic of this class, and probably dates from the end of the fourth century. Among the diptychs of private individuals that of Gallienus Concessus, discovered at Rome on the Esquiline, exhibits only the name of its owner. Others were richly ornamented and reproduced often some of the masterpieces of ancient art. Thus on a diptych in the Mayer Museum, Liverpool, are seen Æsculapius and Telesphorus, Hygieia, and Amor. The most beautiful of the profane diptychs was carved at the time of a marriage between the Symmachi and the Nicomachi (392 to 394, or 401). It represents on each leaf (one of which is at the South Kensington Museum and the other, in a very damaged condition, at Cluny) a woman performing a sacrifice. Many of the profane diptychs were preserved in the treasuries of the churches, where they were eventually used for liturgical purposes or enshrined in book-bindings or in goldsmith work. The diptych of Boetius, among others, bears, on the interior, some liturgical texts and religious paintings, attributed to the seventh century. The Liège diptych of the consul Anastasius (517), one leaf of which is at Berlin and the other at South Kensington, bears an inscription of forty-two lines and the prayer *Communicantes* from the Canon of the Mass. Another of the same consul (in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris) has a list of the bishops of Bourges. At the cathedral of Monza, Lombardy, a diptych represents in the dress of consuls King David and St. Gregory the Great. It is perhaps an ancient consular diptych, transformed in the eighth or ninth century; according to some it appears to be of ecclesiastical origin. Many carved diptychs reproduced purely religious subjects. On a diptych in the treasury of Rouen cathedral the figure of St. Paul is exactly the same as that on a sarcophagus in Gaul. A diptych leaf in the treasury of Tongres was evidently influenced by the carvings on the *cathedra* of St. Maximinus at Ravenna, and seems to have belonged to an ancient episcopal see. Certain diptychs with religious subjects, e. g. the Holy Sepulchre and the holy women at the Tomb of Christ (Milan), an angel (British Museum), probably date from the fourth or fifth century. Diptych leaves divided into five compartments have generally served as a cover for copies of the Gospels. The diptychs, though often clumsily executed, are important for the history of sculpture, there being a good number of them extant, and several being accurately dated. At different periods in the Middle Ages, numerous diptychs or triptychs of ivory were made, to serve as little devotional panels.

The liturgical use of diptychs offers considerable interest. In the early Christian ages it was customary to write on diptychs the names of those, living or dead, who were considered as members of the Church, a signal evidence of the doctrine of the Communion of Saints. Hence the terms "diptychs of the living" and "diptychs of the dead". Such liturgical diptychs varied in shape and dimensions. Their use (*sacræ tabulæ*, *matriculæ*, *libri vivorum et mortuorum*) is attested in the writings of St. Cyprian (third century) and by the history of St. John Chrysostom (fourth century), nor did they disappear from the churches until the twelfth century in the West and the fourteenth century in the East. In the ecclesiastical life of antiquity these liturgical diptychs served various purposes. It is probable that the names of the baptized were written on diptychs, which were thus a kind of baptismal register. The "diptychs of the living" would include the names of the pope, bishops, and illustrious persons, both lay and ecclesiastical, of the benefactors of a church, and of those who offered the Holy Sacrifice. To these names were sometimes added those of the Blessed Virgin, of martyrs, and of other saints. From such diptychs came the first ecclesiastical calendars and the martyrologies. The "diptychs of the dead" would include the names of persons otherwise qualified for inscription on the diptychs of the living, e. g. the bishops of the community (also other bishops), moreover priests and laymen who had died in the odour of sanctity. It is to this kind of diptychs that the later necrologies owe their origin. Occasionally special diptychs were made to contain only the names of a series of bishops; in this way arose at an early date the episcopal lists or catalogues of occupants of sees. Whatever their immediate purpose the liturgical diptychs admitted only the names of persons in communion with the Church; the names of heretics and of excommunicated members were never inserted. Exclusion from these lists was a grave ecclesiastical penalty; the highest dignity, episcopal or imperial, would not avail to save the offender from its infliction. The content of the diptychs was read out, either from the ambo (q. v.) or from the altar by a priest or a deacon. In this respect a variety of customs obtained in different churches and at different periods; sometimes the diptychs were simply laid on the altar during Mass, and when read publicly, such reading did not always occur at the same stage of the Mass. The order of which traces are now seen in the Roman Canon of the Mass was the fixed usage of the Roman Church as early as the fifth century. In that venerable document a long passage after the Sanctus corresponds to the ancient recitation of the diptychs of the living; it contains, as is well known, mention of those for whom the Mass is offered, of the pope, of the bishop of the diocese, of the Blessed Virgin, and of several saints. At Easter and at Pentecost the *Hanc igitur* furnished a proper occasion to mention the names of the newly baptized, now mentioned only as a body. Finally the recitation of the "diptychs of the dead" is still recalled by the Memento which follows the consecration.

THOMPSON, *Handbook of Greek and Latin Palæography* (London, 1894), 19; GORI, *Thesaurus veterum diptychorum* (Florence, 1795); MOLINIER, *Histoire générale des arts appliqués à l'industrie* (Paris, 1896), I; VENTURI, *Storia dell' arte Italiana* (Rome, 1901), I, 356, 484; GRAEVEN, *Frühchristliche und mittelalterliche Elfenbeinwerke* (Rome, 1898——); WESTWOOD, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Fictile Ivories in the South Kensington Museum* (London, 1896); MEYER, *Abhandl. der philos. philol. Classe der bayerischen Akademie*, XV, I, 4; DAREMBERG AND SAGLIO, *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines* (Paris, 1892), II, 1, 271; KRAUS, *Real-Encyklopädie der christlichen Alterthümer* (Freiburg im Br., 1896), I, 499; LECLERCQ, *Manuel d'archéologie chrétienne* (Paris, 1907), II, 334; MOLINIER, *Les obituaires français* (Paris, 1890), 4; DUCHESNE, *Origines du culte chrétien* (Paris, 1902); CABROL, *Dict. de lit. et d'arch chrét.*, s. v.

R. MAERE.

Direction, SPIRITUAL.—In the technical sense of the term, spiritual direction is that function of the sacred ministry by which the Church guides the faithful to the attainment of eternal happiness. It is part of the commission given to her in the words of Christ: "Going, therefore, teach ye all nations . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matt., xxviii, 19 sq.). She exercises this function both in her public teaching, whether in word or writing, and in the private guidance of souls according to their individual needs; but it is the private guidance that is generally understood by the term "spiritual direction".

I. In one way the Church requires all her adult members to submit to such private direction, namely, in the Sacrament of Penance. For she entrusts to her priests in the confessional, not only the part of judge to absolve or retain the sins presently confessed, but also the part of a director of consciences. In the latter capacity he must instruct his penitents if ignorant of their duties, point out the wrong or the danger in their conduct, and suggest the proper means to be employed for amendment or improvement. The penitent, on his part, must submit to this guidance. He must also, in cases of serious doubt regarding the lawfulness of his action, ask the advice of his director. For a person who acts in a practical doubt, not knowing whether he is offending God or not, and yet consenting to do what he thinks to be morally wrong, thereby offends his Creator. Such consultation is the more necessary as no one is a good judge in his own cause: a business man is sometimes blind to the injustice of a tempting bargain, and passion often invents motives for unlawful indulgence.

II. Still more frequently is spiritual direction required in the lives of Christians who aim at the attainment of perfection (see PERFECTION). All religious are obliged to do so by their profession; and many of the faithful, married and unmarried, who live amidst worldly cares aspire to such perfection as is attainable in their states of life. This striving after Christian perfection means the cultivation of certain virtues and watchfulness against faults and spiritual dangers. The knowledge of this constitutes the science of asceticism (q. v.). The spiritual director must be well versed in this difficult science, as his advice is very necessary for such souls. For, as Cassian writes, "by no vice does the devil draw a monk headlong and bring him to death sooner than by persuading him to neglect the counsel of the Elders and trust to his own judgment and determination" (Conf. of Abbot Moses).

III. Since, in teaching the Faith, the Holy Ghost speaks through the sovereign pontiff and the bishops of the Church, the work of the private spiritual director must never be at variance with this infallible guidance. Therefore the Church has condemned the doctrine of Molinos, who taught that directors are independent of the bishops, that the Church does not judge about secret matters, and that God and the director alone enter into the inner conscience (Denzinger, Enchiridion, nos. 1152, 1153). Several of the most learned Fathers of the Church devoted much attention to spiritual direction, for instance, St. Jerome, who directed St. Paula and her daughter St. Eustochium; and some of them have left us learned treatises on ascetic theology. But while the hierarchy of the Church is Divinely appointed to guard the purity of faith and morals, the Holy Spirit, who "breatheth where he will; and thou hearest his voice, but thou knowest not whence he cometh, and whither he goeth" (John, iii, 8), has often chosen priests or religious, and even simple laymen and women, and filled them with supernatural wisdom in order to provide for the spiritual direction of others.

IV. Whoever the director be, he will find the principal means of progress towards perfection to consist in the exercise of prayer (q. v.) and mortification (q. v.). But upon the special processes of these two means, spiritual guides have been led by the Holy Spirit in various directions. Different is the type for the solitary in the desert, the cenobite in the community, for a St. Louis or a Blanche of Castile in a palace, St. Frances of Rome in her family, or a St. Zita in her kitchen, for contemplative and for active religious orders and congregations. Another marked difference in the direction of souls arises from the presence or absence of the mystical element in the life of the person to be directed (see MYSTICISM). Mysticism involves peculiar modes of action by which the Holy Ghost illumines a soul in ways which transcend the normal use of the reasoning powers. The spiritual director who has such persons in charge needs the soundest learning and consummate prudence. Here especially sad mistakes have been made by presumption and imprudent zeal, for men of distinction in the Church have gone astray in this matter.

V. Even in ordinary cases of spiritual direction in which no mysticism is involved, numerous errors must be guarded against; the following deserve special notice: (1) The false principles of the Jansenists, who demanded of their penitents an unattainable degree of purity of conscience before they allowed them to receive Holy Communion. Many priests, not members of the sect, were yet so far tainted with its severity as gradually to alienate large numbers of their penitents from the sacraments and consequently from the Church. (2) The condemned propositions summarized under the headings "De perfectione christianâ" in Denzinger's "Enchiridion Symbolorum et Definitionum" (Würzburg, 1900), page 485, which are largely the principles of Quietism. These are specimens: To obtain perfection a man ought to deaden all his faculties; he should take no vows, should avoid external work, ask God for nothing in particular, not seek sensible devotion, not study science, not consider rewards and punishments, not employ reasoning in prayer. (3) The errors and dangers pointed out in the Encyclical of Leo XIII, "Testem Benevolentiæ". In it the pope singles out for particular condemnation: "First, all external guidance is set aside for those souls which are striving after Christian perfection as being superfluous, or indeed not useful in any sense, the contention being that the Holy Spirit pours richer and more abundant graces into the soul than formerly; so that, without human intervention, He teaches and guides them by some hidden instinct of His own." In the same document warnings are given against inculcating an exaggerated esteem of the natural virtues, thus depreciating the supernatural ones; also against casting contempt on religious vows, "as if these were alien to the spirit of our times, in that they restrict the bounds of human liberty, and that they are more suitable to weak than to strong minds".

VI. An important document of Leo XIII bearing specifically on the direction of religious souls is the decree "Quemadmodum" of 1890. It forbids all religious superiors who are not priests "the practice of thoroughly inquiring into the state of their subjects' consciences, which is a thing exclusively reserved to

the Sacrament of Penance". It also forbids them to refuse to their subjects an extraordinary confessor, especially in cases where the conscience of the persons so refused stands greatly in need of this privilege; as also "to take it on themselves to permit at their pleasure their subjects to approach the Holy Table, or even sometimes to forbid them Holy Communion altogether". The pope abrogates all constitutions, usages, and customs so far as they tend to the contrary; and absolutely forbids such superiors as are here spoken of to induce in any way their subjects to make to them any such manifestations of conscience. (See the decree "Quemadmodum", with explanations, in the American Ecclesiastical Review, March, 1893.)

VII. Catholic literature is rich in works of ascetic and mystical theology; of which we mention a few below. But it must be noticed that such works cannot be recommended for the use of all readers indiscriminately. The higher the spiritual perfection aimed at, especially when mysticism enters into the case, the more caution should be used in selecting and consulting the guide-books, and the more danger there is that the direction given in them may be misapplied. Spiritual direction is as much a matter for the personal supervision of an experienced living guide as is the practice of medicine; the latter deals with abnormal defects of the body, the former with the acquisition of uncommon perfection by the soul.

Scaramelli, *Directorium Asceticum*, or *Guide to the Spiritual Life* (Dublin, 1870); Idem, *Directorium Mysticum*, or *Divine Asceticism;* Guilloré, *Manière de Conduire les Ames* (Lyons and Paris, 1853); Faber, *Growth in Holiness* (Baltimore); Lancogne, *Manifestation of Conscience* (New York, 1892); Schram, *Institutiones Theologiæ Mysticæ;* Neumayr, *Idea Theologiæ Asceticæ*, or *Science of the Spiritual Life* (London, 1876); Idem, *Higher Paths in Spiritual Life* (London); St. Teresa, *The Interior Castle* (London, 1859); Idem, *Way of Perfection* (London, 1860); St. Ignatius, *Spiritual Exercises* (London, 1900); St. Francis of Sales, *The Devout Christian* (New York); Scrupoli, *The Spiritual Combat* (London); Clare, *Science of the Spiritual Life* (London, 1896); St. Liguori, *The Christian Virtues* (New York); Grou, *Manual of Interior Souls* (London, 1905); Lallemant, *Spiritual Doctrine* (New York, 1884); Lehmkuhl, *Theologia Moralis* (Friburg, 1889); Schieler-Heuser, *Theory and Practice of the Confessional*, Part III, sect. 2, *The Office of the Confessor;* Dupont, *Guide Spirituel* (Paris, 1866); Cardinal Bona, *Traité du Discernement des Esprits* (Tournai, 1840); Lewis of Granada, *Sinner's Guide* (Philadelphia, 1877); Bellecius, *Solid Virtue* (New York, 1882).

Charles Coppens.

Directories, Catholic.—The ecclesiastical sense of the word directory, as will be shown later, has become curiously confused with its secular use, but historically speaking the ecclesiastical sense is the earlier. *Directorium* simply means guide, but in the later Middle Ages it came to be specially applied to guides for the recitation of Office and Mass. For example, in the early part of the fifteenth century one Clement Maydeston, probably following earlier foreign precedents, adopted the title "Directorium Sacerdotum" for his reorganized Sarum Ordinal. In this way the words "Directorium Sacerdotum" came to stand at the head of a number of books, some of them among the earliest products of the printing press in England, which were issued to instruct the clergy as to the form of Mass and Office to be followed from day to day throughout the year. This employment of the word *directorium* was by no means peculiar to England. To take one convenient example, though not the earliest that might be chosen, we find a very similar work published at Augsburg in 1501, which bears the title: "Index sive Directorium Missarum Horarumque secundum ritum chori Constanciensis diocesis dicendarum". As this title suffices to show, a *directorium* or guide for the recitation of Office and Mass had to be constructed according to the needs of a particular diocese or group of dioceses, for as a rule each diocese has certain saints' days and feasts peculiar to itself, and these have all to be taken account of in regulating the Office, a single change often occasioning much disturbance by the necessity it creates of transferring coincident celebrations to other days. Out of the "Directorium Sacerdotum" which in England was often called the "Pye", and which seems to have come into almost general use about the time of the invention of printing, our present Directory, the "Ordo divini Officii recitandi Sacrique peragendi" has gradually developed. We may note a few of the characteristics both of the actual and the ancient usage.

Actual Usage.—It is now the custom for every diocese, or, in cases where the calendar followed is substantially identical, for a group of dioceses belonging to the same province or country, to have a "Directory" or "Ordo recitandi" printed each year for the use of all the clergy. It consists simply of a calendar for the year, in which there are printed against each day concise directions concerning the Office and Mass to be said on that day. The calendar is usually provided with some indication of fast days, special indulgences, days of devotion, and other items of information which it may be convenient for the clergy to be reminded of as they occur. This Ordo is issued with the authority of the bishop or bishops concerned, and is binding upon the clergy under their jurisdiction. The religious orders have usually a Directory of their own, which, in the case of the larger orders, often differs according to the country in which they are resident. For the secular clergy the calendar of the Roman Missal and Breviary, apart from special privilege, always forms the basis of the "Ordo recitandi". To this the feasts and saints' days celebrated in the diocese are added, and, as the higher grade of these special celebrations often causes them to take precedence of those in the ordinary calendar, a certain amount of shifting and transposition is inevitable, even apart from the complications introduced by the movable feasts. All this has to be calculated and arranged beforehand in accordance with the rules supplied by the general rubrics of the Missal and Breviary. Even so, the clergy of particular churches have further to provide for the celebration of their own patronal or dedication feasts, and to make such other changes in the Ordo as these insertions may impose. The Ordo is always compiled in Latin, though an exception is sometimes made in the Directories drawn up for nuns who recite the Divine Office, and, as it is often supplemented with a few extra pages of diocesan notices, recent decrees of the Congregation of Rites, regulations for the saying of votive Offices, etc., matters only affecting the clergy, it is apt to acquire a somewhat professional and exclusive character.

How long a separate and annual "Ordo recitandi" has been printed for the use of the English clergy it seems impossible to discover. Possibly Bishop Challoner, Vicar Apostolic from 1741 to 1781, had something to do with its introduction. But in 1759 a Catholic London printer conceived the idea of translating the official "Directorium", or Ordo, issued for the clergy, and accordingly published in that year: "A Lay Directory or a help to find out and assist at Vespers . . . . on Sundays and Holy Days". Strange to say, another Catholic printer, seemingly the publisher of the official Ordo, shortly afterwards, conceiving his privileges invaded, produced a rival publication: "The Laity's Directory or the Order of the (Catholic) Church Service for the year 1764". This "Laity's Directory" was issued year by year for three-quarters of a century, gradually growing in size, but in 1837 it was supplanted by "The Catholic Directory" which since 1855 has been published in London by Messrs. Burns & Lambert, now Burns & Oates. The earliest numbers of the "Laity's Directory" contained nothing save an abbreviated translation of the clerical "Ordo recitandi", but towards the end of the eighteenth century a list of the Catholic chapels in London, advertisements of schools, obituary notices, important ecclesiastical announcements, and other miscellaneous matters began to be added, and at a still later date we find

an index of the names and addresses of the Catholic clergy serving the missions in England and Scotland. This feature has been imitated in the "Irish Catholic Directory" and in the Catholic Directories of the United States. Hence the widespread idea that Catholic directories are so called because they commonly form an address book for the churches and clergy of a particular country, but an examination of the early numbers of the "Laity's Directory" conclusively shows that it was only to the calendar with its indication of the daily Mass and Office that the name originally applied.

FORMER USAGE.—In the Middle Ages, and indeed almost down to the invention of printing, the books used in the service of the Church were much more divided up than they are at present. Instead of one book, our modern Breviary for example, containing the whole Office, we find at least four books—the Psalterium, the Hymnarium, the Antiphonarium, and the Legendarium, or book of lessons, all in separate volumes. Rubrics or ritual directions were rarely written down in connexion with the text to which they belonged (we are speaking here of the Mass and Office, not of the services of rarer occurrence such as those in the Pontifical), but they were probably at first communicated by oral tradition only, and when they began to be recorded they took only such summary form as we find in the "Ordines Romani" of Hittorp and Mabillon. However, about the eleventh century there grew up a tendency towards greater elaboration and precision in rubrical directions for the services, and at the same time we notice the beginning of a more or less strongly marked division of these directions into two classes, which in the case of the Sarum Use are conveniently distinguished as the Customary and the Ordinal. Speaking generally, we may say that the former of these rubrical books contains the principles and the latter their application; the former determines those matters that are constant and primarily the duties of persons, the latter deals with the arrangements which vary from day to day and from year to year. It is out of the latter of these books, i. e. the Ordinal (often called Ordinarium and Liber Ordinarius), that the "Directorium", or "Pye", and eventually also our own modern "Ordo recitandi" were in due time evolved. These distinctions are not clear-cut. The process was a gradual one. But we may distinguish in the English and also in the Continental Ordinals two different stages. We have, first, the type of book in common use from the twelfth to the fifteenth century, and represented by the "Sarum Ordinal" edited by W. H. Frere, or the "Ordinaria of Laon" edited by Chevalier. Here we have a great deal of miscellaneous information respecting feasts, the Office and Mass to be said upon them according to the changes necessitated by the occurrence of Easter and the shifting of the Sundays, as well as the "Incipits" of the details of the service, e. g. of the lessons to be read and the commemorations to be made. The second stage took the form of an adaptation of this Ordinal for ready use, an adaptation with which, in the case of Sarum, the name of Clement Maydeston is prominently connected. This was the "Directorium Sacerdotum", the complete "Pye" (known in Latin as Pica Sarum), abbreviated editions of which were afterwards published in a form which allowed it to be bound up with the respective portions of the Breviary. The idea of this great "Pye" was to give all the thirty-five possible combinations, five to each Dominical Letter (q. v.), which the fixed and movable elements of the ecclesiastical year admitted of, assigning a separate calendar to each, more or less corresponding to our present "Ordo recitandi". This arrangement was not peculiar to England.

One of the earliest printed books of the kind was that issued about 1475 for the Diocese of Constance, of which a rubricated copy is to be found in the British Museum. It is a small folio in size, of one hundred and twelve leaves, and after the ordinary calendar it supplies summary rules, under thirty-five heads, for drawing up the special calendar for each year according to the Golden Number and the Dominical Letter. Then the Ordo for each of the thirty-five possible combinations is set out in detail. The name most commonly given to these "Pyes" on the Continent was "Ordinarius", more rarely "Directorium Missæ". For example, the title of such a book printed for the Diocese of Liège in 1492 runs: "In nomine Domini Amen . . . Incipit liber Ordinarius ostendens qualiter legatur et cantetur per totum anni circulum in ecclesia leodiensi tam de tempore quam de festis sanctorum in nocturnis officiis divinis." Such books were also provided for the religious orders. An "Ordinarius Ordinis Præmonstratensis" exists in manuscript at Jesus College, Cambridge, and an early printed one in the British Museum. When the use of printing became universal, the step from these rather copious directories, which served for all possible years, to a shorter guide of the type of our modern "Ordo recitandi", and intended only for one particular year, was a short and easy one. Since, however, such publications are useless after their purpose is once served, they are very liable to destruction, and it seems impossible to say how early we may date the first attempt at producing an Ordo after our modern fashion. The fact that at the Council of Trent (Sess. XXIII, De Reform., cap. xviii) it was thought necessary to urge that ecclesiastical students should be trained in the understanding of the *computus*, by which they could determine the *ordo recitandi* in each year for themselves, seems to imply that such Ordos as we now possess were not in familiar use in the middle of the sixteenth century.

MODERN DIRECTORIES.—At the present day it may be said that in every part of the world not only is a printed Ordo provided for the clergy of every diocese and religious institute, but that almost everywhere some adaptation of this is available for the use of the laity. The earliest English attempt at anything of the sort seems to have been a little "Catholic Almanac", which appeared for three or four years in the reign of James II (see The Month, vol. CXI, 1908). But this was a mere calendar of feasts without any directions for the Office and Mass. In Ireland the work which at present appears under the title "The Irish Catholic Directory and Almanac for 1909, with a complete Directory in English" seems to have existed under various names since 1837 or earlier. It was first called "A Complete Catholic Directory", and then, in 1846, "Battersby's Registry", from the name of the publisher. For Scotland, though the Scottish missions are included in the "Catholic Directory" published in London, there is also a separate "Catholic Directory for the Clergy and Laity of Scotland" which began under a slightly different name in 1868. Catholic Directories also exist for the Australian and Canadian provinces, and occasionally for separate dioceses, e. g. the Diocese of Birmingham, England, possesses an "Official Directory" of its own. Attention may briefly be called, also, to two Roman handbooks of a character somewhat analogous to our Directories, which supply names and details regarding the Catholic hierarchy throughout the world and especially regarding the cardinals, the Roman Congregations and their personnel, the prelates and camerieri, etc., in attendance upon the papal court. The first of these, called since 1872 "La Gerarchia Cattolica e la Famiglia Pontificia", was first published in 1716 and was long familiarly known as "Cracas" from the name of the publisher. Officially, the early numbers were simply called "Notizie per l'Anno 1716, etc." (see Moroni, Dizionario, XX, 26 sqq.). The other work, which is very similar in character, but somewhat more ample in its information, has appeared since 1898 under the title "Annuario Ecclesiastico". Finally we notice the

existence of the "Directorium Chori", a work originally compiled by Guidetti in 1582, possessing a quasi-official character and often reprinted since. It is intended for the use of the hebdomadarius and cantors in collegiate churches, and is quite different in character from the works considered above.

See SCHROD in *Kirchenlexikon*, s. v. *Directorium*. For the Pye and Ordinal see especially FRERE, *The Use of Sarum* (Cambridge, 1901), II, Introduction; WORDSWORTH, *The Directorium Sacerdotum of Clement Maydeston* (Henry Bradshaw Society, London, 1902), especially the Appendixes to vol. II; and also, in the same series, *The Tracts of Clement Maydeston* (London, 1894); CHEVALIER, *Bibliothèque liturgique* (Paris, 1897 —), in which series the editor has printed the *Ordinaria* of Laon, Reims, Bayeux, etc. On English directories, see THURSTON, *An Old-Established Periodical* in *The Month* (London, Feb., 1882).

HERBERT THURSTON.

THE UNITED STATES.—These publications begin in the United States with an "Ordo Divini Officii Recitandi", published at Baltimore, in 1801, by John Hayes. It had none of the directory or almanac features. "The Catholic Laity's Directory to the Church Service with an Almanac for the year", an imitation of the English enterprise, was the next, in 1817. It was published in New York with the "permission of the Right Rev. Bishop Connolly" by Mathew Field, who was born in England of an Irish Catholic family and left there for New York in 1815. He died at Baltimore, 1832. His son, Joseph M. Field, was six years old when he arrived in New York, and became a prolific and brilliant writer, dying at Mobile in 1856. Joseph's daughter, Kate Field, was later the well-known author and lecturer. Though both were baptized, neither was a professed Catholic. This Field production, in addition to the ordinary almanac calendars, had a variety of pious and instructive reading-matter with an account of the churches, colleges, seminaries, and institutions of the United States. It made up a small 32mo book of sixty-eight pages. Among other things, it promised the preparation of a Catholic magazine which, however, was never started. Only one issue of this almanac was made. The next effort in the same direction, and on practically the same lines, was also at New York, in 1822, by W. H. Creagh. It was edited by the Rev. Dr. John Power, rector of St. Peter's church, and says in the preface that it was "intended to accompany the Missal with a view to facilitate the use of the same". The contents include "Brief Account of the Establishment of the Episcopacy in the United States"; "Present Status of religion in the respective Dioceses"; "A short account of the present State of the Society of Jesus in the U. S.", and obituaries of priests who had died from 1814 to 1821. This was the only number of this almanac.

In 1834 Fielding Lucas of Baltimore took up the idea and brought out "The Metropolitan Catholic Calendar and Laity's Directory" for that year, to be published annually. He said in it that he had "intended to present it in 1832 but from circumstances over which he had no control it has been delayed to the present period". It prints a list of the hierarchy and the priests of the several dioceses, with their stations. In this publication and its various successors the title Directory is used in its purely secular meaning, as the issues include no ecclesiastical calendar or Ordo. James Meyers "at the Cathedral" is the publisher of the subsequent volumes until 1838, when Fielding Lucas, Jr., took hold and changed the name "U. S. Catholic Almanac", that Meyers had given it, back to "Metropolitan Catholic Almanac". In the issue of 1845 there is inserted a map of the United States, "prepared at much expense to exhibit at a glance the extent and relative situation of the different dioceses", with a table of comparative statistics, 1835 to 1845. A list of the clergy in England and Ireland was added in the volume for 1850. "Lucas Brothers" is the imprint on the almanac for 1856–57, and the Baltimore publication then ceased, to be taken up in 1858 by Edward Dunigan & Brother of New York, as "Dunigan's American Catholic Almanac and List of the Clergy". All general reading-matter was omitted in this almanac, publication of which was stopped the following year when John Murphy & Co. of Baltimore resumed there the compilation of the "Metropolitan Catholic Almanac". Owing to the Civil War no almanacs were printed during 1862 or 1863. In 1864 D. & J. Sadlier of New York started "Sadlier's Catholic Directory, Almanac and Ordo", which John Gilmary Shea compiled and edited for them. It made a volume of more than 600 pages and gave lists of the clergy in the United States, Canada, Great Britain, Ireland, and Australasia, with diocesan statistics. This publication continued alone in the field until 1886, when Hoffman Brothers, a German firm of publishers of Milwaukee, brought out "Hoffman's Catholic Directory", which the Rev. James Fagan, a Milwaukee priest, compiled for them. In contents it was similar to the New York publication. This directory continued until 1896, when the Hoffman Company failed, and their plant was purchased by the Wiltzius Company, which has since continued the directory. The Sadlier "Directory" ceased publication in 1895.

The Wiltzius "Catholic Directory, Almanac and Clergy List" has reports for all dioceses in the United States, Canada, Alaska, Cuba, Sandwich Islands, Porto Rico, Philippine Islands, Newfoundland, England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, together with statistics of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, Belgium, Costa Rica, Guatemala, British Honduras, Nicaragua, San Salvador, German Empire, Japan, Luxemburg, The United States of Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Oceanica, South Africa, The United States of Brazil, Curaçao, Dutch Guiana, Switzerland, and the West Indies. It contains also an alphabetical list of all clergymen in the United States and Canada, as well as a map of the ecclesiastical provinces in the United States. It gives a list of English-speaking confessors abroad, American colleges in Europe, and the leading Catholic societies; statistics of the Catholic Indian and Negro missions, and a list of Catholic papers and periodicals in the United States and Canada.

In the almanac for 1837 it is noted, concerning the statistics, that "the numbers marked with an asterisk are not given as strictly exact, though it is believed they approximate to the truth, and are as accurate as could be ascertained from the statements forwarded to the editor from the several dioceses". On the same topic "Hoffman's Directory" for 1890 says: "It is much to be regretted that the statistics are not more carefully kept. In every diocese there are parishes that fail to report and many dioceses report statistics only partially, so that any general summary that can be made up at best is only an approximation." Dealing with this long-standing and well-founded complaint of inaccurate Catholic statistics, the archbishops of the United States, at their annual conference in 1907, resolved to co-operate with the United States Census Bureau in an effort to collect correct figures. Archbishop Glennon of St. Louis was appointed a special census official by the Government for this purpose, and under his direction an enumeration of the Catholics of every parish in the United States was made. The figures thus obtained were used in the "Directory" for 1909. It is the first, therefore, of these publications giving statistics of population on which any reliance can be placed in respect to accuracy of detail.

CANADA.—In 1886 "Le Canada Ecclésiastique, Almanach Annuaire du clergé Canadien", printed in French, was begun in Montreal. The contents are similar to those of the directories in English. Recent issues have a number of illustrations of local and historical interest, such as a series of portraits of the

Bishops of Quebec in the issue for 1908, in commemoration of the centenary celebrations. The Rev. Charles P. Beaubien edited the publication.

Files of these various publications; FINOTTI, *Bibliographia Catholica Americana* (New York, 1872).

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Diriment Impediments. See IMPEDIMENTS.

Discalced (Lat. *dis*, without, and *calceus*, shoe), a term applied to those religious congregations of men and women, the members of which go entirely unshod or wear sandals, with or without other covering for the feet. These congregations are often distinguished on this account from other branches of the same order. The custom of going unshod was introduced into the West by St. Francis of Assisi for men and St. Clare for women. After the various modifications of the Rule of St. Francis, the Observantines adhered to the primitive custom of going unshod, and in this they were followed by the Minims and Capuchins. The Discalced Franciscans or Alcantarines, who prior to 1897 formed a distinct branch of the Franciscan Order went without footwear of any kind. The followers of St. Clare at first went barefoot, but later came to wear sandals and even shoes. The Colettines and Capuchin Sisters returned to the use of sandals. Sandals were also adopted by the Camaldolese monks of the Congregation of Monte Corona (1522), the Uniat Maronite monks, the Poor Hermits of St. Jerome of the Congregation of Bl. Peter of Pisa, the Augustinians of Thomas of Jesus (1532), the Barefooted Servites (1593), the Discalced Carmelites (1568), the Feuillants (Cistercians, 1575), Trinitarians (1594), Mercedarians (1604), and the Passionists. (See FRIARS MINOR.)

HEIMBUCHER, *Die Orden u. Kongregationen* (Paderborn, 1907), I, 44; BUCHBERGER, *Kirchliches Handlex.*, s. v.

STEPHEN M. DONOVAN.

Discernment of Spirits.—All moral conduct may be summed up in the rule: avoid evil and do good. In the language of Christian asceticism, *spirits*, in the broad sense, is the term applied to certain complex influences, capable of impelling the will, the ones toward good, the others toward evil; we have the worldly spirit of error, the spirit of race, the spirit of Christianity, etc. However, in the restricted sense, *spirits* indicate the various spiritual agents which, by their suggestions and movements, may influence the moral value of our acts. Here we shall speak only of this second kind. They are reduced to four, including, in a certain way, the human soul itself, because in consequence of the original Fall, its lower faculties are at variance with its superior powers. Concupiscence, that is to say, disturbances of the imagination and errors of sensibility, thwart or pervert the operations of the intellect and will, by deterring the one from the true and the other from the good (Gen., viii, 21; James, i, 14). In opposition to our vitiated nature or, so to speak, to the *flesh* which drags us into sin, the Spirit of God acts within us by grace, a supernatural help given to our intellect and will to lead us back to good and to the observance of the moral law (Rom., vii, 22–25). Besides these two spirits, the human and the Divine, in the actual order of Providence, two others must be observed. The Creator willed that there should be communication between angels and men, and as the angels are of two kinds (see ANGELS), good and bad, the latter try to win us over to their rebellion and the former endeavour to make us their companions in obedience. Hence four spirits lay siege to our liberty, the angelic and the Divine seeking its good and the human (in the sense heretofore mentioned); the diabolical its misery. In ordinary language they may, for brevity sake, be called simply the good and the evil spirit.

Discernment of spirits is the term given to the judgment whereby to determine from what spirit the impulses of the soul emanate, and it is easy to understand the importance of this judgment both for self-direction and the direction of others. Now this judgment may be formed in two ways. In the first case the discernment is made by means of an intuitive light which infallibly discovers the quality of the movement; it is then a gift of God, a grace *gratis data*, vouchsafed mainly for the benefit of our neighbour (I Cor., xii, 10). This charisma or gift was granted in the early Church and in the course of the lives of the saints as, for example, St. Philip Neri. Second, discernment of spirits may be obtained through study and reflexion. It is then an acquired human knowledge, more or less perfect, but very useful in the direction of souls. It is procured, always, of course, with the assistance of grace, by the reading of Holy Writ, of works on theology and asceticism, of autobiographies, and the correspondence of the most distinguished ascetics. The necessity of self-direction and of directing others, when one had charge of souls, produced documents, preserved in spiritual libraries, from the perusal of which one may see that the discernment of spirits is a science that has always flourished in the Church. In addition to the special treatises enumerated in the bibliography the following documents may be cited for the history of the subject: they are the "Shepherd of Hermas" (1, II, Mand. VI, c. 2); St. Anthony's discourse to the monks of Egypt, in his life by St. Athanasius; the "De perfectione spirituali" (ch. 30–33) by Marcus Diadochus; the "Confessions" of St. Augustine; St. Bernard's XXIII sermon, "De discretione spirituum"; Gerson's treatise, "De diversis diaboli tentationibus"; St. Theresa's autobiography and "Castle of the Soul"; St. Francis de Sales' letters of direction, etc.

An excellent lesson is that given by St. Ignatius Loyola in his "Spiritual Exercises". Here we find rules for the discernment of spirits and, being clearly and briefly formulated, these rules indicate a secure course, containing in embryo all that is included in the more extensive treatises of later date. For a complete explanation of them the best commentaries on the "Exercises" of St. Ignatius may be consulted, especially those by P. Gagliardi and a few authors like Godinez, Lopez Ezquerra, and Scaramelli who, setting aside the other parts of the "Exercises", are manifestly imbued with the doctrine of this book on the discernment of spirits. Of the rules transmitted to us by a saint inspired by Divine light and a learned psychologist taught by personal experience, it will suffice to recall the principal ones. Ignatius gives two kinds and we must call attention to the fact that in the second category, according to some opinions, he sometimes considers a more delicate discernment of spirits adapted to the extraordinary course of mysticism. Be that as it may, he begins by enunciating this clear principle, that both the good and the evil spirit act upon a soul according to the attitude it assumes toward them. If it pose as their friend, they flatter it; if it resist them, they torment it. But the evil spirit speaks only to the imagination and the senses, whereas the good spirit acts upon reason and conscience. The evil labours to excite concupiscence, the good to intensify love for God. Of course it may happen that a perfectly well-disposed soul suffers from the attacks of the devil deprived of the sustaining consolations of the good angel; but this is only a temporary trial the passing of which must be awaited in patience and humility. St. Ignatius also teaches us to distinguish the spirits by their mode of action and by the end they seek. Without any preceding cause, that is to say, suddenly, without previous knowledge or sentiment, God alone, by virtue of His sovereign dominion, can flood the soul with light and joy. But if there has been a preceding cause, either the good or the bad angel may be the author of the consolation; this remains to be judged from the consequences. As the

good angel's object is the welfare of the soul and the bad angel's its defects or unhappiness, if, in the progress of our thoughts all is well and tends to good there is no occasion for uneasiness; on the contrary, if we perceive any deviation whatsoever towards evil or even a slight unpleasant agitation, there is reason to fear. Such, then, is the substance of these brief rules which are nevertheless so greatly admired by the masters of the spiritual life. Although requiring an authorized explanation, when well understood, they act as a preservative against many illusions.

SUAREZ, *De Gratiâ*, Proleg. III, c. 5, n. 36 et sqq.; GAGLIARDI, *S. P. Ignatii de Loyola de Discretione spirituum regulæ explanatæ* (Naples, 1851); ROSSIGNOLI, *De Disciplinâ Christ. Perfectionis* (Venice, 1601), 1, III, c. 13–20; BONA, *De Discretione Spirituum* (Brussels, 1671); DE PAZ, *Opera Spiritualia* (Mainz, 1619), III, V, 1855; SCARAMELLI, *Discernimento de' Spiriti* (Venice, 1753); SARNELLI, *La Discrezione degli Spiriti* (Naples, 1864); GODINEZ, *Practica de la Theologia Mistica* (Madrid, 1903); EZQUERRA, *Lucerna mystica pro Directoribus Animarum* (Venice, 1722).

PAUL DEBUCHY.

Disciple.—This term is commonly applied to one who is learning any art or science from one distinguished by his accomplishments. Though derived from the Latin *discipulus*, the English name conveys a meaning somewhat narrower than its Latin equivalent: *disciple* is opposed to *master*, as *scholar* to *teacher*, whilst both *disciple* and *scholar* are included under the Latin *discipulus*. In the English versions of the Old Testament the word *disciple* occurs only once (Is., viii, 16); but the idea it conveys is to be met with in several other passages, as, for instance, when the Sacred Writer speaks of the "sons" of the Prophets (IV K., ii, 7); the same seems, likewise, to be the meaning of the terms *children* and *son* in the Sapiential books (e. g. Prov., iv, 1, 10; etc.). Much more frequently does the New Testament use the word *disciple* in the sense of pupil, adherent, one who continues in the Master's word (John, viii, 31). So we read of disciples of Moses (John, ix, 28), of the Pharisees (Matt., xxii, 16; Mark, ii, 18; Luke, v, 33), of John the Baptist (Matt., ix, 14; Luke, vii, 18; John, iii, 25). These, however, are only incidental applications, for the word is almost exclusively used of the Disciples of Jesus.

In the Four Gospels it is most especially applied to the Apostles, sometimes styled the "twelve disciples" (Matt., x, 1; xi, 1; xx, 17; xxvi, 20; the sixteenth verse of chapter xxviii, having reference to events subsequent to Christ's Passion, mentions only the "eleven disciples"), sometimes merely called "the disciples" (Matt., xiv, 19; xv, 33, 36; etc.). The expression "his disciples" frequently has the same import. Occasionally the Evangelists give the word a broader sense and make it a synonym for *believer* (Matt., x, 42; xxvii, 57; John, iv, 1; ix, 27, 28; etc.). Besides the signification of "Apostle" and that of "believer" there is finally a third one, found in St. Luke, and perhaps also in the other Evangelists. St. Luke narrates (vi, 13) that Jesus "called unto him his disciples, and he chose twelve of them (whom also he named apostles)". The disciples, in this context, are not the crowds of believers who flocked around Christ, but a smaller body of His followers. They are commonly identified with the seventy-two (seventy, according to the received Greek text, although several Greek MSS. mention seventy-two, as does the Vulgate) referred to (Luke, x, 1) as having been chosen by Jesus. The names of these disciples are given in several lists (Chronicon Paschale, and Pseudo-Dorotheus in Migne, P. G., XCII, 521–524; 543–545; 1061–1065); but these lists are unfortunately worthless. Eusebius positively asserts that no such roll existed in his time, and mentions among the disciples only Barnabas, Sosthenes, Cephas, Matthias, Thaddeus, and James "the Lord's brother" (Hist. Eccl., I, xii). In the Acts of the Apostles the name *disciple* is exclusively used to designate the converts, the believers, both men and women (vi, 1, 2, 7; ix, 1, 10, 19; etc.; in reference to the latter connotation see in particular ix, 36), even such as were only imperfectly instructed, like those found by St. Paul at Ephesus (Acts, xix, 1–5).

CREMER, *Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der neutestamentlichen Gräcität* (8th ed., Gotha, 1895), tr. URWICK, *Biblico-theological Lexicon of the N. T. Greek* (3rd ed., Edinburgh, 1892); HARNACK, *Die Mission und die Ausbreitung des Christentums* (Leipzig, 1902); TILLEMONT, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire eccl.* (Paris, 1655), I; OLLIVIER, *Les amitiés de Jésus* (Paris, 1895); LESÊTRE, *La sainte Eglise au siècle des Apôtres* (Paris, 1896).

CHARLES L. SOUVAY.

Disciples of Christ, a sect founded in the United States of America by Alexander Campbell. Although the largest portion of his life and prodigious activity was spent in the United States, Alexander Campbell was born, 12 Sept., 1788, in the County Antrim, Ireland. On his father's side he was of Scotch extraction; his mother, Jane Corneigle, was of Huguenot descent. Both parents are reported to have been persons of deep piety and high literary culture. His father, after serving as minister to the Anti-Burgher Church in Ahorey and director of a prosperous academy at Richhill, emigrated to the United States and engaged in the oft-attempted and ever futile effort "to unite all Christians as one communion on a purely scriptural basis", the hallucination of so many noble minds, the only outcome of which must always be, against the will of the Founder, to increase the discord of Christendom by the creation of a new sect. In 1808 Alexander embarked with the family to join his father, but was shipwrecked on the Scottish coast and took the opportunity to prepare himself for the ministry at the University of Glasgow. In 1809 he migrated to the United States, and found in Washington County, Pennsylvania, the nucleus of the new movement in the "Christian Association of Washington", under the auspices of which was issued a "Declaration and Address", setting forth the objects of the association. It was proposed "to establish no new sect, but to persuade Christians to abandon party names and creeds, sectarian usages and denominational strifes, and associate in Christian fellowship, in the common faith in a divine Lord, with no other terms of religious communion than faith in and obedience to the Lord Jesus Christ".

An independent church was formed at Brush Run on the principles of the association, and, 1 Jan., 1812, Alexander was "ordained". His earnestness is attested by the record of one hundred and six sermons preached in one year; but he wrecked every prospect of success by finding in his reading of the Scriptures the invalidity of infant baptism, and the necessity of baptism by immersion, thus excluding from the Christian discipleship the vast majority of believing Christians. On 12 June, 1812, with his wife, father, mother, and three others, Alexander was rebaptized by immersion. Nothing was left him now but to seek association with one or other of the numerous Baptist sects. This he did, but with the proviso that he should be allowed to preach and teach whatever he learned from the Holy Scriptures. The Baptists never took to him cordially; and in 1817, after five years of herculean labours, his followers, whom he wished to be known by the appellation of "Disciples of Christ", but who were generally styled "Campbellites", numbered only one hundred and fifty persons. Campbell's mission as a messenger of peace was a failure; as time went on he developed a polemical nature, and became a sharp critic in speech and in writing of the weaknesses and vagaries of the Protestant sects. Only once did he come in direct contact with the Catholics, on the occasion of his five days' debate, in 1837, with Archbishop Purcell of Cincinnati, which excited great interest at the time but is now forgotten. His sixty volumes are of no interest. Campbell was twice married and was the father of twelve children.

He died at Bethany, West Virginia, where he had established a seminary, 4 March, 1866.

According to their census prepared in 1906 the sect then had 6475 ministers, 11,633 churches, and a membership of 1,235,294. It is strongest in the West and South-West, Missouri, Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, and Ohio having the largest bodies. J. H. Garrison, editor of their organ "The Christian Evangelist", outlines (1906) the belief of his sect. According to their investigations of the New Testament the confession of faith made by Simon Peter, on which Jesus declared he would build His Church, namely "Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God", was the creed of Christianity and the essential faith, and that all those who would make this confession from the heart, being penitent of their past sins, were to be admitted by baptism into the membership of the early Church; that baptism in the early Church consisted of the burial of a penitent believer in water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and that only such were fit subjects for baptism; that the form of church government was congregational; that each congregation had its deacons and elders or bishops, the former to look after the temporal and the latter the spiritual interests of the church. They practise weekly communion and consider it not as a sacrament but as a memorial feast. While they hold both New and Old Testaments to be equally inspired, both are not equally binding upon Christians. Accepting the Bible as an all-sufficient revelation of the Divine will, they repudiate all authoritative creeds and human grounds of fellowship.

CAMPBELL, *Christian System* (Cincinnati, 1853); ERRETT, *Our Position* (Cincinnati, 1885); RICHARDSON, *Life of Alexander Campbell* (Philadelphia, 1868); GARRISON, *The Reformation of the Nineteenth Century* (St. Louis, 1901).

JAMES F. LOUGHLIN.

Discipline, ECCLESIASTICAL.—Etymologically the word *discipline* signifies the formation of one who places himself at school and under the direction of a master. All Christians are the disciples of Christ, desirous to form themselves at His school and to be guided by His teachings and precepts. He called Himself, and we, too, call Him, Our Master. Such, then, is evangelical discipline. However, in ecclesiastical language the word *discipline* has been invested with various meanings, which must here be enumerated and specified.

I. MEANING OF DISCIPLINE.—All discipline may be considered first in its author, then in its subject, and finally in itself. In its author it is chiefly the method employed for the formation and adaptation of the precepts and directions to the end to be attained, which is the perfect conduct of subjects; in this sense discipline is said to be severe or mild. In those who receive it discipline is the more or less perfect conformity of acts to the directions and formation received; it is in this sense that discipline may be said to flourish in a monastery. Or, again, it is the obligation of subjects to conform their acts to precepts and directions, and is thus defined by Cardinal Cavagnis: *Praxis factorum fidei consona*—"conduct conforming itself to faith" (Inst. jur. publ. eccl., Bk. IV, n. 147). More frequently, however, discipline is considered objectively, that is, as being the precepts and measures for the practical guidance of subjects. Thus understood ecclesiastical discipline is the aggregate of laws and directions given by the Church to the faithful for their conduct both private and public. This is discipline in its widest acceptation, and includes natural and Divine as well as positive laws, and faith, worship, and morals; in a word, all that affects the conduct of Christians. But if we eliminate laws merely formulated by the Church as the exponent of natural or Divine law, there remain the laws and directions laid down and formulated by ecclesiastical authority for the guidance of the faithful; this is the restricted and more usual acceptation of the word *discipline*. Nevertheless, it must be understood that this distinction, however justified, is not made for the purpose of separating ecclesiastical laws into two clearly divided categories in so far as practice is concerned; the Church does not always make known to what extent she speaks in the name of natural or of Divine law, and with this corresponds the observance of laws by her subjects.

II. OBJECT OF DISCIPLINE.—Since ecclesiastical discipline should direct every Christian life, its object must differ according to the obligations incumbent on each individual. The first duty of a Christian is to believe; hence dogmatic discipline, by which the Church proposes what we should believe and so regulates our conduct that it shall not fail to assist our faith. Dogmatic discipline springs from the power of *magisterium*, i. e. the teaching office, in the exercise of which power the Church can proceed only by declaration; therefore it is ecclesiastical discipline only in a broad sense. The second duty of Christians is to observe the Commandments, hence moral discipline (*disciplina morum*). Strictly understood the latter does not depend much more upon the Church than does dogmatic discipline, as the natural law is anterior and superior to ecclesiastical law; however, the Church authoritatively proposes to us the moral law, she specifies and perfects it; hence it is that we generally call moral discipline whatsoever directs the Christian in those acts that have a moral value, including the observance of positive laws, both ecclesiastical and secular. Among the chief duties of a Christian the worship of God must be assigned a place apart. The rules to be observed in this worship, especially public worship, constitute liturgical discipline. This cannot be said to depend absolutely upon the Church, as it derives the essential part of the Holy Sacrifice and the sacraments from Jesus Christ; however, for the greater part, liturgical discipline has been regulated by the Church and includes the rites of the Holy Sacrifice, the administration of the sacraments and of the sacramentals, and other ceremonies.

There still remain the obligations incumbent on the faithful considered individually, either on the members of different groups or classes of ecclesiastical society, or, finally, on those who are to any extent whatever depositaries of a portion of the authority. This is discipline properly so called, exterior discipline, established by the free legislation of the Church (not, of course, in a way absolutely independent of natural or Divine law, but outside of, yet akin to this law) for the good government of society and the sanctification of individuals. On individuals it imposes common precepts (the Commandments of the Church); then it states their mutual obligations, in conjugal society by matrimonial discipline, in larger societies by determining relations with ecclesiastical superiors, parish priests, bishops, etc. Special classes also have their own particular discipline, there being clerical discipline for the clergy and religious or monastic discipline for the religious. The government of Christian society is in the hands of prelates and superiors who are subject to a special discipline either for the conditions of their recruitment, for the determining of their privileges and duties, or for the manner in which they should fulfil their functions. We may include here the rules for the administration of temporal goods. Finally, any authority from which emanate orders or prohibitions should have power to ratify the same by penal measures applicable to all transgressors; hence, another object of discipline is the imposing and inflicting of disciplinary sanctions. It must be noted, however, that the object of these measures is to ensure observance or to chastise infractions of the natural and Divine as well as of ecclesiastical laws.

III. DISCIPLINARY POWER OF THE CHURCH.—It is evident, therefore, that the disciplinary power of the

Church is a phase, a practical application, of its power of jurisdiction, and includes the various forms of the latter. namely, legislative, administrative, judicial, and coercive power. As for the power of order (*potestas ordinis*), it is the basis of liturgical discipline by which its exercise is regulated. For the proof that the Church is a society and that, as such, it necessarily has the power of jurisdiction which it derives from Divine institution through the Apostolic succession, see CHURCH. Disciplinary power is proved by the very fact of its exercise; it is an organic necessity in every society whose members it guides to their end by providing them with rules of action. Historically it can be shown that a disciplinary power has been exercised by the Church uninterruptedly, first by the Apostles and then by their successors. The Apostles in the first council at Jerusalem formulated rules for the conduct of the faithful (Acts, xv). St. Paul gave moral advice to the Christians of Corinth on virginity, marriage, and the agape (I Cor., vii, xi). The Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul are a veritable code of clerical discipline. The Church, moreover, has never ceased to represent herself as charged by Christ with the guidance of mankind in the way of eternal salvation. The Council of Trent expressly affirms the disciplinary power of the Church in all that concerns liturgical discipline and Divine worship (Sess. XXI, c. ii): "In the administration of the sacraments, the substance of the latter remaining intact, the Church has always had power to establish or to modify whatever she considered most expedient for the utility of those who receive them, or best calculated to ensure respect for the sacraments themselves according to the various circumstances of time and place." In fact, we need only to recall the numerous laws enacted by the Church in the course of centuries for the maintenance, development, or restoration of the moral and spiritual life of Christians.

IV. MUTABILITY OF DISCIPLINE.—That ecclesiastical discipline should be subject to change is natural since it was made for men and by men. To claim that it is immutable would render the attainment of its end utterly impossible, since, in order to form and direct Christians, it must adapt itself to the variable circumstances of time and place, conditions of life, customs of peoples and races, being, in a certain sense, like St. Paul, all things to all men. Nevertheless, neither the actual changes nor the possibility of further alteration must be exaggerated. There is no change in those disciplinary measures through which the Church sets before the faithful and confirms the natural and the Divine law, nor in those strictly disciplinary regulations that are closely related to the natural or Divine law. Other disciplinary rules may and must be modified in proportion as they seem less efficacious for the social or individual welfare. Thomassin aptly says [Vetus et nova Ecclesiæ disciplina (ed. Lyons, 1706), preface, n. xvii]: "Whoever has the least idea of ecclesiastical laws, those that concern government as well as those that regulate morals, knows well that they are of two kinds. Some represent immutable rules of eternal truth, itself the fundamental law, the source and origin of these laws, from the observance of which there is no dispensation, against which no prescription obtains, and which are not modified either by diversity of custom or vicissitudes of time. Other ecclesiastical rules and customs are by nature temporary, indifferent in themselves, more or less authoritative, useful, or necessary according to circumstances of time and place, having been established only to facilitate the observance of the fundamental and eternal law." As to the variations of discipline concerning these secondary laws, the same author describes them in these terms (loc. cit., n. xv): "While the Faith of the Church remains the same in all ages, it is not so with her discipline. This changes with time, grows old with the years, is rejuvenated, is subject to growth and decay. Though in its early days admirably vigorous, with time defects crept in. Later it overcame these defects and although along some lines its usefulness increased, in other ways its first splendour waned. That in its old age it languishes is evident from the leniency and indulgence which now seem absolutely necessary. However, all things fairly considered, it will appear that old age and youth have each their defects and good qualities." Were it necessary to exemplify the mutability of ecclesiastical discipline it would be perplexing indeed to make a choice. The ancient catechumenate exists only in a few rites; the Latin Church no longer gives Communion to the laity under two kinds; the discipline relating to penance and indulgences has undergone a profound evolution; matrimonial law is still subject to modifications; fasting is not what it formerly was; the use of censures in penal law is but the shadow of what it was in the Middle Ages. Many other examples will easily occur to the mind of the well-informed reader.

V. DISCIPLINARY INFALLIBILITY.—What connexion is there between the discipline of the Church and her infallibility? Is there a certain disciplinary infallibility? It does not appear that the question was ever discussed in the past by theologians unless apropos of the canonization of saints and the approbation of religious orders. It has, however, found a place in all recent treatises on the Church (De Ecclesiâ). The authors of these treatises decide unanimously in favour of a negative and indirect rather than a positive and direct infallibility, inasmuch as in her general discipline, i. e. the common laws imposed on all the faithful, the Church can prescribe nothing that would be contrary to the natural or the Divine law, nor prohibit anything that the natural or the Divine law would exact. If well understood this thesis is undeniable; it amounts to saying that the Church does not and cannot impose practical directions contradictory of her own teaching. It is quite permissible, however, to inquire how far this infallibility extends, and to what extent, in her disciplinary activity, the Church makes use of the privilege of inerrancy granted her by Jesus Christ when she defines matters of faith and morals. Infallibility is directly related to the teaching office (*magisterium*), and although this office and the disciplinary power reside in the same ecclesiastical authorities, the disciplinary power does not necessarily depend directly on the teaching office. Teaching pertains to the order of truth; legislation to that of justice and prudence. Doubtless, in last analysis all ecclesiastical laws are based on certain fundamental truths, but as laws their purpose is neither to confirm nor to condemn these truths. It does not seem, therefore, that the Church needs any special privilege of infallibility to prevent her from enacting laws contradictory of her doctrine. To claim that disciplinary infallibility consists in regulating, without possibility of error, the adaptation of a general law to its end, is equivalent to the assertion of a (quite unnecessary) positive infallibility, which the incessant abrogation of laws would belie and which would be to the Church a burden and a hindrance rather than an advantage, since it would suppose each law to be the best. Moreover, it would make the application of laws to their end the object of a positive judgment of the Church; this would not only be useless but would become a perpetual obstacle to disciplinary reform.

From the disciplinary infallibility of the Church, correctly understood as an indirect consequence of her doctrinal infallibility, it follows that she cannot be rightly accused of introducing into her discipline anything opposed to the Divine law; the most remarkable instance of this being the suppression of the chalice in the Communion of the laity. This has often been violently attacked as contrary to the Gospel. Concerning it the Council of Constance (1415) declared (Sess. XIII): "The claim that it is sacrilegious or illicit to observe this custom or law [Communion under one

kind] must be regarded as erroneous, and those who obstinately affirm it must be cast aside as heretics." The opinion, generally admitted by theologians, that the Church is infallible in her approbation of religious orders, must be interpreted in the same sense; it means that in her regulation of a manner of life destined to provide for the practice of the evangelical counsels she cannot come into conflict with these counsels as received from Christ together with the rest of the Gospel revelation. (See ROMAN CONGREGATIONS.)

THOMASSIN, *Vetus et nova Ecclesiæ disciplina* (ed. Lyons, 1706), preface; JEILER in *Kirchenlex.*, s.v. *Disciplin;* all treatises on public ecclesiastical law, especially that by CAVAGNIS, *Inst. jur. publ. eccl.* (Rome, 1906), I, III, ch. ii; the treatise *de Ecclesiâ* in theological works, especially in HURTER, *Theol. dogm. comp.* (Innsbruck, 1878), I, thesis xlvi, and WILMERS, *De Christi Ecclesiâ* (Ratisbon, 1897), 469 sq.

A. BOUDINHON.

Discipline of the Secret (Lat. *Disciplina Arcani;* Ger. *Arcandisciplin*), a theological term used to express the custom which prevailed in the earliest ages of the Church, by which the knowledge of the more intimate mysteries of the Christian religion was carefully kept from the heathen and even from those who were undergoing instruction in the Faith. The custom itself is beyond dispute, but the name for it is comparatively modern, and does not appear to have been used before the controversies of the seventeenth century, when special dissertations bearing the title "De disciplinâ arcani" were published both on the Protestant and on the Catholic side.

The origin of the custom must be looked for in the recorded words of Christ: "Give not that which is holy to dogs; neither cast ye your pearls before swine; lest perhaps they trample them under their feet, and turning upon you, they tear you" (Matt., vii, 6), while the practice in Apostolic times is sufficiently vouched for by St. Paul's assurance that he had fed the Corinthians "as . . . little ones in Christ", giving them "milk to drink, not meat", because they were not yet able to bear it (I Cor., iii, 1–2). With this passage we may compare also Heb., v, 12–14, where the same illustration is used, and it is declared that "solid food is for the perfect; for them who by custom have their senses exercised to the discerning of good and evil." Although the origin of the custom is thus to be traced back to the very beginnings of Christianity, it does not appear to have been so general, or to have been carried out with so much strictness in the earlier centuries as it was immediately after the persecutions had ceased. This may be due in part to the absence of detailed information with regard to the earlier period, but it is probable enough that the discipline was growing more strict all through the second and third centuries on account of the pressure of persecution, and that, when persecution was at last relaxed, the need for reserve was felt at first, while the Church was still surrounded by hostile Paganism, to be increased rather than diminished. After the fifth or sixth century, when Christianity was thoroughly established and secure, the need of such a discipline was no longer felt, and it passed rapidly away. The practice of reserve (*οἰκονομία*) was exercised mainly in two directions, in dealing with catechumens, and with the heathen. It will be convenient to treat of these separately, as the reasons for the practice, and the mode in which it was carried out, differ somewhat in the two cases.

(1) *Catechumens.*—It was desirable to bring learners slowly and by degrees to a full knowledge of the Faith. A convert from heathenism could not profitably assimilate the whole Catholic religion at once, but must be taught gradually. It would be necessary for him to learn first the great truth of the unity of God, and not until this had sunk deep into his heart could he safely be instructed concerning the Blessed Trinity. Otherwise tritheism would have been the inevitable result. So again, in times of persecution, it was necessary to be very careful about those who offered themselves for instruction, and who might be spies wishing to be instructed only that they might betray. The doctrines to which the reserve was more especially applied were those of the Holy Trinity and the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist. The Lord's Prayer, too, was jealously guarded from the knowledge of all who were not fully instructed. With regard to the Holy Eucharist and the Lord's Prayer some relics of the practice still survive in the Church. The Mass of the Catechumens, that earlier portion of the Eucharistic service to which learners and neophytes were admitted, and which consisted of prayers or readings from Holy Scripture and sometimes included a sermon, is still quite distinguishable, though the custom no longer survives in the Western Liturgy, as it does in the Eastern, of formally bidding the uninitiated to depart when the more solemn part of the service is about to begin. So also the custom of saying the Lord's Prayer in silence in all public services, except the latter part of the Mass, when catechumens would according to the ancient use no longer have been present, owes its origin to this discipline.

The earliest formal witness for the custom seems to be Tertullian (Apol., vii): *Omnibus mysteriis silentii fides adhibetur.* Again, speaking of heretics, he complains bitterly that their discipline is lax in this respect, and that evil results have followed: "Among them it is doubtful who is a catechumen and who a believer; all can come in alike; they hear side by side and pray together; even heathens, if any chance to come in. That which is holy they cast to the dogs, and their pearls, though to be sure they are not real ones, they fling to the swine" (Præscr. adv. Hær., xli). Other passages from the Fathers which may be cited are St. Basil (De Spir. Sanct., xxvii): "These things must not be told to the uninitiated"; St. Gregory Nazianzen (Oratio xl, in s. bapt.) where he speaks of a difference of knowledge between those who are without and those who are within, and St. Cyril of Jerusalem whose "Catechetical Discourses" are entirely built upon this principle, and who in his first discourse cautions his hearers not to tell what they have heard. "Should a catechumen ask what the teachers have said, tell nothing to a stranger; for we deliver to thee a mystery . . . Let no man say to thee, What harm if I also know it? . . . See thou let out nothing, not that what is said is not worth telling, but because the ear that hears does not deserve to receive it. Thou thyself wast once a catechumen, and then I told thee not what was coming. When thou hast come to experience the height of what is taught thee, thou wilt know that the catechumens are not worthy to hear them" (Cat., Lect. i, 12). St. Augustine and St. Chrysostom in like manner frequently stop short in their public addresses, and, after a more or less veiled reference to the mysteries, continue with: "The initiated will understand what I mean."

The Lord's Prayer was in St. Augustine's time taught eight days before baptism (Hom. xlii; cf. "Enchir.", lxxi, and the "Apostolic Constitutions", VII, xliv; St. Chrys., Hom. xx, al. xix, in Matt.). The Creed in like manner was taught just before baptism. So St. Ambrose, writing to his sister Marcellina (Epist. xx, Benedict. ed.), says that on Sunday, after the catechumens had been dismissed, he was teaching the Creed in the baptistery of the basilica to those who were sufficiently advanced. (Cf. also St. Jerome, Epist. xxxviii, ad Pammach.) More detailed teaching about the Holy Trinity and about the other sacraments was only given after baptism. Other passages which may be consulted are: Chrys., "Hom. in Matt.", xxiii, "Hom. xviii, in II Cor."; Pseud. Augustine, "Serm. ad Neoph.", i; St. Ambrose, "De his qui mysteriis initiantur"; Gaudentius, "Ser. ii ad Neoph."; Apost. Constit., III, v, and VIII, xi. The rule of reti-

cence applied to all the sacraments, and no catechumen was ever allowed to be present at their celebration. St. Basil (De Spir. S. ad Amphilochium, xxvii) speaking of the sacraments says: "One must not circulate in writing the doctrine of mysteries which none but the initiated are allowed to see." For baptism reference may be made to Theodoret (Epitom. Decret., xviii), St. Cyril of Alexandria (Contr. Julian., i), and St. Gregory Nazianzen (Orat. xl, de bapt.).

The discipline with respect to the Holy Eucharist of course requires no proof. It is involved in the very name of the *Missa Catechumenorum*, and one can scarcely turn to any passage of the Fathers which deals with the subject in which the reticence to be observed is not expressly stated. Confirmation was never spoken of openly. St. Basil, in the treatise already quoted (De Spir. S., xxv, 11), says that no one has ever ventured to speak openly in writing of the holy oil of unction, and Innocent I, writing to the Bishop of Gubbio on the sacramental "form" of this ordinance answers: "I dare not speak the words, lest I should seem rather to betray a trust, than to respond to a request for information" (Epist. i, 3). Holy orders in the same way were never given publicly. The Council of Laodicea forbade it definitely in its fifth canon. St. Chrysostom (Hom. xvii in II Cor.), in speaking of the practice of begging the prayers of the faithful for those who are to be ordained, says that those who understand co-operate with and assent to what is done. "For it is not lawful to reveal everything to those who are yet uninitiated." So also St. Augustine (Tract xi, in Joann.): "If you say to a catechumen, Dost thou believe in Christ? he will answer, I do, and will sign himself with the Cross. . . . Let us ask him, Dost thou eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink the Blood of the Son of Man? He will not know what we mean, for Jesus has not trusted himself to him."

(2) *The Heathen.*—The evidence for the reserve of Christian writers when dealing with religious questions in books which might be accessible to the heathen is, naturally, to a large extent of a negative character, and therefore difficult to produce. Theodoret (Quæst. xv in Num.) lays down the general principle in terms which are quite clear and unmistakable: "We speak in obscure terms concerning the Divine Mysteries, on account of the uninitiated, but when these have withdrawn we teach the initiated plainly." That passage alone would suffice to refute the allegation not unfrequently made that the Discipline of the Secret was a confinement of the knowledge of the mysteries of the Faith to a chosen few, and was introduced in imitation of the heathen "mysteries". On the contrary all Christians were taught the whole truth, there was no esoteric doctrine, but they were brought to full knowledge slowly, and precautions were taken, as was very necessary, to prevent heathens from learning anything of which they might make an evil use. A very striking example of the way in which the discipline worked may be found in the writings of St. Chrysostom. He writes to Pope Innocent I to say that in the course of a disturbance at Constantinople an act of irreverence had been committed, and "the blood of Christ had been spilt upon the ground". In a letter to the pope there was no reason for not speaking plainly. But Palladius, his biographer, speaking of the same incident in a book for general reading, says only, "They overturned the symbols" (Chrys. ad Inn., i, 3 in P. G., LII, 534; cf. Döllinger, "Lehre der Eucharistie", 15). It is, no doubt, on this account that almost all the early apologists, as Minucius Felix, Athenagoras, Arnobius, Tatian, and Theophilus, are absolutely silent on the Holy Eucharist. Justin Martyr and to a less degree Tertullian are more outspoken; the frankness of the former has been unduly urged to prove the non-existence of this institution in the first half of the second century. So again, as Cardinal Newman has observed (Development, 27), both Minucius Felix and Arnobius in controversy with heathens deny absolutely that Christians used altars in their churches. The obvious meaning was that they did not use altars in the heathen sense, and they must not be taken as denying the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that, in a Christian sense, "we have an altar".

The controversial importance of this subject in more recent times is, of course, obvious. The Catholics answered the accusation of Protestant writers, that their special doctrines could not be found in the writings of the early Fathers, by showing the existence of this practice of reserve. If it was forbidden to speak or write publicly of these doctrines, silence was completely accounted for. So again, if here and there in early writings terms were used which seemed to countenance Protestant teaching—as for instance by speaking of the Holy Eucharist as symbols—it became necessary always to examine whether these terms were not used intentionally to conceal the true doctrine from the uninitiated, and whether the same writers did not, under other circumstances, use much more definite language. Protestant controversialists, therefore, endeavoured first of all to deny that the practice had ever really existed, and then when they were driven from this position, they asserted that it was unknown to the earliest Christians, as shown by the freedom with which Justin Martyr speaks on the subject of the Holy Eucharist, and that it was the result of persecution. They alleged therefore that Catholics could not use it to account for the silence of any writer before the latter part of the second century at the earliest. To this Catholics responded that, although no doubt the practice may have been intensified through persecution, it goes back to the very beginnings of Christianity, and to Christ's own words. Moreover it can be shown to have been in force before St. Justin's time, and his action must be regarded as an exception, rendered necessary by the need for putting before the emperor an account of the Christian religion which should be true and full.

The monuments of the earliest centuries afford interesting examples of the principle of the Discipline of the Secret. Monuments which could be seen by all could only speak of the mysteries of religion under veiled symbols. So in the catacombs there is scarcely any instance of a painting the subject of which is directly Christian, although all spoke of Christian truth to those who were instructed in their meaning. Jewish subjects typical of Christian truths were commonly chosen, while the representation of Christ under the name and form of a fish (see FISH) made the allusion to the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist possible and plain. There is, for example, the famous Autun inscription (see PECTORIUS): "Take the food, honey-sweet, of the redeemer of the saints, eat and drink holding the Fish in thy hands"; words which every Christian would understand at once, but which conveyed nothing to the uninitiated. The inscription of Abercius (q. v.) offers another notable instance.

The need for this reticence became less pressing after the fifth century, as Europe became Christianized and the discipline gradually passed away. We may, however, still trace its effects in the seventh century in the absurd misstatements contained in the Koran on the subject of the Blessed Trinity and the Holy Eucharist. This, perhaps, is almost the last instance which could be brought forward. Once the doctrines of the Church had been publicly set forth, any such discipline became impossible and no return to it was practicable. For a refutation of the theory of G. Anrich (Das antike Mysterienwesen, 1894), that the primitive Christians borrowed this practice from the mysteries of Mithra, see Cumont, "The Mysteries of Mithra" (London, 1903), 196–99.

SCHELSTRATE, *De disciplinâ arcani* (Antwerp, 1678); MEIER,

De recondità vet. Eccl. theol. (Helmstedt, 1670); SCHOLLINGER, *Dissert. de Disc. arc.* (Venice, 1756); LIENHARDT, *De antiq. liturg. et de disc. arc.* (Strasburg, 1823); TOKLOT, *De Disc. arc.* (Cologne, 1836); WEISS, *Die altkirchliche Pädagogik* (1869); MARTIGNY, *Dict.*; NEWMAN, *Arians*, i, §3. Among Protestant works: FROMANN, *De Disc. arc. in vet. Eccl.* (Jena, 1833); ROTHE, *De disc. arc.* (Heidelberg, 1841); CREDNER in *Jenaer Literaturzeitung* (1844); BONWETSCH, *Ueber Wesen, Entstehung u. Fortgang d. Arkanidisziplin* in *Zeitschr. für hist. Theol.* (1873), II, 203–299; cf. also BINGHAM, *Antiq. Eccl.*, and HADDAN in *Dict. of Christ. Antiq.*, s. v. The doubts raised by ABBÉ BATIFFOL in *Etudes d'Hist. et de Théologie positive* (Paris, 1902), 1–42, as to the antiquity and customary view of the Disciplina Arcani seem to have been satisfactorily quieted by the learned treatise of IGNAZ VON FUNK, *Das Alter der Arkanidisziplin* in his *Theologische Abhandlungen* (Paderborn, 1907), III, 42–57; MACDONALD, *The Discipline of the Secret* in *The Am. Eccl. Rev.* (Philadelphia, 1904), XXX.

ARTHUR S. BARNES.

Discus. See PATEN.

Discussions, RELIGIOUS (CONFERENCES, DISPUTATIONS, DEBATES), as contradistinguished from polemical writings, designate oral dialectical duels, more or less formal and public, between champions of divergent religious beliefs. For the most part, the more celebrated of these discussions have been held at the instigation of the civil authorities; for the Church has rarely shown favour to this method of ventilating revealed truth. This attitude of opposition on the part of the Church is wise and intelligible. A champion of orthodoxy, possessed of all the qualifications essential to a public debater, is not easily to be found. Moreover, it seems highly improper to give the antagonists of the truth an opportunity to assail mysteries and institutions which should be spoken of with reverence. The fact that the Catholic party to the controversy is nearly always obliged to be on the defensive places him at a disadvantage before the public, who, as Demosthenes remarks, "listen eagerly to revilings and accusations". At any rate, the Church, as custodian of Revelation, cannot abdicate her office and permit a jury of more or less competent individuals to decide upon the truths committed to her care.

St. Thomas (II–II, Q. x, a. 7) holds that it is lawful to dispute publicly with unbelievers, under certain conditions. To discuss as doubting the truth of the faith, is a sin; to discuss for the purpose of refuting error, is praiseworthy. At the same time the character of the audience must be considered. If they are well instructed and firm in their belief, there is no danger; if they are simple-minded then, where they are solicited by unbelievers to abandon their faith, a public defence is needful, provided it can be undertaken by competent parties. But where the faithful are not exposed to such perverting influences, discussions of the sort are dangerous. It is not, then, surprising that the question of disputations with heretics has been made the subject of ecclesiastical legislation. By a decree of Alexander IV (1254–1261) inserted in "Sextus Decretalium", Lib. V, c. ii, and still in force, all laymen are forbidden, under threat of excommunication, to dispute publicly or privately with heretics on the Catholic Faith. The text reads: "Inhibemus quoque, ne cuiquam laicæ personæ liceat publice vel privatim de fide catholicâ disputare. Qui vero contra fecerit, excommunicationis laqueo innodetur." (We furthermore forbid any lay person to engage in dispute, either private or public, concerning the Catholic Faith. Whosoever shall act contrary to this decree, let him be bound in the fetters of excommunication.) This law, like all penal laws, must be very narrowly construed. The terms *Catholic Faith* and *dispute* have a technical signification. The former term refers to questions purely theological; the latter to disputations more or less formal, and engrossing the attention of the public. There are numerous questions, somewhat connected with theology, which many laymen who have received no scientific theological training can treat more intelligently than a priest. In modern life, it frequently happens that an O'Connell or a Montalembert must stand forward as a defender of Catholic interests upon occasions when a theologian would be out of place. But when there is a question of dogmatic or moral theology, every intelligent layman will concede the propriety of leaving the exposition and defence of it to the clergy.

But the clergy are not free to engage in public disputes on religion without due authorization. In the "Collectanea S. Cong. de Prop. Fide" (p. 102, n. 294) we find the following decree, issued 8 March, 1625: "The Sacred Congregation has ordered that public discussions shall not be held with heretics, because for the most part, either owing to their loquacity or audacity or to the applause of the audience, error prevails and the truth is crushed. But should it happen that such a discussion is unavoidable, notice must first be given to the S. Congregation, which, after weighing the circumstances of time and persons, will prescribe in detail what is to be done." The Sacred Congregation enforced this decree with such vigour, that the custom of holding public disputes with heretics wellnigh fell into desuetude. [See the decree of 1631 regarding the missionaries in Constantinople; also the decrees of 1645 and 1662, the latter forbidding the General of the Capuchins to authorize such disputes (Collectanea, 1674, n. 302).]

That this legislation is still in force appears from the letter addressed to the bishops of Italy by Cardinal Rampolla in the name of the Cong. for Ecclesiastical Affairs (27 Jan., 1902) in which it is declared that discussions with Socialists are subject to the decrees of the Holy See regarding public disputes with heretics; and, in accordance with the decree of Propaganda, 7 Feb., 1645, such public disputations are not to be permitted unless there is hope of producing greater good and unless the conditions prescribed by theologians are fulfilled. The Holy See, it is added, considering that these discussions often produce no result at all or even result in harm, has frequently forbidden them and ordered ecclesiastical superiors to prevent them; where this cannot be done, care must be taken that the discussions are not held without the authorization of the Apostolic See; and that only those who are well qualified to secure the triumph of Christian truth shall take part therein. It is evident, then, that no Catholic priest is ever permitted to become the aggressor or to issue a challenge to such a debate. If he receives from the other party to the controversy a public challenge under circumstances which make a non-acceptance appear morally impossible, he must refer the case to his canonical superiors and be guided by their counsel. We thus reconcile two apparently contradictory utterances of the Apostles: for according to St. Peter (I Pet., iii, 15) you should be "ready always to satisfy every one that asketh you a reason of that hope which is in you", while St. Paul admonishes Timothy (II Tim., ii, 14), "Contend not in words, for it is to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers".

HISTORIC DISPUTATIONS IN EARLY TIMES.—The disputes of St. Stephen and St. Paul, mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, were rather in the nature of Apostolic pleading than of formal discussions. St. Justin's "Dialogue with Tryphon" was, in all probability, a literary effort after the model of Plato's dialogues. St. Augustine, the ablest disputant of all time, engaged in several set debates with Arians, Manichæans, Donatists, and Pelagians. An interesting summary of each of these great disputations is preserved among the saint's works, and ought to be closely studied by those who are called to defend the Catholic cause. Of particular interest is the celebrated Conference of Carthage, convened by order of Emperor Honorius to finish the inveterate schism of the Donatists. It opened 1 June, 411, and lasted three days. The tribune Marcellinus represented the emperor, and in the presence of 286 Catholic and 279 Donatist bishops, St. Augustine, as chief spokesman of the Catholics, so completely upset the sectarian arguments, that the victory was

awarded to the Catholics, many prominent members of the sect were converted, and Donatism was doomed to a lingering death. Another memorable disputation took place in Africa a couple of centuries later (645) between St. Maximus, Abbot of Chrysopolis (Scutari) and the Monothelite Patriarch Pyrrhus, who had been driven from Constantinople by popular violence. It was conducted with rare skill and ended with the temporary conversion of Pyrrhus to the orthodox faith.

During the Reformation Period.—At the outbreak of the Lutheran and Zwinglian revolution, tumultuous discussions of religious subjects grew to be epidemic. Luther opened the revolt by inviting discussion upon his ninety-five theses, 31 Oct., 1517. Although ostensibly framed to furnish matter for an ordinary scholastic dispute, Luther did not seriously contemplate an oral debate; for several of his theses were at variance with Catholic doctrine and could not be discussed at a Catholic university. Instead, they were widely scattered through Europe, everywhere creating confusion. An opportunity of disseminating more openly his peculiar tenets regarding justification by faith alone, the slavery of the human will, and the sinfulness of good works was offered to the Reformer by his order during a convention held at Heidelberg in April, 1518, when he directed a dispute on twenty-eight theological and forty philosophical theses in the presence of many professors, students, citizens, and courtiers. Though his novel tenets were viewed with deep displeasure by the older heads, he was successful in winning over several of his younger hearers, notably Brenz and the Dominican, Martin Bucer. Emboldened by the outcome of the Heidelberg Dispute, and having discovered that the road to success lay in captivating the young, the agitator made futile attempts at organizing disputations at the seats of higher learning; but no university would lend its halls to the dissemination of un-Catholic doctrines.

The imprudence of Dr. Eck, who had become involved in a literary contest with Carlstadt and had hastily challenged his adversary to a public debate, gave Luther his long-looked-for opportunity. With his customary energy, he took the direction of the intellectual duel, encouraged both antagonists to persevere, and arranged the details. The city of Leipzig was chosen as the scene. Although the faculty of the university entered a vigorous protest, and the Bishops of Merseburg and Brandenburg launched prohibitions and an excommunication, the disputation took place under the ægis of Duke George of Saxony. The discontent of the Catholics was increased when they learned that Luther had secured permission to subjoin a controversy with Eck on the subject of papal supremacy. Eck came to Leipzig with one attendant; Luther and Carlstadt entered the city accompanied by an army of adherents, mostly students. The preliminaries were carefully arranged; after which, from 27 June to 4 July (1519) Eck and Carlstadt debated the subject of free will and our ability to cooperate with grace. Eck had the better part of the argument throughout, and forced his antagonist to make admissions which stultified the new Lutheran doctrine. Thereupon Luther himself came forward to assail the dogma of Roman supremacy by Divine right. Sweeping away the authority of decretals, councils, and Fathers, he discovered to his hearers, and possibly also to himself, how completely he had abandoned the basic principles of the Catholic religion. There could no longer remain a doubt that a new Hus had arisen to scourge the Church. The debate on the primacy was succeeded by discussions of purgatory, indulgences, penance, etc. On 14 and 15 July, Carlstadt, regaining courage, resumed the debate on free will and good works. Finally, Duke George declared the disputation closed, and each of the contendents departed, as usual, claiming the victory.

Of the two universities, Erfurt and Paris, to which the final decision had been reserved, Erfurt declined to intervene and returned the documents; Paris sat in judgment upon Luther's writings, attaching to each of his opinions the proper theological censure. The most tangible outcome of this disputation was that, while it opened the eyes of Duke George to the true nature of Luther's revolt and attached him unalterably to the Church of his fathers, on the other hand it gained for the Lutheran cause the valuable aid of the youthful Melanchthon, who never understood the merits of the controversy, but was overawed by the vigorous personality of the Reformer.

The Leipzig Disputation was the last occasion on which the ancient custom of swearing to advance no tenet contrary to Catholic doctrine was observed. In all subsequent debates between Catholics and Protestants, the bare text of Holy Writ was taken as the sole and sufficient fountain of authority. This, naturally, placed the Catholics in a disadvantageous position and narrowed their prospect of success. This was particularly the case in Switzerland, where Zwingli and his lieutenants organized a number of one-sided debates under the presidency of town councils already won over to Protestantism. Such were the disputations of Zurich, 1523, of Swiss Baden, 1526, and of Berne, 1528. In all of these the result was invariably the same, the abolition of Catholic worship and the desecration of churches and religious institutions.

Passing over the numerous futile attempts made by the Protestants to heal their intestine quarrels by means of colloquies, we come to the still more hopeless efforts of Charles V to bring the religious troubles of Germany to a "speedy and peaceful termination" by conferences between the Catholic and the Protestant divines. Since the Protestants proclaimed their determination to adhere to the terms of the Augsburg Confession, and, in addition, formally repudiated the authority of the Roman pontiff and "would admit no other judge of the controversy than Jesus Christ", it was to be foreseen that the result of conferences thus conducted could only be to waste time and increase the acrimony already existing between the parties. This was as clear to Pope Paul III as to Luther, both of whom predicted the inevitable failure. However, since the emperor and his brother, King Ferdinand, persisted in making a trial, the pope authorized his nuncio, Morone, to proceed to Speyer, whither the meeting had been summoned for June, 1540. As the plague was raging in that city the conference took place in Hagenau. Neither the Elector of Saxony nor the Landgrave of Hesse could be induced to attend. Melanchthon was absent through a heavy illness brought on by grief and shame at the ignoble part he had taken in the affair of the Landgrave's bigamy. The leading Protestant theologians at the conference were Bucer, Myconius, Brenz, Blaurer, and Urbanus Rhegius. The most prominent on the Catholic side were Bishop Faber of Vienna and Dr. Eck. Present and actively intriguing to prevent an accommodation was John Calvin, then exiled from Geneva; he appeared as confidential agent of the King of France, whose settled policy it was to perpetuate religious discord in the domains of his rival. After a month wasted in useless wrangling, King Ferdinand prorogued the conference to reassemble at Worms on 28 October.

Undismayed by the failure of the Hagenau conference, the emperor made more strenuous efforts for the success of the coming colloquy at Worms. He dispatched his minister Granvella and Ortiz, his envoy, to the papal court. The latter brought with him the celebrated Jesuit, Father Peter Faber. The pope sent the Bishop of Feltri, Tommaso Campeggio, brother of the great cardinal, and ordered Morone to attend. They were not to take part in the debates, but were to watch events closely and report to Rome. Granvella opened the proceedings at Worms, 25 Nov., with an

eloquent and conciliatory address. He pictured the evils which had befallen Germany, "once the first of all nations in fidelity, religion, piety, and divine worship", and warned his hearers that "all the evils that shall come upon you and your people, if, by clinging stubbornly to preconceived notions, you prevent a renewal of concord, will be ascribed to you as the authors of them." On behalf of the Protestants, Melanchthon returned "an intrepid answer"; he threw all the blame upon the Catholics, who refused to accept the new Gospel.

A great deal of time was spent in wrangling over points of order; finally it was decided that Dr. Eck should be spokesman for the Catholics and Melanchthon for the Protestants. The debate began 14 Jan., 1541. A tactical blunder was committed in accepting the Augsburg Confession as the basis of the conference. That document had been drawn up to meet an emergency. It was apologetic and conciliatory, so worded as to persuade the young emperor that there was no radical difference between the Catholics and the Protestants. It admitted the spiritual jurisdiction of the bishops and tacitly acknowledged the supremacy of the pope by laying the ultimate appeal with a council by him convened. But many changes had taken place in the ten intervening years. The bishops had been driven out of every Protestant territory in Germany; the Smalkald confederates had solemnly abjured the pope and scorned his proffer of a council; each petty territorial prince had constituted himself the head and exponent of religion within his domain. For all practical purposes the Augsburg Confession was as useless as the laws of Lycurgus. Moreover, as Dr. Eck pointed out, the Augsburg Confession of 1540 was a different document from the Confession of 1530, having been changed by Melanchthon to suit his sacramentarian view of the Eucharist. Had the theologians at Worms reached an agreement on every point of doctrine, the discord in Germany would have continued none the less; for the princes had not the remotest idea of giving up their lucrative dominion over their territorial churches. Eck and Melanchthon battled four days over the topic of original sin and its consequences, and a formula was drafted to which both parties agreed, the Protestants with a reservation.

At this point Granvella suspended the conference, to be resumed at Ratisbon, whither the emperor had summoned a diet, which he promised to attend in person. This diet, from which the emperor anticipated brilliant results, was called to order 5 April, 1541. As legate of the pope appeared Cardinal Contarini, assisted by the nuncio Morone. The inevitable Calvin was present, ostensibly to represent Luneburg, in reality to foster discord in the interest of France. As collocutors at the religious conference which met simultaneously, Charles appointed Eck, Pflug, and Gropper for the Catholic side, and Melanchthon, Bucer, and Pistorius for the Protestants. A document of mysterious origin, the "Ratisbon Book", was presented by Joachim of Brandenburg as the basis of agreement. This strange compilation, it developed later, was the result of secret conferences, held during the meeting at Worms, between the Protestants, Bucer and Capito, on one side, and the Lutheranizing Gropper and a secretary of the emperor named Veltwick on the other. It consisted of twenty-three chapters, in which, by an ingenious phraseology, the attempt was made so to formulate the controverted doctrines that each party might find its own views therein expressed. How much Charles and Granvella had to do in the transaction, is unknown; they certainly knew and approved of it. The "Book" had been submitted by the Elector of Brandenburg to the judgment of Luther and Melanchthon; and their contemptuous treatment of it augured ill for its success. When it was shown to the legate and Morone, the latter was for rejecting it summarily; Contarini, after making a score of emendations, notably emphasizing in Article 14 the dogma of Transubstantiation, declared that now "as a private person" he could accept it; but as legate he must consult with the Catholic theologians. Eck secured the substitution of a conciser exposition of the doctrine of justification. Thus emended, the "Book" was presented to the collocutors by Granvella for consideration. The first four articles, treating of man before the fall, free will, the origin of sin, and original sin, were accepted. The battle began in earnest when the fifth article, on justification, was reached. After long and vehement debates, a formula was presented by Bucer and accepted by the majority, so worded as to be capable of bearing a Catholic and a Lutheran interpretation. Naturally, it was unsatisfactory to both parties. The Holy See condemned it and administered a severe rebuke to Contarini for not protesting against it. No greater success was attained as to the other articles of importance.

On 22 May the conference ended, and the emperor was informed as to the articles agreed upon and those on which agreement was impossible. Charles was sorely disappointed, but he was powerless to effect anything further. The decree known as the "Ratisbon Interim", published 28 July, 1541, enjoining upon both sides the observance of the articles agreed upon by the theologians, was by both sides disregarded. Equally without result was the last of the conferences summoned by Charles at Ratisbon, 1546, just previously to the outbreak of the Smalkaldic War.

THE COLLOQUY AT POISSY.—In 1561 six French cardinals and thirty-eight archbishops and bishops, with a host of minor prelates and doctors, wasted in a barren controversy with the Calvinists an entire month, which might have been spent far more advantageously to the Church and more in consonance with the duties of their offices had they taken their places in the Council of Trent. The conference had been arranged by Catharine de' Medici, the queen-mother and regent during the minority of her son, Charles IX. Between this typical representative of the Medici and her contemporary, Elizabeth of England, there was little to choose. With both religion was simply a matter of expediency and politics. The Calvinist faction in France, though less than half a million in number, was aggressive and insolent, under the guidance of several princes of the royal blood and members of the higher nobility. The fatal virus of Gallicanism and chronic disaffection towards the Holy See paralysed Catholic activity; and although a general council was in session under the legitimate presidency of the Roman pontiff, voices were heard even among the French bishops, advocating the convocation of a schismatical national synod. We may regard it as an extenuation of the guilt of Catharine and her advisers, that they refused to go the whole length of a schism and chose the alternative of a religious conference under the direction of the civil power. The pope did his utmost to prevent what, under the circumstances, could only be construed as a public defiance of ecclesiastical authority. He dispatched the Cardinal of Ferrara, with Laynez, General of the Jesuits, as his adviser, to dissuade the regent and the bishops. But the affair had gone too far; on 9 Sept. the representatives of the rival religions began their pleadings before a woman and a boy eleven years old. The proceedings were opened by a speech of Chancellor L'Hôpital, in which he emphasized the right and duty of the monarch to provide for the needs of the Church. Even should a general council be in session, a colloquy between Frenchmen convened by the king was the better way of settling religious disputes; for a general council, being, for the most part, composed of foreigners, was incapable of understanding the wishes and the needs of France. Yet these French politicians who refused to submit articles of faith to the decision of a

general council because the majority of the Fathers were not French, chose as authoritative expounders of the dogmas of the Church the Genevan Beza and the Italian Vermigli.

It was a deep humiliation for the proud hierarchy of France to be compelled to listen to a long tirade by Beza against the most cherished of Catholic doctrines, the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. They suppressed their feelings, out of respect for the king, until the hardy Reformer, in the heat of argument, gave utterance to his conviction that the Body and Blood of Christ were as far distant from the bread and wine, as the highest heaven is from the earth. This was too much for the bishops to bear, and they cried out, "He blasphemeth". It was too much for Catharine herself, and proved to her that the fundamental dogma of the Catholic Church was at stake. Beza's speech, revised and emended, was scattered broadcast among the people of France. We are told that the Cardinal of Lorraine confuted the heretic at the next session in a masterly address; but since he did not set it down in writing its value cannot be ascertained. The only sensible speech made at this colloquy was that of the Jesuit Laynez, who had the courage to remind the queen that the proper place for ventilating subjects concerning the Faith was Trent, not Paris; that the Divinely appointed judge of the religious controversies was the supreme pontiff, not the Court of France. Catharine wept; but instead of following the Jesuit's wise counsel, she appointed a committee of five Calvinists and five lukewarm Catholics, who drafted a vague formula which could be interpreted in a Catholic or a Calvinistic sense, and was consequently condemned by both parties.

The spread of Protestantism and the application of its fundamental principle of private judgment naturally produced far-reaching differences in belief. To heal these and so bring about unity, various conferences were held: at Weimar (1560), between the Lutherans, Striegel and Flacius, on free will; at Altenburg (1568–69), between the Jena theologians and those from Wittenberg, on free will and justification; at Montbéliard (1586), between Beza and the Tübingen theologians, on predestination. None of these resulted in harmony; they rather emphasized divergences in belief and intensified partisanship.

Discussions in Modern Times.—The conference of Poissy was the last attempt made to reconcile or slur over the radical differences of Catholicity and Protestantism. There have been some notable oral debates between champions of the rival religions in more recent times; but in these each side laboured to establish its own position and prove that of its adversary untenable. The most memorable and successful of these modern disputations was the "Conference on the Authority of the Church" held 8 March, 1679, between Bossuet and the Calvinist minister Jean Claude. This was a model of close debate, in which, with due courtesy, each antagonist kept strictly to the subject in hand, the relation of the Church and the Bible. The fondness of English-speaking peoples for public disputes has often shown itself in challenges, generally delivered by Protestant controversialists, to discuss religious topics in public. As a rule, they have produced no good results, since both sides revived worn-out arguments and wandered over too wide a field. Such was the "Controversial Discussion between Rev. Thomas Maguire and Rev. Richard T. Pope", held in the lecture-room of the Dublin Institution in April, 1827, Daniel O'Connell being one of the presiding officers. It was printed and widely circulated. Of a similar nature was the "Debate on the Roman Catholic Religion", held in Cincinnati from 13 to 21 Jan., 1837, between Alexander Campbell, the founder of the Campbellite sect, and Bishop John P. Purcell. More satisfactory, because confined within closer limits, was the celebrated "Discussion of the Question, Is the Roman Catholic Religion, in any or in all its Principles or Doctrines, Inimical to Civil or Religious Liberty? and of the Question, Is the Presbyterian Religion, in any or in all its Principles or Doctrines, Inimical to Civil or Religious Liberty?" debated in Philadelphia in 1836 between Rev. John Hughes, later Archbishop of New York, and Rev. John Breckinridge of the Presbyterian Church. Both parties kept their tempers remarkably well; but to judge from the violent riots which broke out not long after, the debate had little effect in extinguishing unreasoning prejudices. With the exception of a debate on the question of St. Peter's residence in Rome, held in the Eternal City in 1872, there have been no oral religious discussions in recent times and this method of elucidating religious truth may be regarded as discountenanced by modern public opinion.

Göpfert in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Disputation;* Santi, *Prælectiones Juris Can.* (4th ed., Ratisbon, 1906), lib. V, p. 106; Loiselet, *Ce que pense l'Eglise des Conférences Contradictoires* in *Etudes* (20 Aug., 1905); Pastor, *Die kirchlichen Reunionsbestrebungen während der Regierung Karls V.* (Freiburg, 1879).

James F. Loughlin.

Disibod, Saint, Irish bishop and patron of Disenberg (Disibodenberg), born c. 619; d. 8 July, 700. His life was written in 1170 by St. Hildegarde, from her visions. St. Disibod journeyed to the Continent about the year 653, and settled in the valley of the Nahe, not far from Bingen. His labours continued during the latter half of the seventh century, and, though he led the life of an anchorite, he had a numerous community, who built bee-hive cells, in the Irish fashion, on the eastern slopes of the mountain. Before his death he had the happiness of seeing a church erected, served by a colony of monks following the Rule of St. Columba, and he was elected abbot-bishop, the monastery being named Mount Disibod, subsequently Disenberg, in the Diocese of Mainz. Numerous miracles are recorded of the saint. Some authors are of opinion that his death really took place on 8 Sept., whilst the date 8 July is that of the translation of his relics in the year 754, St. Boniface being present.

Acta SS., 8 July; Mabillon, *Annal. Ord. S. Ben.* (Lucca, 1739), IV; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, 8 Sept.; O'Hanlon, *Lives of the Irish Saints* (London, 1875), VII, IX.

W. H. Grattan-Flood.

Disparity of Worship (*Disparitas Cultus*), a diriment impediment introduced by the Church to safeguard the sanctity of the Sacrament of Marriage. To effect this purpose a law was necessary that would debar Catholics from contracting marriage with persons unfit to receive the sacrament. The unfitness consists in (a) either non-reception of the Sacrament of Baptism, which is the door to the other six sacraments; or (b) in an unbelief in the sacramental character of marriage or in either or both of its essential properties (unity and indissolubility); or (c) in a profession of belief or unbelief that endangers the three ends and threefold substantial blessings or advantages of this "great sacrament . . . in Christ and the church". This unfitness, in whole or in part, is to be found in all persons who are not of the Catholic Faith and worship. Disparity of worship, in a general way, signifies a difference of religion or worship between two persons. This state of disagreement may be antecedent to, or consequent upon, their marriage. Consequent disparity occurs in the case of two pagans or unbaptized persons, one of whom, becoming a convert, is baptized in the Catholic Faith or validly baptized in some Christian sect after marriage. The marriage is not affected by this consequent disparity of religion. Another species of consequent diversity of worship which does not militate against the marriage is that of two Catholics, one of whom after their union apostatizes, or turns infidel, Mohammedan, etc. Antecedent disparity is twofold: considered in its strict and proper sense it is called perfect disparity of worship,

or simply disparity of worship, and implies a different relation on the part of the contracting parties in the matter of an essential religious rite, to wit, the Sacrament of Baptism. Viewed in a less strict, but still a proper, sense, it is named imperfect disparity of worship or, more commonly, mixed religion (*mixta religio*), which presupposes an equality as to the reception of baptism, but denotes a divergency as to form of belief and religious observance. Imperfect disparity, or mixed religion, does not render void the marriage of a Catholic with a baptized non-Catholic; but it does make it (unless dispensation intervenes) illicit and sinful. However, such a marriage may be null and void on account of another diriment impediment, e. g. clandestinity.

Disparity of worship, in its strict sense, and as the subject of this article, is that diversity which exists between two persons, one of whom has, and the other has certainly not, received Christian baptism. This disparity exists between a baptized Christian, whether Catholic or non-Catholic, and a pagan, Mohammedan, Jew, or even a catechumen (believer in the Catholic Faith yet not baptized). Imperfect disparity of worship, or mixed religion, might more strictly and aptly be named disparity of faith, since faith (an internal act), and not baptism, is the point of difference; perfect disparity of worship, on the contrary, might more aptly and properly be called disparity of baptism, for the reason that the external act (baptism), and not the internal assent of the mind (faith), is the fixed point of dissimilarity. Baptism has been chosen as the basis of this diriment impediment for a twofold reason: (1) it is an external ceremony, easy of recognition and proof, and (2) it is a sacrament which imprints an indelible character upon the soul of the receiver and so presents a personal religious condition which is fixed and unchangeable. Personal faith, on the contrary, viewed either as the internal assent of the mind or as the outward profession of the internal act, is subject to change and not always easy of demonstration, and hence could not afford a certain and immovable foundation. The primary reason why Catholics are debarred from intermarriage with unbaptized persons is because the latter are not capable of receiving the Sacrament of Matrimony, as baptism is the door to all the other sacraments. Furthermore, according to the more probable opinion, the Catholic party who, with a dispensation, marries an unbaptized person, does not receive the sacrament or the concomitant graces (cf. Sanchez, Bk. II, disp. viii, n. 2; Pirhing, Bk. IV, tit. i, n. 71; Schmalzgrüber, Bk. IV, tit. i, n. 307; Billot, "De Ecclesiæ Sacramentis", pars posterior, 359 sqq.; Hurter, III, 538, n. 598; and Wernz, who examines the reasons for the opposite opinion and answers them, "Jus Decret.", IV, 63 sqq.). The Church has not decided this question; hence the opinion of Dominicus de Soto (In IV Sent., art. iii, *ad finem*), Perrone (II, 306), Rosset, who holds that it is the more probable (De Sacr. Matrimonii, I, 284 sqq.), and Tanquerey (Synopsis Theol. Dogmat., II, 648, n. 31), to wit, that the Catholic does receive the sacrament, is tenable. The marriage, according to both opinions, is certainly sacred (Leo XIII, "Arcanum", 10 Feb., 1880) and indissoluble.

EXTENT OF THE IMPEDIMENT.—This impediment exists only in instances where the disparity is of such nature that one of the contracting parties is, and the other party is certainly not, baptized. Every baptized person, Protestant as well as Catholic, is subject to this disqualifying and annulling impediment, because Christ gave the Church jurisdiction over all who belong to it by baptism. Under the name "Catholic" are here included, besides practical Catholics, children baptized as infants in the Catholic Church but never reared or instructed in her teachings, Catholics who have fallen away or apostatized from the Catholic Faith and have joined other denominations or turned infidel. Once baptized always baptized, and always subject to the laws of Christ and His infallible Church, is axiomatic. Disparity of worship embraces and renders null and void (no dispensation having been granted) the marriage (a) of a Catholic with pagan, Mohammedan, Jew, or catechumen, and (b) of baptized non-Catholics, e. g. heretics and schismatics, with unbaptized persons. It does not extend to, or make void, the marriage (1) of two certainly unbaptized persons, for, since they do not belong to Christ by baptism, the Church has no jurisdiction over them; (2) of a Catholic with a baptized Protestant, or schismatic, or apostate Catholic, or Catholic turned infidel; (3) of baptized non-Catholics with one another. Seeing that the parties in the second and third classes have been baptized, it is evident that their marriages are outside the domain of the diriment impediment, whose aim is to protect the sacrament.

Difficulties as to the marriages of Catholics with non-Catholics, and of non-Catholics with one another, or with pagans or other unbaptized persons have in these days multiplied, due either to absolute omission of baptism, or its careless and often invalid administration even among the so-called Christian denominations. Doubts about the administration (*dubium facti*) or valid administration (*dubium juris*) of baptism in these sects are as a consequence frequent, and render complex the question whether or not disparity of worship covers the marriages in these instances. The safe guide in this confusion is the axiom: a doubtful baptism, as regards a marriage already, or about to be, celebrated, is presumed to be valid if, after due investigation, the doubt is still insoluble or it is not prudent (on account of delay, etc.) to remove it. This rule, so different from that governing baptism as a necessary means for salvation, is based upon the principle that the right to marry yields but to the evidence (not doubt) of the non-baptism. Accordingly, disparity of worship invalidates the matrimonial union of one doubtfully baptized with another certainly not baptized. The doubt may concern the act of baptizing or the validity of the ceremony. Investigation on these points must proceed in this manner: search must be made of the ritual belonging to the denomination of the party concerning whose baptism there is doubt, and if the ritual teaches the necessity of baptism, and prescribes the use of the valid matter and form in its administration, and, further, if the parents are strict adherents and observers of their religion, there is a certainty (sufficient for marriage) that the baptism was valid. If the ritual prescribes baptism with the necessary matter and form, but, upon investigation, a serious doubt remains, the baptism is still considered valid. If, on the contrary, the sect repudiates baptism, forbids infant-baptism, or admits to baptism only adults of thirty years, or the parents assert that they do not belong or wish to belong to any sect or denomination, but are satisfied with pleasing the Supreme Being by a good, moral life rather than by any fixed form of worship, then there is no certainty, not even a presumption, in favour of the baptism in childhood. Should the parents be careless and negligent in the observances of the sect of which they are members, or belong to a denomination which, whilst not rejecting baptism, yet does not admit its necessity, and in which, ordinarily, baptism is not administered, then there is no presumption for or against the baptism of their offspring, and each individual case must be referred to Rome (Congreg. of the Inquisition, 1 Aug., 1883).

Disparity of worship does not affect the marriage of a Catholic or baptized non-Catholic with one whose baptism, even after careful investigation concerning the baptismal ceremony or its validity, remains doubtful. Neither does it in any way influence the marriage of two who, after diligent examination, are still

considered doubtfully baptized. There is a difference of opinion among the jurists and theologians as to the influence of this diriment impediment upon the marriage of two doubtfully baptized, if after investigation it turns out for a certainty that one was certainly unbaptized. The more common opinion is that disparity of worship does not nullify this marriage. Gasparri gives as reason that the consuetudinary law never contemplated this case, and hence does not influence it (De Matrimonio, I, nos. 597 and 601). Wernz (IV, 772, note), Gury-Ballerini (II, 831), and others say that the marriage is valid, but give as reason the Church's dispensation, either special or general. Lehmkuhl (II, 536) distinguishes and asserts that if a dispensation from the prohibitive impediment of "mixed religion" has been granted antecedent to the marriage, the union is valid; his reason, however, that the Church in dispensing with the prohibitive did implicitly dispense with the diriment impediment, seems to be at variance with a decree of the Holy Office (29 April, 1840, n. 2) which clearly states that the Holy See dispenses with the impediment of disparity of worship only in express terms. Where no dispensation has been granted, he holds that the marriage is null on account of the existing disparity of worship and must be revalidated. He recognizes, however, as valid the marriage of the doubtfully baptized, if they had been considered and had considered themselves Catholics, and had followed Catholic practices, and afterwards it was discovered that one of them had not been baptized (loc. cit. in note).

ORIGIN OF THE IMPEDIMENT.—This impediment, inasmuch as it is diriment, is not enjoined by the natural, Divine, or written ecclesiastical law, but has been introduced by a universal custom and practice in the Eastern and Western Churches since the twelfth century. The natural and Divine laws do, however, repudiate and prohibit such marriages as tend to frustrate the primary ends of marriage by exposing believers and their offspring to the loss of their Catholic faith, and this prohibition continues in force so long as the danger exists and no proportionately grave cause dictates the necessity of such marriage. The Mosaic Law (Deut., vii, 3) prohibits marriage between the Israelites and the Chanaanites, and even the Samaritans (who kept the Law and had the Book of Moses), on account of the heathenish ceremonies they observed, lest the Jews might be turned away from the service of the true God and cling to the worship of the false gods of their pagan wives. The Pauline injunctions (I Cor., vii, 39), " . . . let her marry to whom she will but only in the Lord" and (II Cor., vi, 14): " . . . bear not the yoke with [i. e. do not marry] unbelievers", do not, indeed, declare invalid the marriages of Christians with unbelievers, but certainly do earnestly forbid the faithful to marry unbelievers unless the ends of Christian marriage are safeguarded and grave and weighty reasons exist for the union. Certainly in the time of St. Paul and immediately afterwards the proportionately small number of Christians was sufficiently grave cause for permitting such intermarriages with the hope of the conversion of the unbelieving partner.

With the development of the Church and its growth in numbers, opportunities for Christian marriage increased, proportionately grave reasons for mixed unions (unless in rare cases) ceased, and then the natural and Divine laws asserted their right to prohibit such marriages as tended to frustrate the ends of the matrimonial sacrament by exposing the Catholic to a weakening or loss of faith, the offspring to a lack of Christian education, and the family to a want of that Christian love which is its very corner-stone. The Christian laity, as well as clergy, realized from sad experience and observation the ordinary tendency of mixed unions to a compromise or loss of faith on the part of the Catholic, and the un-Catholic bringing-up, or at least religious indifference, of the children, and, finally, injury to domestic peace and happiness by the constant exposure to disputes, and sometimes bitter quarrels, about the fundamental principles of Catholic Faith, and the consequent weakening, if not total extinction, of Christian love between husband and wife (St. Ambrose, De Abraham, Bk. I, ch. ix, says: "There can be no unity of love where there is no unity of faith"). At different periods and in different countries (especially Spain and Gaul) particular councils inveighed against them, and although these canons were not strictly observed, and there were many mixed marriages in the days of Sts. Jerome (Lib. I in Jovinianum) and Augustine (Lib. de Fide et operibus, ch. xix), yet after the death of the latter, and especially from the seventh to the twelfth century, the detestation of them so increased, and the conviction that they were not Christian marriages, and therefore to be shunned and not contracted, grew so strong and general throughout the entire Church that as far back as the twelfth century it was a universal custom and practice which even had the force of a universal church law (Bellarmine, De Controversiis, III, De Sacramento Matrimonii, Bk. I, ch. xxiii; Benedict XIV, Constit. "Singulari nobis", paragraphs 9 and 10).

This impediment is binding on Christians of newly converted or even pagan countries, where there has been no such custom inasmuch as there have been no Catholics. The opinion of Lessius and others to the contrary is clearly refuted by the granting of faculties by Gregory XIII to the Christian missionaries of Japan to dispense with this impediment in the cases of newly converted Japanese Catholics. Many theologians and canonists say that there is one exception to this nullifying law, and that is the instance of an emigrant Catholic family settled in a pagan country without a single Catholic neighbour, forty or fifty days journey removed from the nearest Catholic, and unable on account of the distance or want of means to leave the country or procure a dispensation from the impediment, and thus compelled to remain their whole lives single or marry pagans (Santi-Leitner, IV, 74; Gasparri, De Matrimonio, I, 429). It does not seem that disparity of worship holds in a case of this kind; the ecclesiastical law under such circumstances does not bind a man so as to deprive him of his natural right to marry. Wernz, however (Jus Decret., IV, 775, n. 37), holds the opposite opinion.

DISPENSATION FROM THE IMPEDIMENT.—The Church can dispense from this impediment, inasmuch as it is of ecclesiastical institution. It never does so unless for gravest reasons and upon the fulfilment of certain conditions and guarantees that safeguard, as far as possible, the ends of the Sacrament of Matrimony. The natural and Divine laws, before permitting mixed marriages, exact the removal of all danger to the faith of the Catholic and to the baptism and Catholic bringing-up of all of the children of the marriage. The Church cannot dispense with this necessary requirement, and, the better to ensure its presence, insists upon certain conditions and promises, which must be committed to writing and signed and, in some instances and countries, also sworn to, by the unbaptized party to the pact. The unbeliever promises faithfully to comply with the requirements of the Church, and the Church on her part grants the permission for the marriage. The promises on the part of the unbaptized party are: (1) that he (or she) will afford the Catholic partner full and perfect freedom to practise the Catholic Faith, and that he (or she) will abstain from saying or doing aught to weaken or change that faith, and, if he be an inhabitant of a pagan country, that he will not practise polygamy; (2) that he (or she) will permit all children of their union to be baptized and reared in the Catholic Faith and practice, and that he (or she) will do or say nothing calculated to lessen their faith or turn

them away from it or its practices. The Catholic petitioner for the dispensation must also give promise (usually also written, in order that the dispenser may have a moral certainty of the absence of danger to the substantial ends of the sacrament) that he (or she) will strictly attend to his (or her) personal religious duties and have all the children baptized and properly reared and trained in the Catholic doctrine and practice, and that by prayer and good example and other legitimate and prudent means he (or she) will constantly labour to bring about the conversion to the Catholic Faith of his (or her) unbaptized partner. The promise to strive to effect the conversion of the unbeliever is of special importance, although too frequently lost sight of. The conversion most assuredly eliminates the last vestige of possible perversion of the Catholic party, ensures the primary end of marriage, i. e. the bearing and rearing of children for the Church and heaven, and rounds out, by the perfect unity of the married couple in faith and Christian love, their marriage according to its great type, the union of Christ with the Church. Even with all these promises, written and sworn to as safeguards to Christian marriage, a dispensation cannot be licitly given unless a grave necessity, proportionate to the great risks to be encountered, justifies the marriage.

This dispensation, in former days very rarely granted in Catholic countries, is now of more frequent occurrence, owing to the existence of "civil marriage" and the growing indifference on the part of parents in the matter of their children's baptism. The rule of the Church was, and is, not to grant a dispensation from this impediment unless in provinces or countries where the Catholics are largely outnumbered by the non-baptized inhabitants. Rather than dispense from the disparity of worship, the Church will more willingly and readily grant dispensation from the diriment impediments of affinity and consanguinity, precisely for the reason that in the latter cases there is no danger to the faith of either Catholic or offspring, while in the case of the former, even though the necessary promises are made and kept, there is always danger of religious indifference on the part of the Catholic parent, and especially of the children on account of the example of the non-baptized parent. The pope alone *suo jure* can dispense with this impediment; bishops cannot. They, however, are delegated to do so, but in the pope's name and by virtue of the delegated authority. Thus the bishops in pagan countries—China, Japan, Africa, etc.—and in countries where the unbaptized largely outnumber the Catholics, as England, United States, etc., have ample faculties in respect of this impediment. To-day the only case (and should there be danger in delay it is not: see Formula T, 11 June, 1907) reserved to Rome in the faculties granted to bishops of the United States is that of a Catholic with an orthodox Jew, i. e. a circumcised follower of Judaism. The case of a Jew uncircumcised, or even circumcised if he has abandoned Judaism, is not reserved.

This delegated faculty to bishops is given only for a specified period of five years or for a certain number of cases and requires that the bishop in granting a dispensation must state that it was conceded by virtue of Apostolic delegation of specified date. Where the impediment is occult, and there is danger in delay, bishops may dispense without express faculty of Rome, which in such cases is presumed to grant it. All bishops can (decrees of Congreg. of Inquis., 20 Feb., 1888, and 1 March, 1889) dispense, and delegate the parish priests to dispense, from the impediment of disparity of worship in the case of one who is in danger of death but is only civilly married or lives in concubinage. The aforesaid promises cannot be omitted. The sick party must promise absolutely to observe the requirements of the natural and Divine laws, and to carry out the injunctions of the ecclesiastical law as far as possible (Collectanea S. C. de Prop. Fide, n. 2188). Bishops cannot dispense in instances where the ends, purposes, and substantial blessings of the sacrament are well protected, unless there also exists a grave and proportionately weighty reason. There are sixteen canonical reasons, some grave and others still more grave (Instruct. S. C. de Prop. Fide, 9 May, 1877). Should the bishop dispense without cause, the dispensation would be null and void. The pope's dispensation, in a similar case labouring under the same defect, would be valid. The reason of this difference is that a bishop cannot violate the law of his superior (in this instance the universal law), whereas the pope, who is supreme legislator, can dispense from universal ecclesiastical laws. He cannot, however, do so validly with the prohibition of the natural and Divine laws; hence he must have, before conceding the dispensation, a moral certainty that the practice of the Faith by the Catholic, and the Catholic baptism and rearing of the children, are amply protected. The Holy See dispenses from this impediment only for the gravest reasons and only in express terms (Collectanea S. C. de Prop. Fide, n. 948, 2); hence a dispensation from mixed religion instead of disparity of worship would not suffice for the validity of the marriage.

All the European Governments (except Austria) ignore this impediment. The Austrian impediment is different from the ecclesiastical impediment. Its basis is the profession of faith, and not the baptism of the parties, and so far as Catholicism is concerned, this civil impediment is more injurious than otherwise. According to the Austrian law, the marriage of a Catholic with a Jew, or other unbaptized party, is civilly invalid as long as the Catholic remains in the Catholic Church. Should the Catholic leave the Church, and announce that he (or she) held no belief in any faith, the marriage with an unbaptized partner would be civilly valid. Unbaptized parties can, on the other hand, enter into civilly valid marriage with baptized Protestants. The Church in granting dispensation from disparity of worship, thus permitting the marriage of a Catholic and an unbaptized person, by that act dispenses also from all impediments of purely ecclesiastical institution, from which the unbaptized is exempt (except clandestinity; cf. "Praxis Curiæ Romanæ"; "Ne Temere", 2 Aug., 1907); the Church does this in order that the exemption of the unbaptized may, on account of the indissolubility of the marriage, be communicated to the Catholic party (Congreg. of Inquis., 3 March, 1825). This dispensation never includes dispensation in any degree in the direct line nor in the first degree of the transverse line (Gasparri, op. cit., nos. 700, 701). This impediment, which is *publici juris*, can be invoked by any Catholic to annul a marriage contracted without the necessary dispensation. The burden of proof rests upon the challenger, who must clearly demonstrate that there was either no act of baptismal administration or that the act of administration which actually took place was certainly invalid. The usual canonical laws of evidence are supplemented by special laws laid down for the demonstration of the ceremony or the validity of the baptism. The customary norm (c. iii, X, De presby. non-bap., III, xliii) in case of practical Catholics does not govern the cases of non-Catholics or negligent Catholics. The rules prescribed by the Congreg. of the Inquisition (1 Aug., 1883, and 5 Feb., 1851) for the verification of the fact or non-fact of the baptism, as also of the validity of the act, must be strictly followed.

SCHMALZGRÜBER, Bk. IV, tit. vi, sect. 4; FERRARIS, *Bibliotheca* (Rome, 1889), V, 301 sq.; PIRHING, *Jus. Can.* (Dillingen, 1678), Bk. IV, tit. i, sect. 6; FEIJE, *De Imped. et Dispen. Matrimonialibus* (Louvain, 1874), XX; GASPARRI, *De Matrimonio* (Paris, 1893), I, 401 sqq.; BALLERINI, *Opus Theol. Morale* (Prato, 1894), VI, *De Matrimonio*, 530 sq.; HAINE, *Theol. Moralis Elementa* (Louvain, 1900), IV, 158 sqq.; WERNZ, *Jus Decret.* (Rome, 1904), IV, 759–81; ROSSET, *De Sacramento Matrimonii*

(Montreuil-sur-Mer, 1895), III, art. iii; SANTI-LEITNER, *Prælect. Jur. Can.* (Ratisbon, 1899), IV, 66–75; ANDRÉ-WAGNER, *Empêchements de mariage* in *Dict. de droit canon.* (3rd ed., Paris, 1901), 84–86; BECKER, *De Sponsal. et Matrimonio* (Brussels, 1896), 214 sqq.; NOLDIN, *De Sacramentis* (Innsbruck, 1906), 698 sqq.; PUTZER, *Commentarium in Apost. Facul.* (New York, 1898), 379 sqq.; *Irish Eccl. Record*, Series III, vol. X (1889), 924 sqq.; *Collectanea S. Cong. de Prop. Fide* (Rome, 1907), index, s. v. *Disparitas.*

P. M. J. ROCK.

Dispensation (Lat. *dispensatio*), an act whereby in a particular case a lawful superior grants relaxation from an existing law. This article will treat: I. Dispensation in General; II. Matrimonial Dispensations. For dispensations from vows see VOWS and RELIGIOUS ORDERS; and from fasting and abstinence, FAST, ABSTINENCE.

I. DISPENSATION IN GENERAL.—Dispensation differs from abrogation and derogation, inasmuch as these suppress the law totally or in part, whereas a dispensation leaves it still in vigour; and from epikeia, or a favourable interpretation of the purpose of the legislator, which supposes that he did not intend to include a particular case within the scope of his law, whereas by dispensation a superior withdraws from the power of the law a case which otherwise would fall under it. The *raison d'être* for dispensation lies in the nature of prudent administration, which often counsels the adapting of general legislation to the needs of a particular case by way of exception. This is peculiarly true of ecclesiastical administration. Owing to the universality of the Church, the adequate observance by all its members of a single code of laws would be very difficult. Moreover, the Divine purpose of the Church, the welfare of souls, obliges it to reconcile as far as possible the general interests of the community with the spiritual needs or even weaknesses of its individual members. Hence we find instances of ecclesiastical dispensations from the very earliest centuries; such early instances, however, were meant rather to legitimize accomplished facts than to authorize beforehand the doing of certain things. Later on antecedent dispensations were frequently granted; as early as the eleventh century Yves of Chartres, among other canonists, outlined the theory on which they were based. With reference to matrimonial dispensations now common, we meet in the sixth and seventh centuries with a few examples of general dispensations granted to legitimize marriages already contracted, or permitting others about to be contracted. It is not, however, until the second half of the eleventh century that we come upon papal dispensations affecting individual cases. The earliest examples relate to already existing unions; the first certain dispensation for a future marriage dates from the beginning of the thirteenth century. In the sixteenth century the Holy See began to give ampler faculties to bishops and missionaries in distant lands; in the seventeenth century such privileges were granted to other countries. Such was the origin of the ordinary faculties (see FACULTIES, CANONICAL) now granted to bishops.

(1) *Kinds of Dispensation.*—(a) A dispensation may be explicit, tacit, or implicit, according as it is manifested by a positive act, or by silence under circumstances amounting to acquiescence, or solely by its connexion with another positive act that presupposes the dispensation. (b) It may be granted *in foro interno*, or *in foro externo*, according as it affects only the personal conscience, or conscience and the community at large. Although dispensations *in foro interno* are used for secret cases, they are also often granted in public cases; hence they must not be identified with dispensations *in casu occulto*. (c) A dispensation may be either direct or indirect, according as it affects the law directly, by suspending its operation, or indirectly, by modifying the object of the law in such a way as to withdraw it from the latter's control. For instance, when a dispensation is granted from the matrimonial impediment of a vow, the pope remits the obligation resulting from the promise made to God, consequently also the impediment it raised against marriage. (d) A dispensation may be *in formâ gratiosâ*, *in formâ commissâ*, or *in formâ commissâ mixtâ*. Those of the first class need no execution, but contain a dispensation granted *ipso facto* by the superior in the act of sending it. Those of the second class give jurisdiction to the person named as executor of the dispensation, if he should consider it advisable; they are, therefore, favours to be granted. Those of the third class command the executor to deliver the dispensation if he can verify the accuracy of the facts for which such dispensation is asked; they seem, therefore, to contain a favour already granted. From the respective nature of each of these forms of dispensation result certain important consequences that affect delegation, obreption, and revocation in the matter of dispensations (see DELEGATION; OBREPTION; REVOCATION).

(2) *The Dispensing Power.*—It lies in the very notion of dispensation that only the legislator, or his lawful successor, can of his own right grant a dispensation from the law. His subordinates can do so only in the measure that he permits. If such communication of ecclesiastical authority is made to an inferior by reason of an office he holds, his power, though derived, is known as *ordinary*. If it is only given him by way of commission it is known as *delegated* power. When such delegation takes place through a permanent law, it is known as delegation *by right of law*. It is styled *habitual*, when, though given by a particular act of the superior, it is granted for a certain period of time or a certain number of cases. Finally, it is called *particular* if granted only for one case. When the power of dispensation is ordinary it may be delegated to another unless this be expressly forbidden. When it is delegated, as stated above, it may not be subdelegated unless this be expressly permitted; exception is made, however, for delegation *ad universitatem causarum*, i. e. for all cases of a certain kind, and for delegation by the pope or the Roman Congregations. Even these exceptions do not cover delegations made because of some personal fitness of the delegate, nor those in which the latter receives, not actual jurisdiction to grant the dispensation, but an appointment to execute it, e. g. in the case of dispensations granted *in formâ commissâ mixtâ* (see above).

The power of dispensation rests in the following persons: (A) The Pope.—He cannot of his own right dispense from the Divine law (either natural or positive). When he does dispense, e. g. from vows, oaths, unconsummated marriages, he does so by derived power communicated to him as Vicar of Christ, and the limits of which he determines by his *magisterium*, or authoritative teaching power. There is some diversity of opinion as to the nature of the pope's dispensing power in this respect; it is generally held that it operates by way of indirect dispensation: that is, by virtue of his power over the wills of the faithful the pope, acting in the name of God, remits for them an obligation resulting from their deliberate consent, and therewith the consequences that by natural or positive Divine law flowed from such obligation. The pope, of his own right, has full power to dispense from all ecclesiastical laws, whether universal or particular, even from the disciplinary decrees of œcumenical councils. Such authority is consequent on his primacy and the fullness of his immediate jurisdiction. A part of this power, however, he usually communicates to the Roman Congregations.

(B) The Bishop.—Of his ordinary right, the bishop can dispense from his own statutes and from those of his predecessors, even when promulgated in a diocesan synod (where he alone is legislator). From the other laws of the Church he cannot dispense of his own right. This is evident from the nature of dispensation and of diocesan jurisdiction. A principle main-

tained by some authors, viz. that the bishop can grant all dispensations which the pope has not reserved to himself, cannot be admitted. But by derived right (either ordinary or delegated according to the terms of the grant) the bishop can dispense from those laws that expressly permit him to do so or from those for which he has received an indult to that effect. Moreover, by ordinary right, based on custom or the tacit consent of the Holy See, he may dispense: (a) in a case where recourse to the Holy See is difficult and where delay would entail serious danger; (b) in doubtful cases, especially when the doubt affects the necessity of the dispensation or the sufficiency of the motives; (c) in cases of frequent occurrence but requiring dispensation, also in frequently occurring matters of minor importance; (d) in decrees of national and provincial councils, although he may not pronounce a general decree to the contrary; (e) in pontifical laws specially passed for his diocese. It should be always remembered that to fix the exact limit of these various powers legitimate custom and the interpretation of reputable authors must serve as guides. Superiors of exempt religious orders (see EXEMPTION) can grant to their subjects, individually, those dispensations from ecclesiastical laws which the bishop grants by his ordinary power. When there is question of the rules of their order they are bound to follow what is laid down in their constitutions (see RELIGIOUS ORDERS).

(C) The Vicar-General.—He enjoys by virtue of his appointment the ordinary dispensing power of the bishop, also the delegated powers of the latter, i. e. those granted him not personally but as ordinary (according to present discipline, the pontifical faculties known as *ordinary*); exception is made, however, for those powers which require a special mandate like those of the chapter *Liceat*, for dealing with irregularities and secret cases. The vicar capitular likewise has all the dispensing power which the bishop has of his own right, or which has been delegated to him as ordinary.

(D) Parish Priest.—By his own ordinary right, founded on custom, he may dispense (but only in particular cases, and for individuals separately, not for a community or congregation) from the observance of fasting, abstinence, and Holy Days. He can also dispense, within his own territory, from the observance of diocesan statutes when the latter permit him to do so; the terms of these statutes usually declare the extent of such power, also whether it be ordinary or delegated. Dispensation being an act of jurisdiction, a superior can exercise it only over his own subjects, though as a general rule he can do so in their favour even outside his own territory. The bishop and the parish priest, except in circumstances governed by special enactments, acquire jurisdiction over a member of the faithful by reason of the domicile or quasi-domicile he or she has in a diocese or parish (see DOMICILE). Moreover, in their own territory they can use their dispensing power in respect of persons without fixed residence (*vagi*), probably also in respect of travellers temporarily resident in such territory. As a general rule he who has power to dispense others from certain obligations can also dispense himself.

(3) *Causes for Granting Dispensations.*—A sufficient cause is always required in order that a dispensation may be both valid and licit when an inferior dispenses from a superior's law, but only for the liceity of the act when a superior dispenses from his own law. Nevertheless, in this latter case a dispensation granted without a motive would not (*in se*), except for some special reason, e. g. scandal, constitute a serious fault. One may be satisfied with a *probably sufficient* cause, or with a cause less than one that, of itself and without any dispensation, would excuse from the law. It is always understood that a superior intends to grant only a licit dispensation. Therefore a dispensation is null when in the motives set forth for obtaining it a false statement is made which has influenced not only the *causa impulsiva*, i. e. the reason inclining the superior more easily to grant it, but also the *causa motiva*, i. e. the really determining reason for the grant in question. For this, and in general for the information which should accompany the petition, in order that a dispensation be valid, see below apropos of obreption and subreption in rescripts of dispensation. Consequently a false statement or the fraudulent withholding of information, i. e. done with positive intention of deceiving the superior, totally annuls the dispensation, unless such statement bear on a point foreign to the matter in hand. But if made with no fraudulent intent, a false statement does not affect the grant unless the object of the statement be some circumstance which ought to have been expressed under pain of nullity, or unless it affects directly the motive cause as above described. Even then false statements do not always nullify the grant; for (a) when the dispensation is composed of several distinct and separable parts, that part or element alone is nullified on which falls the obreption or subreption, as the case may be; (b) when several adequately distinguished motive causes are set forth, the dispensation is null and void only when the obreption or subreption in question affects them all. It is enough, moreover, that the accuracy of the facts be verified at the moment when the dispensation is granted. Therefore, in the case of dispensations *ex gratiâ* (or *in formâ gratiosâ*), i. e. granting favours, the facts must be true when the dispensation is expedited; on the other hand, in the case of dispensations *in formâ commissâ* (and according to the more general opinion, in those *in formâ commissâ mixtâ*), the causes alleged must be verified only when the dispensation is actually executed.

(4) *Form and Interpretation.*—It is proper, generally speaking, that dispensations be asked for and granted in writing. Moreover, the Roman Congregations are forbidden, as a rule, to receive petitions for dispensations or to answer them by telegram. The execution of a dispensation made on receipt of telegraphic information that such dispensation had been granted would be null, unless such means of communication had been officially used by special authorization from the pope. Except when the interest of a third party is at stake, or the superior has expressed himself to the contrary, the general dispensing power, whether ordinary or delegated, ought to be broadly interpreted, since its object is the common good. But the actual dispensation (and the same holds true of dispensing power given for a particular case) ought to be strictly interpreted unless it is a question of a dispensation authorized by the common law, or one granted *motu proprio* (by the superior spontaneously) to a whole community, or with a view to the public good. Again, that interpretation is lawful without which the dispensation would prove hurtful or useless to the beneficiary, also that which extends the benefits of the dispensation to whatever is juridically connected with it.

(5) *Cessation of Dispensations.*—(a) A dispensation ceases when it is renounced by the person in whose favour it was granted. However, when the object of the dispensation is an obligation exclusively resulting from one's own will, e. g. a vow, such renunciation is not valid until accepted by the competent superior. Moreover, neither the non-use of a dispensation nor the fact of having obtained another dispensation incompatible with the former is, in itself, equivalent to a renunciation. Thus, if a girl had received a dispensation to marry Peter and another to marry Paul, she would remain free to marry either of them. (b) A dispensation ceases when it is revoked after due notice to the recipient. The legislator can validly revoke a dispensation, even without cause, though in

the latter case it would be illicit to do so; but without a cause an inferior cannot revoke a dispensation, even validly. With a just cause, however, he can do so if he has dispensed by virtue of his general powers (ordinary or delegated); not so, however, when his authority extended merely to one particular case, since thereby his authority was exhausted. (c) A dispensation ceases by the death of the superior when, the dispensation having been granted *in formâ commissâ*, the executor had not yet begun to execute it. But the grant holds good if given *ex gratiâ* (as a favour) and even, more probably, if granted *in formâ commissâ mixtâ*. In any case, the new pope is wont to revalidate all favours granted in the immediately previous year by his predecessor and not yet availed of. (d) A conditional dispensation ceases on verification of the condition that renders it void, e. g. the death of the superior when the dispensation was granted with the clause *ad beneplacitum nostrum* (at our good pleasure). (e) A dispensation ceases by the adequate and total cessation of its motive causes, the dispensation thereupon ceasing to be legitimate. But the cessation of the influencing causes, or of a part of the motive causes, does not affect the dispensation. However, when the motive cause, though complex, is substantially one, it is rightly held to cease with the disappearance of one of its essential elements.

II. Matrimonial Dispensations.—A matrimonial dispensation is the relaxation in a particular case of an impediment prohibiting or annulling a marriage. It may be granted: (a) in favour of a contemplated marriage or to legitimize one already contracted; (b) in secret cases, or in public cases, or in both (see Impediments of Matrimony); (c) *in foro interno* only, or *in foro externo* (the latter includes also the former). Power of dispensing *in foro interno* is not always restricted to secret cases (*casus occulti*). These expressions, as stated above, are by no means identical. We shall classify the most important considerations in this very complex matter, under four heads: (1) general powers of dispensation; (2) particular indults of dispensation; (3) causes for dispensations; (4) costs of dispensations.

(1) *General Powers of Dispensation.*—(A) The Pope.—The pope cannot dispense from impediments founded on Divine law—except, as above described, in the case of vows, espousals, and non-consummated marriages, or valid and consummated marriage of neophytes before baptism (see Neophytes). In doubtful cases, however, he may decide authoritatively as to the objective value of the doubt. In respect of impediments arising from ecclesiastical law the pope has full dispensing power. Every such dispensation granted by him is valid, and when he acts from a sufficient motive it is also licit. He is not wont, however, out of consideration for the public welfare, to exercise this power personally, unless in very exceptional cases, where certain specific impediments are in question. Such cases are error, violence, Holy orders, disparity of worship, public conjugicide, consanguinity in the direct line or in the first degree (equal) of the collateral line, and the first degree of affinity (from lawful intercourse) in the direct line. As a rule the pope exercises his power of dispensation through the Roman Congregations and Tribunals.

Up to recent times the Dataria was the most important channel for matrimonial dispensations when the impediment was public or about to become public within a short time. The Holy Office, however, had exclusive control *in foro externo* over all impediments connected with or juridically bearing on matters of faith, e. g. disparity of worship, *mixta religio*, Holy orders, etc. The dispensing power *in foro interno* lay with the Penitentiaria, and in the case of *pauperes* or *quasi-pauperes* this same Congregation had dispensing power over public impediments *in foro externo*. The Penitentiaria held as *pauperes* for all countries outside of Italy those whose united capital, productive of a fixed revenue, did not exceed 5370 lire (about 1050 dollars); and as *quasi-pauperes*, those whose capital did not exceed 9396 lire (about 1850 dollars). It likewise had the power of promulgating general indults affecting public impediments, as for instance the indult of 15 Nov., 1907. Propaganda was charged with all dispensations, both *in foro interno* and *in foro externo*, for countries under its jurisdiction, as was the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs for all countries depending on it, e. g. Russia, Latin America, and certain vicariates and prefectures Apostolic.

On 3 November, 1908, the duties of these various Congregations received important modifications in consequence of the Constitution "Sapienti", in which Pope Pius X reorganized the Roman Curia. Dispensing power from public impediments in the case of *pauperes* or *quasi-pauperes* was transferred from the Dataria and the Penitentiaria to a newly established Congregation known as the Congregatio de Disciplinâ Sacramentorum. The Penitentiaria retains dispensing power over occult impediments *in foro interno* only. The Holy Office retains its faculties, but restricted expressly under three heads: (1) disparity of worship; (2) *mixta religio;* (3) the Pauline Privilege [see Divorce (in Moral Theology)]. Propaganda remains the channel for securing dispensations for all countries under its jurisdiction, but as it is required for the sake of executive unity, to defer, in all matters concerning matrimony, to the various Congregations competent to act thereon, its function is henceforth that of intermediary. It is to be remembered that in America, the United States, Canada and Newfoundland, and in Europe, the British Isles are now withdrawn from Propaganda, and placed under the common law of countries with a hierarchy. The Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs loses all its powers; consequently the countries hitherto subject to it must address themselves either to the Holy Office or to the Congregatio de Disciplinâ Sacramentorum according to the nature of the impediment.

It should be noted that the powers of a Congregation are suspended during the vacancy of the Holy See, except those of the Penitentiaria *in foro interno*, which, during that time, are even increased. Though suspended, the powers of a Congregation may be used in cases of urgent necessity.

(B) The Diocesan Bishops.—We shall treat first of their fixed perpetual faculties, whether ordinary or delegated, afterwards of their habitual and temporary faculties. By virtue of their ordinary power (see Jurisdiction) bishops can dispense from those prohibent impediments of ecclesiastical law which are not reserved to the pope. The reserved impediments of this kind are espousals, the vow of perpetual chastity, and vows taken in diocesan religious institutes (see Religious Congregations), *mixta religio*, public display and solemn blessing at marriages within forbidden times, the *vetitum*, or interdict laid on a marriage by the pope, or by the metropolitan in a case of appeal. The bishop may also dispense from diriment impediments after the following manner:—

(a) By tacit consent of the Holy See he can dispense *in foro interno* from secret impediments from which the pope is wont to exercise his power of dispensing, in the three following cases: (1) in marriages already contracted and consummated, when urgent necessity arises (i. e. when the interested parties cannot be separated without scandal or endangering their souls, and there is no time to have recourse to the Holy See or to its delegate)—it is, however, necessary that such marriage shall have taken place in lawful form before the Church, and that one of the contracting parties at least shall have been ignorant of the impediment; (2) in marriages about to be contracted and which are called embarrassing (*perplexi*) cases, i. e. where everything

being ready a delay would be defamatory or would cause scandal; (3) when there is a serious doubt of fact as to the existence of an impediment; in this case the dispensation seems to hold good, even though in course of time the impediment becomes certain, and even public. In cases where the law is doubtful no dispensation is necessary; but the bishop may, if he thinks proper, declare authentically the existence and sufficiency of such doubt. (b) By virtue of a decree of the Congregation of the Inquisition or Holy Office (20 February, 1888) diocesan bishops and other ordinaries (especially vicars Apostolic, administrators Apostolic, and prefects Apostolic, having jurisdiction over an allocated territory, also vicars-general *in spiritualibus*, and vicars capitular) may dispense in very urgent (*gravissimum*) danger of death from all diriment impediments (secret or public) of ecclesiastical law, except priesthood and affinity (from lawful intercourse) in the direct line. However, they can use this privilege only in favour of persons actually living in real concubinage or united by a merely civil marriage, and only when there is no time for recourse to the Holy See. They may also legitimize the children of such unions, except those born of adultery or sacrilege. In the decree of 1888 is also included the impediment of clandestinity. This decree permits therefore (at least until the Holy See shall have issued other instructions) to dispense, in the case of concubinage or civil marriage, with the presence of the priest and of the two witnesses required by the Decree "Ne temere" in urgent cases of marriage *in extremis*. Canonists do not agree as to whether bishops hold these faculties by virtue of their ordinary power or by general delegation of the law. It seems to us more probable that those just described under (a) belong to them as ordinaries, while those under (b) are delegated. They are, therefore, empowered to delegate the former; in order to subdelegate the latter they must be guided by the limits fixed by the decree of 1888 and its interpretation dated 9 June, 1889. That is, if it is a question of habitual delegation parish priests only should receive it, and only for cases where there is no time for recourse to the bishop.

Besides the fixed perpetual faculties, bishops also receive from the Holy See habitual temporary indults for a certain period of time or for a limited number of cases. These faculties are granted by fixed "formulæ", in which the Holy See from time to time, or as occasion requires it, makes some slight modifications. (See FACULTIES, CANONICAL.) These faculties call for a broad interpretation. Nevertheless it is well to bear in mind, when interpreting them, the actual legislation of the Congregation whence they issue, so as not to extend their use beyond the places, persons, number of cases, and impediments laid down in a given indult. Faculties thus delegated to a bishop do not in any way restrict his ordinary faculties; nor (*in se*) do the faculties issued by one Congregation affect those granted by another. When several specifically different impediments occur in one and the same case, and one of them exceeds the bishop's powers, he may not dispense from any of them. Even when the bishop has faculties for each impediment taken separately he cannot (unless he possesses the faculty known as *de cumulo*) use his various faculties simultaneously in a case where, all the impediments being public, one of them exceeds his ordinary faculties. It is not necessary for a bishop to delegate his faculties to his vicars-general; since 1897 they are always granted to the bishop as ordinary, therefore to the vicar-general also. With regard to other priests a decree of the Holy Office (14 Dec., 1898) declares that for the future temporary faculties may be always subdelegated unless the indult expressly states the contrary. These faculties are valid from the date when they were granted in the Roman Curia. In actual practice they do not expire, as a rule, at the death of the pope nor of the bishop to whom they were given, but pass on to those who take his place (the vicar capitular, the administrator, or succeeding bishop). Faculties granted for a fixed period of time, or a limited number of cases, cease when the period or number has been reached; but while awaiting their renewal the bishop, unless culpably negligent, may continue to use them provisionally. A bishop can use his habitual faculties only in favour of his own subjects. The matrimonial discipline of the Decree "Ne temere" (2 Aug., 1907) contemplates as such all persons having a true canonical domicile, or continuously resident for one month within his territory, also *vagi*, or persons who have no domicile anywhere and can claim no continuous stay of one month. When a matrimonial impediment is common to both parties the bishop, in dispensing his own subject, dispenses also the other.

(C) Vicars Capitular and Vicars-General.—A vicar capitular, or in his place a lawful administrator, enjoys all the dispensing powers possessed by the bishop in virtue of his ordinary jurisdiction or of delegation of the law; according to the actual discipline he enjoys even the habitual powers which had been granted the deceased bishop for a fixed period of time or for a limited number of cases, even if the indult should have been made out in the name of the Bishop of N. Considering the actual praxis of the Holy See, the same is true of particular indults (see below). The vicar-general has by virtue of his appointment all the ordinary powers of the bishop over prohibent impediments, but requires a special mandate to give him common-law faculties for diriment impediments. As for habitual temporary faculties, since they are now addressed to the ordinary, they belong also *ipso facto* to the vicar-general while he holds that office. He can also use particular indults when they are addressed to the ordinary, and when they are not so addressed the bishop can always subdelegate him, unless the contrary be expressly stated in the indult.

(D) Parish Priests and Other Ecclesiastics.—A parish priest by common law can dispense only from an interdict laid on a marriage by him or by his predecessor. Some canonists of note accord him authority to dispense from secret impediments in what are called embarrassing (*perplexi*) cases, i. e. when there is no time for recourse to the bishop, but with the obligation of subsequent recourse *ad cautelam*, i. e. for greater security; a similar authority is attributed by them to confessors. This opinion seems yet gravely probable, though the Penitentiaria continues to grant among its habitual faculties a special authority for such cases and restricts somewhat its use.

(2) *Particular Indults of Dispensation.*—When there is occasion to procure a dispensation that exceeds the powers of the ordinary, or when there are special reasons for direct recourse to the Holy See, procedure is by way of *supplica* (petition) and private rescript. The supplica need not necessarily be drawn up by the petitioner, nor even at his instance; it does not, however, become valid until he accepts it. Although, since the Constitution "Sapienti", all the faithful may have direct recourse to the Congregations, the supplica is usually forwarded through the ordinary (of the person's birthplace, or domicile, or, since the Decree "Ne temere", residence of one of the petitioners), who transmits it to the proper Congregation either by letter or through his accredited agent; but if there is question of sacramental secrecy, it is sent directly to the Penitentiaria, or handed to the bishop's agent under a sealed cover for transmission to the Penitentiaria. The supplica ought to give the names (family and Christian) of the petitioners (except in secret cases forwarded to the Penitentiaria), the name of the ordinary forwarding it, or the name of the priest to whom, in secret cases, the rescript must be sent; the age of the parties, especially in dispensations affecting consanguinity and affinity; their religion, at least

when one of them is not a Catholic; the nature, degree, and number of all impediments (if recourse is had to the Congregatio de Disciplinâ Sacramentorum or to the Holy Office in a public impediment, and to the Penitentiaria at the same time in a secret one, it is necessary that the latter should know of the public impediment and that recourse has been had to the competent Congregation). The supplica must, moreover, contain the causes set forth for granting the dispensation and other circumstances specified in the Propaganda Instruction of 9 May, 1877 (it is no longer necessary, either for the validity or liceity of the dispensation, to observe the paragraph relating to incestuous intercourse, even when probably this very thing had been alleged as the only reason for granting the dispensation). When there is question of consanguinity in the second degree bordering on the first, the supplica ought to be written by the bishop's own hand. He ought also to sign the declaration of poverty made by the petitioners when the dispensation is sought from the Penitentiaria *in formâ pauperum;* when he is in any way hindered from so doing he is bound to commission a priest to sign it in his name. A false declaration of poverty henceforth does not invalidate a dispensation in any case; but the authors of the false statement are bound in conscience to reimburse any amount unduly withheld (regulation for the Roman Curia, 12 June, 1908). For further information on the many points already briefly described the reader is referred to the special canonical works, wherein are found all necessary directions as to what must be expressed so as to avoid nullity. When a supplica is affected (in a material point) by obreption or subreption it becomes necessary to ask for a so-called "reformatory decree" in case the favour asked has not yet been granted by the Curia, or for the letters known as "Perinde ac valere" if the favour has already been granted. If, after all this, a further material error is discovered, letters known as "Perinde ac valere super perinde ac valere" must be applied for. See Gasparri, "Tractatus de matrimonio" (2nd ed., Rome, 1892), I, no. 362.

Dispensation rescripts are generally drawn up *in formâ commissâ mixtâ*, i. e. they are entrusted to an executor who is thereby obliged to proceed to their execution, if he finds that the reasons are as alleged (*si vera sint exposita*). Canonists are divided as to whether rescripts *in formâ commissâ mixtâ* contain a favour granted from the moment of their being sent off, or to be granted when the execution actually takes place. Gasparri holds it as received practice that it suffices if the reasons alleged be actually true at the moment when the petition is presented. It is certain, however, that the executor required by Penitentiaria rescripts may safely fulfil his mission even if the pope should die before he had begun to execute it. The executor named for public impediments is usually the ordinary who forwards the supplica and for secret impediments an approved confessor chosen by the petitioner. Except when specially authorized the person delegated cannot validly execute a dispensation before he has seen the original of the rescript. Therein it is usually prescribed that the reasons given by the petitioners must be verified. This verification, usually no longer a condition for valid execution, can be made, in the case of public impediments, extrajudicially or by subdelegation. *In foro interno* it can be made by the confessor in the very act of hearing the confessions of the parties. Should the inquiry disclose no substantial error, the executor proclaims the dispensation, i. e. he makes known, usually in writing, especially if he acts *in foro externo*, the decree which dispenses the petitioners; if the rescript authorizes him, he also legitimizes the children. Although the executor may subdelegate the preparatory acts, he may not, unless the rescript expressly says so, subdelegate the actual execution of the decree, unless he subdelegates to another ordinary. When the impediment is common to, and known to, both parties, execution ought to be made for both; wherefore, in a case *in foro interno*, the confessor of one of the parties hands over the rescript, after he has executed it, to the confessor of the other. The executor ought to observe with care the clauses enumerated in the decree, as some of them constitute conditions *sine quâ non* for the validity of the dispensation. As a rule, these clauses affecting validity may be recognized by the conditional conjunction or adverb of exclusion with which they begin (e. g. *dummodo*, "provided that"; *et non aliter*, "not otherwise"), or by an ablative absolute. When, however, a clause only prescribes a thing already of obligation by law it has merely the force of a reminder. In this matter also it is well to pay attention to the *stylus curiæ*, i. e. the legal diction of the Roman Congregations and Tribunals, and to consult authors of repute.

(3) *Causes for Granting Dispensations.*—Following the principles laid down for dispensations in general, a matrimonial dispensation granted without sufficient cause, even by the pope himself, would be illicit; the more difficult and numerous the impediments the more serious must be the motives for removing them. An unjustified dispensation, even if granted by the pope, is null and void, in a case affecting the Divine law; and if granted by other bishops or superiors in cases affecting ordinary ecclesiastical law. Moreover, as it is not supposable that the pope wishes to act illicitly, it follows that if he has been moved by false allegations to grant a dispensation, even in a matter of ordinary ecclesiastical law, such dispensation is invalid. Hence the necessity of distinguishing in dispensations between motive or determining causes (*causæ motivæ*) and impulsive or merely influencing causes (*causæ impulsivæ*). Except when the information given is false, still more when he acts spontaneously (*motu proprio*) and "with certain knowledge", the presumption always is that a superior is acting from just motives. It may be remarked that if the pope refuses to grant a dispensation on a certain ground, an inferior prelate, properly authorized to dispense, may grant the dispensation in the same case on other grounds which in his judgment are sufficient. Canonists do not agree as to whether he can grant it on the identical ground by reason of his divergent appreciation of the latter's force.

Among the sufficient causes for matrimonial dispensations we may distinguish canonical causes, i. e. classified and held as sufficient by the common law and canonical jurisprudence, and reasonable causes, i. e. not provided for nominally in the law, but deserving of equitable consideration in view of circumstances or particular cases. An Instruction issued by Propaganda (9 May, 1877) enumerates sixteen canonical causes. The "Formulary of the Dataria" (Rome, 1901) gives twenty-eight, which suffice, either alone or concurrently with others, and act as a norm for all sufficient causes. They are: smallness of place or places; smallness of place coupled with the fact that outside it a sufficient dowry cannot be had; lack of dowry; insufficiency of dowry for the bride; a larger dowry; an increase of dowry by one-third; cessation of family feuds; preservation of peace; conclusion of peace between princes or states; avoidance of lawsuits over an inheritance, a dowry, or some important business transaction; the fact that a fiancée is an orphan; or has the care of a family; the age of the fiancée over twenty-four; the difficulty of finding another partner, owing to the fewness of male acquaintance, or the difficulty the latter experience in coming to her home; the hope of safeguarding the faith of a Catholic relation; the danger of a mixed marriage; the hope of converting a non-Catholic party; the keeping of property in a family; the preservation of an illustrious or honourable family; the excellence and merits of the parties; defamation to be avoided, or scandal pre-

vented; intercourse already having taken place between the petitioners, or rape; the danger of a civil marriage; of marriage before a Protestant minister; revalidation of a marriage that was null and void; finally, all reasonable causes judged such in the opinion of the pope (e. g. the public good), or special reasonable causes actuating the petitioners and made known to the pope, i. e. motives which, owing to the social status of the petitioners, it is opportune should remain unexplained out of respect for their reputation. These various causes have been stated in their briefest terms. To reach their exact force, some acquaintance is necessary with the *stylus curiæ* and the pertinent works of reputable authors, always avoiding anything like exaggerated formalism. This list of causes is by no means exhaustive; the Holy See, in granting a dispensation, will consider any weighty circumstances that render the dispensation really justifiable.

(4) *Costs of Dispensations.*—The Council of Trent (Sess. XXIV, cap. v, De ref. matrim.) decreed that dispensations should be free of all charges. Diocesan chanceries are bound to conform to this law (many pontifical documents, and at times clauses in indults, remind them of it) and neither to exact nor accept anything but the modest contribution to the chancery expenses sanctioned by an Instruction approved by Innocent XI (8 Oct., 1678), and known as the Innocentian Tax (*Taxa Innocentiana*). Rosset holds that it is also lawful, when the diocese is poor, to demand payment of the expenses it incurs for dispensations. Sometimes the Holy See grants ampler freedom in this matter, but nearly always with the monition that all revenues from this source shall be employed for some good work, and not go to the diocesan curia as such. Henceforth every rescript requiring execution will state the sum which the diocesan curia is authorized to collect for its execution.

In the Roman Curia the expenses incurred by petitioners fall under four heads: (a) expenses (*expensæ*) of carriage (postage, etc.), also a fee to the accredited agent, when one has been employed. This fee is fixed by the Congregation in question; (b) a tax (*taxa*) to be used in defraying the expenses incurred by the Holy See in the organized administration of dispensations; (c) the *componendum*, or eleemosynary fine to be paid to the Congregation and applied by it to pious uses; (d) an alms imposed on the petitioners and to be distributed by themselves in good works. The moneys paid under the first two heads do not affect, strictly speaking, the gratuity of the dispensation. They constitute a just compensation for the expenses the petitioners occasion the Curia. As for the alms and the componendum, besides the fact that they do not profit the pope nor the members of the Curia personally, but are employed in pious uses, they are justifiable, either as a fine for the faults which, as a rule, give occasion for the dispensation, or as a check to restrain a too great frequency of petitions often based on frivolous grounds. And if the Tridentine prohibition be still urged, it may be truly said that the pope has the right to abrogate the decrees of councils, and is the best judge of the reasons that legitimize such abrogation. We may add that the custom of tax and componendum is neither uniform nor universal in the Roman Curia.

I. Dispensations in General: Suarez, *De legibus* (Naples, 1882), Bk. VI, x sqq., and *Opera Omnia* (Paris, 1856), VI; Pyrrhus Corradius, *Praxis dispensationum apostolicarum* (Venice, 1699); Konings-Putzer, *Commentarium in facultates apostolicas* (New York, 1898), pt. I; the commentators on the Decretals, especially Schmalzgrueber, *Jus ecclesiasticum universale* (Rome, 1843), Bk. I, tit. ii; Wernz, *Jus decretalium* (Rome, 1905), I, tit. iv, 138; von Scherer, *Handbuch des Kirchenrechts* (Graz, 1898), I, 172; Hinschius, *System d. kath. Kirchenr.* (Berlin, 1869), I, 744, 789; the moral theologies, under the treatise *De legibus*, particularly St. Alphonsus Liguori, *Theologia Moralis* (Rome, 1905), I, iv, Dub. 4; D'Annibale, *Summula Theologiæ Moralis* (Rome, 1908), I, tr. iii, 220; Ballerini, *Opus Morale* (Prato, 1889), I, 363; Ojetti, *Synopsis rerum moralium et juris pontificii* (Rome, 1904), s. v. *Dispensatio;* Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline de l'Eglise touchant les bénéfices* (Paris, 1725), II, p. II, 1, 3, xxiv-xxix; Stiegler, *Dispensation, Dispensationswesen, und Dispensationsrecht* in his *Kirchenrecht* (Mainz, 1901), I, and in *Archiv f. kath. Kirchenr.*, LXXVII, 3; Fiebag, *De indole ac virtute dispensationum secundum principia jur. canonici* (Breslau, 1867).

II. Matrimonial Dispensations: Pyrrhus Corradius, *op. cit.;* De Justis, *De dispens. matrim.* (Venice, 1769); Giovine, *De dispens. matrim.* (Naples, 1863); Planchard, *Dispenses matrim.* (Angoulême, 1882); Feije, *De imped. et dispens. matrim.* (Louvain, 1885); Zitelli, *De dispens. matrim.* (Rome, 1887); Van de Burgt, *De dispens. matrim.* (Bois-le-Duc, 1865); Pompen, *De dispens. et revalidatione matrim,* (Amsterdam, 1897); Rosset, *De sacramento matrimonii* (Saint-Jean de Maurienne, 1895), IV, 231; Konings-Putzer, *op. cit.*, 174 sqq., 376 sqq.; Sanchez, *De s. matrimonii sacramento* (Viterbo, 1739), Bk. VIII; Gasparri, *Tract. canonicus de matrimonio* (Paris, 1892), I, iv, 186; Mansella, *De imped. matrim.* (Rome, 1881), 162; Leitner, *Lehrb. des kath. Eherechts* (Paderborn, 1902), 401; Schnitzer, *Kath. Eherecht* (Freiburg, 1898), 496; Santi-Leitner, *Prælectiones juris canonici* (Ratisbon, 1899), IV, appendix I; Wernz, *Jus Decretalium* (Rome, 1908), IV, tit. xxix; Freisen, *Geschichte des kanon. Eherechts bis zum Verfall der Glossenlitteratur* (Tübingen, 1888), and in *Archiv für kath. Kirchenr.*, LXXVII, 3 sqq., and LXXVIII, 91; Esmein, *Le mariage en droit canonique* (Paris, 1891), II, 315; Zhisman, *Das Eherecht der orient. Kirche* (Vienna, 1864), 190, 712.

Jules Besson.

Dispersion of the Apostles (Lat. *Divisio Apostolorum*), a feast in commemoration of the missionary work of the Twelve Apostles. It is celebrated as a double major on 15 July. The first vestige of this feast is found in the sequence composed for it by a certain Godescalc (d. 1098) while a monk of Limburg on the Haardt; he also introduced this feast at Aachen, when provost of the church of Our Lady. The sequence is authentic beyond doubt (G. M. Dreves, Hymnographi Latini, L. 399, Leipzig, 1907; Idem, Godescalcus Lintburgensis, ib., 1897). It is next mentioned by William Durandus, Bishop of Mende (Rationale Div. Off. 7.15), in the second half of the thirteenth century. Under the title, "Dimissio", "Dispersio", or "Divisio Apostolorum" it was universally celebrated in the northern countries of Europe, but unknown during the Middle Ages in Spain and Italy. The object of the feast (so Godescalcus) is to commemorate the departure (dispersion) of the Apostles from Jerusalem for the various parts of the world, some fourteen years after the Ascension of Christ. According to Durandus some of his contemporaries honoured this feast the (apocryphal) division of the relics (bodies) of St. Peter and St. Paul by St. Sylvester (Schulting, Bibl. eccl., 1591, 2. 2, 173 sq; M. Armellini, Chiese di Roma, 1891, 902 sq.). The feast is now kept with solemnity by modern missionary societies, in Germany and Poland, also in some English and French dioceses, and in the United States by the ecclesiastical provinces of St. Louis, Chicago, Milwaukee, Dubuque, and Santa Fé.

Schermann, *Propheten und Apostellegenden* (Leipzig, 1907); Funk in *Kirchenlex.*, I, 1151; Daniel, *Thesaurus hymnologicus* (Halle, 1841), II, 45; cf. Kellner, *Heortologie* (Freiburg, 1901), pp. 161–62.

F. G. Holweck.

Dispersion of the Jews. See Diaspora.

Dissen, Heinrich von, b. 18 Oct., 1415, at Osnabrück, in Westphalia; d. at Cologne, 26 Nov., 1484. After studying philosophy and theology at Cologne under Heinrich von Gorinchem (Gorkum), a celebrated divine of that time and vice-chancellor of the university, he became a monk in the Carthusian monastery of the same place, and took his solemn vows 14 Jan., 1437. He remained there all his life, which was a very laborious one, for he read much, copied many books for the library of his monastery, and composed a good many works. He was appointed subprior 23 March, 1457, and continued in that office until his death. His literary productions, all in Latin, comprise commentaries on the Psalms, on the Apocalypse, on the Gospels of Sundays and Festivals, on the Creed of St. Athanasius, on the Lord's Prayer, and a great number of sermons and homilies, treatises, and devotional writings, such as "De Sacerdotii digni-

tate", "De multiplici bonorum verecundia", "Quo pacto hæreticorum fraudes deprehendi queant", "Expositio in totum Missale", "Expositio Antiphonarii", "Consolationes in Cantica Canticorum", "De XIII mansionibus", etc. It does not appear that any of these works have ever been printed.

LE VASSEUR, *Ephemerides Ord. Cartus* (Montreuil, 1892), IV, 434; PETREIUS, *Bibliotheca Cartus.* (Cologne, 1609); HURTER, *Nomenclator* (Innsbruck, 1899), IV, 911.

EDMUND GURDON.

Dissenters. See NONCONFORMISTS.

Dissentis, ABBEY OF, a Benedictine monastery in the Canton Grisons in eastern Switzerland, dedicated to Our Lady of Mercy. Tradition ascribes its foundation to Sts. Placid and Sigebert, in the year 614, but Mabillon places the date two years earlier. The history of the abbey has been somewhat chequered, but it has at times risen to positions of great importance and influence. It was destroyed by the Avars in 670, when its abbot and thirty monks suffered martyrdom, but was rebuilt by Charles Martel and Abbot Pirminius in 711. Charlemagne visited the abbey on his return journey from Rome in 800 and bestowed upon it many benefactions. Abbot Udalric I (1031–1055) was the first of its superiors to be made a prince of the empire, which dignity was subsequently held by several other of its abbots; many of them also became bishops of the neighbouring sees. In 1581 the abbey was honoured by a visit from St. Charles Borromeo. After enjoying independence for a thousand years it was incorporated into the newly formed Swiss Congregation in 1617, since which date it has, in common with the other five Benedictine abbeys of Switzerland, been subject to the jurisdiction of the president of that Congregation. In 1799 it was burned and plundered by the soldiers of Napoleon's army, when amongst other valuable treasures, a seventh century MS. chronicle of the abbey perished. The printing press that had been set up in 1729 was also destroyed at the same time, but much of the melted type and other metal was saved and from it were made the pipes of the organ of St. Martin's church at Dissentis, which is still in use. The abbey was rebuilt by Abbot Anselm Huonder, the last of its superiors to enjoy the rank and title of Prince of the Empire. During the nineteenth century the monastery suffered greatly from misfortunes of various kinds, and so great was the relaxation of discipline in consequence that its recovery was almost despaired of. Abbot Paul Birker came from his abbey of St. Boniface at Munich to assist in restoring regular observance, but so little success attended his efforts that he left Dissentis in 1861 and returned to Munich as a simple monk. The abbey has, however, survived those evil times and is in a satisfactory and flourishing condition. Dom Benedict Prevost, the eightieth who has ruled over its fortunes, was abbot in 1908 of a community of between thirty and forty monks, who, among their other duties, served five public oratories and conducted successfully a gymnasium of nearly a hundred boys.

MABILLON, *Annales Ordinis Sancti Benedicti* (Paris, 1703–1739); YEPEZ, *Chronicon Generale Ord. S. P. N. Benedicti* (Cologne, 1603); BRUNNER, *Ein Benediktinerbuch* (Würzburg, 1880); *Album Benedictinum* (St. Vincent's, Penn., 1880).

G. CYPRIAN ALSTON.

Dissidents in Poland. See POLAND.

Distraction (Lat. *distrahere*, to draw away, hence to distract) is here considered in so far as it is wont to happen in time of prayer and in administering the sacraments. It hardly needs to be noted that the idea of mental prayer and mind-wandering are destructive of each other. So far as vocal prayer is concerned, the want of actual interior attention, if voluntary, will take from its perfection and be morally reprehensible. Distractions, however, according to the commonly accepted teaching, do not rob prayer of its essential character. To be sure one must have had the intention to pray and therefore in the beginning some formal advertence; otherwise a man would not know what he was doing, and his prayer could not be described even as a human act. So long, however, as nothing is done outwardly which would be incompatible with any degree whatever of attention to the function of prayer, the lack of explicit mental application does not, so to speak, invalidate prayer. In other words, it keeps its substantial value as prayer, although, of course, when the dissipation of thought is wilful our addresses to the throne of mercy lose a great deal in efficacy and acceptability. This doctrine has an application, for example, in the case of those who are bound to recite the canonical Office and who are esteemed to have fulfilled their obligation substantially even though their distractions have been abundant and absorbing. Voluntary distractions, that is the conscious deliberate surrender of the mind to thoughts foreign to prayers, are sinful because of the obvious irreverence for God with Whom at such times we are presuming to hold intercourse. The guilt, however, is judged to be venial. In the administration of the sacraments their validity cannot be assailed merely because the one who confers them fails to, here and now, think of what he is doing. Provided he has the required intention and posits the essentials of the external rite proper to each sacrament, no matter how taken over he may be by outside reflections, his act is distinctly a human one and as such its value cannot be impugned. Such a state of mind, however, when it is wilful, is sinful, but the guilt is not mortal unless one has thereby laid himself open to the danger of making a mistake in what is regarded as essential for the validity of the sacrament in question.

NOLDIN, *Summa theologiæ moralis* (Innsbruck, 1904); LEHMKUHL, *Theologia moralis* (Freiburg, 1887); GÉNICOT, *Theologiæ moralis institutiones* (Louvain, 1898).

JOSEPH F. DELANY.

Distributions (from Lat. *distribuere*), canonically termed *distrubtiones quotidianæ*, are certain portions of the revenue of a church, distributed to the canons present at Divine service. There are many regulations concerning these distributions in the "Corpus Juris". The latest law on the subject is found in the decrees of the Council of Trent (Sess. XXII, cap. iii, De ref.), where it is ordained that bishops have power to set aside one-third of the revenues of officials and dignitaries of cathedral and collegiate chapters and convert this third into distributions for those who satisfy exactly their obligation of being personally present every day at the service to which they are bound. Canons retired on account of their age retain their right to the distributions, as do also capitulars who have received coadjutors, and supernumerary canons who are waiting a regular stall in the chapter. To earn these distributions it is necessary to chant the Office in common, according to the custom of the particular church to which the beneficiary belongs. A mere corporal presence, however, without mental application to the services performed, will not entitle one in conscience to these emoluments.

ANDRÉ-WAGNER, *Dict. du Droit Cath.* (Paris, 1901); FERRARIS, *Bibl. Can.* (Rome, 1899), III.

WILLIAM H. W. FANNING.

District of Columbia. See WASHINGTON.

Dithmar (THIETMAR), Bishop of Merseburg and medieval chronicler, b. 25 July, 975; d. 1 Dec., 1018. He was a son of Count Siegfried of Walbeck and a relative of the imperial family of the Saxon Ottos. After receiving his education in the monastic schools of Quedlinburg, Bergen, and Magdeburg, he became, in 1002, provost of the monastery of Walbeck which had been founded by his grandfather, was ordained priest in 1003 and consecrated fourth Bishop of Merseburg on 24 April, 1009. As bishop he worked with great energy for the spiritual and temporal restoration of his

diocese which had been almost ruined by Giseler, the second Bishop of Merseburg, in his unholy ambition to become Archbishop of Madgeburg in 981. At the same time he fearlessly defended the canonical liberty of ecclesiastical elections against the encroachments of the secular princes.

While Bishop of Merseburg he composed his famous chronicle "Chronicon Thietmari", which comprises in eight books the reigns of the Saxon Emperors Henry I (called the Fowler), the three Ottos, and Henry II (the Saint). The first three books, covering the reigns of Henry I and the first two Ottos, are largely based on previous chronicles, most of which are still extant; the fourth book, comprising the reign of Otto III, contains much original matter; while the remaining four books, which describe the reign of Henry II to the year 1018, are the independent narrative of Dithmar. As councillor of the emperor and participant in many important political transactions, he was well equipped for writing a history of his times. The spirit of sincerity which pervades his chronicle is abundant compensation for the barbarous expressions which occasionally mar the literary style. The last four books, besides being the principal source for Saxon history during the reign of the holy emperor Henry II, contain valuable information, not to be found elsewhere, regarding the contemporary history and civilization of the Slavic tribes east of the river Elbe, especially the Poles and Hungarians. Dithmar's original manuscript, with corrections and additions made by himself, is still preserved at Dresden. A facsimile edition of it was prepared by L. Schmidt (Dresden, 1905). The chronicle was also published by Kurze in "Script. Rer. Germ." (Hanover, 1889), and by Lappenberg in "Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script." III, 733–871, whence it was reprinted in Migne, P. L., CXXXIX, 1183–1422. A German translation was made by Laurent (Berlin, 1848, and Leipzig, 1892).

KURZE in *N. Archiv. der Gesellsch. für ältere deutsche Geschichte* (Hanover, 1888), XIV, 59–86; WATTENBACH, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter* (7th ed., 1904), I; HURTER, *Nomenclator* (3d ed., Innsbruck, 1903), I, 950 sq; WELTE in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.

MICHAEL OTT.

Diurnal (HORÆ DIURNÆ). See HOURS.

Dives (Latin for rich).—The word is not used in the Bible as a proper noun; but in the Middle Ages it came to be employed as the name of the rich man in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, Luke, XVI, 19–31. It has often been thought that in this lesson on the use of riches Christ spoke of real persons and events. The "House of Dives" is still pointed out in Jerusalem; but, of course, if such a house ever existed, it must have long since disappeared.

RENARD in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v. LAZARE; Commentaries on this passage of St. Luke.

W. S. REILLY.

Divination, the seeking after knowledge of future or hidden things by inadequate means. The means being inadequate they must, therefore, be supplemented by some power which is represented all through history as coming from gods or evil spirits. Hence the word *divination* has a sinister signification. As prophecy is the lawful knowledge of the future, divination, its superstitious counterpart, is the unlawful. As magic aims to do, divination aims to know. Divination is practically as old as the human race. It is found in every age and country, among the Egyptians, Chaldeans, Hindus, Romans, and Greeks; the tribes of Northern Asia had their shamans, the inhabitants of Africa their mgangas, the Celtic nations their druids, the aborigines of America their medicine-men —all recognized diviners and wizards. Everywhere divination flourished and nowhere, even to-day, is it completely neglected. Cicero's words were, and apparently always will be, true, that there is no nation, civilized or barbarian, which does not believe that there are signs of the future and persons who can interpret them. Cicero divided divination into natural and artificial. Natural (untaught, unskilled) included dreams and oracles in which the diviner was a passive subject of inspiration, and the prediction was from a power supposed to be then and there within him. Artificial (taught, studied) comprised all foretelling from signs found in nature or produced by man. Here the diviner was active, and the divination came apparently from his own skill and observation. This division is almost the same as that given by St. Thomas with respect to the invocation of demons: divination with express invocation of spirits, embracing dreams, portents or prodigies, and necromancy, and divination with tacit invocation through signs and movements observed in objects in nature, such as stars, birds, figures, etc., or through signs and arrangements produced by man, such as molten lead poured in water, casting of lots, etc. Dreams here mean those expressly prepared and prayed for with hope of intercourse with gods or the dead. Portents or prodigies are unusual and marvellous sights coming from the lower world. Here we are considering artificial divination.

METHODS.—The variety of divinatory methods is very great. Scarcely an object or movement in the heavens, on the earth, or in the air or water escaped being metamorphosed into a message of futurity. Add to these the inventions of man, and there is a glimpse of the immense entanglement of superstitions in which pagan people groped their way. They can, however, be grouped into three classes, as seen from St. Thomas's division. A detailed list has been given by Cicero, Clement of Alexandria in his "Stromata", and others of the Fathers. Under the first class, express invocation, come oneiromancy or divination by dreams; necromancy, by so-called apparitions of the dead or spiritism; apparitions of various kinds, which may be either external or in imagination, as Cajetan observes; Pythonism or by possessed persons, as the Delphic Pythoness; hydromancy, by signs in water; aeromancy, by signs in air; geomancy, by signs in terrestrial substances (geomancy has also another meaning); aruspices, by signs in the entrails of sacrificial victims, etc. The second class, tacit invocation and signs found ready-made in nature, embraces judicial or genethliac astrology, pretending to tell the future through the stars; augury, through the notes of birds, and later covering prediction through their mode of acting, feeding, flying, and also the neighing of horses and sneezing of men, etc.—with us it comprises all foretelling by signs; omens, when chance words are turned into signs; chiromancy, when the lines of the hand are read; and many similar modes. The third class, tacit invocation and signs prepared by man, includes geomancy from points or lines on paper or pebbles thrown at random; drawing of straws; throwing dice; cutting cards; letting a staff fall or measuring it with the fingers saying, "I will, I will not"; opening a book at random, called *Sortes Virgilianæ*, so much was the Æneid used in this fashion by the Romans; etc. This last transferred to the Bible is still common in Germany and elsewhere. Hypnotism is also used for purposes of divination.

HISTORY.—To attempt to trace the origin of divination is a waste of time, since like religion it is universal and indigenous in one form or another. Some nations cultivated it to a higher degree than others, and their influence caused certain modes of divination to spread. By its practice they gained a wide reputation for occult power. Pre-eminent in history stand the Chaldeans as seers and astrologers, but the ancient Egyptians and Chinese were also great adepts in elaborate mysterious rites. Which of them had priority therein is still an open question, though the larger share

in the development of divination, especially in connexion with celestial phenomena, is attributed to the Chaldeans, a vague term embracing here both Babylonians and Assyrians. In Greece from the earliest historical times are found diviners, some of whose methods came from Asia and from the Etruscans, a people famous for the art. While the Romans had modes of their own, their intercourse with Greece introduced new forms, and principally through these two nations they spread in the South and West of Europe. Before Christianity divination was practised everywhere according to rites native and foreign. In early days priest and diviner were one, and their power was very great. In Egypt the pharaoh was generally a priest; in fact, he had to be initiated into all the secrets of the sacerdotal class, and in Babylonia and Assyria almost every movement of the monarch and his courtiers was regulated by forecasts of the official diviners and astrologers. The cuneiform inscriptions and the papyri are filled with magical formulæ. Witness the two treatises, one on terrestrial and the other on celestial phenomena, compiled by Sargon several centuries before our era. In Greece, where more attention was paid to aerial signs, the diviners were held in high esteem and assisted at the public assemblies. The Romans, who placed most reliance in divination by sacrifices, had official colleges of augurs and aruspices who by an adverse word could postpone the most important business. No war was undertaken, no colony sent out without consulting the gods, and at critical moments the most trifling occurrence, a sneeze or a cough, would be invested with meaning. Alongside all this official divining there were practised secret rites by all kinds of wizards, magicians, wise men, and witches. Chaldean soothsayers and strolling sibyls spread everywhere telling fortunes for gain. Between the regulars and the irregulars there was a very bitter feeling, and as the latter often invoked gods or demons regarded as hostile to the gods of the country, they were regarded as illicit and dangerous and were often punished and prohibited from exercising their art. From time to time in various countries the number and influence of the regular diviners were diminished on account of their pride and oppression, and no doubt at times they in turn may have adroitly mitigated the tyranny of rulers. With an increase of knowledge the fear and respect of the cultivated people for their mysterious powers so decreased that their authority suffered greatly and they became objects of contempt and satire. Cicero's "De Divinatione" is not so much a description of its various forms as a refutation of them; Horace and Juvenal launched many a keen arrow at diviners and their dupes, and Cato's saying is well known, that he wondered how two augurs could meet without laughing at each other. Rulers, however, retained them and honoured them publicly, the better to keep the people in subjection, and outside classical lands, workers of magic still held sway.

Wherever Christianity went divination lost most of its old-time power, and one form, the natural, ceased almost completely. The new religion forbade all kinds, and after some centuries it disappeared as an official system though it continued to have many adherents. The Fathers of the Church were its vigorous opponents. The tenets of Gnosticism gave it some strength, and neo-Platonism won it many followers. Within the Church itself it proved so strong and attractive to her new converts that synods forbade it and councils legislated against it. The Council of Ancyra (c. xxiv) in 314 decreed five years penance to consulters of diviners, and that of Laodicea (c. xxxvi), about 360, forbade clerics to become magicians or to make amulets, and those who wore them were to be driven out of the Church. A canon (xxxvi) of Orléans (511) excommunicates those who practised divination, auguries, or lots falsely called *Sortes Sanctorum* (*Bibliorum*), i. e. deciding one's future conduct by the first passage found on opening a Bible. This method was evidently a great favourite, as a synod of Vannes (c. xvi) in 461 had forbidden it to clerics under pain of excommunication, and that of Agde (c. xlii) in 506 condemned it as against piety and faith. Sixtus IV, Sixtus V, and the Fifth Council of Lateran likewise condemned divination. Governments have at times acted with great severity. Constantius decreed the penalty of death for diviners. The authorities may have feared that some would-be prophets might endeavour to fulfil forcibly their predictions about the death of sovereigns. When the races of the North, which swept over the old Roman Empire, entered the Church, it was only to be expected that some of their lesser superstitions should survive. All during the so-called Dark Ages divining arts managed to live in secret, but after the Crusades they were followed more openly. At the time of the Renaissance and again preceding the French Revolution, there was a marked growth of noxious methods. The latter part of the nineteenth century witnessed a strange revival, especially in the United States and England, of all sorts of superstition, necromancy or spiritism being in the lead. To-day the number of persons who believe in signs and seek to know the future is much greater than appears on the surface. They abound in communities where dogmatic Christianity is weak.

The natural cause of the rise of divination is not hard to discover. Man has a natural curiosity to know the future, and coupled with this is the desire of personal gain or advantage; some have essayed, therefore, in every age to lift the veil, at least partially. These attempts have at times produced results which cannot be explained on merely natural grounds, they are so disproportionate or foreign to the means employed. They cannot be regarded as the direct work of God nor as the effect of any purely material cause; hence they must be attributed to created spirits, and since they are inconsistent with what we know of God, the spirits causing them must be evil. To put the question directly: can man know future events? Let St. Thomas answer in substance: Future things can be known either in their causes or in themselves. Some causes always and necessarily produce their effects, and these effects can be foretold with certainty, as astronomers announce eclipses. Other causes bring forth their effects not always and necessarily, but they generally do so, and these can be foretold as well-founded conjectures or sound inferences, like a physician's diagnosis or a weather observer's prediction about rain. Finally there is a third class of causes whose effects depend upon what we call chance or upon man's free will, and these cannot be foretold from their causes. We can only see them in themselves when they are actually present to our eyes. Only God alone, to whom all things are present in His eternity, can see them before they occur. Hence we read in Isaias (xli, 23), "Shew the things that are to come hereafter, and we shall know that ye are gods." Spirits can know better than men the effects to come from the second class of causes because their knowledge is broader, deeper, and more universal, and many occult powers of nature are known to them. Consequently they can foretell more events and more precisely, just as a physician who sees the causes clearer can better prognosticate about the restoration of health. The difference, in fact, between the first and second classes of causes is due to the limitations of our knowledge. The multiplicity and complexity of causes prevent us from following their effects. Future contingent things, the effects of the third class, spirits cannot know for certain, except God reveal them, though they may wisely conjecture about them because of their wide knowledge of human nature, their long experience, and their judgments based upon our thoughts as revealed to them by our words, countenances, or acts. Unless we wish to deny the value of

human testimony, it cannot be doubted that diviners foretold some contingent things correctly and magicians produced at times superhuman effects. The very survival of divination for so many centuries would otherwise be inexplicable and its rôle in history an insoluble problem. On religious grounds, to say that divination and kindred arts were complete impostures would be to contradict Scripture. In it we read laws forbidding magic, we have facts like the deeds of Jannes and Mambres before Pharaoh, and we have a declaration of God showing it possible for a sign or wonder to be foretold by false prophets and to come to pass (Deut., xiii, 1–12). But, except when God gave them knowledge, their ignorance of the future resulted in the well-known ambiguity of the oracles.

Attempts to give artificial divination a merely natural basis have not succeeded. Chrysippus (de Divinatione, ii, 63) spoke about a power in man to recognize and interpret signs, and Plutarch (de Oraculis) wrote on the special qualifications an augur should have and the nature of the signs; but a preternatural influence was recognized in the end. Some modes may have been natural in their origin, especially when necessary causes were concerned, and many a prediction made without occult intervention, but these must have been comparatively rare, for the client, if not always the seer, generally believed in supernatural assistance. That some analogy may be traced between an eagle and victory, an owl and sadness—though to the Athenians a welcome omen—and that to lose a tooth is to lose a friend, may readily be admitted, but to try to connect these with future contingent events would be to reason badly from a very slight analogy, just as to stab an image, to injure the person it represents, would be to mistake an ideal connexion for a real one. Human instinct demanded a stronger foundation and found it in the belief in an intervention of some supernatural agency. Reason demands the same. A corporeal sign is either an effect of the same cause of which it is a sign, as smoke of fire, or it proceeds from the same cause as the effect which it signifies, as the falling of the barometer foretells rain, i. e. the change in the instrument and the change in the weather come from the same cause. Man's future actions and signs in nature stand in no such relation. The sign is not an effect of his future act; neither do the sign and his act proceed from the same cause. The other kinds of signs from living creatures can be passed over by almost the same reasoning. From those who believed in fatalism, or pantheism, or that man, gods, and nature were all in close communion, or that animals and plants were divinities, a belief in omens and auguries of all kinds might be expected (see ANIMISM). Everywhere, as a matter of fact, divination and sacrifice were so closely connected that no strict line could have been drawn in practice between divination with and without express invocation of gods or demons. The client came to offer sacrifice, and the priest, the diviner, tried to answer all his questions, while the private wizards boasted of their "familiar spirits".

THEOLOGICAL ASPECT.—From a theological standpoint divination supposes the existence of devils who have great natural powers and who, actuated by jealousy of man and hatred of God, ever seek to lessen His glory and to draw man into perdition, or at least to injure him bodily, mentally, and spiritually. Divination is not, as we have seen, foretelling what comes from necessity or what generally happens, or foretelling what God reveals or what can be discovered by human effort, but it is the usurpation of knowledge of the future, i. e. arriving at it by inadequate or improper means. This knowledge is a prerogative of Divinity and so the usurper is said to *divine*. Such knowledge may not be sought from the evil spirits except rarely in exorcisms. Yet every divination is from them either because they are expressly invoked or because they mix themselves up in these vain searchings after the future that they may entangle men in their snares. The demon is invoked tacitly when anyone tries to acquire information through means which he knows to be inadequate, and the means are inadequate when neither from their own nature nor from any Divine promise are they capable of producing the desired effect. Since the knowledge of futurity belongs to God alone, to ask it directly or indirectly from demons is to attribute to them a Divine perfection, and to ask their aid is to offer them a species of worship; this is superstition and a rebellion against the providence of God Who has wisely hidden many things from us. In pagan times when divining sacrifice was offered it was idolatry, and even now divination is a kind of demonolatry or devil-worship (d'Annibale.) All participation in such attempts to attain knowledge is derogatory to the dignity of a Christian, and opposed to his love and trust in Providence, and militates against the spread of the Kingdom of God. Any method of divination with direct invocation of spirits is grievously sinful, and worse still if such intervention ensues; with tacit invocation divination is in itself a grievous sin, though in practice, ignorance, simplicity, or want of belief may render it venial. If, however, notwithstanding the client's disbelief the diviner acts seriously, the client cannot be easily excused from grievously sinful co-operation. If in methods apparently harmless strong suspicion of evil intervention arises it would be sinful to continue; if only a doubt arise as to the natural or diabolical character of the effect protest should be made against the intervention of spirits; if in doubt as to whether it be from God or Satan, except a miraculous act be sought (which would be extremely rare), it should be discontinued under pain of sin. A protestation of not wishing diabolical interference in modes of divination where it is expressly or tacitly expected is of no avail, as actions speak louder than words. A scientific investigator in doubt about the adequacy of the means can experiment to see if such superhuman intervention be a fact, but he should clearly express his opposition to all diabolical assistance. The divining-rod, if used only for metals or water, may perhaps be explained naturally; if used for detecting guilty persons, or things lost or stolen as such (which may be metals), it is certainly a tacit method. To believe in most of the popular signs is simply ignorance or weakness of mind (see SUPERSTITION).

DIVINATION IN THE BIBLE.—The Hebrews coming from Egypt, a land teeming with diviners, and dwelling in a country surrounded by superstitious tribes would have their inborn desire for foreknowledge intensified by the spirit of the times and their environments; but God forbade them repeatedly to have anything to do with charmers, wizards, diviners, necromancers, etc., all of whom were abomination in His sight (Deut., xviii, 10, 11). The ideal was in Balaam's day when "there is no soothsaying in Jacob nor divination in Israel" (Num., xxiii, 23), and to preserve this, the soul that went aside after diviners God declared He would destroy (Lev., xx, 6), and the man or woman in whom there was a divining spirit was to be stoned to death (Lev., xx, 27). God, however, as St. Chrysostom puts it, humoured the Hebrews like children, and to preserve them from excessive temptation, lots were allowed under certain conditions (Jos., vii, 14; Num., xxvi, 55; Prov., xvi, 33, and in N. T. See also LOTS). Hebrew seers were permitted to answer when it pleased Him (Origen, c. Cels., I, xxxvi, xxxvii), prophets might be consulted on private affairs (I K., ix, 6), and the high priest could respond in greater matters by the Urim and Thummim. Gifts were offered to seers and prophets when consulted, but the great prophets accepted no reward when they acted as God's representatives (IV K., v, 20). When the

Hebrews fell into idolatry, divination, which always accompanied idolatry, revived and flourished, but all during their history it is evident that secretly and again more openly wrongful arts were used, and as a result condemnations were frequent (I K., xv, 23; IV K., xvii, 17; Zach., x, 2; Is., xliv, 25 etc.). It should be borne in mind that their history is a very long one, and when we reflect how completely other nations were given over to all kinds of impious arts and silly observances we shall readily admit that the Hebrews were in comparison remarkably free from superstitions. When later on these flourished more strongly and permanently it was during the decay of faith preceding and following the time of Christ (see Jos., Ant. Jud., XX, v, i, viii, 6; Bell. Jud., VI, v, 2). The Talmud shows the downward tendency.

The various methods of divining and kinds of diviners are not always clearly distinguished in Scripture, the Hebrew words being differently interpreted and sometimes merely synonyms. The following list is based mainly upon Lesêtre's article in Vigouroux's "Dict. de la Bible":—

1. Divination by consulting the *Ṭerāphîm* (תרפים), or small household gods of which we first read in the time of Abraham and Laban (Gen., xxxi, 19). How they were consulted is not known. It was apparently a Chaldean form, as Laban came from that country. They are met with in Judges, xvii, 5; IV K., xxiii, 24, and elsewhere. They sometimes deceived their inquirers (Zach., x, 2).

2. The *Ḥartummîm* (חרטמים), a name translated by "interpreters" (Vulg. *conjectores*) in the Douay version (Gen., xli, 8), but elsewhere (Dan., ii, 2) by "diviners" (Vulg. *arioli*) and other names, especially "Chaldeans".

3. The *Ḥăkāmîm* (חכמים) are the wise men (Vulg. *sapientes*) of the Bible (Gen., xli, 8), a name given to those skilled in divination in Egypt, Idumea (Abd., 8), Persia (Esth., i, 13), and Babylon (Jer., l, 35).

4. *Qéṣém* or *Mīqṣām* (מקסם, קסם) designated divination in general and is always used in the Scripture in a bad sense except in Prov., xvi, 10. By it the witch of Endor raised up the dead Samuel (I K., xxviii, 8). "The king of Babylon stood in the highway, at the head of two ways, seeking divination [*qéṣém*], shuffling arrows; he inquired of the idols (*terāphîm*), and consulted entrails" (Ezech., xxi, 21). The arrows bore the signs or names of towns, and the first name drawn was the one to be attacked. This was a Babylonian mode. The Arabs practised it so: three arrows were prepared and the first inscribed "The Lord wills it", the second "The Lord wills it not", and the third was blank. If the blank came a new drawing followed until an inscribed arrow was taken. The last method mentioned in text quoted was aruspicy (Vulg. *exta consuluit*).

5. *Náḥásh* (נחש) is soothsaying (Vulg. *augurium*) in the Bible (Num., xxiii, 23). The precise method signified by it is in dispute. The versions make it equivalent to divination by the flight of birds, but this mode, so common among the Greeks and Romans, was apparently not used by the Hebrews except towards the time of Christ. From its derivation, as commonly accepted, it would mean divination by serpents, ophiomancy, but on the other hand it is never in this sense in the Scriptures. Balaam's divination by animal sacrifices is so termed (Num., xxiv, 1) and also Joseph's (Gen., xliv, 5, 15) which remains a vexed question in spite of Calmet's triumphant solution (Dict. of the Bible, III, p. 30) except the reasonable explanation of Grotius be accepted (Hummelauer, Com. in Gen., p. 561).

6. *Mekáshsheph* (מכשף) is the magician (Vulg. *maleficus*) in Ex., vii, 11, and the wizard in Deut., xviii, 10, who not only seeks the secrets of the future but works wonders. St. Paul mentions two of their leaders, Jannes and Mambres, and their modes are styled sorceries (Vulg. *veneficia*) in IV K., ix, 22 and (Vulg. *maleficia*) Micheas, v, 11.

7. The word *'ôbh* (אוב) signifies the spirit called and the person calling him, the necromancer. In Deut., xviii, 11, it is expressed by "seeking the truth from the dead" (the best known case is that of the witch of Endor) and elsewhere by Pythons (Is., viii, 19), divining spirits (I K., xxviii, 7). The Septuagint translates the words by "ventriloquist" because when the necromancers failed or wished to deceive the people they muttered as if from under the ground as though spirits so spoke; it recalls Shakespeare's "squeak and gibber". (Cf. Is., xxix, 4.) A bottle or skin waterbag is *'ôbh;* the use of the word here may come from the diviner containing the spirit or being inflated by it.

8. The *Yidde 'onîm* (ידעני) were diviners whom we generally find connected with necromancers, and the two terms are perhaps practically synonymous (I K., xxviii, 3; IV K., xxi, 6; etc.).

9. Divining by *Me'ônēn* (מעונן) included apparently many methods: divination by chance words, as when Abraham's servant sought a wife for Isaac (Gen., xxiv, 14; I K., xiv, 9; III K., xx, 33); auguries (Is., xi, 6); observers of dreams (Deut., xviii, 10), etc. There were also modes by charming serpents (Jer., viii, 17), astrology (Is., xlvii, 13), and by consulting the Ephod (I K., xxiii, 9).

In the N. T. diviners are not specifically mentioned except in Acts, xvi, 16, concerning the girl who had a pythonical spirit; but it is altogether likely that Simon Magus (Acts, viii, 9), Elymas (Acts, xiii, 6), and others (II Tim., iii, 13), including the possessors of the magical books burnt at Ephesus (Acts, xix, 19), practised divination and that it is included in the wonders by which Antichrist will seduce many (Apoc., xix, 20). Under the New Law all divination is forbidden because, placed on a higher plane than under the Old Dispensation, we are taught not to be solicitous for the morrow (Matt., vi, 34), but to trust Him perfectly Who numbers the very hairs of our heads (Matt., x, 30). In divination, apart from the fraud of the Father of Lies, there was much merely human fraud and endless deception; the predictions were generally as vague and as worthless as modern fortune-telling, and the general result then as now favoured vice and injured virtue. (See ASTROLOGY.)

TYLOR, *Researches into the Early Hist. of Mankind* (London, 1865); IDEM, *Primitive Culture* (London, 1891); SALERTE, *Philosophy of Magic* (New York, 1862); ENNERMOSER, *Hist. of Magic* (Bonn); ANTHON-SMITH, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Antiq.*, JEVONS in HAST., *Dict. of the Bible* (New York, 1905), s. v. *Divination*; WHITEHOUSE, *ibid.*, s. v. *Soothsaying;* LENORMANT, *Chaldæan Magic* (London, 1875), tr. of *La Divination ... chez les Chaldéens* (Paris, 1875); LESÊTRE in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible* (Paris); LECLERQ, *Hist. de la divination dans l'antiquité* (Paris); SCHOLZ, *Götzendienst und Zauberwesen* (Ratisbon, 1877); SCHANZ in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Wahrsagerei;* CICERO, *De Divinatione;* PLUTARCH. *De Oraculis;* ST. CLEMENT OF ALEX., *Stromata*, I; DELRIO, *Disquisitiones Magicæ* (Louvain, 1599) often reprinted; compendium in French (Paris, 1611); SLATER, *Moral Theology* (New York, 1908); HUNTER, *Outlines of Dogm. Theol.* (New York, 1896); LEHMKUHL, *Theol. Moralis* (Freiburg, 1888); D'ANNIBALE, *Summula Theol. Mor.* (Rome, 1908); ST. THOMAS, *Summa*, II–II, Q. XCV; IDEM, *Con. Gentes*, III; IDEM, *Opusc. de Sortibus.* All works on magic and ancient religions treat of divination.

E. P. GRAHAM.

Divine Charity, SOCIETY OF (SOCIETAS DIVINÆ CHARITATIS), founded at Maria-Martental near Kaiserswerth, in 1903, by Joseph Tillmanns for the solution of the social question through the pursuit of agriculture and trades (printing, etc.) as well as by means of intellectual pursuits. The society consists of both priests and laymen.

TILLMANNS AND OEHMEN, *Die wahre Lösung der sozialen Frage* (Martental, 1905).

SISTERS OF DIVINE CHARITY, founded at Besançon, in 1799, by a Vincentian Sister, and modelled on the Sisters of Mercy of St. Vincent de Paul. The motherhouse, originally at Naples, is now in Rome, and there are many filial establishments in Italy, in Malta, and

Gozzo. The sisters have charge of educational institutions, orphanages, hospitals, and insane asylums.

DAUGHTERS OF DIVINE CHARITY, founded at Vienna, 21 November, 1868, by Franziska Lechner (d. 1894) on the Rule of St. Augustine, and approved by the Holy See in 1884 and definitively confirmed 22 July, 1891. The purpose of the congregation is to furnish girls without positions, shelter, care and the means of obtaining a position, without compensation, likewise to care for servants no longer able to work. The sisters are also engaged in schools, orphan asylums, and kindergartens. The mother-house and novitiate are at Vienna; the congregation has 36 filial houses, 766 sisters, and 59 postulants.

F. M. RUDGE.

Divine Compassion, INSTITUTE OF THE, founded in the City of New York, U. S. A., by the Rt. Rev. Thomas Stanislaus Preston. On 8 September, 1869, Father Preston began a semi-weekly gathering of the poor and abject children of the street in one of the most wretched quarters of the city; after this came the opening of a house for the reformation of young girls not yet hardened in vice, and the preservation of children and older girls from the moral danger in which they lived. The founder called it the House of the Holy Family and became its spiritual director. The work was fostered by many prominent Catholic ladies of New York, under the name of The Association for Befriending Children and Young Girls. Foremost among these ladies was Mrs. Mary C. D. Starr (in religion Mother Veronica; d. at White Plains, 9 Aug., 1904), who became the president of the association and devoted all her time and energies to this work of charity under the direction of Father Preston. Seeing the necessity of a religious community which should be trained to this work and perpetuate it, Father Preston compiled a rule of life for those who desired to devote their lives to it. The first draft was written 5 September, 1873, and was observed in its elemental form until 1886, when it was elaborated and obtained the informal approbation of the Archbishop of New York. The constitutions, which are an enlargement of the rule, and represent the norm of living in the institute, were written gradually, as it developed, and reached their completion in 1899. On the 29th of September, 1900, both rule and constitutions received the express canonical approbation of Archbishop Corrigan of New York. The object of the institute is (1) the reformation of erring girls; and (2) the training, religious, mental, and industrial of girls in moral danger from ignorance, indolence, or waywardness, or dangerous influences. The institute is composed of two classes, choir sisters and little (or lay) sisters. In addition to the House of the Holy Family the sisters are in charge of a training school for girls at White Plains, and a working-girls' home in New York City. The institute comprises about 40 sisters in charge of 215 girls.

Divine Office. See OFFICE.

Divine Providence, SISTERS OF.—I. SISTERS OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL, founded at Molsheim, in the Diocese of Strasburg, by Vicar Ludwig Kremp (1783). After the Revolution the community reassembled at Bindernheim and, in 1807, received both ecclesiastical and civil approbation, the former from the Archbishop of Strasburg, the latter from Napoleon I. In 1819 the mother-house was definitely located at Rappoltsweiler, and in 1869 the institute received papal confirmation. The congregation has (1908) 1800 members, over 1200 of them teachers in 357 primary schools of Alsace. The sisters have over 44,000 children under instruction; they conduct boarding and day schools, orphan asylums, reformatories, a housekeeping school, a high school for girls, and a deaf and dumb institution. Attached to the novitiate are a teacher's seminary and practice school.

II. THE SOCIETY OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE, founded, in 1842, at St. Mauritz near Münster by Eduard Michelis, chaplain and private secretary to Archbishop Droste zu Vischering of Cologne. He shared the imprisonment of his archbishop and on his return went to St. Mauritz, where, with the help of two other priests, he founded an orphan asylum. He selected several teachers whom he sent to the Sisters of Divine Providence at Rappoltsweiler to be trained in the religious life. The rule followed there was adopted with a few alterations by the new community and received episcopal approbation. The congregation took as its special work the care of poor, neglected, and orphaned children, as well as teaching in general. In 1878 the work of the sisters was interrupted by the *Kulturkampf*, and they were forced to take refuge at Steyl, Holland. In 1887, when they resumed their work in Germany, the mother-house was removed to Friedrichsburg near Münster, where a boarding and a trade school were opened. In the city of Münster the sisters have charge of the domestic management of five episcopal institutions, and in the city and diocese they conduct boarding schools, orphan asylums, protectories, trade schools, elementary schools, Sunday schools, a working-women's home (Rheine), and a Magdalen asylum (at Marienburg). In Bremen they direct an elementary school, Sunday school, and orphanage. This congregation has 50 branch houses in Germany, and 14 in Holland, among the latter the convent of St. Joseph at Steyl, that of Maria-Roepaan at Ottersum, and of St. Aloysius at Kessel. In 1895 a colony of sisters went to Brazil, where they now have six institutions. The congregation numbers (1908) 1115 members.

F. M. RUDGE.

III. SISTERS OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE, founded at Finthen near Mainz (whence they are sometimes called the Finthen Sisters) in 1851 by Bishop Wilhelm Emmanuel Freiherr von Ketteler. The first superior was sent to the Sisters of Divine Providence at Ribeauvillée, Alsace, to be formed in the religious life, and the rule followed there was made the basis of the new institute, which later received the papal approbation. The congregation was founded primarily for the work of teaching and for the care of the sick so far as consonant with their duties as teachers. The right of corporation was not obtained until 1858, but as early as 1856 the Finthen Sisters had charge of the orphan asylum of Neustadt. At the time of the *Kulturkampf* they had 24 foundations in the Grand Duchy of Hesse. When they were allowed to resume their activities they devoted themselves less to purely educational work and took charge of hospitals, children's asylums, homes for girls, industrial and housekeeping schools, orphan asylums, servants' homes, endowed infirmaries, and almshouses. Connected with the mother-house at Mainz are 76 branch houses with 730 members, 70 in the Diocese of Mainz, and 6 in that of Limburg. In Mainz the sisters conduct a boarding school with housekeeping and trade courses. At Oberursel they direct the *Johannesstift* for abandoned children founded by Johannes Janssen. Wherever these sisters have houses they care for the sick in their homes.

IV. SISTERS OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE, mother-house at Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, U. S. A., founded in 1876 by six sisters from Mainz (see III), who were later joined by other sisters from Mainz. The congregation now numbers about 200, in charge of 20 schools in the Diocese of Pittsburg, one in the Wheeling, and 2 in the Columbus, Diocese.

SISTER M. THERESIA.

DIVINE PROVIDENCE, CONGREGATION OF THE SISTERS OF, founded in Lorraine, 1762, by the Venerable Jean-Martin Moye (b. 1730; d. 1793), priest of the

Diocese of Metz, afterwards missionary to China, for "the propagation of the faith, the ensuring of a Christian education to children, especially those of the rural population, for the care of the sick, and other works of mercy". Approved by the Bishop of Metz in 1762, and recommended to the solicitude of his clergy, within six years the congregation had exceeded the limits of his diocese and planted itself on the banks of the Vosges. Marie Morel was the first superior. Suppressed in 1792, the congregation was re-established after the Revolution; in 1816 the Rules and Constitutions were formally approved by Louis XVIII. The mother-house general is at St-Jean-de-Bassel, in the Diocese of Metz, Lorraine, with establishments in Lorraine, Alsace, Belgium, and the United States. There are about 500 sisters in the Diocese of Metz, and 300 in the Diocese of Strasburg, who direct schools, boarding schools, industrial schools, domestic economy institutes, hospitals, etc. At St-Jean-de-Bassel there is a normal institute devoted exclusively to the training of the young teachers of the congregation, generally 185 in number, and connected with this institute is a model school, all under the supervision of the educational boards of the German Imperial Government. In Belgium there are about 100 sisters. At Pecq, near Tournai, they direct a normal school and a boarding school. Elsewhere they have charge of schools and kindergartens.

Archives and Unpublished Annals of Congregation; Directoire des Sœurs de la Providence (St-Germain-en-Laye, 1858); WEYLAND, *Une âme apôtre* (Metz, 1901); MARCHAL, *Vie de M. l'Abbé Moye* (Paris, 1872).

Sisters of Divine Providence, of Kentucky, incorporated American provincial house at Mt. St. Martin's convent, Newport, Kentucky. Mother Anna Houlné, superior general (d. 1903) of the congregation succeeded in placing the Sisters of St-Jean-de-Bassel in the foremost ranks of teachers in Alsace-Lorraine, and then, like Moye, longed to see them labour for the Christian education of youth in America, where she rightly judged the labourers to be few. In 1888 Bishop Maes of Covington, Kentucky, visited the mother-house general at St-Jean-de-Bassel, and arranged to have the sisters introduced into his diocese. Accordingly, in August, 1889, three sisters arrived in Covington and took up residence in one of the historical mansions of northern Kentucky, now known as Mt. St. Martin's convent. The growth of the American branch has necessitated the building of a new convent. In October, 1908, a considerable estate was acquired at Melbourne, Kentucky, the site of a new St. Ann's Convent, where it is designed to erect the new provincial house. Mother Anna visited the American Province in 1892. There are 215 sisters; until 1903 occasional small colonies were added from the mother-house general; about one-third of the subjects are American. At Mt. St. Martin's convent are the novitiate and normal school for the province. Teaching is the primary object of the sisters. They conduct an academy and many parish schools, an infant asylum, a home for French emigrant and working girls, and a home for the aged. The sisters are working in the dioceses of Covington, Providence, and Cleveland, and the archdioceses of New York, Baltimore, and Cincinnati. SISTER M. CAMILLUS.

VI. SISTERS OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE, founded at Castroville, Texas, U. S. A., 1868, by Sister St. Andrew from the mother-house at St-Jean-de-Bassel, Lorraine, at the instance of Bishop Dubuis of Galveston. In 1896 the mother-house was transferred to San Antonio. The Constitutions were approved by Pope Leo X, 28 May, 1907. The sisters have charge (1908) of 67 schools and academies in Texas, Louisiana, and Oklahoma. MOTHER MARY FLORENCE.

VII. SISTERS OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE OF ST. ANDREW, founded at Hambourg-la-Forteresse, in 1806, by Father Anton Gapp, "for the Christian instruction of children in the primary schools and higher schools for girls". The congregation received the authorization of the French Government in 1826, and the mother-house was established at Forbach, Lorraine, but in 1839 was removed to Peltre. Destroyed in 1870 by the flames which swept the whole district, it was rebuilt after the close of the Franco-Prussian War. The congregation has now in Lorraine 138 institutions, among them 7 higher schools for girls, 20 trade and several housekeeping schools, and 9 hospitals. In Belgium they have 35 foundations. There are altogether 900 sisters, who teach 17,000 children in Lorraine and 4000 in Belgium.

HEIMBUCHER, *Die Orden und Kongregationen* (Paderborn, 1908), III; IDEM in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Vorsehung.*

Divine Redeemer, DAUGHTERS OF THE, mother-house at Oedenburg, Hungary; founded in 1863 from the Daughters of the Divine Saviour of Vienna. This congregation has 37 filial houses and 300 sisters, who conduct schools of all kinds and care for the sick.

Divine Saviour, SOCIETY OF THE, founded at Rome, 8 Dec., 1881, by Johann Baptist Jordan (b. 1848 at Gartweil im Breisgau), elected superior general as Father Francis Mary of the Cross. The original name, Society of Catholic Instruction, was changed some years after its foundation to the present title. The first papal approbation was granted in the "Decretum laudis" of 27 May, 1905. The founder imposed on his congregation, in addition to the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, a fourth of apostolic mission work. The rules and constitutions are based largely on those of the Society of Jesus. The habit is black with a black cincture, in which four knots are tied to remind the wearer of his four vows. In tropical countries the habit is white and the cincture is red.

On 13 Dec., 1889, the newly erected Prefecture Apostolic of Assam was placed in charge of the society, which has now 7 principal and 32 dependent stations, served by 13 missionaries, aided by 12 native catechists. The Fathers have published many books in the Khasi dialect, and since September, 1906, a periodical, "Ka iing Khristan". At Lochau, near Bregenz, a German college was established 15 Sept., 1893; in the same year a station was founded at Corvallis, Oregon, U. S. A.; in 1896 several members began work in Brazil. At present (1908) missions are given in thirteen languages from the various centres. The Salvatorians have establishments in Italy, Sicily, Austria, Poland, Moravia, Galicia, Hungary, Germany, Switzerland, Belgium, England, the United States, Brazil, and Colombia. The congregation numbers 400 members, 175 priests, the rest scholastics, lay brothers, and novices, in 35 foundations, of which 28 are Marian Colleges and 7 mission centres.

Among the periodicals issued by the society, in addition to the "Apostel-kalender" (in German and Hungarian), are the "Nuntius Romanus", "Il Missionario" (in German "Der Missionär", since 1907 "Illustrierte Monatshefte fürs christl. Haus"; also in Polish), "L'amico dei fanciulli" (in German "Manna für Kinder"; also in Polish), and the "Salvatorianische Mitteilungen" (German and Polish), containing reports of the work of the society. Connected with the society are a Third Order for lay men and women; the "Academia litteratorum", the members of which cooperate with the fathers in the advancement of Catholic knowledge and literature; the Angel Sodality, founded 8 Dec., 1884, for children under fourteen, which has as its organ "L'amico dei fanciulli", and a membership of 40,000.

SISTERS OF THE DIVINE SAVIOUR, founded 8 Dec., 1888, by Father Jordan, to supplement the work of the Salvatorian Fathers, and placed under the Third Rule of St. Francis. The mother-house is in Rome and

there are stations in Assam (where the sisters conduct 6 orphan asylums), Austria, Hungary, Belgium, Switzerland, Italy, Sicily, British Burma, and in the United States. They conduct orphan asylums, kindergartens, and schools, and visit the sick in their homes. The congregation numbers about 200.

DAUGHTERS OF THE DIVINE SAVIOUR, mother-house at Vienna, a branch of the Niederbrunn Sisters of the Most Holy Saviour, established 1857. The congregation has over 1200 sisters, choir and lay, who care for the sick in hospitals and in their own homes, and conduct schools for girls, primary and grammar schools, trade schools, kindergartens, etc. The sisters have 72 houses in the Dioceses of Vienna, St. Pölten, Seckau, Königgrätz, Brünn, Gran, Raab, and Parenzo-Pola.

HEIMBUCHER, *Orden und Kongregationen* (Paderborn, 1908); *Die Gesellschaft des göttlichen Heilandes* (Rome, 1903); MÜNZLOHER, *Die ap. Präfektur Assam* (Rome, 1899).

F. M. RUDGE.

Divine Service. See BREVIARY; FEASTS; LITURGY; MASS; WORSHIP.

Divine Word, SOCIETY OF THE (SOCIETAS VERBI DIVINI), the first German Catholic missionary society established. It was founded in 1875 during the period of the *Kulturkampf* at Steyl, near Tegelen, Holland, by a priest, Rev. Arnold Janssen (d. 15 January, 1909), for the propagation of the Catholic religion among pagan nations. It is composed of priests and lay brothers. On completion of their philosophical studies the students make a year of novitiate, at the end of which they take the ordinary vows binding for three years. Before ordination the members of the society make perpetual vows. The coadjutor brothers renew their vows every three years for nine years, when they take perpetual vows.

The first mission of the society was established in 1882 in Southern Shantung, China, a district containing 158 Catholics and about 10,000,000 pagans. According to the statistics of 1906–07, this mission numbered 35,378 Catholics, 36,367 catechumens, 1 seminary with 64 Chinese seminarians, 46 European priests, 12 Chinese priests, 13 coadjutor brothers of the society, 3 teaching brothers, and 19 nuns. The second mission founded was in Togo, West Africa, in 1892. There were then scarcely a hundred Catholics in the district. In 1906 the mission had a prefect Apostolic, 31 European priests, 12 coadjutor brothers, 14 nuns, 53 native teachers, and 68 mission stations. There were nearly 3000 children attending the schools; the Catholics numbered 3300. The third mission was in German New Guinea. It is a comparatively new colony. Dangerous fevers are common. The natives are Papuans (Negritos). They are all savages, recognizing no form of authority, having no fixed customs, or administration of justice. The greatest difficulty experienced by the missioners is the incredible number of languages. Thus in the entire mission district, 467 sq. m., probably more than a hundred languages are spoken. The first Catholic missionaries arrived in German New Guinea in August, 1896. At the close of 1906, there were in the mission a prefect Apostolic, 16 European priests, 13 coadjutor brothers, 18 nuns, 1000 native Catholics, and 400 children in the schools.

In the Argentine Republic the society numbers 51 priests, 31 coadjutor brothers, and 41 nuns. They have charge of colleges, seminaries, and of 12 parishes in the four Dioceses of Buenos Ayres, La Plata, Santa Fé, and Paraná. Part of the mission district includes the territory once occupied by the famous Jesuit Reductions of Paraguay. The mission was established in 1898. In Brazil there are 39 priests, 14 coadjutor brothers, and 13 nuns. The society also has a mission in the United States, at Shermerville Techny, Cook Co., Illinois. There are 13 priests and 37 coadjutor brothers in charge of a technical school, and 30 nuns who conduct a home for the aged. In Europe the society has six houses or colleges with 126 priests, 546 coadjutor brothers, and 1089 students for the society. The training convent for the nuns has 231 members. The colleges in Europe are: (1) St. Michael, at Steyl near Tegelen, Holland, founded 8 Sept., 1875. The superior general resides here with 47 priests, 314 coadjutor brothers, and 282 students for the society. (2) Heiligkreuz (Holy Cross) near Neisse, Silesia, founded 24 Oct., 1892. There are 23 priests, 84 coadjutor brothers, and 241 students. (3) St. Wendel, in the Diocese of Trier, with 18 priests, 68 coadjutor brothers, and 185 students. (4) St. Gabriel, near Vienna, established 4 Oct., 1889. There are 26 priests, 370 novices and students of philosophy and theology, and 80 coadjutor brothers. (5) St. Raphael, Rome, with 5 priests and one coadjutor brother. (6) Bischofshofen, near Salzburg in Austria, established 17 Aug., 1904.

NUNS.—The Society of the Servants of the Holy Ghost (*Societas Servarum Spiritus Sancti*) was founded in 1889, at Steyl, Holland, by the Rev. Arnold Janssen. It numbers about 300 nuns who help the fathers in their missions, chiefly by teaching.

HEIMBUCHER, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche* (Paderborn, 1808), III, 510–15.

EB. LIMBROCK.

Divinity of Christ. See JESUS CHRIST.

Divisch, PROCOPIUS, Premonstratensian, b. at Senftenberg, Bohemia, 26 March, 1698; d. at Prenditz, Moravia, 21 December, 1765. He was christened Wenceslaus, but took the name of Procopius when he became a religious. He began his studies at the Znaym Gymnasium and later entered the cloister school of the Premonstratensians at Bruck, Styria. In 1726 he was ordained and soon after became professor of philosophy at the school. His lectures on physics were illustrated by numerous interesting experiments. He received the doctorate in theology at Salzburg in 1733, his thesis being "Tractatus de Dei unitate sub inscriptione A et Ω". In 1736 he took charge of the little parish of Prenditz near Znaym. Here he had sufficient leisure for work and experiment in his favourite subjects, hydraulics and electricity, constructing the necessary instruments himself. His fame soon spread abroad, and he was called to Vienna to repeat his electrical experiments before the Emperor Francis and the Empress Maria Theresa. He was one of the first to apply electricity in the treatment of disease. In 1750, prior to the publication of the French translation of Franklin's letters to Collinson (1751), he knew of the discharging property of pointed rods and applied his knowledge to the performance of curious tricks. The first lightning-rod was erected by Divisch at Prenditz, in 1754, before Franklin's suggestions were known and before they had been carried out elsewhere. Divisch's device is quite different from that proposed by the Philadelphian. He petitioned the emperor in 1755 to put up similar rods all over the country and thus protect the land from lightning. This proposal was rejected on the advice of the mathematicians of Vienna. He also constructed the Denydor (Denis, "Divisch", *d'or*, "of gold"), a musical instrument, imitating string and wind instruments and producing orchestral effects. His theories are expounded in his published work, "Theoretischer Tractat oder die längst verlangte Theorie von der meteorologischen Electricität" (Tübingen, 1765; Frankfort, 1768; Bohemian tr. Prague, 1899).

PELZL, *Abbildungen böhm. and mähr. Gel.* (Vienna, 1777); NUŠL, *Prokop Diviš* (Prague, 1899); POGGENDORFF, *Gesch. d. Physik* (Leipzig, 1879).

WILLIAM FOX.

Divorce.—This subject will be treated here under two distinct heads: I. IN MORAL THEOLOGY; II. IN CIVIL JURISPRUDENCE.

I. IN MORAL THEOLOGY.—The term *divorce* (*divortium*, from *divertere*, *divortere*, "to separate") was

employed in pagan Rome for the mutual separation of married people. Etymologically the word does not indicate whether this mutual separation included the dissolution of the marriage bond, and in fact the word is used by the Church and in ecclesiastical law in this neutral signification. Hence we distinguish between *divortium plenum* or *perfectum* (absolute divorce), which implies the dissolution of the marriage bond, and *divortium imperfectum* (limited divorce), which leaves the marriage bond intact and implies only the cessation of common life (separation from bed and board, or in addition separation of dwelling-place). In civil law divorce means the dissolution of the marriage bond; *divortium imperfectum* is called separation (*séparation de corps*).

The Catholic doctrine on divorce may be summed up in the following propositions: A. In Christian marriage, which implies the restoration, by Christ Himself, of marriage to its original indissolubility, there can never be an absolute divorce, at least after the marriage has been consummated; B. Non-Christian marriage can be dissolved by absolute divorce under certain circumstances in favour of the Faith; C. Christian marriage before consummation can be dissolved by solemn profession in a religious order, or by an act of papal authority; D. Separation from bed and board (*divortium imperfectum*) is allowed for various causes, especially in the case of adultery or lapse into infidelity or heresy on the part of husband or wife. These propositions we shall explain in detail.

A. *In Christian marriage*, which implies the restoration, by Christ Himself, of marriage to its original indissolubility, *there can never be an absolute divorce*, at least *after the marriage has been consummated.*

1. *The Original Indissolubility of Marriage and Its Restoration by Christ.*—The inadmissibility of absolute divorce was ordained by Christ Himself according to the testimony of the Apostles and Evangelists: "Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another, committeth adultery against her. And if the wife shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery" (Mark, x, 11, 12.—Cf. Matt., xix, 9; Luke, xvi, 18). In like manner, St. Paul: "To them that are married, not I but the Lord commandeth, that the wife depart not from her husband. And if she depart, that she remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband. And let not the husband put away his wife" (I Cor., vii, 10, 11). In these words Christ restored the original indissolubility of marriage as it had been ordained by God in the Creation and was grounded in human nature. This is expressly stated by Him against the Pharisees, who put forward the separation allowed by Moses: "Moses by reason of the hardness of your heart permitted you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so" (Matt., xix, 8); "He who made man from the beginning, made them male and female. And he said: For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they two shall be in one flesh. Therefore now they are not two, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder" (Matt., xix, 4–6). The indissolubility of all marriage, not merely of Christian marriage, is here affirmed. The permanence of marriage for the whole human race according to natural law is here confirmed and ratified by a Divine positive ordinance.

No Catholic can doubt that even according to the natural law marriage is in a certain sense indissoluble. The following proposition is condemned in the Syllabus of Pius IX (Proposition LXVII): "According to the natural law, the bond of marriage is not indissoluble, and in certain cases divorce in the strict sense can be sanctioned by civil authority." The meaning of this condemnation is clear from the document whence it has been taken. This is the papal Brief ("Ad apostolicæ sedis fastigium", 22 August, 1851, in which several works of the Turin professor, J. N. Nuytz, and a series of propositions defended by him were condemned, as is expressly said, "de Apostolicæ potestatis plenitudine". A certain indissolubility of marriage whenever contracted must therefore be admitted, even according to the natural law, at least in the sense that marriage, unlike other contracts, may not be dissolved at the pleasure of the contracting parties. Such dissolubility would be in direct contradiction with the essential purpose of marriage, the proper propagation of the human race, and the education of the children. That in exceptional cases, in which continued cohabitation would nullify the essential purpose of marriage, the dissolution may nevertheless not be permitted, can hardly be proved as postulated by the natural law from the primary purpose of marriage. However, even such dissolubility would not be in accord with the secondary purposes of marriage, and it is therefore regarded by St. Thomas (IV Sent., dist. xxxiii, Q. ii, a. 1) and most Catholic scholars as against the secondary demands of the natural law. In this sense marriage, considered merely according to the natural law, is intrinsically indissoluble. That it is also extrinsically indissoluble, i. e. that it cannot be dissolved by any authority higher than the contracting parties, cannot be asserted without exception. Civil authority, indeed, even according to the natural law, has no such right of dissolving marriage. The evil consequences which would follow so easily, on account of the might of passion, in case the civil power could dissolve marriage, seem to exclude such a power; it is certainly excluded by the original Divine positive law: "What therefore *God* hath joined together, let no *man* put asunder" (Matt., xix, 6). However, that part of the proposition condemned by Pius IX, in which it is asserted, "And in certain cases divorce in the strict sense can be sanctioned by civil authority", need not necessarily be understood of marriage according to the purely natural law, because Nuytz, whose doctrine was condemned, asserted that the State had this authority in regard to Christian marriages, and because the corresponding section of the Syllabus treats of the errors about Christian marriage. [Cf. Schrader, Der Papst und die modernen Ideen, II (Vienna, 1865), p. 77.]

2. *Divorce among the Israelites.*—In spite of the Divine law of the indissolubility of marriage, in the course of time divorce, in the sense of complete dissolution of marriage, became prevalent to a greater or less extent among all nations. Moses found this custom even among the people of Israel. As lawgiver, he ordained in the name of God (Deut., xxiv, 1): "If a man take a wife, and have her, and she find not favour in his eyes, for some uncleanness: he shall write a bill of divorce, and shall give it in her hand, and send her out of his house." The rest of the passage shows that this divorce was understood as justifying the wife in her marriage with another husband, hence as a complete annulment of the first marriage. Some regard it only as a freedom from penalty, so that in reality the remarriage of the divorced wife was not allowed, and was adultery, because the bond of the first marriage had not been dissolved. This opinion was held by the Master of the Sentences, Peter Lombard (IV Sent., dist. xxxiii, 3), St. Bonaventure (IV Sent., dist. xxxiii, art. 3, Q. i), and others. Others again, however, believe that there was a real permission, a dispensation granted by God, as otherwise the practice sanctioned in the law would be blamed as sinful in some part of the Old Testament. Moreover, Christ (loc. cit.) seems to have rendered illicit what was illicit in the beginning, but what had really been allowed later, even though it was allowed "by reason of the hardness of your heart" (St. Thomas, III, Supplem., Q. lxvii, a. 3; Bellarmine, "Controvers. de matrim.", I, xvii; Sanchez, "De matrim.", X, disp. i.

n. 7; Palmieri, "De matrimonio christ.", Rome, 1880, 133 sqq.; Wernz, "Jus decretalium", IV, n. 696, not. 12; etc.). This second opinion maintains and must maintain that the expression "for some uncleanness" (in Hebrew ערות דבר) does not mean any slight cause, but a grievous stain, something shameful directed against the purpose of marriage or marital fidelity. A separation at will, and for slight reasons, at the pleasure of the husband, is against the primary principles of the natural moral law, and is not subject to Divine dispensation in such a way that it could be made licit in every case. It is different with separation in serious cases governed by special laws. This, indeed, does not correspond perfectly with the secondary purposes of marriage, but on that account it is subject to Divine dispensation, since the inconvenience to be feared from such a separation can be corrected or avoided by Divine Providence. In the time of Christ there was an acute controversy between the recent, lax school of Hillel and the strict, conservative school of Schammai about the meaning of the phrase ערות דבר. Hence the question with which the Pharisees tempted Our Lord: "Is it lawful . . . for every cause?" The putting-away of the wife for frivolous reasons had been sharply condemned by God through the Prophets Micheas (ii, 9) and Malachias (ii, 14), but in later days it became very prevalent. Christ abolished entirely the permission which Moses had granted, even though this permission was strictly limited; He allowed a cause similar to the ערות דבר as reason for putting away the wife, but not for the dissolution of the marriage bond.

3. *The Dogmatic Basis and Practical Application of the Complete Indissolubility of Consummated Marriage within the Catholic Church.*—(a) Its Foundation in Scripture.—The complete exclusion of absolute divorce (*divortium perfectum*) in Christian marriage is expressed in the words quoted above (Mark, x; Luke, xvi; I Cor., vii). The words in St. Matthew's Gospel (xix, 9), "except it be for fornication", have, however, given rise to the question whether the putting-away of the wife and the dissolution of the marriage bond were not allowed on account of adultery. The Catholic Church and Catholic theology have always maintained that by such an explanation St. Matthew would be made to contradict Sts. Mark, Luke, and Paul, and the converts instructed by these latter would have been brought into error in regard to the real doctrine of Christ. As this is inconsistent both with the infallibility of the Apostolic teaching and the inerrancy of Sacred Scripture, the clause in Matthew *must* be explained as the mere dismissal of the unfaithful wife without the dissolution of the marriage bond. Such a dismissal is not excluded by the parallel texts in Mark and Luke, while Paul (I Cor., vii, 11) clearly indicates the possibility of such a dismissal: "And if she depart, that she remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband". Grammatically, the clause in St. Matthew may modify one member of the sentence (that which refers to the putting-away of the wife) without applying to the following member (the remarriage of the other), though we must admit that the construction is a little harsh. If it means, "Whoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery", then, in case of marital infidelity, the wife may be put away; but that, in this case, adultery is not committed by a new marriage cannot be concluded from these words. The following words, "And he that shall marry her that is put away"—therefore also the woman who is dismissed for adultery—"committeth adultery", say the contrary, since they suppose the permanence of the first marriage. Moreover, the brevity of expression in Matthew, xix, 9, which seems to us harsh, is explicable, because the Evangelist had previously given a distinct explanation of the same subject, and exactly laid down what was justified by the reason of fornication: "Whosoever shall put away his wife, excepting for the cause of fornication, maketh her to commit adultery: and he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery" (Matt., v, 32). Here all excuse for remarriage or for the dissolution of the first marriage is excluded. Even the mere dismissal of the wife, if this is done unjustly, exposes her to the danger of adultery and is thus attributed to the husband who has dismissed her—"he maketh her to commit adultery". It is only in the case of marital infidelity that complete dismissal is justified—"excepting for the cause of fornication". In this case not he, but the wife who has been lawfully dismissed, is the occasion, and she will therefore be responsible should she commit further sin. It must also be remarked that even for Matthew, xix, 9, there is a variant reading supported by important codices, which has "maketh her to commit adultery" instead of the expression "committeth adultery". This reading answers the difficulty more clearly. (Cf. Knabenbauer, "Comment. in Matt.", II, 144.)

Catholic exegesis is unanimous in excluding the permissibility of absolute divorce from Matthew, xix, but the exact explanation of the expressions, "except it be for fornication" and "excepting for the cause of fornication", has given rise to various opinions. Does it mean the violation of marital fidelity, or a crime committed before marriage, or a diriment impediment? (See Palmieri, "De matrim. christ.", 178 sqq.; Sasse, "De sacramentis", II, 418 sqq.) Some have tried to answer the difficulty by casting doubt on the authenticity of the entire phrase of Matthew, xix, but the words are in general fully vouched for by the most reliable codices. Also, the greater number, and the best, have "committeth adultery". (See Knabenbauer, loc. cit., and Schanz, "Kommentar über das Evang. d. hl. Matth.", 191, 409.) That absolute divorce is never allowable is therefore clear from Scripture, but the argument is cogent only for a consummated marriage. For Christ founds His law on the words: "They two shall be in one flesh", which are verified only in consummated marriage. How far divorce is excluded, or can be allowed, before the consummation of the marriage must be derived from other sources.

(b) Tradition and the Historical Development in Doctrine and Practice.—The doctrine of Scripture about the illicitness of divorce is fully confirmed by the constant tradition of the Church. The testimonies of the Fathers and of the councils leave us no room for doubt. In numerous places they lay down the teaching that not even in the case of adultery can the marriage bond be dissolved or the innocent party proceed to a new marriage. They insist rather that the innocent party must remain unmarried after the dismissal of the guilty one, and can only enter upon a new marriage in case death intervenes.

We read in Hermas (about the year 150), "Pastor", mand. IV, i, 6: "Let him put her [the adulterous wife] away and let the husband abide alone; but if after putting away his wife he shall marry another, he likewise committeth adultery" (ed. Funk, 1901). The expression in verse 8, "For the sake of her repentance, therefore, the husband ought not to marry", does not weaken the absolute command, but it gives the supposed reason of this great command. St. Justin Martyr (d. 176) says (Apolog., I, xv, in P. G., VI, 349), plainly and without exception: "He that marrieth her that has been put away by another man committeth adultery." In like manner Athenagoras (about 177) in his "Legatio pro christ.", xxxiii (P. G., VI, 965): "For whosoever shall put away his wife and shall marry another, committeth adultery"; Tertullian (d. 247), "De monogamiâ", c. ix (P. L., II, 991): "They enter into adulterous unions even when they do not put away their wives;

are not allowed even to marry, although we put our wives away"; Clement of Alexandria (d. 217), "Strom.", II, xxiii (P. G., VIII, 1096), mentions the ordinance of Holy Scripture in the following words: "You shall not put away your wife except for fornication, and [Holy Scripture] considers as adultery a remarriage while the other of the separated persons survives." Similar expressions are found in the course of the following centuries both in the Latin and in the Greek Fathers, e. g. St. Basil of Cæsarea, "Epist. can.", ii, "Ad Amphilochium", can. xlviii (P. G., XXXII, 732); St. John Chrysostom, "De libello repud." (P. G., LI, 218); Theodoretus, on I Cor., vii, 39, 40 (P. G., LXXXII, 275); St. Ambrose, "in Luc.", VIII, v, 18 sqq. (P. L., XV, 1855); St. Jerome, Epist. lv (ad Amand.), n. 3 (P. L., XXII, 562); St. Augustine, "De adulterinis conjugiis", II, iv (P. L., XL, 473), etc., etc. The occurrence of passages in some Fathers, even among those just quoted, which treat the husband more mildly in case of adultery, or seem to allow him a new marriage after the infidelity of his spouse, does not prove that these expressions are to be understood of the permissibility of a new marriage, but of the lesser canonical penance and of exemption from punishment by civil law. Or if they refer to a command on the part of the Church, the new marriage is supposed to take place after the death of the wife who was dismissed. This permission was mentioned, not without reason, as a concession for the innocent party, because at some periods the Church's laws in regard to the guilty party forbade forever any further marriage (cf. can. vii of the Council of Compiègne, 757). It is well known that the civil law, even of the Christian emperors, permitted in several cases a new marriage after the separation of the wife. Hence, without contradicting himself, St. Basil could say of the husband, "He is not condemned", and "He is considered excusable" (Ep. clxxxviii, can. ix, and Ep. cxcix, can. xxi, in P. G., XXXII, 678, 721), because he is speaking distinctly of the milder treatment of the husband than of the wife with regard to the canonical penance imposed for adultery. St. Epiphanius, who is especially reproached with teaching that the husband who had put away his wife because of adultery or another crime was allowed by Divine law to marry another (Hæres., lix, 4, in P. G., XLI, 1024), is speaking in reality of a second marriage *after the death* of the divorced wife, and, whilst he declares in general that such a second marriage is allowed, but is less honourable, still he makes the exception in regard to this last part in favour of one who had long been separated from his first wife. The other Fathers of the following centuries, in whose works ambiguous or obscure expressions may be found, are to be explained in like manner.

The practice of the faithful was not indeed always in perfect accord with the doctrine of the Church. On account of defective morality, there are to be found regulations of particular synods which permitted unjustifiable concessions. However, the synods of all centuries, and more clearly still the decrees of the popes, have constantly declared that divorce which annulled the marriage and permitted remarriage was never allowed. The Synod of Elvira (A. D. 300) maintains without the least ambiguity the permanence of the marriage bond, even in the case of adultery. Canon ix decreed: "A faithful woman who has left an adulterous husband and is marrying another who is faithful, let her be prohibited from marrying; if she has married, let her not receive communion until the man she has left shall have departed this life, unless illness should make this an imperative necessity" (Labbe, "Concilia", II, 7). The Synod of Arles (314) speaks indeed of counselling, as far as possible, that the young men who had dismissed their wives for adultery should take no second wife" (*ut, in quantum possit, consilium eis detur*); but it declares at the same time the illicit character of such a second marriage, because it says of these husbands, "They are forbidden to marry" (*prohibentur nubere*, Labbe, II, 472). The same declaration is to be found in the Second Council of Mileve (416), canon xvii (Labbe, IV, 331); the Council of Hereford (673), canon x (Labbe, VII, 554); the Council of Friuli (Forum Julii), in northern Italy (791), canon x (Labbe, IX, 46); all of these teach distinctly that the marriage bond remains even in case of dismissal for adultery, and that new marriage is therefore forbidden.

The following decisions of the popes on this subject deserve special mention: Innocent I, "Epist. ad Exsuper.", c. vi, n. 12 (P. L., XX, 500): "Your diligence has asked concerning those, also, who, by means of a deed of separation, have contracted another marriage. It is manifest that they are adulterers on both sides." Compare also with "Epist. ad Vict. Rothom.", xiii, 15 (P. L., XX, 479): "In respect to all cases the rule is kept that whoever marries another man, while her husband is alive, must be held to be an adulteress, and must be granted no leave to do penance unless one of the men shall have died." The impossibility of absolute divorce during the entire life of married people could not be expressed more forcibly than by declaring that the permission to perform public penance must be refused to women who remarried, as to a public sinner, because this penance presupposed the cessation of sin, and to remain in a second marriage was to continue in sin.

Besides the adultery of one of the married parties, the laws of the empire recognized other reasons for which marriage might be dissolved, and remarriage permitted, for instance, protracted absence as a prisoner of war, or the choice of religious life by one of the spouses. In these cases, also, the popes pronounced decidedly for the indissolubility of marriage, e. g. Innocent I, "Epist. ad Probum", in P. L., XX, 602; Leo I, "Epist. ad Nicetam Aquil.", in P. L., LIV, 1136; Gregory I, "Epist. ad Urbicum Abb.", in P. L., LXXVII, 833, and "Epist. ad Hadrian. notar.", in P. L., LXXVII, 1169. This last passage, which is found in the "Decretum" of Gratian (C. xxvii, Q. ii, c. xxi), is as follows: "Although the civil law provides that, for the sake of conversion (i. e. for the purpose of choosing the religious life), a marriage may be dissolved, though either of the parties be unwilling, yet the Divine law does not permit it to be done." That the indissolubility of marriage admits of no exception is indicated by Pope Zacharias in his letter of 5 January, 747, to Pepin and the Frankish bishops, for in chapter vii he ordains "by Apostolic authority", in answer to the questions that had been proposed to him: "If any layman shall put away his own wife and marry another, or if he shall marry a woman who has been put away by another man, let him be deprived of communion" [Monum. Germ. Hist.: Epist., III: Epist. Merovingici et Karolini ævi, I (Berlin, 1892), 482]

(c) Laxer Admissions and their Correction.—Whilst the popes constantly rejected absolute divorce in all cases, we find some of the Frankish synods of the eighth century which allowed it in certain acute cases. In this regard the Councils of Verberie (752) and Compiègne (757) erred especially. Canon ix of the first council is undoubtedly erroneous (Labbe, VIII, 407). In this canon it is laid down that if a man must go abroad, and his wife, out of attachment to home and relatives, will not go with him, she must remain unmarried so long as the husband is alive whom she refused to follow; on the other hand, in contrast to the blameworthy woman, a second marriage is allowed to the husband: "If he has no hope of returning to his own country, if he cannot abstain, he can receive another wife with a penance." So deeply was the pre-Christian custom of the people engraven in their hearts that it was believed allowance should be

made for it to some degree. Canon v seems also to grant the unauthorized permission for a second marriage. It treats of the case in which the wife, with the help of other men, seeks to murder her husband, and he escapes from the plot by killing her accomplices in self-defence. Such a husband is allowed to take another wife: "That husband can put away that wife, and, if he will, let him take another. But let that woman who made the plot undergo a penance and remain without hope of marriage." Some explain this canon to mean that the husband might marry again after the death of his first wife, but that the criminal wife was forbidden forever to marry. This last is in agreement with the penitential discipline of the age, because the crime in question was punished by life-long canonical penance, and hence by permanent exclusion from married life.

In its thirteenth canon (according to Labbe, VIII, 452; others call it the sixteenth), the Council of Compiègne gives a somewhat ambiguous decision and may seem to allow absolute divorce. It says that a man who has dismissed his wife in order that she might choose the religious life, or take the veil, can marry a second wife when the first has carried out her resolution. Nevertheless, the intended choice of the state of Christian perfection seems to imply that this canon must be limited to a marriage that has not been consummated. Hence it gives the correct Catholic doctrine, of which we shall speak below. This must also be the meaning of canon xvi (Labbe, VIII, 453; others, canon xix), which allows the dissolution of a marriage between a leper and a healthy woman, so that the woman is authorized to enter upon a new marriage, unless we suppose that here there is question of the diriment impediment of impotence. If these canons were really intended in any other sense, then they are contrary to the general doctrine of the Church. Other canons, in which separation and second marriage are allowed, refer undoubtedly to the diriment impediments of affinity and spiritual relationship, or to a marriage contracted in error by persons one of whom is free and the other not free. Hence they have no reference to actual divorce, and cannot be interpreted as a lax concession to popular morals or to passion. It is true that several of the Penitential Books composed about this time in the Frankish regions contain the cases mentioned by these two synods and add others in which the real dissolution of the marriage bond and a new marriage with another wife might be allowed. The following cases are mentioned in several of these Penitential Books: adultery, slavery as punishment for crime, imprisonment in war, wilful desertion without hope of reunion, etc. (Schmitz, "Bussbücher", II, 129 sqq.). These Penitential Books had indeed no official character, but they influenced for a time the ecclesiastical practice in these countries. However, their influence did not last long. In the first decades of the ninth century, the Church began to proceed energetically against them (cf. the Synod of Châlons, in the year 813, canon xxxviii; Labbe, IX, 367). They were not completely suppressed at once, especially as a general decay of Christian morality took place in the tenth and early part of the eleventh century. Towards the end of the eleventh century, however, every concession to the laxer practice as regards divorce had been corrected. The complete indissolubility of Christian marriage had become so firmly fixed in the juridical conscience that the authentic collections of church laws, the Decretals of the twelfth century, do not even see the necessity of expressly declaring it, but simply suppose it, in other juridical decisions, as a matter of course and beyond discussion. This is shown in the entire series of cases in IV Decretal., xix. In all cases, whether the cause be criminal plotting, adultery, loss of faith, or anything else, the bond of marriage is regarded as absolutely indissoluble and entrance upon a second marriage as impossible.

(d) Dogmatic Decision on the Indissolubility of Marriage.—The Council of Trent was the first to make a dogmatic decision on this question. This took place in Session XXIV, canon v: "If anyone shall say that the bond of matrimony can be dissolved for the cause of heresy, or of injury due to cohabitation, or of wilful desertion; let him be anathema", and in canon vii: "If anyone shall say that the Church has erred in having taught, and in teaching that, according to the teaching of the Gospel and the Apostles, the bond of matrimony cannot be dissolved, and that neither party—not even the innocent, who has given no cause by adultery—can contract another marriage while the other lives, and that he, or she, commits adultery who puts away an adulterous wife, or husband, and marries another; let him be anathema." The decree defines directly the infallibility of the church doctrine in regard to the indissolubility of marriage, even in the case of adultery, but indirectly the decree defines the indissolubility of marriage. Doubts have been expressed here and there about the dogmatic character of this definition (cf. Sasse, "De Sacramentis", II, 426). But Leo XIII, in his Encyclical "Arcanum", 10 February, 1880, calls the doctrine on divorce condemned by the Council of Trent "the baneful heresy" (*hæresim deterrimam*). The acceptance of this indissolubility of marriage as an article of faith defined by the Council of Trent is demanded in the creed by which Orientals must make their profession of faith when reunited to the Roman Church. The formula prescribed by Urban VIII contains the following section: "Also, that the bond of the Sacrament of Matrimony is indissoluble; and that, although a separation *tori et cohabitationis* can be made between the parties, for adultery, heresy, or other causes, yet it is not lawful for them to contract another marriage." Exactly the same declaration in regard to marriage was made in the short profession of faith approved by the Holy Office in the year 1890 (Collectanea S. Congr. de Prop. Fide, Rome, 1893, pp. 639, 640). The milder indirect form in which the Council of Trent pronounced its anathema was chosen expressly out of regard for the Greeks of that period, who would have been very much offended, according to the testimony of the Venetian ambassadors, if the anathema had been directed against them, whereas they would find it easier to accept the decree that the Roman Church was not guilty of error in her stricter interpretation of the law (Pallavicini, "Hist. Conc. Trid.", XXII, iv).

(e) Development of the Doctrine on Divorce outside of the Catholic Church.—In the Greek Church, and the other Oriental Churches in general, the practice, and finally even the doctrine, of the indissolubility of the marriage bond became more and more lax. Zhishman (Das Eherecht der orientalischen Kirchen, 729 sqq.) testifies that the Greek and Oriental Churches separated from Rome permit in their official ecclesiastical documents the dissolution of marriage, not merely on account of adultery, but also "of those occasions and actions the effect of which on married life might be regarded as similar to natural death or to adultery, or which justify the dissolution of the marriage bond in consequence of a well-founded supposition of death or adultery". Such reasons are, first, high treason; second, criminal attacks on life; third, frivolous conduct giving rise to suspicion of adultery; fourth, intentional abortion; fifth, acting as sponsor for one's own child in baptism; sixth, prolonged disappearance; seventh, incurable lunacy rendering cohabitation impossible; eighth, entrance of one party into a religious order with the permission of the other party.

Among the sects that arose at the time of the Reformation in the sixteenth century, there can hardly be question of any development of church law about divorce. Jurisdiction in matrimonial affairs was relegated, on principle, to the civil law, and only the blessing of marriage was assigned to the Church. It is true

that the interpretation of the so-called ecclesiastical officials, their approbation or disapprobation of the civil marriage laws, might find expression in certain cases should they refuse to bless an intended marriage of people who had been divorced when the reason for the divorce seemed to them to be too much opposed to Scripture. It is not surprising that in this respect the tendency should have been downwards, when we remember that in the various sects of Protestantism the growth of liberalism has advanced even to the denial of Christ [Dr. F. Albert, Verbrechen und Strafen als Ehescheidungsgrund nach evangel. Kirchenrecht (in Stutz, Kirchenr. Abhandlungen, Stuttgart, 1903), I, IV].

4. *Declaration of Nullity.*—The declaration of nullity must be carefully distinguished from divorce proper. It can be called divorce only in a very improper sense, because it presupposes that there is and has been no marriage. However, as there is question of an alleged marriage and of a union which is considered by the public as a true marriage, we can understand why a previous ecclesiastical judgment should be required, declaring the presence of a diriment impediment and the consequent invalidity of a supposed marriage, before the persons in question might be free to separate or to enter upon a new marriage. It is only when the invalidity of a marriage becomes publicly known, and further cohabitation gives scandal, or when other important reasons render a prompt separation of domicile necessary or advisable, that such a separation should take place at once, to be made definitive by a later judicial sentence. When the invalidity of a marriage is publicly known, official procedure is necessary, and the ecclesiastical process of nullification must be introduced. In the case of impediments which refer exclusively to the rights of the husband and wife, and which can be removed by their consent, only the one of the supposed spouses whose right is in question is permitted to impugn the marriage by complaint before the ecclesiastical court, provided it is desired to maintain this right. Such cases are the impediments of fear or violence, of essential error, of impotence on the part of the other not fully established, and failure to comply with some fixed condition. In cases of the other possible impediments, every Catholic, even a stranger, may enter a complaint of nullity if he can bring proofs of such nullity. The only plaintiffs excluded are those who, on account of private advantage, were unwilling to declare the invalidity of the marriage before its dissolution by death, or who knew the impediment when the banns of marriage were proclaimed and culpably kept silence. Of course it is allowed to the married parties to disprove the reasons alleged by strangers against their marriage (Wernz, "Jus decretalium", IV, n. 743).

That separation and remarriage of the separated parties may not take place merely on account of private convictions of the invalidity of a supposed marriage, but only in consequence of an ecclesiastical judgment was taught by Alexander III and Innocent III in IV Decretal., xix, 3, and II Decretal., xiii, 13. In the earlier centuries the summary decision of the bishops sufficed; at present the Constitution of Benedict XIV, "Dei miseratione", 3 November, 1741, must be followed. This prescribes that in matrimonial cases a "defender of the matrimonial tie" (*defensor matrimonii*) must be appointed. If the decision is for the validity of the marriage, there need be no appeal in the second instance. The parties can be satisfied with the first decision and continue in married life. If the decision is for the invalidity of the marriage, an appeal *must* be entered, and sometimes even a second appeal to the court of third instance, so that it is only after two concordant decisions on the invalidity of the marriage in question that it can be regarded as invalid, and the parties are allowed to proceed to another marriage. (Cf. III Conc. plen. Baltim., App. 262 sqq.; Conc. Americ. latin., II, n. 16; Laurentius, "Instit. iuris eccl.", 2nd ed., n. 696 sqq.; Wernz, "Jus decretal.", IV, n. 744 sqq.) Sometimes, however, in missionary countries, Apostolic prefects are permitted to give summary decision of cases in which two concordant opinions of approved theologians or canonists pronounce the invalidity of the marriage to be beyond doubt. Moreover, in cases of evident nullity, because of a manifest impediment of blood-relationship or affinity, of previous marriage, of the absence of form, of lack of baptism on the part of one party, a *second* sentence of nullity is no longer demanded (Decr. of the Holy Office, 5 June, 1889, and 16 June, 1894. Cf. Acta S. Sedis, XXVII, 141; also Decr. of the Holy Office, 27 March, 1901, Acta S. Sedis, XXXIII, 756). The court of first instance in the process of nullification is the episcopal court of the diocese, of second instance the metropolitan court, of third instance the Roman See. Sometimes, however, Rome designates for the third instance a metropolitan see of the country in question (Laurentius, above, 697, not. 6). No one, however, is prohibited from immediate application in the first instance to the Holy See. Custom reserves to the Holy See matrimonial cases of reigning princes.

In the Decretals the declaration of nullity is treated under the title "De Divortiis". But it is important that these matters should be carefully distinguished from one another. The lack of exact distinction between the expressions "declaration of invalidity" and "divorce", and the different treatment of invalid marriages at different periods, may lead to incorrect judgments of ecclesiastical decisions. Decisions of particular Churches are too easily regarded as dissolutions of valid marriages, where in fact they were only declarations of nullity; and even papal decisions, like those of Gregory II communicated to St. Boniface and of Alexander III to the Bishop of Amiens, are looked on by some writers as permissions granted by the popes to the Frankish Churches to dissolve a valid marriage in certain cases. The decision of Gregory II, in the year 726, was embodied in the collection of Gratian (C. xxxii, Q. vii, c. xviii), and is printed in "Mon. Germ. Hist.", III: Epist. (Epist. Merovingici et Karolini ævi I), p. 276; the decision of Alexander III is given in the Decretals as *pars decisa*, i. e., a part of the papal letter (IV Decretal., xv, 2) left out in the Decretal itself. In both cases there was question of a declaration of the invalidity of a marriage which was invalid from the very beginning because of antecedent impotence. A certain concession to the Frankish Churches was, however, made in these cases. According to Roman custom such supposed husband and wife were not separated, but were bound to live together as brother and sister. In the Frankish Churches, however, a separation was pronounced and permission to contract another marriage was allowed to the one not afflicted with absolute impotence. This custom Alexander III granted to the Frankish Churches for the future. If, therefore, the union in question is spoken of as a *legitima conjunctio*, or even as a *legitimum matrimonium*, this is done only on account of the external form of the marriage contract. That in such cases a diriment impediment according to the natural law was present, and an actual marriage was impossible, was well understood by the pope. He says this expressly in the part of his letter that has been embodied in the Decretals (IV Decretal., xv, 2. Cf. Sägmüller, "Die Ehe Heinrichs II" in the Tübingen "Theol. Quartalschr.", LXXXVII, 1905, 84 sqq.). That in similar cases decision has been given sometimes for separation and sometimes against it, need excite no surprise, for even at the present day the ecclesiastical idea of impotence on the part of the woman is not fully settled (cf. controversy in "The American Eccl. Review", XXVIII, 51 sqq.).

B. *Non-Christian Marriage Can Be Dissolved by Absolute Divorce under Certain Circumstances in Favour of the Faith.*

1. *The Pauline Privilege.*—The *Magna Charta* in favour of Christian faith is contained in the words of the Apostle, I Cor., vii, 12–15: "If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she consent to dwell with him, let him not put her away. And if any woman hath a husband that believeth not, and he consent to dwell with her, let her not put away her husband. For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the believing wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the believing husband: otherwise your children should be unclean; but now they are holy. *But if the unbeliever depart, let him depart. For a brother or sister is not under servitude in such cases. But God hath called us in peace.*" (On the interpretation of these words see Cornely on I Cor., 175 sqq.) The exegetical controversy, as to whether these words are dependent on the preceding sentence, "For to the rest I speak, not the Lord", or whether that sentence refers to the one preceding it, is of no importance in this question. In the first supposition, we should seem to have here an ordinance which is not immediately Divine, but was established by the Apostle through the power of Christ. In the second supposition, it may be an immediately Divine ordinance.

These words of the Apostle tell us that in all cases when one of the married parties has received the Christian Faith, and the other remains an infidel and is not willing to live in peace with the Christian, *the believer is not bound but is free.* The Apostle does not indeed say expressly and formally that the marriage bond has been dissolved, but if it were not at least in the power of the Christian to dissolve the previous bond and to enter upon another marriage, the words would not have their full truth. Hence the Church has understood the words in this sense, and at the same time has fixed more exactly how and under what conditions this so-called Pauline privilege may be exercised. Innocent III declares authoritatively (IV Decretal., xix, 7, in cap. "Quanto") that the convert is justified in entering upon another marriage if he will, provided the non-Christian is unwilling either to live with the other or such cohabitation would cause the blasphemy of the Divine name or be an incentive to mortal sin: "Si enim alter infidelium conjugum ad fidem convertatur, altero vel nullo modo, vel non sine blasphemiâ divini nominis, vel ut eum pertrahat ad mortale peccatum ei cohabitare volente: qui relinquitur, ad secunda, si voluerit, vota transibit: et in hoc casu intelligimus quod ait Apostolus: *Si infidelis discedit*, etc., et canonem etiam in quo dicitur: *Contumelia creatoris solvit jus matrimonii circa eum qui relinquitur.*" According to the Church's interpretation and practice, the dissolution of the marriage that was contracted before conversion is not effected by the separation of the married parties, but only when a new marriage is contracted by the Christian party because of this privilege. The Holy Office says this expressly in the decree of 5 August, 1759, ad 2: "Then only may the yoke of the matrimonial bond with an infidel be understood to be loosed when the convert spouse . . . proceeds to another marriage with a believer" (Collectan. S. Congr. de Prop. F., n. 1312). The manner of obtaining this right to enter upon a new marriage is fixed by the Church under penalty of invalidity, and consists in a demand (*interpellatio*) made of the non-Christian party whether he or she be willing to live with the other in peace or not. If this interpellation is not possible, an Apostolic dispensation *ab interpellatione* must be obtained (Collectanea, n. 1323). If the spouse that remains in infidelity agrees to live in peace, but later on acts contrary to this agreement by abusing the Christian religion, or tempting the Christian to infidelity, or preventing the children from being educated in the Christian Faith, or becomes a temptation for the Christian to commit any mortal sin, the latter regains the right to proceed to a new marriage after any lapse of time. This consequence which follows from the very nature of the privilege was expressly declared by the Holy Office in the decree of 27 September, 1848, and was confirmed by Pius IX (Collectan., n. 1337; Ballerini-Palmieri, "Opus theol. Mor.", 3d ed., VI, n. 468). If, however, the non-Christian party refuses to continue further in married life, not from hatred of the Faith or for other sinful reasons, but because the Christian, by sinful conduct (for instance by adultery), has given just reason for separation, the Christian would not be justified in entering upon a new marriage. The privilege, however, would still be his if the non-Christian party wished to maintain as reason for separation adultery committed before the time of conversion. (Collectan., n. 1312, 1318, 1322.) The interpellation of the non-Christian party, which must take place before the remarriage of the Christian, must as a general rule be about living together in peace or not, but as peaceful cohabitation can only be imagined in a case where there are no serious dangers, and such dangers may arise in certain circumstances from continued living with the non-Christian party, it is readily understood that the Holy See is justified in making the interpellation mean, whether the non-Christian party be willing to accept the Christian Faith; and in case the non-Christian refuses after careful deliberation, then, as a result of this refusal, permission may be granted to the Christian party to enter upon a new marriage and thereby to dissolve the previous one. This procedure, allowed by Sixtus V, received new confirmation and direction under Leo XIII by the decree of the Holy Office, 29 November, 1882 (Collectan., n. 1358, ad 3).

The Pauline privilege is said to be *in favour of the Christian Faith*, but the meaning of the privilege and the right in such cases to absolute divorce is not exactly defined thereby. Doubt might arise in regard to catechumens, and also in regard to such as join a Christian denomination but do not belong to the Roman Catholic Church. The solution of these doubts is contained in the following proposition: *the Pauline privilege is attached to baptism.* That the privilege is granted to nobody *before* the actual reception of baptism is beyond question from the decree of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda, 16 January, 1803 (Collectan., n. 1319), and also from the decree of the Holy Office, 13 March, 1901 (Acta S. Sedis, XXXIII, 550). Even the interpellation of the non-Christian party ought to be postponed until after the baptism of the other. It requires a papal dispensation to proceed to such an interpellation validly before baptism (Cf. Instructio S. Officii, under the authorization of Pius IX, 3 June, 1874, in Collectan., n. 1357). It is also certain that the dissolubility here in question is not limited to the marriages of pagans, but to all marriages of unbaptized persons, even though they should belong to some non-Catholic Christian denomination (Acta S. Sedis, loc. cit.). Whether, however, the privilege is so joined to baptism that it belongs to Christian adherents of a non-Catholic denomination when they profess the Christian Faith by the reception of baptism is a question disputed by theologians. Some theologians of repute assert that the privilege is granted in this case, and that a practical decision to this effect has been made by a Roman Congregation, according to the testimony of Konings, "Theol. mor.", II, 394 (New York, 1878). (Cf. Palmieri, "De matrim. christ.", th. xxvii, p. 224; Tarquini in "Archiv für kath. Kirchenrecht", L, 224 sqq.; Wernz, "Jus decretal.", IV, n. 702, not. 59; Gasparri, "De matrim.", II, n. 1331; Ballerini-Palmieri, "Opus theol. mor.", 3d ed., VI, 457 sqq.) Even in the early ages, the Venerable Bede and St. Augustine seem to have understood the passage from St. Paul (I Cor.) in this sense.

2. *The Papal Authority to Dissolve a Non-Christian Marriage.*—From the ecclesiastical decisions that have been already quoted, it is clear that the Church

has at least the authority of explaining the Pauline privilege, of limiting, and extending it. This would give rise to no difficulties if the Pauline privilege, as expressed in I Cor., vii, 15, were an immediate Apostolic ordinance and only mediately Divine, inasmuch as Christ would have granted the power in general in a case of necessity to dissolve in favour of the Faith a marriage contracted in infidelity. For the entire Apostolic power passed to the supreme head of the Church, and as the Apostle could determine fixed rules and conditions for the dissolution of the marriages in question, the pope would have precisely the same authority. Yet on this point there is a diversity of opinion among theologians, and the Church has not settled the dispute. For, even if the privilege as promulgated by St. Paul was of immediate Divine right, the Church's power to make at least modifications in case of necessity can readily be explained because such a power belongs to her without a doubt in other matters that are of Divine right. The first opinion seems to have been held in the fourteenth century by eminent scholars like P. de Palude and de Tudeschis, and in the fifteenth century by St. Antoninus; in recent times it is defended by Gasparri, Rossi, Fahrner, and others. The second opinion is held by Th. Sanchez, Benedict XIV, St. Alphonsus, Perrone, Billot, Wernz, and others. The instruction of the Holy Office, 11 July, 1866 (Collectan., n. 1353), calls the privilege a Divine privilege "promulgated by the Apostle". However, in spite of the disagreement in regard to the Pauline privilege, the defenders of both opinions agree that there is another method for the dissolution of the marriage of infidels when one of the parties receives baptism, namely, by papal authority. This power is indeed not admitted by all theologians. Even Lambertini (who later became Pope Benedict XIV) doubted it when he was secretary of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, in the *causa Florentina*, in the year 1726. But earlier papal decisions, as well as the actual decision in this very case, leave no room for doubt that the popes attribute to themselves this power and act accordingly.

If the Pauline privilege alone be applied, it will follow that when a pagan is converted who has been living in polygamy, he can be permitted to choose any one of his wives who may be willing to receive baptism, provided his first wife is unwilling to live with him in peace or, under the circumstances, to be converted to the Faith. Hence it is that the answers of Roman Congregations based on the Pauline privilege always include the phrase *nisi prima voluerit converti*. Now several of the popes have at times granted permission to whole nations to choose any one of the several wives, without adding the clause "unless the first be willing to be converted". This was done for India by St. Pius V, 2 August, 1571, in the Constitution "Romani Pontificis". Urban VIII, 20 October, 1626, and 17 September, 1627, did the same for the South American nations, and expressly declares: "Considering that such pagan marriages are not so firm that in case of necessity they cannot be dissolved"; similarly, Gregory XIII, 25 January, 1585 (cf. Ballerini-Palmieri, "Opus theol. mor.", 3d ed., VI, nn. 444, 451, 452). The theological proof of this papal authority is easy for those who, as has been said, regard the Pauline privilege as an immediate Apostolic ordinance. For it is then expressly testified by Holy Scripture that the Apostolic authority, hence also the papal authority, can allow in favour of the Faith the dissolution of marriage contracted in infidelity. The method of procedure and the precise application in various cases would naturally be committed to the bearer of the Apostolic authority. Those who consider that the Pauline privilege is an immediate Divine determination of the case in which marriage may be dissolved, prove the papal authority in another way. Since it follows from I Cor., vii, 15, that marriage contracted in infidelity is not absolutely indissoluble according to Divine right, it follows from the general power of loosing which was granted to the successor of St. Peter, Matt., xvi, 19—"Whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven"—that this power extends also to our present matter. Moreover, the successors of St. Peter are themselves the best interpreters of their power. Whenever the exercise of an authority that has not hitherto been clearly recognized occurs, not merely on one occasion but frequently, there can be no more doubt that such authority is rightfully exercised. Now this is precisely what took place in the grants of Pius V, Gregory XIII, and Urban VIII for the vast territories of India, the West Indies, etc.

3. *The Dissolution of Marriage Contracted in Infidelity by Profession in a Religious Order.*—When the doctrine explained above, which now is practically admitted beyond doubt, has been established, the question, whether a marriage contracted in infidelity can be dissolved by the religious profession of the converted party, is not very important. It is so to be understood that the baptized party may choose the religious life, even against the will of the one still unbaptized, and, in consequence of this, the other may enter upon a new marriage. According to the doctrine we have just explained, it is clear that the pope, at least in single cases, can permit this. Whether, according to a general law, and by immediate Divine ordinance, without the intervention of the pope, this privilege belongs to the baptized party, is somewhat connected with another question, viz., for what reason Christian (i. e. sacramental) matrimony, not yet consummated, can be dissolved by religious profession. This leads us to the third proposition about this subject of divorce.

C. *Christian Marriage before Consummation Can Be Dissolved by Solemn Profession in a Religious Order, or by an Act of Papal Authority.*

1. *Dissolution by Solemn Profession.*—The fact that religious profession causes the dissolution of the marriage bond, provided the marriage has not been consummated, is distinctly taught in the Extrav. Joan. XXII (tit. VI, cap. unic.), and was solemnly defined by the Council of Trent (Sess. XXIV, can. vi). The reason why this dissolution takes place is a theological question. The definition reads: "If anyone shall say that a marriage contracted, but not consummated, is not dissolved by the solemn religious profession of either one of the parties to the marriage, let him be anathema." The expression, *by the solemn profession*, is important. Neither the mere entrance into a religious order, nor life in the novitiate, nor the so-called profession of simple vows, even though they be for life, as is customary in modern congregations, is capable of dissolving a previous marriage. The simple vows which are pronounced in the Society of Jesus, either as vows of scholastics or as vows of formed coadjutors, do not dissolve a marriage which has been contracted and not yet consummated, though they cause a diriment impediment in regard to any future marriage. The question as to how and for what reason such marriage is dissolved by solemn religious profession is answered by some by pointing to an immediate Divine right, as if God himself had so ordained immediately. Others, however, ascribe it to the power which the Church has received from God, and to its ordinance. The first opinion is defended by Dominic Soto, Th. Sanchez, Benedict XIV, Perrone, Rosset, Palmieri, and others; the second by Henry de Segusia (commonly called Hostiensis), Suarez, Laymann, Kugler, the Würzburg theologians, Wernz, Gasparri, Laurentius, Fahrner, and others. The tradition of the Christian Church for centuries bears witness that Christian marriage before consummation has not the same indissolubility as a consummated marriage. Scholars, however, are not unanimous

about the limits of its dissolubility. Many facts from the lives of the saints, of St. Thecla, St. Cecilia, St. Alexius, and others, such for example as are narrated by Gregory the Great (III Dialog., xiv, in P. L., XXXIII) and by the Venerable Bede (Hist Angl., xix, in P. L., XCV, 201 sqq.), are proof of the universal Christian conviction that, even after marriage had been contracted, it was free for either of the married parties to separate from the other in order to choose a life of evangelical perfection. Now this would be a violation of the right of the other spouse if in such circumstances the marriage bond were not dissolved, or at least could not easily be dissolved under certain conditions, and thereby the right granted to the other to enter upon another marriage. The precise conditions under which this dissolution of the marriage bond actually took place, and still takes place, can only be decided with certainty by the authentic declaration of the Church. Such a declaration was made by Alexander III, according to III Decretal., xxxii, 2: "After a lawfully accorded consent affecting the present, it is allowed to one of the parties, even against the will of the other, to choose a monastery (just as certain saints have been called from marriage), provided that carnal intercourse shall not have taken place between them; and it is allowed to the one who is left to proceed to a second marriage." A similar declaration was made by Innocent III, op. cit., cap. xiv. From this latter declaration we learn that religious profession alone has this effect, and that therefore those who wished to practise a life of higher perfection in any other manner could be obliged by the other spouse either actually to choose the religious state or else to consummate the marriage. Under earlier ecclesiastical conditions, no long delay was imposed upon the other party before entering upon another marriage, because religious profession might be made without a long novitiate. The introduction of a novitiate of at least one year by the Council of Trent, and the time of three years prescribed by Pius IX and Leo XIII for simple vows before the solemn profession, and the general restriction of solemn profession by the establishment of simple profession, which does not dissolve the marriage bond, have rendered difficult the dissolution of unconsummated marriage by religious profession. So that now it seems practically necessary that if one of the married parties should choose the state of evangelical perfection before the consummation of the marriage, the marriage bond should be dissolved by papal authority.

2. *Dissolution by the Pope of Marriage not yet Consummated.*—The pope's authority as supreme head of the Church to dissolve Christian marriage not yet consummated is proved on the one hand from the words of Christ to Peter, Matt., xvi, 19 (see above, under B 2), and on the other, from the dissolubility of such a marriage by religious profession, inasmuch as this profession must be *solemn*, for according to the declaration of Boniface VIII (III Sexti Decretal., xv, c. unic.), solemn vows as such depend entirely upon the ordinance of the Church—"voti solemnitas ex solâ constitutione Ecclesiæ est inventa". Hence it follows without a doubt that the dissolution of a marriage by solemn profession could never take place without the exercise of the Church's authority. Now if the Church can cause such a dissolution according to a general law, a fortiori she can do this in single cases—not indeed arbitrarily, but for grave reasons—because this power has been granted by God to dispense in matters of Divine right, and a delegated authority may not be exercised without a sufficient reason (cf. Wernz, "Jus decretal.", IV, n. 698, not. 39). The actual exercise of this power on the part of the popes, which has become constant and general, is a further proof of its propriety and its actual existence. Clear instances occur during the pontificates of Martin V (1417–31) and Eugene IV (1431–47). St. Antoninus tells us that he had seen several Bulls of these popes which granted such a dispensation or a dissolution of a marriage that had not been consummated, so that thereafter they might proceed to a new marriage (Summa theol., III, tit. i, c. xxi). We can find traces of such a practice even in much earlier times. A decretal of Alexander III, namely, IV Decretal., xiii, 2, seems, according to a probable interpretation, to refer to a possible concession of such a dissolution. Perhaps the decision of Gregory II to St. Boniface, in 726 (see above under A. 4), might possibly be explained in the same sense, though it is very uncertain, for it seems to refer neither to the dissolution of a consummated marriage, as some supposed, nor to the dissolution of a real marriage that had not been consummated, but rather to a declaration of invalidity. For several centuries the exercise of this power of dissolving such marriages has belonged to the ordinary functions of the Holy See, and is exclusively papal, for the work of the Roman Congregations in such cases is only preparatory. However, exceptional instances occur when it has been delegated to bishops (Wernz, op. cit., n. 698, not. 41). The judicial procedure in such cases was exactly prescribed by Benedict XIV in his Bull of judicial procedure ("Dei miseratione", 3 November, 1741 (section 15), obligatory on the whole Latin Church. Any uncertainty about this ecclesiastical power (cf. Fahrner, Geschichte des Unauflöslichkeitsprincips, p. 170 sqq.) was removed by this Bull; for if this power did not belong to the Church, then the Bull in question would have approved and originated an institution against all good morals. It is, however, inconceivable that the pope could issue a general prescription that would contain an attack on morality and could formally sanction bigamy in certain cases. Several of the older canonists, especially those of Bologna, brought forward some special reasons which are supposed to justify the dissolution of a marriage before consummation. If thereby they wish to assert the right of dissolution by private authority, then they erred. If they intended to speak of a dissolution that could be granted by the Church, that is, by its supreme head, and the permission for a new marriage, then they had merely collected the cases in which such a dissolution might take place in virtue of the papal authority just spoken of, but they had not given a new title to such dissolution. Some held the erroneous opinion of private dissolubility, because they regarded such a union as no real marriage, but simply as a betrothal, and therefore they treated it according to the juridical principles in regard to betrothal. This theory of marriage, however, was not often defended, and has long disappeared from theological schools; neither does it deserve any consideration at present, because it is in conflict with established Catholic dogmas.

D. *Limited Divorce, or Separation from Bed and Board (Divortium Imperfectum) is allowed for various causes*, especially in the case of adultery or lapse into infidelity or heresy on the part of husband or wife.

A separation of married parties leaving the marriage bond intact is mentioned by St. Paul, I Cor., vii, 11: "If she depart, that she remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband." From the very nature of the case it follows that occasions may arise in which further cohabitation is unadvisable or even unseemly and morally impossible. If such circumstances do not bring about a dissolution of the marriage bond, at least a cessation of married life must be permitted. Hence it is that the Council of Trent, immediately after its definition of the indissolubility of the marriage bond, even in case of adultery, added another canon (Sess. XXIV, can. viii): "If anyone shall say that the Church errs when she, for many causes, decrees a separation of husband and wife in respect to bed and dwelling-place for a definite or an indefinite period; let him be anathema." The cessation of married life in common may have different degrees. There

can be the mere cessation of married life (*separatio quoad torum*), or a complete separation as regards dwelling-place (*separatio quoad cohabitationem*). Each of these may be permanent or temporary. Temporary abstinence from married life, or *separatio a toro*, may take place by mutual private consent from higher religious motives, not, however, if such continence be the occasion of moral danger to either of the parties. Should such danger threaten either, it would become their duty to resume married life. The Apostle speaks of this in I Cor., vii, 5: "Defraud not one another, except, perhaps, by consent, for a time, that you may give yourselves to prayer; and return together again, lest Satan tempt you for your incontinency."

1. *The Choice of Evangelical Perfection.*—For a permanent separation on account of entrance into the state of Christian perfection, i. e. entrance into religious life on the part of the wife or of the husband, or by the reception of Holy orders on the part of the husband, there is required not only mutual consent, but also some arrangement on the part of ecclesiastical authority, according to the laws about such cases. This holds in regard to the reception of the major orders immediately after the contraction of marriage, even before it is consummated. In regard to the choice of religious life, it holds only after consummated marriage. For, as we have said above, by the religious life marriage which has not yet been consummated can be dissolved, and on that account newly-married parties have the right to a delay of two months to consider the choice of the state of perfection, and during which the consummation of the marriage may be refused (St. Alphonsus, "Theol. mor.", VI, n. 958). In case the marriage is not dissolved, the reception of Holy orders or religious profession cannot take place before provision has been made for a continent life on the part of the other party. In accordance with the judgment of the diocesan bishop, he or she must either enter a religious order, or, if age and other circumstances remove all suspicion and all danger of incontinency, at least take a private vow of perpetual chastity. In no case can it ever be allowed that the husband who should receive Holy orders might dwell in the same house with the wife bound only by a private vow (cf. Laurentius, "Instit. jur. eccl.", 2nd ed., n. 694).

2. *Adultery of One of the Parties.*—Cause for the cessation of complete community of life, which in itself is perpetual, is given to the innocent party by adultery of the spouse. In order, however, that this right may exist, the adultery must be, first, proven; second, not attributable to the other spouse either entirely or as accomplice; third, not already condoned; fourth, not, as it were, compensated by the adultery of the other party (cf. IV Decretal., xiii, 6, and xix, 4, 5; Wernz, "Jus decret.", IV, n. 707 sq.; St. Alphonsus, VI, n. 960). If the innocent party is certain of the sin of the other, he or she has a right immediately to refuse the continuation of married life. If the crime is manifest, then the innocent party is justified in leaving at once the guilty one, or in dismissing him or her from the house. If, however, the crime is not known, or not proved with certainty, then complete separation can follow only after a judicial investigation and a judicial decision, which must be made by ecclesiastical authority (IV Decretal., xix, 4, 5; i, 9; Wernz, "Jus decretal.", IV, n. 711). All sexual intercourse outside of married life is regarded as equivalent to adultery in justifying complete separation, even the unnatural sins of sodomy and bestiality. As proof of the crime may be alleged what are called *suspiciones vehementes*. In the first centuries of the Church, there was often a commandment, and the duty was imposed on the innocent party, to separate from the party guilty of adultery. There never, however, was any such general legislation. The duty, however, of separation was founded partly on the canonical penance imposed for adultery that was publicly known (and this penance was incompatible with marital life), and partly on the duty of avoiding scandal, as continued living with a husband or wife addicted to adultery might seem to be a scandalous approval of this criminal life. For this latter reason, even nowadays, circumstances may arise making the dismissal of the guilty party a duty (cf. St. Alphonsus, VI, n. 963 sqq.). Commonly, however, at least for a single violation, there is no duty of separation; still less is there any duty of permanent separation; in fact, charity may in certain cases demand that after a temporary separation the contrite party might be invited or admitted to a renewal of the married life. There is, however, never any obligation of justice to receive again the guilty party. The most that some theologians recognize is an obligation of justice when the party originally innocent has meanwhile become guilty of the same crime. The innocent party always retains the right in justice to recall or to demand the return of the guilty party. If the innocent husband or wife wishes to give up this right forever, then he or she can enter a religious order, or he may receive Holy orders, without the necessity of consent on the part of the guilty wife or husband who has been dismissed, or without any further obligation being imposed upon this party (III Decretal., xxxii, 15, 16). The guilty party can, however, proceed to the religious life or to the reception of Holy orders only with the consent of the innocent. This consent must either be granted expressly or be deduced with certainty from the constant refusal to be reconciled. It is the business of ecclesiastical authority to decide in any case, whether such certainty exists or not. A further obligation, such as the vow of perpetual chastity, is not imposed upon the innocent party, but the freedom to remarry is allowed after the death of the other spouse (cf. III Decretal., xxxii, 19; Wernz, op. cit., n. 710, not. 126; St. Alphonsus, VI, n. 969).

3. *Heresy or Defection from the Faith.*—Next to adultery, a reason for separation almost equivalent to it is defection from the Faith, whether by the rejection of Christianity or by heresy (IV Decretal., xix, 6, 7). However, there are some important differences to be noted:—

(a) In the case of adultery, a single action, if proven, is enough for permanent separation, but in the case of infidelity or heresy, a certain persistence in the sin is required (cf. St. Thomas, IV Sent., dist. xxxv, Q. i, a. 1), such for example as adhesion to a non-Catholic denomination.

(b) An ecclesiastical sentence is necessary in this case for the right of permanent separation. If this has not been obtained, the innocent party is bound to receive the guilty party after conversion and reconciliation with the Church. This is expressly decided by IV Decretal., xix, 6. When, however, the right to permanent separation has been granted, the innocent party can proceed at once to the religious life or receive Holy orders, and thereby render it impossible to return to married life. It need hardly be mentioned that infidelity or heresy, as such, gives no just cause for separation of any kind, if it existed before the marriage was contracted, and if a dispensation from the impediment of disparity of worship between a baptized and a non-baptized person has been granted, or if a valid marriage, even without ecclesiastical dispensation, has taken place between a Catholic and a baptized non-Catholic. In such cases, passage from one denomination to another does not give a reason for separation.

4. *Danger to Body or Soul.*—Besides these special cases of separation founded on ecclesiastical law, many other cases may arise, which, of their nature, justify temporary separation. They are summed up under the general notion of "danger to body or soul" (*periculum corporis aut animæ*). There must, of course, be question of an approximate danger of great

harm, because this very important right of the other party may not be set aside, or even partially limited, for trivial reasons. The reasons for a temporary separation are as various as the evils which may be inflicted. To judge the gravity correctly, reasonable consideration is demanded of all the circumstances. Danger to the soul, which is given as a reason for separation, almost always supposes a crime on the part of the other party. It consists in temptation to some mortal sin, either to the denial of the Catholic Faith, or the neglect of the proper education of the children, or to some other grievous sin and violation of the moral law. Dangerous solicitation, or pressure, or intimidation, or threats inflicted either by, or with the consent of, one party, or silent approbation to induce the other to a grievous violation of duty would give justification—and even the obligation, if the danger were great—to proceed to separation, which should last as long as the danger exists. Such a reason as this might later on justify a separation in the case of a mixed marriage. Danger to the body, which is a further reason for a separation, means any great danger to life or health, as well as other intolerable conditions. Such are, without doubt, plotting against one's life, ill-treatment which in the circumstances should be regarded as gross, well-grounded fear of dangerous contagion, insanity, serious and constant quarrelling, etc. It is to be noted that in every case there must be a very serious evil to justify separation for any length of time. Other inconveniences must be borne with Christian patience. Great crimes of one party, provided they are not against marital fidelity, or do not include any incentive to sin on the part of the other, do not, according to Catholic law, of themselves give any right to separation; neither do punishments that might be inflicted on the guilty party in consequence of such crimes, even when this punishment be joined with dishonour. The Catholic view of this matter is directly opposed to the non-Catholic, which, as we have seen above under A. 3. (e), permits in such cases the dissolution of the marriage bond.

By private authority, i. e. without previous application to an ecclesiastical court and its decision, a temporary separation may take place when delay would bring danger. The church law does not allow a separation in other cases (Wernz, "Jus Decret.", IV, n. 714; St. Alphonsus, "Theol. mor.", VI, n. 971), although, where there are evident and public reasons for separation, the non-observance of the Church's regulations can more easily be overlooked. Separation because of the mere decision of a civil judge is never allowed to Catholics. (Cf. III Conc. plen. Baltim., tit. IV, c. ii.)

Fahrner, *Geschichte der Ehescheidung* (Freiburg, 1903), I; Schneemann, *Die Irrtümer über die Ehe* in *Die Encyclica Pius IX. vom 8 Dez., 1864* (Freiburg, 1866), III; Avogrado, *Teorica dell' Istituzione del matrimonio* (Turin, 1853–1860); Perrone, *De matrimonio christiano* (Rome, 1858); Palmieri, *De matrimonio christiano* (Rome, 1880); Ballerini-Palmieri, *Opus theol. mor.* (Prato, 1900), VI; Sasse, *De sacramentis* (Friburg, 1898); Pesch, *Prælectiones dogmat.* (Friburg, 1900), VII; St. Alphonsus, *Theologia moral.*, VI; Wernz, *Jus decretalium*, IV: *Jus matrimoniale* (Rome, 1904), Esmein, *Le mariage en droit canonique* (Paris, 1891); Laurentius, *Institutiones juris eccles.* (Friburg, 1908); Gasparri, *De matrimonio tract. canon.* (Paris, 1904); Rosset, *De sacramento matrimonii tract. dogm.* etc. (Paris, 1895–1896); Freisen, *Geschichte der kath. Eherechts bis zum Verfall der Glossenliteratur* (Tübingen, 1888); Cigoi, *Die Unauflöslichkeit der christl. Ehe und die Ehescheidung nach Schrift und Tradition* (Paderborn, 1895); Cornely, *Commentar. in Ep. ad Rom.* (Paris, 1896); Knabenbauer, *Commentar. in Matth.* (Paris, 1903); Prat, *La théologie de S. Paul* (Paris, 1908); Schanz, *Kommentar über das Evang. d. hl. Matth.* (Freiburg, 1879); Schmitz, *Die Bussbücher und die Bussdisciplin der Kirche* (Mainz, 1883; Düsseldorf, 1893); *Collectanea S. Congr. de Prop. Fide* (Rome, 1893); Zhishman, *Das Eherecht der orientalischen Kirchen* (Vienna, 1864); Slater, *Manual of Moral Theology* (New York, 1908), II, 278 sqq.; Devine, *The Law of Christian Marriage* (New York, 1908), 85–114.

For divorce among the Jews: Amram, *The Jewish Law of Divorce* (Philadelphia, 1896; London, 1897); *Jewish Encyclopedia*, s. v. *Divorce* (New York and London, 1901–1906); Selden, *Uxor Ebraica absolvens nuptias et divortia Ebræorum* (Wittenberg, 1712).

Aug. Lehmkuhl.

II. In Civil Jurisprudence.—Divorce is defined in civil jurisprudence as "the dissolution or partial suspension by law of the marriage relation" (Bouvier's Law Dictionary). Strictly speaking, there is but one form of absolute divorce, known, under the name derived from the civil and canon law, as divorce *a vinculo matrimonii*, i. e. from the marriage tie. In the states where it is administered this form of divorce puts an end legally to the marriage relation. There is, however, a limited form of divorce which is, more accurately speaking, a suspension, either for a time or indefinitely, of the marriage relation, and is known as divorce *a mensâ et toro*, or from bed and board. In addition, in some states courts grant decrees declaring marriages absolutely void, *ab initio*, i. e. from the beginning. Such marriages never having been valid, the parties cannot be said to have been divorced; however, proceedings for nullity are frequently provided for under divorce statutes.

Pre-Christian Divorce Legislation among the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans.—Before the adoption of Christianity as the state religion of the Roman Empire, it would appear that divorce in some form existed among all ancient peoples from whom European civilization is derived. Among the Hebrews no precedent for divorce can be found prior to the Mosaic Law. It became frequent afterwards, though it would seem that the husband alone possessed the power, at least until the reign of Herod. Divorce was prevalent among the Greeks, especially in Athens, but the party suing had to appeal to the magistrate, state the grounds of complaint, and submit to his judgment; if the wife was the prosecutor, she was obliged to appear in person. The lax customs of the Spartans made divorce rare. Among the Romans the law of Romulus permitted divorce to men, but refused it to women. Adultery, poisoning of children, and falsification or counterfeiting of keys, were sufficient grounds. While divorce was so far free that there was no one authorized by the civil power to oppose it, this freedom was restrained by the moral feeling of the people and their respect for the marriage bond. It was necessary to consult the family council and there was fear of the authority of the censors. There were three forms of marriage among the Romans: the *confarreatio*, which was celebrated with certain highly religious ceremonies peculiar to that form of wedding; the *conventio in manum*, effected by a simulated purchase (*coemptio*), a much more simple ceremony; and the *usus* or prescription, where, after living with her husband for one year without being absent for three days, the woman came, as in the other forms of marriage, *in manum mariti*, that is to say, under the control of her husband. No instance of divorce is known before A. U. C. 520 or 523. It is thought by many that this was the first instance of divorce under the Roman Republic, but it would seem probable that it was the first divorce for the special purpose of retaining the wife's dower (*dos*). This is the suggestion of Becker, who points out that the divorce of Antonius took place in A. U. C. 447, and states that other proof exists that in much earlier times divorce was properly established and strictly ordained by laws. He quotes also from Cicero (Phil., ii, 28) where he says jokingly of Antonius, who had dismissed his wife Cytheris under the same formalities as those of divorce, "that he commanded her to have her own property according to the Twelve Tables; he took away her keys and drove her out."

The causes for divorce on the part of the woman were capital offences, adultery, and drinking. After the Punic wars the number of divorces reached scandalous proportions. Sulla, Cæsar, Pompey, Cicero, Antony, Augustus, and Tiberius all put away their wives. Under Augustus an effort was made to curb the licence of divorce. In the interest of publicity, that emperor made it necessary for the party seeking

a divorce to make his declaration in the presence of seven witnesses, all Roman citizens of full age. Divorce remained, however, a private legal act. Women could obtain divorce without any fault of their husbands. Under the Roman law of the early imperial period, there was a separation pronounced, first, between parties whose marriage engagement was not legally contracted; second, where parties were separated when the contract of espousals had been made but not consummated by actual marriage. This was known as *repudium*. *Divortium* was a separation of persons already married, and included divorce *a mensâ et toro* and *a vinculo matrimonii*.

Imperial Christian Legislation.—In 331 Constantine the Great restricted the causes for divorce to three on the part of the man, viz., if he was a murderer, a poisoner, or a robber of graves; and three on the part of the woman, viz., if she was an adulteress, a poisoner, or a corrupter of youth. Among soldiers an absence of four years was sufficient to entitle the petitioner to a divorce. This edict was ratified by Theodosius the Great and Honorius. Under Justinian several reasons for divorce were added, and liberty of divorce by mutual consent was restored by his nephew Justin (565–78). No change was now made in the Roman law until after a lapse of 340 years, when Leo the Philosopher (886–912) made a collection of laws known as the "Libri Basilici", from which he excluded the edicts of Justin.

English Legislation.—According as Catholic doctrine penetrated more profoundly the medieval life, the laws of European nations were gradually accommodated to its demands. In this way, for example, the teaching of the Council of Trent (1563), which anathematized the error that matrimony could so far be dissolved by divorce that it was lawful to marry again, was universally accepted among the nations adhering to the Catholic Church. This council, however, introduced thereby no essential change in the divorce law of the Church. Originally, under the common law of England, there was no jurisdiction on the subject of divorce excepting in the ecclesiastical courts, they having jurisdiction in all matters relating to marriage and divorce, the restitution of conjugal rights, suits for limited divorce and for annulment of marriage. This followed from the Catholic doctrine that marriage, being a sacrament, could not be dissolved; for the same reason any question relative to its validity or to a suspension of conjugal relations must necessarily pertain to the ecclesiastical courts. The ecclesiastical law of England, though originating differently from the other branches of the common law and distinguished by special rules, was part of the unwritten law of the State, just as what are technically called the common law, the law of admiralty, and equity.

The Protestant Reformers rejected the sacramental theory of marriage, and agreed that absolute divorce should be granted for adultery and for malicious desertion, and that the innocent party might then remarry. As they also rejected the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts it was for some time a question among them whether marriage was dissolved *ipso facto* by the commission of one of these offences, or whether it was necessary to have the dissolution declared by public authority. Luther recommended the parish priest as the proper tribunal. Appeals were sometimes taken to the prince or sovereign. Gradually "consistorium courts" were created, of both lay and ecclesiastical members, under sanction of the civil power. In England under Henry VIII, after his separation from the Catholic Church, the law relative to divorce remained practically unchanged. An effort was made in the time of Edward VI to secure the adoption of a new code of ecclesiastical laws, drafted mainly by Cranmer, under which separation *a mensâ et toro* was not recognized and complete divorce was granted in cases of extreme conjugal faithlessness; in cases of conjugal desertion or cruelty; in cases where a husband not guilty of desertion of his wife, had been several years absent from her, provided there were reason to believe him dead; and in cases of such violent hatred as rendered it in the highest degree improbable that the husband and wife would survive their animosities and again love one another. Divorce was denied when both parties were guilty of unfaithfulness, and when only one was guilty the innocent party might marry again. The ecclesiastical court was to decide all questions concerning these causes. It is said by Howard (Hist. of Matrim. Institutions, p. 80) that the principles of this code, known as the "Reformatio Legum", were carried out in practice, though not enacted into law. He adds that "according to the ancient form of judgment divorce was probably still pronounced only a mensa et thoro; but whatever the shape of the decrees, there is strong evidence that from about 1548 to 1602, except for the short period of Mary's reign, 'the community, in cases of adultery, relied upon them as justifying a second act of matrimony'". He says also that throughout nearly the whole of Elizabeth's reign new marriages were freely contracted after obtaining divorce from unfaithful partners. However, in 1602 the Star Chamber pronounced a marriage invalid which had been contracted after separation from bed and board by the decree of an ecclesiastical judge (Foljambe's case, 3 Salk. 138).

Following this decision the canon law was administered in the English spiritual courts with such rigour that it required an Act of Parliament to permit a remarriage after divorce. In the tenth year of James I (1613) an Act was passed to restrain remarriage by one party while the other was alive, excepting, however, cases where sentences of divorce had been pronounced by ecclesiastical courts. There were some cases where, after sentences had been pronounced by an ecclesiastical court, a second marriage was upheld, but the decisions are generally to the effect that a perfect marriage cannot be dissolved excepting by death. Oughton says (tit. 215) "that the marriage tie once perfected cannot be dissolved by man, but only by natural death. The parties may be separated, but they remain man and wife". The Puritans of England strongly advocated the right of divorce, but without effect, and until 1857 there was no English statute which permitted the granting of a decree of absolute divorce by any court, the only jurisdiction being vested in Parliament. Precedents of divorce by Parliament strictly so called are not found earlier than 1698, but it came to be understood that if a divorce *a mensâ* had been granted by the spiritual court, a divorce would be granted by Parliament absolutely dissolving the marriage, though only for the cause of adultery on the part of the wife. By the Act of 1857 the entire jurisdiction in matrimonial questions was transferred to a new civil court for divorce and matrimonial causes, and since the judicature Act of 1873 this jurisdiction has been vested in the probate, divorce, and admiralty division of the High Court of Justice. Its power is restricted, however, to England alone. The principles upon which divorce legislation may be based and which may be traced in the legislation of those countries that permit divorce, are stated by Bishop (Marriage, Divorce and Separation, §46, ed. of 1891) as follows:—

"Matrimony is a natural right, to be forfeited only by some wrongful act. Therefore the government should permit every suitable person to be the husband or wife of another, who will substantially perform the duties of the matrimonial relation; and when it is in good faith entered into, and one of the parties without the other's fault so far fails in those duties as practically to frustrate its ends, the government should provide some means whereby, the failure being estab-

lished and shown to be permanent, the innocent party may be freed from the mere legal bond of what has in fact ceased to be marriage, and left at liberty to form another alliance. The guilty party would have no claim to be protected in a second marriage; and whether it should be permitted to him or not is a question, not of right with him, but of public expediency, upon which there is considerable diversity of opinion."

Modern European Legislation.—A full collection of laws and statistics relating to marriage and divorce in European countries will be found in the report of the United States Commissioner of Labor, Carroll D. Wright, for 1889. It is therein stated that "prior to 1868 the ecclesiastical courts had in most of the countries named more or less complete jurisdiction over matrimonial causes, but the civil courts have now exclusive jurisdiction over such matters in all of them". In Austria-Hungary absolute divorce is not allowed to members of the Catholic Church. Prior to 1 January, 1876, all the cantons of Switzerland had their own peculiar laws of divorce, but subsequent to that date a general law governing the subject took effect. In Germany perpetual separation equivalent to limited divorce was abolished throughout the empire, and the causes for such separation were made causes for absolute divorce. In Hungary divorce has been legal for Protestants since 1786 and for Hebrews since 1863. The laws of their respective churches apply to Latin Catholics, Greek Catholics, and Orthodox Greeks. Questions of divorce or validity of marriage among Protestants are subject to the jurisdiction of the civil courts. Excepting for Protestants and Hebrews, the ecclesiastical courts of other bodies have jurisdiction. In case of mixed marriage the court of the defendant's confession has jurisdiction. In Italy, Spain, and Portugal, still Catholic countries, no absolute divorce is permitted. In Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Mexico, and Cuba, limited divorce alone is permitted.

The following causes in Austria and in Hungary for absolute divorce are typical: in Austria, adultery; commission of a crime punishable by five years imprisonment; malicious abandonment or non-appearance after one year's solicitation where the absentee's residence is known; assault endangering life or health; repeated cruelty; unconquerable aversion, on account of which both parties demand a divorce. In the last case a limited divorce or separation from bed and board must first be obtained. In Belgium, where the husband is at least twenty-five years of age and the wife twenty-one, and the parties have been married two years or longer, divorce may be obtained by mutual consent on certain terms and conditions, but must be approved by the courts. In France divorce was introduced by the law of 1792. This law was modified in 1798 and in 1803 (Code Napoléon), was subsequently abrogated in 1816, and reintroduced in 1884; the grounds of divorce being adultery of either party; excesses, cruelty, grave injury inflicted by one spouse on the other; condemnation to infamous penalty of either of the spouses; mutual and persevering agreement of the wedded to separate, if said consent is expressed and established as prescribed. By recent legislation, after the lapse of a fixed period of time, a decree of separation can be changed into a judgment of divorce on the application of either of the parties. (Civil Code, Sec. 307.) In the German Empire perpetual judicial separations have been abolished, and all subjects of the empire, without regard to their religious status may avail themselves of the laws of divorce which exist in their respective states. In Prussia there are seven causes known as major causes for divorce and six as minor causes. Among the major causes are: false accusations of serious crimes preferred by one of the parties against the other, and endangering the life, honour, or office of the other spouse; among the minor causes are: insanity, disorderly conduct or mode of living, refusal of maintenance or support by the husband. It may be noted that in the divorce laws of European states there exists much similarity as regards the causes for divorce. In Scotland divorce is granted for adultery and malicious desertion; the former since 1560; the latter since 1573. The injured party has the right to choose either a judicial separation or an absolute divorce. In Ireland the civil courts have no jurisdiction to grant decrees of absolute divorce. In Canada exclusive authority was conferred upon the Parliament by the British North America Act of 1867 (Sec. 91). At that time courts of divorce existed in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and British Columbia, and they still continue to exercise their functions. Excepting in Prince Edward Island, the divorce courts appear to have been modelled upon the English court of divorce and matrimonial causes. A court of divorce and alimony was established in Prince Edward Island as early as 1836. In the other provinces of Canada no divorce court has ever been constituted and divorces are granted only by special Act of Federal Parliament. The courts of Quebec, however, can grant *séparation de corps* under the English divorce court practice and annul marriage on the ground of impotence.

In Australia, at the time of the formation of the Federal Commonwealth, there were divorce courts in all or almost all of the constituent states. Under the Constitution (Act 63–64, Vict., ch. xii, part V, Sec. 51), power was granted to the Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia, comprising the states of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Queensland, Tasmania, and Western Australia, with respect to divorce and matrimonial causes and in relation to parental rights and the custody and guardianship of infants. The object of this subsection is stated to have been to avoid "the great mistake made by the framers of the Constitution of the United States of America, who left the question to the states to deal with as they respectively thought proper" and "to provide for uniformity in the law of divorce" (Quick and Garran, Aust. Const., pp. 262–609). The local statutes in the various states still prevail, however, with the right of appeal to the High Court with respect to judgments of the Supreme Court of a state (Act of 1903, 2 Com. Stat., p. 148). In New Zealand, which does not form a part of the Australian Commonwealth, divorce is allowed for adultery on the part of the wife, and adultery with certain aggravating circumstances, or with cruelty, on the part of the husband. (New Zealand Statutes, Vol. I, p. 229.)

Divorce in the United States.—Colonial Period (1607–1787).—At the time of the settlement of the various colonies which subsequently declared their independence of Great Britain, there were no ecclesiastical courts; as in England, therefore, the practice of special acts of legislatures obtained. Sometimes it was in the form of a private statute directly dissolving the marriage; sometimes the court was empowered to investigate the cause and grant the divorce if the complaint was sustained. There are many instances of legislative divorces granted in the New England colonies, all being divorces *a vinculo*. Adultery and desertion were sufficient reasons, though male adultery would require additional circumstances. In the Southern colonies there was no court having jurisdiction to grant divorce, though in some of them an appeal for alimony would be considered in a court of equity. Under the Dutch government of New York divorce jurisdiction was exercised by the courts for absolute, as well as for limited, separation, but when the English took possession of the colony, this jurisdiction was no longer recognized. In Pennsylvania under "The Great Law of 1682" divorce was authorized for adultery. The legislature also granted di-

vorces. In New Jersey there was no divorce jurisdiction granted the courts. It may be said, therefore, that outside of New England during the colonial period there was no such thing as a judicial divorce.

From 1787–1906.—The Constitution of the United States does not grant the Federal Government any power over the subject of divorce. In this matter, therefore, Congress can legislate only for the District of Columbia and for the territories. The organic acts creating the territories give power to their legislatures over all "rightful subjects of legislation not inconsistent with the constitution of the laws of the United States"; special and general divorce laws are, therefore, within the power of territorial legislatures, but by the Act of 30 July, 1886, all special divorce acts have been expressly forbidden. The various states of the Union succeeded to the full sovereign rights exercised by the Parliament of England over all subjects relating to marriage and divorce, but in the absence of special divorce statutes, there being no tribunal having jurisdiction, the law would remain the same as in the colonies prior to the Revolution. However, all states of the Union have adopted divorce statutes, excepting South Carolina, and have clothed the courts with full jurisdiction to administer relief. In most of the states and territories divorces *a vinculo* and *a mensâ et toro* are provided for, and in some of the states courts of equity take jurisdiction over special proceedings for a decree of nullity of marriage. In some states, however, decrees *a mensâ* are expressly forbidden. The causes for which a decree may be granted vary from the single cause of adultery on the part of either husband or wife (law of New York and the District of Columbia) to nine separate causes in the State of Washington, the last being known as the "omnibus provision", which permits a divorce for any other cause deemed by the court sufficient, provided that the court shall be satisfied that the parties can no longer live together. In most of the states there is no restriction upon the parties remarrying after divorce, though in some, as in New York, the court may forbid the guilty party to remarry during the lifetime of the innocent, and in others, as in Pennsylvania, marriage of the guilty party with a paramour during the lifetime of the innocent party is null and void.

Great uncertainty as to the effect of the divorce statutes of the different states has arisen where relief has been sought by a party whose husband or wife was resident of a different state from that in which the proceeding was brought. While it is a fundamental principle that the courts of any state have entire control over the citizens of that state in divorce proceedings, a different question arises where the husband is a resident of one state and the wife of another. The English doctrine that the domicile of the husband is that of the wife, irrespective of where she may actually be living during coverture, does not prevail in the United States. For the purposes of a divorce proceeding the wife may have a domicile separate from that of her husband. In consequence of this rule of American law it has frequently happened that actions for divorce have been initiated and carried to a conclusion without the respondent receiving any actual notice of the proceeding. This is made possible by provisions in the state statutes providing for service of notice by publication, where actual service cannot be had upon a respondent by reason of absence from the state. While decrees granted in accordance with the statutes of any particular state are valid in that state, there is no power to enforce a recognition of their validity in other states, and in consequence it frequently happens that a divorce may be valid in one state and invalid in another; the children of a second marriage legitimate in one state and illegitimate in another; the property rights of the former husband and wife terminated in one state and in full force in another. The Constitution of the United States (Art. IV, Sec. I) provides that "full faith and credit shall be given in each state to the public acts, records and judicial proceedings of every other state, and the Congress may by general laws prescribe the manner in which such acts, records and proceedings shall be proved, and the effect thereof." This provision, however, does not require the recognition of a divorce where one of the parties is not a citizen of the state that has granted the decree. Thus in a case where a husband abandoned his wife without justifiable cause, and removed to another state and acquired a domicile therein, and the wife remained in the matrimonial domicile, since her domicile did not follow that of her husband when he sued for a divorce in the state of his new domicile, and a decree was rendered upon a merely constructive service of process, it was held by the Supreme Court of the United States that the court of the husband's domicile did not acquire such jurisdiction over the wife as would entitle a decree to obligatory enforcement in the state of her domicile, though the state in which the decree was rendered had power to enforce it within its borders, and the state of the wife's domicile had the power to give the decree efficacy if it saw fit to do so. (Haddock vs. Haddock, 201, U. S., 562.) While the courts of the states called upon to administer divorce statutes receive their jurisdiction by reason of the theory adopted by the legislatures representing the actually predominant sentiment of the various communities that marriage results from a civil contract, bringing about a civil status with certain rights and duties appertaining to husband and wife, they by no means accept the theory that it is such a relation or status that the parties by their own agreement can dissolve it. The difference between the marriage relation and that of a contract is set out by Bishop in the following language:—"Because the parties cannot mutually dissolve it; because an act of God incapacitating one to discharge its duties will not release it; because there is no accepted performance that will end it; because a minor of marriageable age can no more recede from it than an adult; because it is not dissolved by failure of the original consideration; because no suit for damages will lie for the non-fulfillment of its duties; because legislation may annul it at pleasure; and because none of its other elements are those of contract but are all of status." (I, Marriage and Divorce, § 46.)

Keeping this distinction in mind, it will be perceived that a suit for divorce is not an action on a contract, but is a proceeding *sui generis* founded on the violation of duty enjoined by law and resembling more an action of tort than of contract. The law looks upon marriage as a permanent status, to be ended only by the death of one of the parties, a promise of competent persons to marry at their pleasure requiring a marriage licence merely to attest their competency. To change this status by divorce it is necessary to satisfy the court that the purpose of the marriage relation has been ended by the fault of the guilty party, and that greater evil will follow from maintaining the marriage status than from terminating it. Therefore, in theory, the divorce statutes embrace only such causes as are recognized as being of such a nature as to defeat the ends for which the marriage was entered into. In the great majority of the United States six causes are included in this category: (1) adultery, (2) bigamy, (3) conviction of crime in certain classes of cases, (4) intolerable cruelty, (5) wilful desertion for two years, (6) habitual drunkenness. These are recognized as just causes, either for absolute divorce or for divorce *a mensâ*. The following causes are also considered such impediments to a lawful marriage that upon their being made to appear, the courts will decree such marriages null and void, in some jurisdictions under a separate proceeding for nullity, and in others under the form of a proceeding for divorce. These causes are (1) impotence, (2) consanguinity and affinity properly lim-

ited, (3) existing marriage, (4) fraud, force, or coercion, (5) insanity unknown to the other party.

The growth of divorce in the United States under the general divorce laws has been unprecedented, and exceeds in number those of any other modern nation, excepting Japan. An analysis of the statistics prepared by Carroll D. Wright, Commissioner of Labor, in 1889, showed the total number of divorces for a period of twenty years, from 1867 to 1887, to be 328,716, an increase of 157 per cent, while the increase in population for the same period was 60 per cent. The Census Bulletin upon marriage and divorce in the United States, issued by the Department of Labor and Commerce under authority of an Act of Congress, in 1908, shows that the total number of divorces for the entire country from 1887 to 1906 inclusive was 945,625. For the earlier investigation covering the twenty years, from 1867 to 1886 inclusive, the number reported was 328,716, or hardly more than one-third of the number reported in the second twenty years.

At the beginning of the forty-year period covered by the two investigations, divorces occurred at the rate of 10,000 a year. At the end of that period the annual number was about 66,000. This increase, however, must be considered in connexion with the increase in population. An increase of 30 per cent in population between the years 1870 to 1880, was accompanied by an increase of 79 per cent in the number of divorces granted. In the next decade, 1880 to 1890, the population increased 25 per cent and divorces 70 per cent. In the following decade, 1890 to 1900, an increase of 21 per cent in population was accompanied by an increase of 66 per cent in the number of divorces. In the six years from 1900 to 1906, population, as estimated, increased 10.5 per cent and divorces 29.3 per cent. It thus appears at the end of the forty-year period that divorces were increasing about three times as fast as the population, while in the first decade, 1870 to 1880, they increased only about two and two-thirds as fast.

The divorce rate per 100,000 population increased from 29 in 1870 to 82 in 1905. In the former year there was one divorce for every 3441 persons and in the latter year one for every 1218. The rate per 100,000 married population was 81 in the year 1870 and 200 in the year 1900. This comparison indicates that divorce is at present two and one-half times as common, compared with married population, as it was forty years ago. Divorce rates appear to be much higher in the United States than in any of the foreign countries for which statistics relating to this subject have been obtained. Two-thirds of the total number of divorces granted in the twenty-year period covered by this investigation were granted to the wife. The most common single ground for divorce is desertion. This accounts for 38.9 per cent of all divorces (period 1887 to 1906), 49.4 per cent or almost one-half of those granted to the husband, and 33.5 per cent or one-third of those granted to the wife. The next most important ground of divorce is, for husbands, adultery, and for wives, cruelty. Of the divorces granted to husbands (1887 to 1906), 28.8 per cent were for adultery, and of those granted to wives 27.5 per cent were for cruelty. Only 10 per cent of the divorces granted to wives were for adultery of the husband, and 10.5 per cent of divorces granted to husbands were for cruelty on the part of the wife. Drunkenness was the ground for divorce in 5.3 per cent of the cases for which the wife brought suit, and in 1.1 per cent of the cases in which the suit was brought by the husband. Intemperance was reported as an indirect or contributory cause for divorce in 5 per cent of the divorces granted to the husband, and in 18 per cent of the divorces granted to the wife, and appeared as a direct or indirect cause in 19.5 per cent of all divorces, and 26.3 per cent of those granted to wives, and 6.1 per cent of those granted to husbands. Only 15 per cent of the divorces were returned as contested and probably in many of these cases the contesting was hardly more than a formality. Alimony was demanded in 18 per cent of the divorces granted to the wife and was granted in 12.7 per cent. The proportion of husbands who asked for alimony was 2.8 per cent and the proportion obtaining it was 2 per cent. The average duration of marriages terminated by divorce is about ten years. Sixty per cent or three-fifths last less than ten years and forty per cent last longer. Of the divorced couples known to have been married in the United States 88.5 per cent were married in the same state in which they were divorced. Of the divorced couples known to have been married in foreign countries 36.9 per cent were married in Canada, 12.7 per cent in England, 16.1 per cent in Germany and 1.9 per cent in Ireland. Children were reported in 39.8 per cent of the total number of divorced cases. The proportion is much larger for divorces granted to the wife than for divorces granted to the husband; children being present in 46.8 per cent of the former class of divorces and 26 per cent of the latter. A reason suggested for this is that the children are usually assigned by the court to the mothers, and to her, therefore, divorce does not imply separation from her children, while to the husband it involves a severance of the parental as well as the marital relation. In Canada during 1900 there were eleven divorces; in 1901 nineteen. In England there were 284 in 1902, as compared with 177 in 1901. In Germany at the same time there were about 10,000 annually, and in France 21,939, with a tendency towards a rapid increase. Among the Japanese there are about 100,000 divorces per annum. It is estimated that about fifty per cent of divorced couples have children, and it is urged "that consideration for the children of divorced people should be a first concern in stimulating restrictive legislation". It has been stated that three-quarters of the boys in two reformatories, one in Ohio and one in Illinois, come from families broken up by death or divorce, "mainly by divorce" (The Divorce Question in New Hampshire, Rev. W. Stanley Emery).

Divorce Congress of 1906.—A well concerted effort was made in 1906, upon the initiative of the State of Pennsylvania, to secure uniform legislation by the various states and territories of the Union so as to eliminate as far as possible fraudulent proceedings for divorce. It resulted in the meeting of a Divorce Congress in the City of Washington, where all of the states, excepting Nevada, Mississippi, and South Carolina, were represented, in addition to the District of Columbia and the territory of New Mexico. The outcome of this congress was the adoption of a form of statute designed to overcome flagrant evils arising from lack of uniformity, and also from inherent objections to various existing methods of procedure. A summary of these points will show how far the existing statutes were considered to need amendment. Having in mind the evils that have arisen from migratory divorce (that is, where the plaintiff has left his or her own state to obtain a residence for the purpose of divorce in another) the congress recommended that all suits for divorce should be brought and prosecuted only in the state where one of the parties has a bona fide residence; that when the courts are given cognizance of suits where the plaintiff was domiciled in a foreign jurisdiction at the time the cause of complaint arose, relief should not be granted unless the cause be included among those recognized in the foreign domicile, and the same rule should apply in the case of the defendant. At least two years residence should be required of one of the parties before jurisdiction should be assumed. The defendant should be given every opportunity to appear and make defence, and one accused as co-respondent should be permitted to defend in the same suit. Hearings and trials should always be before the court and not before a delegated representative of it, and in

all uncontested cases, and in any other case where in the judgment of the court it is wise, a disinterested attorney should be assigned to defend the cause. No decree should be granted on affirmative proof aside from the admission of the respondent. A decree dissolving marriage so as to permit remarriage of either party should not become operative until the lapse of a reasonable time after hearing or trial upon the merits of the case. If an inhabitant of one state should go into another state or territory to obtain a divorce for a cause which occurred in the matrimonial domicile, or for a cause which would not authorize a divorce by the laws of that domicile, such divorce should have no force or effect in the state of the domicile. Fraud or collusion in obtaining or attempting to obtain divorces should be made a statutory crime. The legitimacy of children born during coverture, except in the case of bigamous marriages, should not be affected by divorce of the parents. On the subject of causes each state should legislate for its own citizens and the common sentiment of that state should be properly expressed by the enumeration of causes in its own statute. Those heretofore given are recognized as representing the view of the great majority as covering offences against the marriage contract of so serious a character as to defeat the purpose of the marital relation. The congress expressed the hope that the number of causes for divorce would be reduced rather than increased and declared its opinion that in such jurisdictions as New York and the District of Columbia, where the only cause is adultery, no change is called for. It was recommended that where conviction of crime is made a cause, it must be followed by imprisonment for two years, but no absolute divorce should be granted for insanity, and that desertion should not be a cause unless persisted in for at least two years. Practically the same causes for divorce *a mensâ et toro* were enumerated. The provisions of this statute have already been adopted in Delaware and New Jersey and are under consideration (1908) in other states. While the reforms thus suggested will not put an end to what is known as the divorce evil, it is believed that they will have the effect of safeguarding trials and abating fraud upon the courts.

Philosophical thinkers recognize the fact that the prevalence of divorce in the United States arises from two causes. The first of these causes is the gradual change in the attitude of society towards women in the recognition of their individual rights to their own property, and of their capacity to earn their own living in many vocations heretofore closed to them. The legal fiction that the identity of the woman was merged in that of her husband has given place to a growing recognition of her individuality in all relations of life. This has weakened the dependence of women upon their husbands for support and has affected the concept of the family relation. The theory of the Protestant leaders of the sixteenth century, that marriage is but a civil contract, devoid of sacramental character, has been strengthened by the vicissitudes of modern life, while the facility with which divorces can be obtained has tended to a constant increase of their number. Marriage, not being accounted a sacrament by non-Catholic Christians, is entered into with greater ease than a contract of far less moment affecting property alone. The knowledge that in case of disagreement the parties may obtain a divorce no doubt has its effect. The second cause is the gradual increase and development of irreligion and materialism among non-Catholic members of the community. Leaders of the Protestant Churches in the United States have become alarmed at the progress of divorce, and have been endeavouring in their various denominations to adopt such regulations as would restrict it to flagrant cases or abolish it entirely. It is evident that the prevalence of divorce is an indication of an unsound condition of society. Those who now endeavour to reform the civil statutes in the interest of honest trials, may succeed in abating some of the evils flowing from lax methods of administering the divorce statutes in some of the states, and in obtaining restrictive legislation in all of them, but it is not probable that the demoralization will be stopped until the majority of the people of the civilized nations return to the belief in the supernatural sanction of marriage and "that it is a sacramental union, productive of the graces necessary to bear with one another's shortcomings; an indissoluble union as that of soul and body, which can be dissolved only in death. This means a return to the Catholic view of marriage, and this return alone can remove the national evil of divorce". (See MARRIAGE; WOMAN; PARENTS; also the articles on the various states and countries for divorce legislation.)

TEBB, *Essay on Adultery and Divorce*; BECKER, *Gallus and Charicles* (for Roman and Greek customs and conditions); KENT, *Commentaries on Am. Law;* BISHOP, *Marriage, Divorce and Separation;* HOWARD, *History of Matrimonial Institutions;* WALTON, *Scope and Interpretation of the Civil Code of Lower Canada;* GEMMILL in *Canadian Law Times* (March, 1888); Report of the U. S. Commissioner of Labor (Washington, 1889); *Am. and English Encycl. of Law; Proceedings of the Nat. Divorce Congress* (Washington, Philadelphia, 1906); OTTEN in *The Messenger* (April, 1904). For a full literature of the subject see *Marriage and Divorce Bibliography of the World* (Comparative Law Bureau of the American Bar Association, 1908).

WALTER GEORGE SMITH.

Dixon, JOSEPH, Archbishop of Armagh, Ireland, b. at Coalisland, Co. Tyrone, in 1806; d. at Armagh, 29 April, 1866. Having entered Maynooth College at the age of sixteen he was ordained priest in 1829. In 1834 he was appointed to the chair of Sacred Scripture and Hebrew, a post he worthily occupied for the next eighteen years. His class had an average of 200 students, amongst whom was John McEvilly, afterwards Archbishop of Tuam and a distinguished writer on Scriptural subjects. Dr. Dixon's professorship was signalized by his "Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures", a work highly praised by Cardinal Wiseman and which was very much needed at the time. The first edition appeared in 1852 and a second in 1875. As Primate of Armagh he held an important synod in 1854, at which all the bishops of the northern province assisted with their theologians. In the same year he began the heavy task of completing the unfinished cathedral of Armagh and almost accomplished the work before his death. In 1856 he formed the diocesan chapter consisting of thirteen members. During his incumbency he brought some religious congregations into the diocese, viz. the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul (1855), who opened a house in Drogheda; the Marist Fathers (1861) who opened a college and novitiate in Dundalk, and the Vincentian Fathers who were placed in charge of the ecclesiastical seminary the same year. The primate was a stanch and fearless defender of the rights of the Holy See and at a public meeting in Drogheda denounced Napoleon III for complicity in the acts of the Italian revolutionists. His speech and subsequent letter to the "Freeman's Journal" created a great sensation and the emperor made them a subject of complaint to Pius IX. The primate was the organizer of the Irish Brigade in the papal service.

CUSACK, *Life of Dr. Dixon;* STUART, *History of Armagh*, ed. COLEMAN (1900), 306 sqq.

AMBROSE COLEMAN.

Dlugosz (Lat. LONGINUS), JAN, an eminent medieval Polish historian, b. at Brzeznica, 1415; d. 19 May, 1480, at Cracow. He was one of the twelve sons born to John and Beata. He received his primary education in Nowy Korczyn, then entered the Academy of Cracow, where he studied literature and philosophy. He was ordained priest in 1440, and appointed secretary of Cardinal Zbigniew Oleśnicki, Bishop of Cracow. Later he became a prelate of the cathedral and preceptor for the children of the Polish King,

Casimir IV, Jagielończyk. He was employed as the ambassador of the Polish king to different foreign countries, and especially to Bohemia and Hungary, where he settled political disturbances. His ecclesiastical superiors sent him as their representative to Pope Eugenius IV, and as delegate to the Council of Basle. He declined the Archbishopric of Prague, but shortly before his death was appointed Archbishop of Lemberg. Dlugosz expended his great income for religious and philanthropic purposes; he founded both churches and monasteries, also burses for the maintenance of poor scholars.

The most beautiful church which he founded, and beneath which he was buried, is in Cracow, and is called Na Skalce (meaning, "Upon Rock", as the church was built on an enormous rock). As a Polish historian he outranks all who preceded him. He was not content to repeat the statements made by other chroniclers, but examined for himself the oldest Polish, Bohemian, Hungarian, Ruthenian, and German documents, to understand which thoroughly he studied, in his old age, several foreign languages. His works offer abundant and reliable material not only for Polish, but also for general, history.

Dlugosz paid less attention to beauty of style than to veracity of statement, and wrote in a philosophic manner, as one who saw the action and purposes of Providence in all historical events. His great history of Poland (Historia Polonica in twelve volumes) was composed by order of his friend and master Cardinal Oleśnicki. The works of Dlugosz were first published incompletely in 1614, and fully in 1711. The best edition is that in fourteen volumes by Carl Mecherzyński: "Joannis Dlugosz Senioris Canonici Cracoviensis Opera Omnia" (Cracow, 1863–87). It includes his heraldic work "Banderia Prutenorum", also his "Life of St. Stanislaus", "Life of St. Kinga", lives of many Polish bishops (Sees of Wroclaw, Poznań, Plock, Cracow, etc.), "Liber beneficiorum dicœcesis Cracoviensis", "Lites ac res gestæ inter Polonos ordinemque Cruciferorum", "Annales seu cronicæ incliti regni Poloniæ".

Caro, *J. Longinus* (Jena, 1863); Zeissberg, *Die polnische Geschichtschreibung des Mittelalters* (Leipzig, 1873); Brückner, *Dzieje Literatury Polskiej* (Warsaw, 1908), I.

John Godrycz.

Dobeneck. See Cochlæus.

Dobmayer, Marian, a distinguished Benedictine theologian, b. 24 Oct., 1753, at Schwandorf, Bavaria; d. 21 Dec., 1805, at Amberg, Bavaria. He first entered the Society of Jesus, and after its suppression in 1773 joined the Benedictines in the monastery of Weissenohe, Diocese of Bamberg, where he was professed in 1775, and in 1778 ordained priest. He was successively professor of philosophy at Neuburg, Bavaria (1781–87), of dogmatic theology and ecclesiastical history at Amberg (1787–94), and of dogmatic theology and patrology at the University of Ingolstadt (1794–99). On the reorganization of the latter school in 1799 he returned to his monastery of Weissenohe, where he remained until its secularization. He then retired to Amberg, where he taught theology until his death. In 1789 he published at Amberg a "Conspectus Theologiæ Dogmaticæ". His chief work is the "Systema Theologiæ Catholicæ", edited after his death by Th. P. Senestrey in eight volumes (Sulzbach, 1807–19). The work is very learned and devoid of all harshness in its controversial parts.

Lindner, *Die Schriftsteller . . . des Benedictiner-Ordens im heutigen Königreich Bayern* (Ratisbon, 1880), I; Hurter, *Nomenclator* (Innsbruck, 1895), III; Fischer in *Kirchenlex.*, s.v.

Francis J. Schaefer.

Dobrizhoffer, Martin, missionary, b. in Graz, Styria, 7 Sept., 1717; d. in Vienna, 17 July, 1791. He became a Jesuit in 1736, and twelve years later set out for the missions of South America, where he laboured among the Guaranis and the Abipones for eighteen years. On the expulsion of the Jesuits from the Spanish possessions in 1767, he returned to his native land. The Empress Maria Theresa frequently sent for Dobrizhoffer that she might hear his adventures from his own lips; and she is said to have taken great pleasure in his cheerful and animated conversation. He is the author of a work in three volumes entitled "Historia de Abiponibus, equestri bellicosâque Paraguainâ natione" etc. (Vienna, 1783–1784), a German translation of which, by Professor Keil of the University of Pesth, was published in Vienna the same year. This work is of great ethnological value. In the preface he says, "A seven years residence in the four colonies of the Abipones has afforded me opportunities of closely observing the manners, customs, superstitions, military discipline, slaughters inflicted and received, political and economical regulations, together with the vicissitudes of the colonies". He further declares that what he learned amongst the Paraguayans in the course of eighteen years, what he himself beheld in the colonies of the Indians and the Spaniards, in frequent and long journeys, through woods, mountains, plains and vast rivers, he sets forth, if not in an eloquent and brilliant narrative, certainly in a candid and an accurate one, which is at least deserving of credit. In the course of the work, Dobrizhoffer frequently takes occasion to refute and expose the erroneous statements of other writers respecting the Jesuits in Paraguay, and the malicious calumnies by which the ruin of their institutions in that country was unhappily effected. The English translation (An Account of the Abipones, an Equestrian People of Paraguay, London, 1822), commonly ascribed to Southey, is the work of Sara Coleridge, daughter of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, who judged it a performance "unsurpassed for pure mother-English by anything I have read for a long time". Dobrizhoffer in 1773 was appointed preacher to the Court in Vienna, a post which he held till his death.

Büsching, *Wöchentliche Nachrichten* (1775), 358; *Biog. Univers.* (Paris, 1852), XI; *Dict., of Nat. Biog.* (New York, 1908), IV, 773; *Memoirs and Letters of Sara Coleridge*, edited by her daughter (London, 1873); *Edinburgh Review*, CXXXIX, 23; Sommervogel, *Bibl. de la c. de J.* (Brussels, 1892), III, 108; Azara, *Voyage dans l'Amérique Méridionale* (Paris, 1809).

Edward P. Spillane.

Docetæ (Gr. Δοκηταί), a heretical sect dating back to Apostolic times. Their name is derived from δόκησις, "appearance" or "semblance", because they taught that Christ only "appeared" or "seemed" to be a man, to have been born, to have lived and suffered. Some denied the reality of Christ's human nature altogether, some only the reality of His human body or of His birth or death. The word *Docetæ*, which is best rendered by "Illusionists", first occurs in a letter of Serapion, Bishop of Antioch (190–203) to the Church at Rhossos, where troubles had arisen about the public reading of the apocryphal Gospel of Peter. Serapion at first unsuspectingly allowed, but soon after forbade, this, saying that he had borrowed a copy from the sect who used it, "whom we call Docetæ". He suspected a connexion with Marcionism and found in this Gospel "some additions to the right teaching of the Saviour". A fragment of this apocryphon was discovered in 1886 and contained three passages which savoured strongly of Illusionism. The name further occurs in Clement Alex. (d. 216), Strom., III, xiii, VII, xvii, where these sectaries are mentioned together with the Hæmatites as instances of heretics being named after their own special error. The heresy itself, however, is much older, as it is combated in the New Testament. Clement mentions a certain Julius Cassianus as ὁ τῆς δοκήσεως ἐξάρχων, "the founder of Illusionism". This name is known also to St. Jerome and Theodoret; and Cassianus is said to be a disciple of Valentinian, but nothing more is known of him. The idea of the unreality of Christ's human nature was held by the oldest Gnostic sects and

cannot therefore have originated with Cassianus. As Clement distinguished the Docetæ from other Gnostic sects, he probably knew some sectaries the sum-total of whose errors consisted in this illusion theory; but Docetism, as far as at present known, was always an accompaniment of Gnosticism or later of Manichæism. The Docetæ described by Hippolytus (Philos., VIII, i-iv, X, xii) are likewise a Gnostic sect; these perhaps extended their illusion theory to all material substances.

Docetism is not properly a Christian heresy at all, as it did not arise in the Church from the misunderstanding of a dogma by the faithful, but rather came from without. Gnostics starting from the principle of antagonism between matter and spirit, and making all salvation consist in becoming free from the bondage of matter and returning as pure spirit to the Supreme Spirit, could not possibly accept the sentence, "the Word was made Flesh", in a literal sense. In order to borrow from Christianity the doctrine of a Saviour who was Son of the Good God, they were forced to modify the doctrine of the Incarnation. Their embarrassment with this dogma caused many vacillations and inconsistencies; some holding the indwelling of an Aeon in a body which was indeed real but was not his own; others denying the actual objective existence of any body or humanity at all; others allowing a "psychic", but not a "hylic" or really material body; others believing in a real, yet not human but "sidereal" body; others again accepting the reality of the body but not the reality of the birth from a woman, or the reality of the passion and death on the cross. Christ only seemed to suffer, either because He ingeniously and miraculously substituted some one else to bear the pain, or because the whole occurrence on Calvary was a visual deception. Simon Magus first spoke of a "putative" passion of Christ and blasphemously asserted that it was really he, Simon himself, who underwent these apparent sufferings. "As the angels governed this world badly because each angel coveted the principality for himself, he [Simon] came to improve matters, and was transfigured and rendered like unto the Virtues and Powers and Angels, so that he appeared amongst men as man though he was no man and was believed to have suffered in Judæa though he had not suffered" (*passum in Judæâ putatum cum non esset passus*—Irenæus, Adv. Hær., I, xxiii sqq.). The mention of the demiurgic angels stamps this passage as a piece of Gnosticism. Soon after a Syrian Gnostic of Antioch, Saturninus or Saturnilus (about 125) made Christ the chief of the Aeons, but tried to show that the Saviour was unborn (*ἀγέννητον*) and without body (*ἀσώματον*) and without form (*ἀνείδεον*) and only apparently (*φαντασίᾳ*) seen as man (Irenæus, Adv. Hær., XXIV, ii).

Another Syrian Gnostic, Cerdo, who came to Rome under Pope Hyginus (137) and became the master of Marcion, taught that "Christ, the Son of the Highest God, appeared without birth from the Virgin, yea without any birth on earth as man". All this is natural enough; for matter not being the creation of the Highest God but of the Demiurge, Christ could have none of it. This is clearly brought out by Tertullian in his polemic against Marcion. According to this heresiarch (140) Christ, without passing through the womb of Mary and endowed with only a putative body, suddenly came from heaven to Capharnaum in the fifteenth year of Tiberius; and Tertullian remarks: "All these tricks about a putative corporeality Marcion has adopted lest the truth of Christ's birth should be argued from the reality of his human nature, and thus Christ should be vindicated as the work of the Creator [Demiurge] and be shown to have human flesh even as he had human birth" (Adv. Marc., III, xi). Tertullian further states that Marcion's chief disciple, Apelles, slightly modified his master's system, accepting indeed the truth of Christ's flesh, but strenuously denying the truth of His birth. He contended that Christ had an astral body made of superior substance, and he compared the Incarnation to the appearance of the angel to Abraham. This, Tertullian sarcastically remarks, is getting from the frying-pan into the fire, *de calcariâ in carbonariam*. Valentinus the Egyptian attempted to accommodate his system still more closely to Christian doctrine by admitting not merely the reality of the Saviour's body but even a seeming birth, saying that the Saviour's body passed through Mary as through a channel (*ὡς διὰ σωλῆνος*) though he took nothing from her, but had a body from above. This approximation to orthodoxy, however, was only apparent, for Valentinus distinguished between Christ and Jesus. Christ and the Holy Ghost were emanations from the Aeon Nous; and from all Aeons together proceeded Jesus the Saviour, who became united with the Messias of the Demiurge.

In the East, Marinus and the school of Bardesanes, though not Bardesanes himself, held similar views with regard to Christ's astral body and seeming birth. In the West, Ptolemy reduced Docetism to a minimum by saying that Christ was indeed a real man, but His substance was a compound of the pneumatic and the psychic (spiritual and ethereal). The pneumatic He received from Achamoth or Wisdom, the psychic from the Demiurge; His psychic nature enabled him to suffer and feel pain, though He possessed nothing *ὑλικόν*, i. e. nothing grossly material. (Irenæus, Adv. Hær., I, xii, II, iv). As the Docetæ objected to the reality of the birth, so from the first they particularly objected to the reality of the passion. Hence the clumsy attempts at substitution of another victim by Basilides and others. According to Basilides, Christ seemed to men to be a man and to have performed miracles. It was not, however, Christ who suffered but Simon of Cyrene, who was constrained to carry the cross and was mistakenly crucified in Christ's stead. Simon having received Jesus' form, Jesus assumed Simon's and thus stood by and laughed. Simon was crucified and Jesus returned to his father (Irenæus, Adv. Hær., I, xxiv). According to some apocrypha it was Judas, not Simon the Cyrenean, who was thus substituted. Hippolytus describes a Gnostic sect who took the name of Docetæ, though for what reason is not apparent, especially as their semblance theory was the least pronounced feature in their system. Their views were in close affinity to those of the Valentinians. The primal Being is, so to speak, the seed of a fig-tree, small in size but infinite in power; from it proceed three Aeons, tree, leaves, fruit, which, multiplied with the perfect number ten, become thirty. These thirty Aeons together fructify one of themselves, from whom proceeds the Virgin-Saviour, a perfect representation of the Highest God. The Saviour's task is to hinder further transference of souls from body to body, which is the work of the Great Archon, the Creator of the world. The Saviour enters the world unnoticed, unknown, obscure. An angel announced the glad tidings to Mary. He was born and did all the things that are written of him in the Gospels. But in baptism he received the figure and seal of another body besides that born of the Virgin. The object of this was that when the Archon condemned his own peculiar figment of flesh to the death of the cross, the soul of Jesus—that soul which had been nourished in the body born of the Virgin—might strip off that body and nail it to the accursed tree. In the pneumatic body received at baptism Jesus could triumph over the Archon, whose evil intent he had eluded.

This heresy, which destroyed the very meaning and purpose of the Incarnation, was combated even by the Apostles. Possibly St. Paul's statement that in Christ dwelt the fullness of the Godhead *corporaliter* (Col., i, 19, ii, 9) has some reference to Docetic errors. Beyond doubt St. John (I John, i, 1–3, iv, 1–3; II

John, 7) refers to this heresy; so at least it seemed to Dionysius of Alexandria (Eusebius, H. E., VII, xxv) and Tertullian (De carne Christi, xxiv). In sub-Apostolic times this sect was vigorously combated by St. Ignatius and Polycarp. The former made a warning against Docetists the burden of his letters; he speaks of them as "monsters in human shape" (*θηρίων ἀνθρωπομόρφων*) and bids the faithful not only not to receive them but even to avoid meeting them. Pathetically he exclaims: "If, as some godless men [*ἄθεοι*], I mean unbelievers, say, He has suffered only in outward appearance, they themselves are nought but outward show. Why am I in bonds? Why should I pray to fight with wild beasts? Then I die for nothing, then I would only be lying against the Lord" (Ad Trall., x; Eph., vii, xviii; Smyrn., i-vi). In St. Ignatius' day Docetism seems to have been closely connected with Judaism (cf. Magn., viii, 1, x, 3; Phil., vi, viii). Polycarp in his letter to the Philippians re-echoes I John, iv, 2–4, to the same purpose. St. Justin nowhere expressly combats Docetic errors, but he mentions several Gnostics who were notorious for their Docetic aberrations, as Basilideans and Valentinians, and in his "Dialogue with Trypho the Jew" he strongly emphasizes the birth of Christ from the Virgin. Tertullian wrote a treatise "On the flesh of Christ" and attacked Docetic errors in his "Adversus Marcionem". Hippolytus in his "Philosophoumena" refutes Docetism in the different Gnostic errors which he enumerates and twice gives the Docetic system as above referred to.

The earlier Docetism seemed destined to die with the death of Gnosticism, when it received a long lease of life as parasitic error to another great heresy, that of Manichæism. Manichæan Gnostics started with a twofold eternal principle, good (spirit) and evil (matter). In order to add Christian soteriology to Iranian dualism, they were forced, as the Gnostics were, to tamper with the truth of the Incarnation. Manichees distinguished between a *Jesus patibilis* and a *Jesus impatibilis* or Christ. The latter was the light as dwelling in, or symbolized by, or personified under, the name of the Sun; the former was the light as imprisoned in matter and darkness; of which light each human soul was a spark. *Jesus patibilis* was therefore but a figure of speech, an abstraction for the Good in the world; *Jesus impatibilis*, the unalloyed Good, the pure light above. In the reign of Tiberius Christ appears in Judea, Son of the Eternal Light and also Son of Man; but in the latter expression "man" is a technical Manichæan term for the *Λόγος* or World-Soul; both *ἄνθρωπος* and *πνεῦμα* are emanations of the Deity. Though Christ is son of man He has only a seeming body, and only seemingly suffers, His passion being called the mystical fiction of the cross. It is obvious that this doctrine borrowed from that of the Incarnation nothing but a few names. Scattered instances of Manichæan Docetism are found as far West as Spain among the Priscillianists of the fourth and the fifth century. The Paulicians in Armenia and the Selicians in Constantinople fostered these errors. The Paulicians existed even in the tenth century, denying the reality of Christ's birth and appealing to Luke, vii, 20. God, according to them, sent an angel to undergo the passion. Hence they worshipped not the cross but the Gospel, Christ's word. Among the Slavs the Bogomilæ renewed the ancient fancy that Jesus entered Mary's body by the right ear, and received from her but an apparent body. In the West a council of Orléans in 1022 condemned thirteen Catharist heretics for denying the reality of Christ's life and death. In modern theosophic and spiritist circles this early heresy is being renewed by ideas scarcely less fantastic than the wildest vagaries of old.

TIXERONT, *La Théologie anténicéenne* (Paris, 1905); MEAD, *Fragments of a Faith Forgotten* (London, 1906); HILGENFELD, *Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums* (Leipzig, 1884); SALMON in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. vv. *Docetæ* and *Docetism;* KÜNSTLE, *Antipriscilliana* (Freiburg im Br., 1905); DIPPEL, *Der neuere Spiritismus* (Munich, 1897).

J. P. ARENDZEN.

Docetism. See DOCETÆ.

Docimium, a titular see of Phrygia in Asia Minor. This city, as appears from its coins where the inhabitants are called Macedonians, must have been founded by Antigonos Dokimos. Its name is written Dokimeion, Dokimia Kome, Dokimaion, later Dokimion. It was famous for its marble-quarries, and is now identified with Istcha Kara Hissar, a village north-east of Afion Kara Hissar, in the vilayet of Brusa. On this site have been found many Christian inscriptions, later than Constantine. Docimium was a suffragan of Synnada in Phrygia Salutaris. Six or seven bishops are known, from 344 to 879 (Lequien, Or. Christ., I, 853); another bishop is mentioned in an inscription.

TEXIER, *Description de l'Asie Mineure*, I, 149; LEAKE, *Asia Minor*, 54; RAMSAY, *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, passim and 742; IDEM in *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* (Rome, 1882), II, 290; PERDRIZET in *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* (1900), XXIV, 291.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Doctor (Lat. *docere*, to teach), the title of an authorized teacher. In this general sense the term occurs in the O. T.; the "doctors" are mentioned with the "princes and ancients" (Deut., xxix, 10; xxxi, 28), and Azarias prophesies (II Paral., xv, 3) that "many days shall pass in Israel, without the true God, and without a priest a teacher, and without the law" (absque sacerdote doctore, et absque lege). It was the duty of these doctors to expound the law, and this they performed at the time of Christ, who was found in the Temple "in the midst of the doctors" (St. Luke, ii, 46). Another meeting of Our Lord with the "doctors of the law" is recorded in St. Luke, v, 17. The later Jewish teachers also received the title (*doctor gemaricus, doctor mischnicus*—see Talmud). Under the New Law the doctors are those who have received a special gift or *charisma* (see CHARISMATA) such as the "prophets and doctors" of the Church at Antioch (Acts, xiii, 1), and of whom St. Paul says that "God indeed hath set some in the church; first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly doctors (I Cor., xii, 28; Eph., iv, 11). St. Paul speaks of himself as a doctor of the Gentiles in faith and truth (I Tim., ii, 7), and *Doctor gentium* is one of the titles given him in the Liturgy. In the early Church, teachers in the catechetical schools were known as *doctores audientium* (Cyprian, Ep. xxix, ed. Hartel); and finally, in the course of time, some of the most illustrious theologians were designated as "Doctors of the Church" (q. v.).

The use of *Doctor* as an academic title dates from the founding of the medieval universities. Before these were regularly organized, any teacher who gathered about him a number of students was a doctor, *dominus*, or *magister*. During the first half of the twelfth century, the title *Doctor* acquired a more special significance, though it still implied personal excellence rather than official position. The "Four Doctors" who succeeded Irnerius at Bologna were the distinguished jurists, Martinus (d. before 1166), Bulgarus (d. 1166), Hugo (d. 1168), and Jacobus (d. 1178). But when the doctors formed a *collegium* they prescribed conditions on which other persons might become members of the teaching body, and thus laid the foundation of the system of academic degrees. The doctorate was first granted in civil law (*doctores legum*), later in canon law (*doctores decretorum*), and, during the thirteenth century, in medicine, grammar, logic, and philosophy. The doctorate in music was conferred at Oxford and Cambridge in the fifteenth century. For graduates in arts and theology, *magister* was more generally employed than *doctor*, but for a long time these titles were synonymous. The English universities, adopting the usage of Paris, at first designated teachers of law as doctors, and pro-

fessors of theology as masters; but in the course of time the former title was given to all the superior faculties, and the latter was reserved for grammar and arts. In Germany, *doctor* and *magister* were interchangeable (Kaufmann, "Geschichte" etc., II, 268 sqq.), and though the mastership is no longer conferred as a separate degree, a trace of the medieval practice is still found in the diploma which styles its recipient "Doctor of Philosophy and Master of Arts".

Bologna at first conferred only the doctorate, but Paris and the English universities very soon introduced the preparatory degrees of baccalaureate and licentiate. Later, it is true, the licentiate was granted in the Italian university also at the first examination (*privata*); but this merely implied permission to proceed to the second, more formal, examination (*publica*) in which the *licentia docendi* was given. At Paris, the licentiate meant a real authorization to teach, besides being a pre-requisite for admission to the final examination (*inceptio*) at which the doctorate was conferred. There was a corresponding difference in the length of the course for the degree. Bologna required six years of study for the doctorate in canon law, and seven or eight for the doctorate in civil law; the student might begin his course at the age of fourteen and become a doctor at twenty or twenty-one. At Paris the statutes drawn up in 1215 by the Cardinal Legate Robert de Courçon provided that no one should lecture in theology as a master unless he was thirty-five years of age, had studied for eight years, and taken a five-years' course in theology. According to Denifle (Universitäten, 100–102), the eight years meant three years in arts and five years in theology. (Cf. Rashdall, "Universities", I, 462 sqq.) At Oxford, candidates who had already taken the M.A. degree were required to study theology seven years more for the licentiate. In medicine, M.A. candidates had a six-years' course for the doctorate. For the subjects required in these courses see UNIVERSITY. (Cf. Rashdall, op. cit., II, 452 sq.)

In regard to examinations there seems to have been considerable leniency: at times they were reduced to mere formalities, at other times they were dispensed with. The degree was awarded by the chancellor on the advice of the regent masters of the faculty as to the candidate's fitness. The ceremony of inception was conducted by a regent; it consisted in the tradition of the book and ring, the imposition of the biretta, and the kiss of fellowship. At Paris, however, the degree in theology was conferred by the chancellor himself, who placed the biretta upon the candidate's head with the words, "Incipiatis in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. Amen." Then followed a disputation (*aulica*) in which the chancellor, the masters, and one of the bachelors took part. It was customary also to hold, on the evening before inception, an elaborate disputation known as *vesperiæ* (see, for details, "Chartularium", II, App., p. 693).

Among the various doctorates, that in theology ranked first. It was no uncommon thing for those who had received the degree in the other faculties to take additional courses for the S. T. D. In the German universities, for instance, licentiates in law or medicine might become bachelors in theology after five years of theological study; they would then be obliged to pursue the course prescribed for the other candidates. Conversely, theologians were sometimes permitted to follow courses in civil law and medicine. This privilege was granted to Bologna by Clement V (10 March, 1310) for a period of ten years but it applied only to ecclesiastical persons other than priests, religious, and bishops elect. It was renewed twice by John XXII (1317 and 1330); but when the university (1343–44) petitioned for an indefinite extension of the privilege, Clement VI refused. Innocent VI, however, renewed it (30 June, 1360) for ten years (Denifle, op. cit., 209).

The chief significance of the doctorate lay in the fact that it authorized the recipient to teach everywhere without undergoing further examination—*jus ubique docendi*. This prerogative developed gradually out of the *licentia docendi* which the degree itself implied, i. e. the right to teach in the university which conferred the doctorate. But as the older universities, Bologna, Paris, and Oxford, grew in importance and attracted students from all parts, the idea naturally spread that their graduates had the right to teach everywhere. Subsequently, this authorization was expressly granted to newly founded universities: by Gregory IX to Toulouse (1233), and by Alexander IV to Salamanca (1255). It was long, however, before the universities came to a mutual recognition of their degrees. Paris held tenaciously to its rights; Oxford was more liberal, but would not permit a Parisian doctor to teach merely on the strength of his degree. The doctors themselves were not always anxious to exercise their prerogative; the teaching devolved in large measure upon the bachelors, and the masters were classified as regents (those who taught) and as non-regents, who were content with the prestige implied by their degree or were eager for other occupations.

The essential meaning of the doctorate as fixed by the medieval universities is preserved in modern academic usage; the degree implies a qualification to teach. It has, however, undergone various modifications which are due partly to the development of the sciences and partly to changes in educational theory and practice. The degree, Doctor of Laws, is often conferred as an honorary title. The doctorate in theology, or divinity, has been retained by Catholic institutions as a degree to be given either after a course of study and an examination or as a distinction (*honoris causa*); while the tendency among non-Catholic universities is to confer it only as an honorary degree. Of late the doctorate in philosophy has attained great importance, and its value has been enhanced as the result of stricter requirements. For this and for the other doctorates, research is now generally considered the principal qualification, and in consequence the candidate's work is becoming more specialized.

The influence of the Holy See, in regard to the doctorate, especially in theology, has been exerted in various ways, e. g. by authorizing universities to confer the degree, by prescribing through papal legates the conditions for obtaining it, and by correcting abuses, notably laxity of requirements, which crept in from time to time. The historical details will be found in the article UNIVERSITY. Legislation concerning the ecclesiastical side of the subject may be summarized as follows:—

1. The power of creating doctors belongs to the pope; but he may, and often does, delegate it to universities, seminaries, and other institutions of learning. Charters granted by civil authority are valid; but to obtain canonical recognition, doctorates in theology and canon law must be conferred in virtue of pontifical authorization.

2. The candidate for the degree must be a baptized Christian and must subscribe to the profession of faith formulated by Pius IV. As a rule, only priests receive the doctorate in theology and canon law. It is not, however, necessary that the recipient should be in Sacred orders. Laymen as well as priests are allowed to appear as advocates before the Roman tribunals (Rota, Signatura) and they are required to have the doctorate at least in canon law (Const. "Sapienti consilio", 29 June, 1908).

3. The doctoral biretta, or four-cornered cap, may be worn on academic occasions, but not in choir (Cong. of Rites, "In Venusina", 1844, and reply to the Archbishop of Santiago de Chile, 6 Sept., 1895); the ring may be worn at all times except at Mass and other ecclesiastical functions (Cong. of Rites, 12 Feb., 1892).

4. The Council of Trent (Sess. XXII, c. ii, "de

Ref.") decreed that a bishop must be either doctor or licentiate in theology or in canon law; if a religious, he should have proper testimonials from his superiors. It enacted the same requirement for the archdeacon (Sess. XXIV, c. xii, "de Ref."). Regarding the vicar capitular and the *pœnitentiarius*, it prescribed that they should either have the degree or be otherwise well qualified. The Congregation of Studies recently decided (7 March, 1908) that the penitentiary and theologian of the cathedral chapter, if not already doctors, must receive the degree within a year. The Const. "Sapienti consilio" (29 June, 1908) prescribes the doctorate in theology and canon law for the officials of the Rota and Signatura. It has been a matter of controversy whether the vicar-general is obliged to be a doctor, and whether the Tridentine decree concerning the archdeacon is still in force. For the divergent opinions, see Card. Gennari, "Questioni Canoniche" (Rome, 1908), pp. 372, 292. The whole tenor of ecclesiastical legislation has been in favour of requirements which secure scientific qualifications in those who are appointed to official positions in the Church.

ERMAN-HORN, *Bibliographie d. deutschen Universitäten* (Leipzig, 1904), I, 252; DENIFLE, *Die Universitäten des Mittelalters* (Berlin, 1885); KAUFMANN, *Die Gesch. d. deutschen Universitäten* (Stuttgart, 1888); RASHDALL, *The Universities of Europe*, etc. (Oxford, 1895); LAURIE, *The Rise and Early Constitution of Universities* (New York, 1898); BATTANDIER, *Annuaire Pontifical* (Paris, 1906).

DOCTORS, SURNAMES OF FAMOUS. It was customary in the Middle Ages to designate the more celebrated among the doctors by certain epithets or surnames which were supposed to express their characteristic excellence or dignity. This was especially the case with the doctors in law and theology. The following list exhibits the principal surnames with the dates of death.

Doctors in Theology:—

Abstractionum—Francis Mayron, O.F.M., 1325 or 1327.

Acutissimus—Sixtus IV, 1484.

Acutus—Gabriel Vasquez, S.J., 1604.

Amœnus—Robert Conton, O.F.M., 1340.

Angelicus—St. Thomas Aquinas, O.P., 1274.

Arca testamenti—St. Anthony of Padua, 1231.

Authenticus—Gregory of Rimini, O.S.A., 1358.

Averroista et philosophiæ parens—Urbanus, O.S.M., 1403.

Beatus et fundatissimus—Ægidius of Colonna, O.S.A., 1316.

Bonus—Walter Brinkley, O.F.M., 1310.

Christianus—Nicholas of Cusa, 1464.

Clarus—Louis of Montesinos, 1621.

Clarus ac subtilis—Denis of Cîteaux, 15th cent.

Collectivus—Landolfo Caracciolo, O.F.M., 1351.

Columna doctorum—William of Champeaux, O.S.B., 1121.

Contradictionum—Johann Wessel, 1489.

Divinus, Ecstaticus—John Ruysbroeck, Can. Reg., 1381.

Doctor doctorum, Scholasticus—Anselm of Laon, 1117.

Dulcifluus—Antonius Andreas, O.F.M., 1320.

Ecstaticus—Denys the Carthusian, 1471.

Eminens—St. John of Matha, O. Trin., 1213.

Emporium theologiæ—Laurent Gervais, O.P., 1483.

Excellentissimus—Antonio Corsetti, 1503.

Eximius—Francisco Suarez, S.J., 1617.

Facundus—Petrus Aureoli, O.F.M., 1322.

Famosissimus—Petrus Alberti, O.S.B., 1426.

Famosus—Bertrand de la Tour, O.F.M., 1334.

Fertilis—Francis of Candia, O.F.M., 15th cent.

Flos mundi—Maurice O'Fiehely, O.F.M., Abp. of Tuam, 1513.

Fundamentalis—Joannes Faber of Bordeaux, 1350.

Fundatissimus—see *Beatus*.

Fundatus—William Ware, O.F.M., 1270.

Illibatus—Alexander Alamannicus, O.F.M., 15th cent.

Illuminatus—Francis Mayron, O.F.M., 1325–27; Raymond Lully, O.F.M., 1315.

Illuminatus et sublimis—Joannes Tauler, O.P., 1361.

Illustratus—Franciscus Picenus, O.F.M., 14th cent.

Illustris—Adam of Marisco, O.F.M., 1308.

Inclytus—William Mackelfield, O.P., 1300.

Ingeniosissimus—Andrew of Newcastle, O.F.M., 1300.

Inter Aristotelicos Aristotelicissimus—Haymo of Faversham, O.F.M., 1244.

Invincibilis—Petrus Thomas, O.F.M., 14th cent.

Irrefragibilis—Alexander of Hales, O.F.M., 1245.

Magister Sententiarum—Peter Lombard, 1164.

Magnus—Albertus Magnus, O.P., 1280; Gilbert of Cîteaux, O.Cist., 1280.

Marianus—St. Anselm of Canterbury, O.S.B., 1109.

Mellifluus—St. Bernard, O.Cist., 1153.

Mirabilis—Antonio Perez, S.J., 1649; Roger Bacon, O.F.M., 1294.

Moralis—Gerard Eudo, O.F.M., 1349.

Notabilis—Pierre de l'Ile, O.F.M., 14th cent.

Ordinatissimus—Johannes de Bassolis, O.F.M., c. 1347.

Ornatissimus et sufficiens—Petrus de Aquila, O.F.M., 1344.

Parisiensis—Guy de Perpignan, O.Carm., 1342.

Planus et utilis—Nicolas de Lyre, O.F.M., 1340.

Præclarus—Peter of Kaiserslautern, O.Præm., 1330.

Præstantissimus—Thomas Netter (of Walden), O.Carm., 1431.

Profundissimus—Paul of Venice, O.S.A., 1428; Gabriel Biel, Can. Reg., 1495; Juan Alfonso Curiel, O.S.B., 1609.

Profundus—Thomas Bradwardine, 1349.

Refulgidus—Alexander V, 1410.

Resolutissimus—Durandus of Saint-Pourçain, O.P., 1334.

Resolutus—John Bacon, O.Carm., 1346.

Scholasticus—Peter Abelard, 1142; Gilbert de la Porrée, 1154; Peter Lombard, 1164; Peter of Poitiers, 1205; Hugh of Newcastle, O.F.M., 1322.

Seraphicus—St. Bonaventure, O.F.M., 1274.

Singularis et invincibilis—William of Occam, O.F.M., 1347 or 1359.

Solemnis—Henry of Ghent, 1293.

Solidus, Copiosus—Richard of Middleton, O.F.M., 1300.

Speculativus—James of Viterbo, O.S.A., 1307.

Sublimis—Francis de Bachone, O.Carm., 1372; Jean Courte-Cuisse, 1425.

Subtilis—Duns Scotus, O.F.M., 1308.

Subtilissimus—Peter of Mantua, 14th cent.

Succinctus—Francis of Ascoli, c. 1344.

Universalis—Alanus of Lille, 1202; Gilbert, Bishop of London, 1134.

Venerabilis et Christianissimus—Jean Gerson, 1429.

Venerandus—Geoffroy de Fontibus, O.F.M., 1240.

Vitæ Arbor—Johannes Wallensis, O.F.M., 1300.

Doctors in Law:—

Aristotelis anima—Johannes Dondus, 1380.

Doctor a doctoribus—Antonius Franciscus, 1528.

Fons canonum—Johannes Andrea, 1348.

Fons juris utriusque—Henry of Susa (Ostia), 1267–81.

Lucerna juris—Baldus de Ubaldis, 1400.

Lucerna juris pontificii—Nicholas Tedeschi, O.S.B., 1445.

Lumen juris—Clement IV, 1268.

Lumen legum—Irnerius, 13th cent.

Memoriosissimus—Ludovicus Pontanus, 1439.
Monarcha juris—Bartholomew of Saliceto, 1412.
Os aureum—Bulgarus, 1166.
Pacificus (*Proficuus*)—Nicolas Bonet, O.F.M., 1360.
Pater Decretalium—Gregory IX, 1241.
Pater et organum veritatis—Innocent IV, 1254.
Pater juris—Innocent III, 1216.
Pater peritorum—Pierre de Belleperche, 1307.
Planus ac perspicuus—Walter Burleigh, 1337.
Princeps subtilitatum—Francesco d'Accolti, 1486.
Speculator—William Durandus, 1296.
Speculum juris—Bartholus of Sassoferrato, 1359.
Subtilis—Benedict Raymond, 1440; Filippo Corneo, 1462.
Verus—Thomas Doctius, Siena, 1441.

E. A. Pace.

Doctor Angelicus. See Thomas Aquinas, Saint.

Doctor of the Law. See Law; Scribe.

Doctors of the Church (Lat. *Doctores Ecclesiæ*).—Certain ecclesiastical writers have received this title on account of the great advantage the whole Church has derived from their doctrine. In the Western Church four eminent Fathers of the Church attained this honour in the early Middle Ages: St. Gregory the Great, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and St. Jerome. The "four Doctors" became a commonplace among the Scholastics, and a decree of Boniface VIII (1298) ordering their feasts to be kept as doubles in the whole Church is contained in his sixth book of Decretals (cap. "Gloriosus", de reliqu. et vener. sanctorum, in Sexto, III, 22). In the Eastern Church three Doctors were pre-eminent: Chrysostom, Basil, and Gregory Nazianzen. The feasts of these three saints were made obligatory throughout the Eastern Empire by Leo VI, the Wise, the deposer of Photius. A common feast was later instituted in their honour on 30 January, called "the feast of the three Hierarchs". In the Menæa for that day it is related that the three Doctors appeared in a dream to John, Bishop of Euchaitæ, and commanded him to institute a festival in their honour, in order to put a stop to the rivalries of their votaries and panegyrists. This was under Alexius Comnenus (1081–1118; see "Acta SS.", 14 June, under St. Basil, c. xxxviii). But sermons for the feast are attributed in MSS. to Cosmas Vestitor, who flourished in the tenth century. The three are as common in Eastern art as the four are in Western. Durandus (i, 3) remarks that Doctors should be represented with books in their hands. In the West analogy led to the veneration of four Eastern Doctors, St. Athanasius being very properly added to the three hierarchs.

To these great names others have subsequently been added. The requisite conditions are enumerated as three: *eminens doctrina, insignis vitæ sanctitas, Ecclesiæ declaratio* (i. e. eminent learning, a high degree of sanctity, and proclamation by the Church). Benedict XIV explains the third as a declaration by the supreme pontiff or by a general council. But though general councils have acclaimed the writings of certain Doctors, no council has actually conferred the title of Doctor of the Church. In practice the procedure consists in extending to the Universal Church the use of the Office and Mass of a saint in which the title of Doctor is applied to him. The decree is issued by the Congregation of Sacred Rites and approved by the pope, after a careful examination, if necessary, of the saint's writings. It is not in any way an ex cathedra decision, nor does it even amount to a declaration that no error is to be found in the teaching of the Doctor. It is, indeed, well known that the very greatest of them are not wholly immune from error. No martyr has ever been included in the list, since the Office and the Mass are for Confessors. Hence, as Benedict XIV points out, St. Ignatius, St. Irenæus, and St. Cyprian are not called Doctors of the Church.

The proper Mass of Doctors has the Introit "In medio", borrowed from that of the *Theologus* par excellence, St. John the Evangelist, together with special prayers and Gospel. The Credo is said. The principal peculiarity of the Office is the antiphon to the Magnificat at both Vespers, "O Doctor optime", and it is rather by this antiphon than by the special Mass that a saint is perceived to be a Doctor (S. R. C., 7 Sept., 1754). In fact, St. John Damascene has a Mass of his own, while Athanasius, Basil, Leo, and Cyril of Jerusalem have not the Gospel of Doctors, and several have not the collect. The feasts of the four Latin Doctors were not added to until the sixteenth century, when St. Thomas Aquinas was declared a Doctor by the Dominican St. Pius V in his new edition of the Breviary (1568), in which the feasts of the four Greek Doctors were also raised to the rank of doubles. The Franciscan Sixtus V (1588) added St. Bonaventure. St. Anselm was added by Clement XI (1720), St. Isidore by Innocent XIII (1722), St. Peter Chrysologus by Benedict XIII (1729), St. Leo I (a well-deserved but belated honour) by Benedict XIV (1754), St. Peter Damian by Leo XII (1828), St. Bernard by Pius VIII (1830). Pius IX gave (1851) the honour to St. Hilary and to two more modern saints, Alphonsus Liguori (1871) and Francis de Sales (1877). Leo XIII promoted (1883) the Easterns, Cyril of Alexandria, Cyril of Jerusalem, and John Damascene, and last of all the Venerable Bede (1899). The same pope, when, in 1882, he introduced the simplification of double feasts, made an exception for Doctors, whose feasts are always to be transferred.

There are therefore now twenty-three Doctors of the Church, of whom seven are Eastern, sixteen Western. Two are popes, two are cardinals, all but five are bishops. They include a Dominican, a Franciscan, a Redemptorist, and five Benedictines. For some of these the Office had previously been granted to certain places or orders—St. Peter Damian to the Camaldolese, St. Isidore to Spain, St. Bede to England and to all Benedictines. St. Leander of Seville and St. Fulgentius are kept as Doctors in Spain, and the former by Benedictines also, as he was in earlier times claimed as a monk. St. Ildephonsus has the Introit "In medio" in the same order (for the same reason) and in Spain, without the rank of Doctor.

Pohle in *Kirchliches Handlexikon* (Munich, 1907), II, 384; Fessler-Jungmann, *Instit. Patrologiæ* (Innsbruck, 1890); Bardenhewer, *Patrology*, tr. Shahan (Freiburg im Br., St. Louis, 1908), 2–3. On the early Latin Doctors see Weyman in *Hist. Jahrbuch* (1894), XV, 96, and in *Rev. d'hist. et de litt. religieuses* (1898), III, 562; for the Greek Doctors see Nilles in *Zeitschrift f. kath. Theologie* (1894), XVIII, 742. See also Bouvy, *Les Pères de l'Eglise* in *Rev. Augustinienne* (1904), 461–86, and Pesch, *Prælect. Dogmat.* (Freiburg, 1903), 346 sqq.

John Chapman.

Doctrinarians. See Bus, César de, Venerable.

Doctrine, Christian.—Taken in the sense of "the act of teaching" and "the knowledge imparted by teaching", this term is synonymous with Catechesis and Catechism. Διδασκαλία, διδαχή, in the Vulgate, *doctrina*, are often used in the N. T., especially in the Pastoral Epistles. As we might expect, the Apostle insists upon "doctrine" as one of the most important duties of a bishop (I Tim., iv, 13, 16; v, 17; II Tim., iv, 2, etc.).

The word κατήχησις means instruction by word of mouth, especially by questioning and answering. Though it may apply to any subject-matter, it is commonly used for instruction in the elements of religion, especially preparation for initiation into Christianity. The word and others of the same origin occur in St. Luke's Gospel: "That thou mayest know the verity of those things in which thou hast been instructed" (κατηχήθης, *in quibus eruditus es*—i, 4). In the Acts, xviii, 25, Apollo is described as "instructed [κατηχημένος, *edoctus*] in the way of the Lord". St. Paul uses the word twice: "I had rather speak five words with

my understanding, that I may instruct [κατηχήσω, *instruam*] others also" (I Cor., xiv, 19); and "Let him that is instructed [ὁ κατηχούμενος, *is qui catechizatur*] in the word, communicate to him that instructeth [τῷ κατηχοῦντι, *ei qui catechizat*] him, in all good things" (Gal., vi, 6). Hence the word, with its technical meaning of oral religious instruction, passed into ecclesiastical use, and is applied both to the act of instructing and the subject-matter of the instruction. The word *catechism* was also formerly used for the act of instructing ("To say ay, and no, to these particulars, is more than to answer in a catechism"—As You Like It, act iii, sc. 2), as *catéchisme* is still used in French; but it is now more properly applied to the little printed book in which the questions and answers are contained. The subject will be treated in this article under the three heads: I. History of Catechetics; II. Practical Catechetics; III. Modern Catechisms.

I. History of Catechetics.—(1) Oral instruction by means of questions and answers has occupied a prominent place in the scholastic methods of the moral and religious teachers of all countries and of all ages. The Socratic dialogues will occur to every one as brilliant examples. But many centuries before Socrates' day this method was practised among the Hebrews (Exod., xii, 26; Deut., vi, 7, 20, etc.). They had three forms of catechizing: domestic, conducted by the head of the family for the benefit of his children and servants; scholastic, by teachers in schools; and ecclesiastical, by priests and Levites in the Temple and the synagogues. Proselytes were carefully instructed before being admitted to become members of the Jewish faith. The regular instruction of children began when they were twelve years old. Thus we read of Christ "in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors [διδασκάλων], hearing them, and asking them questions. And all that heard him were astonished at his wisdom and his answers" (Luke, ii, 46, 47). During His public life He frequently made use of the catechetical method to impart instruction: "What think ye of Christ? Whose son is he?" "Whom do men say that the son of man is? . . . Whom do you say that I am?" etc. In His final charge to His Apostles He said: "*Teach* ye [μαθητεύσατε, "make disciples, or scholars"] all nations; . . . . Teaching [διδάσκοντες, "instructing"] them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matt., xxviii, 19). And after this instruction they were to initiate them into the Church, "baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (ibid.).

(2) In obedience to Christ's command, St. Peter, "standing up with the eleven", declared to the Jews on Pentecost day, and proved to them from the Scriptures that Jesus, whom they had crucified, was "Lord and Christ". When they had been convinced of this truth, and had compunction in their heart for their crime, they asked, "What shall we do?" And Peter answered, "Do penance, and be baptized . . . . in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins." "And with very many other words did he testify and exhort them" (Acts, ii). We have here an abridgment of the first catechetical instruction given by the Apostles. It is both doctrinal and moral—the hearers are to believe and to repent. This twofold element is also contained in St. Peter's second discourse after healing the lame man in the Temple (Acts, iii). St. Stephen goes further, and brings out that belief in Jesus as the Christ (Messias) meant the ending of the Old Covenant and the coming in of a New (Acts, vi, vii). St. Philip the Deacon preached "of the kingdom of God, in the name of Jesus Christ"; and the Samaritans "were baptized, both men and women" (Acts, viii). Furthermore, St. Peter and St. John came from Jerusalem and "prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost"; and doubtless declared to them the doctrine of that Holy Spirit (ibid.). The same deacon's discourse to the eunuch deals with the proof from Scripture, and notably Isaias (liii, 7), that "Jesus Christ is the Son of God", and the necessity of baptism. No mention is made of penance or repentance, as the eunuch was a just man anxious to do God's will. So, too, Cornelius, "a religious man, and fearing God with all his house, giving much alms to the people, and always praying to God", did not need much moral instruction; accordingly St. Peter speaks to him of Jesus Christ who "is lord of all . . . Jesus of Nazareth: how God anointed him with the Holy Ghost, and with power, who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed by the devil, for God was with him. And we are witnesses of all things that he did in the land of the Jews and in Jerusalem, whom they killed, hanging him upon a tree. Him God raised up the third day, and gave him to be made manifest . . even to us who did eat and drink with him after he arose again from the dead; and he commanded us to preach to the people, and to testify that it is he who was appointed by God, to be judge of the living and of the dead. To him all the prophets give testimony, that by his name all receive remission of sins, who believe in him" (Acts, x). In this discourse we have the chief articles of the Creed: the Trinity (God, Jesus Christ "Lord of all things", the Holy Ghost), the Crucifixion, Death, and Resurrection of Our Lord; His coming to judge the living and the dead, and the remission of sins. These are also the subjects of St. Paul's discourses, though, of course, in addressing the pagans, whether peasants at Lystra or philosophers at Athens, he deals with the fundamental truths of the existence and attributes of God (Acts, xiii, xiv, xvii). As he himself summed up the matter, he taught "publicly, and from house to house, testifying both to Jews and Gentiles penance towards God, and faith in [εἰς] our Lord Jesus Christ" (Acts, xx). We find also that though Apollo was "instructed [κατηχημένος] in the way of the Lord", Priscilla and Aquila "expounded to him the way of the Lord more diligently" (ἀκριβέστερον—Acts, xviii.—See Apostles' Creed).

(3) The materials for describing the catechetical teaching of the ages immediately succeeding the Apostles are scanty. The books of the New Testament were available, and all that would be needed would be to supplement these. Thus, in the Didache we find little but moral instruction; but it is clear that those to whom it is addressed must have already received some knowledge of what they were to believe. Later on we find more explicit dogmatic teaching, for instance, in St. Justin's Apologies and in the writings of Clement of Alexandria. Still, even this is not much more advanced than what we have seen above as taught by St. Peter, except that Justin dwells on the Creation and proves the Divinity of Christ, the Logos and only-begotten Son of the Father.

(4) In the ages of persecution it became necessary to exercise great caution in admitting persons to membership in the Church. The danger of falling away, or even of betrayal, must be guarded against by a careful doctrinal and moral training. Hence the institution of the catechumenate and the Discipline of the Secret. The work of the Apologists had been to remove prejudices against Christianity, and to set forth its doctrines and practices in such a way as to appeal to the fair-minded pagan. If anyone was moved to embrace the true religion, he was not at once admitted, as in the days of the Apostles. At first he was treated as an inquirer, and only the fundamental doctrines were communicated to him. As soon as he had given proof of his knowledge and fitness he was admitted to the catechumenate proper, and was further instructed. After some years spent in this stage he was promoted to the ranks of the *Competentes*, i. e. those ready for baptism. As might be expected, he was now instructed more especially in the rites for this purpose. Even when he had been

initiated, his instruction was not yet at an end. During the week after Easter, while the grace of first fervour was still upon him, the various rites and mysteries in which he had just participated were more fully explained to him.

In considering the catechetical writings of the Fathers we must bear in mind the distinction of these different grades. When addressing a mere inquirer they would naturally be more guarded and less explicit than if they had to do with one who had passed through the catechumenate. Sometimes, indeed, the language was so chosen that it conveyed only half the truth to the catechumen, while the initiated could understand the whole. The distinction between the elementary and advanced instruction is noted by St. Paul: "As unto little ones in Christ. I gave you milk to drink, not meat; for you were not able as yet" (I Cor., iii, 2). For our present purpose it will be best to take as typical examples of catechesis in the patristic times the works of St. Cyril of Jerusalem (315–386) and St. Augustine (354–430), merely noting by the way the work done by St. Ambrose (the instructor of St. Augustine) and St. Gregory of Nyssa ("The Catechetical Oration", ed. J. H. Strawley, 1903). We have from St. Cyril twenty-four catechetical discourses, forming together a complete course of moral and doctrinal instruction. In the first of these, called the "Procatechesis", he sets forth the greatness and efficacy of the grace of initiation into the Church. The "Catecheses" proper (numbered i to xviii) are divided into two groups: i-v, repeating the leading ideas of the "Procatechesis", and treating of sin and repentance, baptism, the principal doctrines of the Christian religion, and the nature and origin of faith; vi-xviii, setting forth, article by article, the baptismal Creed of the Church of Jerusalem. The "Procatechesis" and the eighteen discourses were intended for the *competentes* during Lent, in immediate preparation for reception into the Church. The remaining discourses (xix-xxiv), called the "Catecheses Mystagogicæ", were delivered during Easter week to those who had been baptized at Easter; and these, though much shorter than the others, treat clearly and openly of baptism, confirmation, and the Holy Eucharist, the veil of secrecy being now removed. This is not the place to point out how completely in accord with Catholic teaching are the doctrines of St. Cyril (see CYRIL OF JERUSALEM; TRANSUBSTANTIATION), and what valuable information he gives of the details of the Liturgy in his day. In studying these "Catecheses" we should bear in mind that they were intended for grown-up persons; hence they are not couched in the simple language which we have to use in our instructions to children. They resemble, rather, the instruction given to converts, for which purpose they are still of great use. The same remark applies to all the catechetical writings of the Fathers.

St. Augustine's treatise "De Catechizandis Rudibus" deals with both the theory and the practice of catechizing. It is divided into twenty-seven chapters: i-xiv theory, xv-xxvii practice. This short work, written about the year 400, shows that the great Doctor did not disdain to devote most careful attention to the work of instructing those who wished to learn the rudiments of the Faith. It could be written only by one who had much experience of the difficulties and tediousness of the task, and who had also pondered deeply on the best method of dealing with the different classes of converts. The deacon Deogratias, who had consulted Augustine on the subject, complained (as so many of us still do) of the weariness of going over the same old ground, and of his inability to put any fresh life into his instructions. St. Augustine begins by words of encouragement, pointing out that we must judge of our discourses not by their effect upon ourselves, but by their effect upon our hearers. The story may be familiar enough to us, who go on repeating it over and over again, but it is not so to those who are listening to it for the first time. Bearing this in mind, the catechist should put himself in the position of the hearer, and speak as though he were telling something new. *Hilaritas*, a bright and cheerful manner, must be one of the chief qualifications of an instructor; "God loveth a cheerful giver" applies to the giving of the word as well as to the giving of wealth. He should so speak that the hearer hearing should believe, believing should hope, and hoping should love (Quidquid narras ita narra, ut ille cui loqueris audiendo credat, credendo speret, sperando amet—iv, 11). But the foundation of all is the fear of God, "for it seldom, or rather never, happens that anyone wishes to become a Christian without being moved thereto by some fear of God". If he comes from some worldly motive he may be only pretending, though indeed a mere pretender may sometimes be turned into a genuine convert by our efforts. Hence, continues the holy Doctor, it is of great importance to ascertain the state of mind and the motives of those who come to us. If we are satisfied that they have received a Divine call, we have a good opening for instruction on the care of God for us. We should go briefly through the story of God's dealings with men, from the time when He made all things even to our own days; showing especially that the Old Testament was a preparation for the New, and the New a fulfilment of the Old (in veteri testamento est occultatio novi, in novo testamento est manifestatio veteris). This is a theme developed at greater length in the "De Civitate Dei". After we have finished our story we should go on to excite hope in the resurrection of the body—a doctrine as much ridiculed in St. Augustine's day as it was in St. Paul's day, and as it is in ours. Then should come the account to be rendered at the last judgment, and the reward of the just, and the punishment of the wicked. The convert should be put on his guard against the dangers and difficulties in trying to lead a good life, especially those arising from scandals within as well as without the Church. Finally, he should be reminded that the grace of his conversion is not due either to his merits or to ours, but to the goodness of God. So far the saint has been speaking of persons of little or no education. In chap. viii he goes on to deal with those who are well educated, and are already acquainted with the Scriptures and other Christian writings. Such persons require briefer instruction, and this should be imparted in such a way as to let them see that we are aware of their knowledge of the Faith. Doubtless St. Augustine had in mind his own case, when he presented himself to be received into the Church by St. Ambrose. We note, too, the wisdom of this piece of advice, especially when we have to deal with Anglican converts. But though less instruction is needed in such cases, continues the holy Doctor, we may rightly inquire into the causes which have induced these persons to wish to become Christians; and in particular as to the books which have influenced them. If these are the Scriptures or other Catholic books we should praise and recommend them; but if these are heretical we should point out wherein they have distorted the true faith. Throughout our instruction we should speak with modesty, but also with authority, that he who hears us may have no scope for presumption but rather for humility. Humility is also the principal virtue to be urged upon that intermediate class of converts who have received some education but not of the higher sort. These are disposed to scoff at Christian writings, and even at the Scriptures for their want of correctness of language. They should be made to see that it is the matter rather than the language which is of importance; it is more profitable to listen to a true discourse than to one which is eloquent. The whole of this chapter should be taken to heart by many who join the Church nowadays. After dealing

with these different classes of inquirers, the saint devotes no less than five lengthy chapters (x to xiv) to the causes of weariness (the opposite of *hilaritas*) and the remedies for it. This portion is perhaps the most valuable of the whole treatise, at least from a practical point of view. Only the merest outline of St. Augustine's advice as to the remedies can be given here. We must bring ourselves down to the level of the lowest of our hearers, even as Christ humbled Himself and took upon Himself "the form of a servant". We must vary the subjects, and we must increase in earnestness of manner so as to move even the most sluggish. If it seems to us that the fault is ours, we should reflect, as already pointed out, that the instruction, though not up to our ideal, may be exactly suited to our hearer and entirely fresh and new to him; in any case the experience may be useful as a trial to our humility. Other occupations may be pleasanter, but we cannot say that they are certainly more profitable; for duty should come first, and we should submit to God's will and not try to make Him submit to ours. After laying down these precepts, St. Augustine goes on to give a short catechetical instruction as an example of what he has been inculcating. It is supposed to be addressed to an ordinary type of inquirer, neither grossly ignorant nor highly educated (xvi to xxv), and might well be used at the present day. What specially strikes one in reading it is the admirable way in which the saint brings out the prophetical and typical character of the Old-Testament narrative, and insinuates gradually all the articles of the Creed without seeming to reveal them. The sketch of Christ's life and passion, and the doctrine of the Church and the sacraments are also noteworthy. The discourse ends with an earnest exhortation to perseverance. This short work has exercised the greatest influence on catechetics. In all ages of the Church it has been adopted as a textbook.

(5) When all fear of persecution had passed away, and the empire had become almost entirely Christian, the necessity for a prolonged period of trial and instruction no longer existed. About the same time the fuller teaching on the subject of original sin, occasioned by the Pelagian heresy, gradually led to the administration of baptism to infants. In such cases instruction was, of course, impossible, though traces of it are still to be seen in the rite of infant baptism, where the godparents are put through a sort of *catechesis* in the name of the child. As the child grew, it was taught its religion both at home and at the services in church. This instruction was necessarily more simple than that formerly given to grown-up catechumens, and gradually came to be what we now understand by catechetical instruction. Meantime, however, the barbarian invaders were being brought into the Church, and in their case the instruction had to be of an elementary character. The missionaries had to go back to the methods of the Apostles and content themselves with exacting a renunciation of idolatry and a profession of belief in the great truths of Christianity. Such was the practice of St. Patrick in Ireland, St. Remigius among the Franks, St. Augustine in England, St. Boniface in Germany. We should bear in mind that in those ages religious instruction did not cease with baptism. Set sermons were rarer than in our time; the priest spoke rather as a catechist than as a preacher. We may take the practice among the Anglo-Saxons as typical of what was done in other countries. "Among the duties incumbent on the parish priest the first was to instruct his flock in the doctrines and duties of Christianity, and to extirpate from among them the lurking remains of paganism. . . . He was ordered to explain to his parishioners the ten commandments; to take care that all could repeat and understand the Lord's Prayer and the Creed; to expound in English on Sundays the portion of Scripture proper to the Mass of the day, and to preach, or, if he were unable to preach, to read at least from a book some lesson of instruction" (Lingard, "Anglo-Saxon Church", c. iv). The laws enacting these duties will be found in Thorpe, "Ecclesiastical Institutes", i, 378; ii, 33, 34, 84, 191.

(6) It is the custom with non-Catholic writers to assert that during the Middle Ages, "the Ages of Faith", religious instruction was entirely neglected, and that the Protestant Reformers were the first to restore the practice of the Early Church. In the "Dict. de théol. cath.", s. v. "Catéchisme", and in Bareille, "Le Catéchisme Romain", Introd., pp. 36 sqq., will be found long lists of authorities showing how false are these assertions. We must here content ourselves with stating what was done in England. Abbot Gasquet has thoroughly gone into the subject, and declares that "in pre-Reformation days the people were well instructed in their faith by priests who faithfully discharged their plain duty in their regard" (Old English Bible and other Essays, p. 186). In proof of this he quotes the constitutions of John Peckham, Archbishop of Canterbury (1281), in which it is enjoined that every priest shall explain to his people in English, and without any elaborate subtleties (*vulgariter absque cujuslibet subtilitatis texturâ fantasticâ*), four times a year, the Creed, the Ten Commandments, the two precepts of the Gospel (viz. love of God and man), the seven deadly sins, the seven chief virtues (theological and cardinal), and the seven sacraments. In these constitutions is contained a brief instruction on all these heads, "lest anyone should excuse himself on the ground of ignorance of these things which all the ministers of the Church are bound to know". This legislation, after all, was nothing but an insisting on a practice dating from Saxon days, as we have already seen. Moreover, it is constantly referred to in subsequent synods and in countless catechetical writings. One of Peckham's predecessors, St. Edmund Rich (1234–1240), was not only a man of great learning, but also a zealous teacher of Christian doctrine among the people. He wrote familiar instructions on prayer, the seven deadly sins, the Commandments, and the sacraments. Cardinal Thoresby, Archbishop of York, published in 1357 a catechism in Latin and English, the "Lay Folks Catechism", for the purpose of carrying out Peckham's Constitutions, and it is based on Peckham's instruction. The two, with the English translation in rude verse, have been reprinted by the Early English Text Society, No. 118. In the episcopal Registers and Visitations we read how the people were asked whether their pastor fulfilled his duties, and they constantly answer that they are taught *bene et optime*. Chaucer's Poor Parson may be taken as a type:—

> But riche he was of holy thought and work.
> He was also a lerned man, a clerk,
> That Christes Gospel trewly wolde preche,
> His parischens devoutly wolde he teche.

His tale is practically a treatise on the Sacrament of Penance. As regards catechetical manuals we need only mention the "Pars Oculi Sacerdotis" (about the middle of the fourteenth century) which was very popular; "Pupilla Oculi", by John de Burgo (1385); "Speculum Christiani", by John Wotton, containing simple English rhymes as well as the Latin text. "One of the earliest books ever issued from an English press by Caxton . . . . . was a set of four lengthy discourses, published, as they expressly declare, to enable priests to fulfil the obligation imposed on them by the Constitutions of Peckham" (Gasquet, op. cit., p. 191). The part which pictures, statues, reliefs, pageants, and especially miracle plays took in the religious instruction of the people must not be forgotten. All of these give proof of an extensive knowledge of sacred history and an astonishing skill in conveying doctrinal and moral lessons. It is enough to refer to Ruskin's "Bible of Amiens", and to the Townley, Chester, and Coventry miracle plays. (Cf. Bareille, op. cit., pp. 42 sqq.)

(7) The invention of printing and the revival of learning naturally had great influence on catechetical instruction. The first great name to be mentioned, though indeed it belongs to a slightly earlier period, is that of John Gerson (1363–1429). He realized that the much-needed reform of the Church should begin by the instruction of the young; and though he was chancellor of the University of Paris he devoted himself to this work. He composed a sort of little catechism entitled "The A B C of Simple Folk". To enable the clergy to catechize he also composed the "Opus Tripartitum de Præceptis Decalogi, de Confessione, et de Arte bene Moriendi", in which he briefly explained the Creed, the Commandments of God, the sins to be mentioned in confession, and the art of dying well. This was printed many times and was translated into French. It was the forerunner of the Catechism of the Council of Trent. In the year 1470, before Luther was born, a German catechism, "Christenspiegel" (the Christian's Mirror), written by Dederich, was printed, and at once became very popular. Two other catechisms, "The Soul's Guide" and "The Consolation of the Soul", were printed a little later and issued in many editions. In Janssen's great "History of the German People at the Close of the Middle Ages" will be found a complete refutation of the popular notion that the Protestant Reformers, and especially Luther, were the first to revive catechetical instruction and to print catechisms. It is, however, proper to acknowledge their activity in this matter, and to note that this activity stirred up the zeal of the Catholics to counteract their influence. Luther's famous "Enchiridion", which was really the third edition of his smaller catechism, was published in 1529, and speedily ran through a number of editions; it is still used in Germany and in other Protestant countries. In 1536 Calvin composed a catechism in French: "Le formulaire d'instruire les enfans en la chrestienté, fait en manière de dialogue où le ministre interroge et l'enfant répond". He candidly admits that it was always the custom in the Church to instruct children in this way. Of course he takes care to introduce the chief points of his heresy: the certainty of salvation, the impossibility of losing justice (righteousness), and the justification of children independently of baptism. It is noteworthy that as regards the Eucharist he teaches that we receive not merely a sign, but Jesus Christ Himself, "really and effectually by a true and substantial union". In England the first Book of Common Prayer (1549) contained a catechism with a brief explanation of the Commandments and the Lord's Prayer. The explanation of the sacraments was not added until the year 1604. If this catechism be compared with that of Cardinal Thoresby, mentioned above, it will be seen that the instruction given to Protestant children in the middle of the sixteenth century was far inferior to that given in pre-Reformation days. In 1647 the Westminster Assembly of Divines drew up the Presbyterian "Larger" and "Smaller" Catechisms.

On the Catholic side Bl. Peter Canisius published three catechisms, or rather one catechism in three forms: major (1555), minor (1558), and minimus (1556). Taking as his foundation Ecclus., i, 33, he divides his treatment into two great parts: wisdom and justice. In the first he deals with Faith (the Creed), Hope (the Lord's Prayer and the Hail Mary), Charity (the Commandments). In the second he deals with avoiding evil (sin and the remission of sin) and doing good (prayer, fasting and almsdeeds, the cardinal virtues, the gifts and fruits of the Holy Ghost, the beatitudes, the evangelical counsels, and the Four Last Things). To obtain and to preserve both wisdom and justice the sacraments are necessary, and hence he places the treatment of the sacraments between the two parts. After the Council of Trent (1563) Canisius added a chapter on the Fall and Justification. The form of the three books is that of questions and answers, some of the latter being as long as four or five pages. In striking contrast to the Protestant catechisms, the tone throughout is calm, and there is an absence of controversial bitterness. The success of Canisius' catechisms was enormous. They were translated into every language in Europe, and were reprinted in many hundreds of editions, so that the name *Canisius* came to be synonymous with Catechism (Bareille, op. cit., p. 61).

The Catechism of the Council of Trent (*Catechismus Romanus*) is not a catechism in the ordinary sense of the word. It is rather a manual of instruction for the clergy (*Catechismus ad Parochos*) to enable them to catechize those entrusted to their spiritual care. The fathers of the council "deemed it of the utmost importance that a work should appear, sanctioned by the authority of the Holy Synod, from which parish priests and all others on whom the duty of imparting instruction devolves may be able to seek and derive certain precepts for the edification of the faithful; that as there is 'one Lord one Faith' so also there may be one common rule and prescribed form of delivering the faith, and instructing the Christian people unto all the duties of piety" (Præf., viii). The composition of the work was entrusted to four distinguished theologians (two of them archbishops and one a bishop), under the supervision of three cardinals. St. Charles Borromeo was the presiding spirit. The original draft was turned into elegant Latin by Pogianus and Manutius, and this version was translated by command of the pope (St. Pius V) into Italian, French, German, and Polish. Brought out under such conditions (1566), the authority of this catechism is higher than that of any other, but is, of course, not on a level with that of the canons and decrees of a council. As to its value Cardinal Newman's estimate may be gathered from these words: "I rarely preach a sermon, but I go to this beautiful and complete Catechism to get both my matter and my doctrine" (Apologia, p. 425) (See ROMAN CATECHISM.)

Cardinal Bellarmine's Catechism was ordered by Clement VIII to be used in the Papal States, and was recommended for use throughout the world. It appeared in two forms: "Dottrina Cristiana Breve" (1597) and "Dichiarazione più Copiosa della Dottrina Cristiana" (1598). The first is for scholars, the second for teachers; in the first the teacher asks the questions and the scholar replies, whereas in the second this process is reversed. The first, which is meant to be learnt by heart, contains eleven chapters and ninety-five questions, and is arranged in the following order: the Calling of the Christian and the Sign of the Cross; the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Hail Mary; the Commandments of God, the Commandments of the Church, and the Counsels; the Sacraments, the Theological and Cardinal Virtues, the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, the Works of Mercy, Sins, the Last Things, and the Rosary. It is an improvement on Canisius' catechisms, and hence it was recommended at the Vatican Council to serve as a model for the projected universal catechism.

The first catechism in English after the Reformation was "A Catechisme or Christian Doctrine necessarie for Children and Ignorante People, briefly compiled by Laurence Vaux, Bacheler of Divinitie"; 1st ed., 1567; reprinted 1574, 1583 (twice), 1599, 1605; 18mo. This has been reprinted for the Chetham Society, new series, vol. IV, Manchester, 1883. Next came a small volume, "A Briefe Instruction by way of Dialogue concerning the principall poyntes of Christian religion gathered out of the Holy Scriptures, Fathers and Councels. By the Reverend M. George Doulye, Priest. Imprinted at Louvaine by Laurence Kellam, anno 1604"; "A Shorte Catechisme of Cardll. Bellarmine illustrated with Images. In Augusta, 1614; A briefe Christian Doctrine to be lerned by heart"; "A Summe of Christian Doctrine composed in Latin by Father Petrus Canisius of the Society of Jesus with an

Appendix of the Fall of Man and Justification. Translated into English [by Fr. Garnet?] at St. Omers for John Heigham. With permission of Superiors: 1622"; "A Catechisme of Christian Doctrine in fifteen Conferences. Paris: 1637", 2nd ed., 1659. The author was Thomas White, alias Blacklow, of Lisbon and Douai. The most important, however, was the book which came to be known as "The Doway Catechism", "An Abridgement of Christian Doctrine with proofs of Scripture for points controverted. Catechistically explained by way of question and answer", printed at Douai, 1st ed., 1649; again 1661, and so constantly. The last editions mentioned by Gillow are London, 1793, and Dublin, 1828; the author was Henry Turberville, a Douai priest. There was also a smaller edition, "An Abstract of the Douay Catechism. For the use of children and ignorant people. London, printed in the year 1688"; it was reprinted many times, and continued in use until the Douai students came to England. In 1625, the Franciscan Florence O'Conry published an Irish catechism at Louvain, entitled "Mirror of a Christian Life". This, like the catechisms of O'Hussey (Louvain, 1608) and Stapleton (Brussels, 1639), was written for the benefit of the Irish troops serving in the Netherlands. In the same century another member of the Franciscan order, Father Francis Molloy, a native of the County Meath, Ireland, and at the time professor of theology in St. Isidore's College, Rome, published a catechism in Irish under the title "Lucerna Fidelium" (Rome, Propaganda Press, 1676). We should also mention Andrew Donlevy's "The Catechism or Christian Doctrine by way of question and answer. Paris, 1742". This was in English and Irish on opposite pages. "The Poor Man's Catechism or the Christian Doctrine explained with short admonitions", 1st ed., 1752; it was edited by the Rev. George Bishop. The author's name does not appear, but a later work tells who he was: "The Poor Man's Controversy, By J. Mannock, O. S. B., the author of the Poor Man's Catechism, 1769." Dr. James Butler Archbishop of Cashel, published his catechism in 1775, and it was soon adopted by many Irish bishops for their dioceses. An account of it was given by Archbishop Walsh in the "Irish Eccl. Record", Jan., 1892. In 1737 Bishop Challoner published "The Catholic Christian instructed in the Sacraments, Sacrifice, Ceremonies, and Observances of the Church by way of question and answer. By R. C. London 1737." There is also "An Abridgement of Christian Doctrine with a short Daily Exercise", "corrected by the late Bp. Challoner", 1783. Bishop Hay's admirable works: "The Sincere Christian instructed in the Faith of Christ from the Written Word" (1781); "The Devout Christian instructed in the Faith of Christ" (1783); and "The Pious Christian" are catechisms on a large scale in the form of question and answer.

During the eighteenth century catechetical instruction received a fresh impulse from Pope Benedict XIII, who issued (1725) three ordinances prescribing in detail the methods: division into small classes and special preparation for confession and Communion. Against the rationalistic tendencies in the pedagogical movement of the century, Clement XIII uttered a protest in 1761. Pius VI wrote (1787) to the Orientals, proposing for their use a catechism in Arabic prepared by the Propaganda. In Germany the "Pastoral Instruction" issued by Raymond Anton, Bishop of Eichstädt (1768; new ed., Freiburg, 1902) emphasized the need and indicated the method of instruction (Tit. XIV, Cap. V). Prominent among the writers on the subject were Franz Neumayr, S. J., in his "Rhetorica catechetica" (1766); M. I. Schmidt, "Katechisten", and J. I. von Felbiger, "Vorlesungen über die Kunst zu katechisieren" (Vienna, 1774). In France, during the same century, great activity was shown, especially by the bishops, in publishing catechisms. Each diocese had its own textbook, but though occasional attempts were made at uniformity, they were not successful. Several catechisms composed by individual writers other than the bishops were put on the Index (see Migne, "Catéchismes", Paris, 1842). The French original of "An Abridgment of the Quebec Catechism" (Quebec, 1817) appeared in Paris (1702) and Quebec (1782).

The pedagogical activity of the nineteenth century naturally exerted an influence upon religious instruction. German writers of the first rank were Overberg (d. 1826), Sailer (d. 1832), Gruber (d. 1835), and Hirscher (d. 1865), all of whom advocated the psychological method and the careful preparation of teachers. Deharbe's "Catechism" (1847) was translated between 1853 and 1860 into thirteen languages, and his "Erklärungen des Katechismus" (1857–61) has passed through numerous editions. In France, Napoleon (1806) imposed upon all the churches of the empire uniformity in the matter of catechisms and, in spite of the opposition of Pius VII, published the "Imperial Catechism", containing a chapter on duties towards the emperor. This was replaced after the fall of the empire by a large number of diocesan catechisms which again led to various plans for securing uniformity. Dupanloup, one of the foremost writers on education, published his "Catéchisme chrétien" in 1865. At the time of the Vatican Council (1869–1870) the question of having a single universal catechism was discussed. There was great diversity of opinion among the Fathers, and consequently the discussion led to no result (see Martin, "Les travaux du concile du Vatican", pp. 113–115). The arguments for and against the project will be examined when we come to speak of catechisms in the third part of this article. The most important event in the recent history of catechetics has been the publication of the Encyclical "Acerbo nimis" on the teaching of Christian doctrine (15 April, 1905). In this document Pius X attributes the present religious crisis to the widespread ignorance of Divine truth, and lays down strict regulations concerning the duty of catechizing (see below). For the purpose of discussing the best methods of carrying out these orders a number of catechetical congresses have been held: e. g., at Munich, 1905 and 1907; Vienna, 1905 and 1908; Salzburg, 1906; Lucerne, 1907; Paris, 1908, etc. At these gatherings scientific, yet practical, lectures were delivered, demonstrations were given of actual catechizing in school, and an interesting feature was the exhibition of the best literature and appliances. Two periodicals have likewise appeared: "Katechetische Blätter" (Munich) and "Christlich-pädagogische Blätter" (Vienna).

In the United States, the few priests who in the early days toiled in this vast field were so overburdened with work that they could not produce original textbooks for religious instruction; they caused to be reprinted, with slight alterations, books commonly used in Europe. Others were composed in the manner described by Dr. England, first Bishop of Charleston, who, in 1821, published a catechism which, he writes, "I had much labor in compiling from various others, and adding several parts which I considered necessary to be explicitly dwelt upon under the peculiar circumstances of my diocese." The first to edit a catechism, so far as is known, was the Jesuit Father Robert Molyneux, an Englishman by birth and a man of extensive learning, who, till 1809, laboured among the Catholics in Maryland and Pennsylvania. Copies of this work are not known to exist now, but, in letters to Bishop Carroll, Father Molyneux mentions two catechisms which he issued—one in 1785, "a spelling primer for children with a Catholic catechism annexed". In 1788 a catechism was published in New York which in all likelihood was a reprint of "Butler's Catechism" mentioned above. Bishop Hay's "Abridgement of Christian Doctrine" (152 pp.) appeared in Philadelphia in 1800; another edition (143 pp.) in 1803,

and one with some alterations in the language in Baltimore in 1809 (108 pp.). Many editions were published of the catechism entitled "A Short Abridgement of Christian Doctrine, Newly Revised for the Use of the Catholic Church in the United States of America". The size of these small catechisms is from 36 to 48 pages. One edition, with title page torn, bears on the last page the record: "Bought September 14, 1794". The Philadelphia edition of 1796 is styled the thirteenth edition; that of Baltimore, 1798, the fourteenth. Whether all these editions were printed in America, or some of the earlier ones in Europe, cannot be ascertained.

This "Short Abridgement of Christian Doctrine", approved by Archbishop Carroll, was generally used throughout the United States until about 1821. In that year Bishop England published his catechism for his own diocese, and in 1825 appeared the "Catechism of the Diocese of Bardstown", recommended as a class-book by Bishop Flaget of Bardstown, Kentucky. The author of the latter catechism was Jean-Baptiste David, coadjutor of Bishop Flaget. It comprised the "First or Small Catechism for Little Children" (13 pp.), and the "Second Catechism" (149 pp.). The English was criticized by Archbishop Maréchal and others. Still more defective and inexact in language was the catechism of Bishop Conwell of Philadelphia, and, at the request of the archbishop, the author suppressed the book. An old English catechism, the "Abridgement of Christian Doctrine", by Henry Turberville, first published at Douai in 1649, was reprinted in New York in 1833. Whereas this edition preserved the quaint old language of the original, another edition of the same book appeared in Philadelphia, as "revised by the Right Rev. James Doyle and prescribed by him for the united dioceses of Kildare and Leighlin" (Ireland). In the New England States the "Boston Catechism" was used for a long time, the "Short Abridgement of Christian Doctrine", newly revised and augmented and authorized by Bishop Fenwick of Boston. But the catechisms which were used most exclusively during several decades were Butler's "Larger Catechism" and "Abridged Catechism". In 1788 Samuel Campbell, New York, published "A Catechism for the Instruction of Children. The Seventh Edition with Additions, Revised and Corrected by the Author". This seems to be the first American edition of Butler's Catechism; for Dr. Troy, Bishop of Ossory, wrote, soon after Butler's Catechism had appeared: "It has been printed here under the title: 'A Catechism for the Instruction of Children', without any mention of Dr. Butler". Butler's Catechism became very popular in the United States, and the First Provincial Council of Canada (1851) prescribed it for the English-speaking Catholics of the Dominion. Some other American catechisms may be briefly mentioned: the so-called "Dubuque Catechism" by Father Hattenberger; the Small and the Larger Catechism of the Jesuit missionary, Father Weninger (1865); and the three graded catechisms of the Redemptorist Father Müller (1874). Far more extensively used than these was the English translation of Deharbe. From 1869 numerous editions of the small, medium, and large catechisms, with various modifications, were published in the United States. An entirely new and much improved edition was issued in New York in 1901.

Repeated efforts have been made in the United States towards an arrangement by which a uniform textbook of Christian Doctrine might be used by all Catholics. As early as 1829, the bishops assembled in the First Provincial Council of Baltimore decreed: "A catechism shall be written which is better adapted to the circumstances of this Province; it shall give the Christian Doctrine as explained in Cardinal Bellarmine's Catechism, and when approved by the Holy See, it shall be published for the common use of Catholics" (Decr. xxxiii). The clause recommending Bellarmine's Catechism as a model was added at the special request of the Congregation of Propaganda. It may be mentioned here that Bellarmine's "Small Catechism", Italian text with English translation, was published at Boston, in 1853. The wish of the bishops was not carried out, and the First and Second Plenary Councils of Baltimore (1852 and 1866) repeated the decree of 1829. In the Third Plenary Council (1884) many bishops were in favour of a "revised" edition of Butler's Catechism, but finally the matter was given into the hands of a committee of six bishops. At last, in 1885, was issued "A Catechism of Christian Doctrine, Prepared and Enjoined by Order of the Third Council of Baltimore". Although the council had desired a catechism "perfect in every respect" (Acta et Decr., p. 219), theologians and teachers criticized several points (Nilles, "Commentaria", II, 265, 188). Soon various editions came forth with additions of word-meanings, explanatory notes, some even with different arrangements, so that there is now a considerable diversity in the books that go by the name of Catechism of the Council of Baltimore. Besides, in recent years several new catechisms have been published, "one or two a decided improvement over the Council Catechism" (Messmer, "Spirago's Method", p. 558). Among the recent catechisms are the two of Father Faerber, the large and small catechisms of Father Groenings, S. J., and the "Holy Family Series of Catholic Catechisms", by Francis H. Butler, of the Diocese of Boston (1902). The three graded catechisms of this series give on the left page the questions and answers, on the right a "Reading Lesson", dealing in fuller, and connected, form with the matter contained in the questions and answers. Some very practical features (reading part, followed by questions and answers, appropriate hymns, and pictorial illustrations) mark the "Text-books of Religion for Parochial and Sunday Schools", edited since 1898 by Father Yorke. These last two series to some extent depart from the traditional method and indicate a new movement in catechetical teaching. A more radical change in the style of the catechism, namely the complete abandonment of the question-and-answer method, has recently been proposed (see below, under II and III of this article, and "Am. Eccl. Rev.", 1907; Jan. and Feb., 1908). The First Plenary Council of Baltimore (1852) appointed Bishop Neumann to write, or revise, a German catechism the use of which, after its approbation by the archbishop and all the German-speaking bishops, should be obligatory. This decree shared the fate of the council's demand for a uniform English catechism. The Third Plenary Council (1884) decreed that the catechism to be issued by its order should be translated into the languages of those parishes in which religious instruction is given in any other than the English tongue. But the translation of the council catechism met with little favour. Another regulation, however, contained in the same decree of the council (ccxix), was gradually carried into effect. The bishops assembled expressed an earnest desire that in schools where English was not used the Christian Doctrine should be taught not only in the foreign tongue there used, but also in English. Undoubtedly this was a wise provision. For the young people of the second or third generation find it difficult to understand the native language of their parents; hearing discussions or attacks on their religion, they are hardly able to answer if they have not learnt the catechism in English. Moreover, after leaving school many young people have to live among English-speaking people, in places where there is no congregation of their own nationality; if they have not been taught religion in English they are tempted not to attend sermons, they feel embarrassed in going to confession, and thus may gradually drift away from the Church. In order to obviate these dangers, various catechisms (Deharbe,

Faerber, Groenings, etc.) have been published with German and English texts on opposite pages. Similarly, there are Polish-English, Bohemian-English, and other editions with double text. In most Italian schools catechism is taught chiefly in English, and only the prayers in Italian. Unwise as it would be to force a change of languages in catechetical teaching, it would be equally injudicious to artificially retard the natural development. The slow but steady tendency is towards the gradual adoption of the English language in preaching and teaching catechism, and it seems but reasonable to think that some day there will be among the Catholics in the United States not only unity in faith in the substance of the catechism, but also in its external form and language.

A number of German immigrants entered Pennsylvania about 1700, a considerable portion of them being Catholics. In 1759 the German Catholics in Philadelphia outnumbered those of the English tongue, and in 1789 they opened the church of the Holy Trinity, the first exclusively national church in the United States. Since 1741 German Jesuits have ministered to the spiritual needs of their countrymen, and Catholic schools have been established in the Pennsylvania settlements. It was natural that the German Jesuits should introduce the Catechism of Canisius, which for centuries had been universally used throughout Germany. The best known American edition of this famous catechism is that printed in Philadelphia, in 1810: "Catholischer Catechismus, worin die Catholische Lehre nach den fünf Hauptstücken V. P. Petri Canisii, aus der Gesellschaft Jesu, erklärt wird". The author or editor of this book was Adam Britt, pastor of the Holy Trinity Church, Philadelphia, who died at Conewaga (1822) as a member of the Society of Jesus. During several decades the Catechism of Canisius was generally used by the German Catholics in the United States. The Redemptorists came to this country in 1833 and soon had charge of flourishing German parishes in nearly all the more important cities. The Venerable John N. Neumann, afterwards Bishop of Philadelphia, wrote, while rector of the Redemptorist house at Pittsburg, about the year 1845, a small and a large catechism. These texts, also known as the "Redemptorist Catechisms", had a wide circulation, whereas those written later by Father Weninger, S. J., and Father Müller, C. SS. R., never became popular. The second half of the nineteenth century may be called the era of Deharbe's Catechism. In 1850 the "Katholischer Katechismus der Lehrbegriffe" was issued in Cincinnati, which by this time had become a centre of German Catholic population with flourishing parochial schools. Bishop Purcell declares in the approbation that the German catechisms previously published were not to be reprinted, but that this "Regensburg [Ratisbon] Catechism, long in use in Germany", was to be the only one in his diocese. Although the name of the author was not given, it was in reality Father Deharbe's "Large Catechism". Since that time numerous editions of the different catechisms of Deharbe appeared with various adaptations and modifications, and for nearly fifty years Deharbe reigned supreme. This supremacy has been challenged within the last two decades. Father Müller, C. SS. R., in the preface to his catechism, severely criticized Deharbe's as a book "which it is difficult for children to learn and to understand". Father Faerber, who devoted forty years to catechetical instruction, produced in 1895 a textbook which commends itself by its simplicity and clearness, although the critics, who charged it with incompleteness and a certain lack of accuracy, were not altogether wrong. Almost simultaneously with Father Faerber's book appeared an excellent, thoroughly revised, edition of Deharbe's texts, from which many defects had been expunged. Finally, in 1900, Father Groenings, S. J., published two catechisms, a small and a large one.

Development of Catechizing after the Council of Trent.—Mindful that the work of catechizing was more important than the issue of catechisms, the Council of Trent decreed that "the bishops shall take care that at least on the Lord's day and other festivals the children in every parish be carefully taught the rudiments of the faith and obedience to God and their parents" (Sess. IV, De Ref., c. iv). In 1560 the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine was founded in Rome by a Milanese, and was approved by St. Pius V in 1571. St. Charles Borromeo in his provincial synods laid down excellent rules on catechizing; every Christian was to know the Lord's Prayer, the Hail Mary, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments; confessors were ordered to examine their penitents as to their knowledge of these formularies (V Prov. Concil., 1579). He also established schools in the villages, in addition to increasing the number in the towns. Besides the renewed activity of the older orders, the Jesuits, the Barnabites, and the Clerks Regular of Pious Schools (Piarists), who devoted themselves to the education of the young, took special care of the religious instruction of those entrusted to them. In this connexion three names are especially worthy of mention: St. Vincent de Paul, St. Francis de Sales, and M. Olier. One of St. Francis's first acts as a bishop was to organize catechetical instruction throughout his diocese, and he himself took his turn with his canons in this holy work. St. Vincent founded his congregation of Priests of the Mission for the purpose of instructing the poor, especially in the villages. The missionaries were to teach the catechism twice a day during each mission. In his own parish of Châtillon he established the Confraternity for the Assistance of the Poor, and one of the duties of the members was to instruct as well as to give material aid. So, too, the Sisters of Charity not only took care of the sick and the poor but also taught the children. M. Olier, both in the seminary and in the parish of Saint-Sulpice, laid special stress on the work of catechizing. The method which he introduced will be described in the second part of this article. The Brothers of the Christian Schools, founded by St. Jean-Baptiste de la Salle, devoted themselves especially to religious as well as secular instruction. Finding that the very poor were unable to attend school on weekdays, the saintly founder introduced secular lessons on Sundays. This was in 1699, nearly a century before such teaching was given in Protestant England.

II. Practical Catechetics.—Catechizing (*catechesis*), as we have seen, is instruction which is at once religious, elementary, and oral.

Catechizing is a religious work not simply because it treats of religious subjects, but because its end or object is religious. The teacher should endeavour to influence the child's heart and will, and not be content with putting a certain amount of religious knowledge into its head; for, as Aristotle would say, the end of catechizing is not knowledge, but practice. Knowledge, indeed, there must be, and the more of it the better in this age of widespread secular education; but the knowledge must lead to action. Both teacher and child must realize that they are engaged in a religious work, and not in one of the ordinary lessons of the day. It is the neglect to realize this that is responsible for the little effect produced by long and elaborate teaching. Religious knowledge comes to be looked upon by the child merely as a branch of other knowledge, and having as little to do with conduct as the study of vulgar fractions. "When the child is fighting its way through the temptations of the world, it will have to draw far more largely on its stock of piety than on its stock of knowledge" (Furniss, "Sunday School or Catechism?"). "The work of a teacher in the Church will be directed chiefly to this, that the faithful earnestly desire 'to know Jesus Christ and Him crucified', and that they be firmly convinced and with

the innermost piety and devotion of heart believe, that 'there is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved', for 'He is the propitiation for our sins'. But as in this we do know that we have known Him, if 'we keep His commandments', the next consideration and one intimately connected with the foregoing, is to show that life is not to be spent in ease and sloth, but that we 'ought to walk even as He walked', and with all earnestness 'pursue justice, godliness, faith, charity, mildness'; for He 'gave Himself for us that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a people acceptable, pursuing good works'; which things the Apostle commands pastors to 'speak and exhort'. But as our Lord and Saviour has not only declared, but has also shown by His own example, that the Law and the Prophets depend on love, and as also, according to the confirmation of the Apostle, 'the end of the commandments and the fulfilment of the Law is charity, no one can doubt that this, as a paramount duty, should be attended to with the utmost assiduity, that the faithful people be excited to a love of the infinite goodness of God towards us; that, inflamed with a sort of divine ardour, they may be powerfully attracted to the supreme and all-perfect good, to adhere to which is solid happiness" (Catech. of the Council of Trent, Pref., x).

The persons concerned in catechizing (teachers and taught) and the times and places for catechizing can hardly be treated apart. But it will be best to begin with the persons. The duty of providing suitable religious instruction for children is primarily incumbent on their parents. This they may fulfil either by teaching them themselves or by entrusting them to others. Next to the natural parents the godparents have this duty. The parish priest should remind both the parents and godparents of their obligation; and he, too, as the spiritual father of those entrusted to his care, is bound to instruct them. In Pius X's Encyclical Letter on the teaching of Christian doctrine it is enacted "(1) that all parish priests, and in general, all those entrusted with the care of souls, shall on every Sunday and feast day throughout the year, without exception, give boys and girls an hour's instruction from the catechism on those things which every one must believe and do in order to be saved; (2) at stated times during the year they shall prepare boys and girls by continued instruction, lasting several days, to receive the sacraments of penance and confirmation; (3) they shall likewise and with special care on all the weekdays in Lent, and if necessary on other days after the feast of Easter, prepare boys and girls by suitable instruction and exhortations to make their first Communion in a holy manner; (4) in each and every parish the society, commonly called the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, shall be canonically erected; through this the parish priests, especially in the places where there is a scarcity of priests, will have lay helpers for the catechetical instruction in pious lay persons who will devote themselves to the office of teaching." In countries where there are Catholic schools religious instruction is given on weekdays either before or after the secular instruction. As is well known, for the sake of this privilege the faithful have contributed enormous sums of money to build and support schools. Where this is the case the difficulty is only a financial one. Nevertheless, the First Provincial Council of Westminster warns the pastor not to make over this duty of catechizing "so far to others, however good or religious they may be, as not to visit the schools frequently and instil into the tender minds of youth the principles of true faith and piety". We see, then, that the work of giving religious instruction belongs to the parents, to priests with the care of souls, to the teachers in Catholic schools, and to other lay helpers.

Turning now to those who are to be taught, we may consider first the young and then those who are grown up. The young may be divided into those who are receiving elementary education (primary scholars) and those who are more advanced (secondary scholars). Although in many dioceses the scholars are arranged in classes corresponding to the secular classes, we may consider them for our present purpose as divided into three groups: those who have not been to confession; those who have been to confession but have not made their first Communion; and those who have made their first Communion. In the case of the first group the instruction must be of the most rudimentary kind; but, as already pointed out, this does not mean that the little ones should be taught nothing except the first part of some catechism; they should have the Creed and the Commandments, the Our Father and the Hail Mary, explained to them, together with the forgiveness of sin by the Sacraments of Baptism and Penance. The principal events in the life of Christ will be found to be an ever-interesting subject for them. How far it is wise to talk to them about Creation and the Fall, the Deluge and the stories of the early patriarchs, may be a matter of discussion among teachers. In any case great care should be taken not to give them any notions which they may afterwards have to discard. It is of importance at this stage to tell the children in the simplest language something about the services of the Church, for they are now beginning to be present at these. Any one who has charge of them there, or, better still, who will recall his own early memories, will understand what a hardship it is to a child to have to sit through a high Mass with a sermon. The second group (those preparing for first Communion) will of course be able to receive more advanced instruction in each of the four branches mentioned above, with special reference to the Holy Eucharist. In instructing both groups the subjects should be taught dogmatically, that is, authoritatively, appealing rather to the children's faith than to their reasoning powers. The after-Communion instruction of elementary scholars will be almost similar to the instruction given to younger secondary scholars, and will consist in imparting wider and deeper knowledge and insisting more upon proofs. When they grow up their difficulty will be not only the observance of the law, but the reason of it. They will ask not only, What must I believe and do? but also, Why must I believe it or do it? Hence the importance of thorough instruction in the authority of the Church, Scripture texts, and also appeals to right reason. This brings us to the subject of catechizing grown-up persons. Pius X goes on to speak of this matter, after laying down the regulations for the young: "In these days adults not less than the young stand in need of religious instruction. All parish priests, and others having the care of souls, in addition to the homily on the Gospel delivered at the parochial Mass on all days of obligation, shall explain the catechism for the faithful in an easy style, suited to the intelligence of their hearers, at such time of the day as they may deem most convenient for the people, but not during the hour in which the children are taught. In this instruction they shall make use of the Catechism of the Council of Trent; and they shall so order it that the whole matter of the Creed, the Sacraments, the Decalogue, the Lord's Prayer, and the Precepts of the Church shall be treated in the space of four or five years."

The subjects to be treated of are laid down by Pius X: "As the things divinely revealed are so many and so various that it is no easy task either to acquire a knowledge of them, or, having acquired that knowledge, to retain them in the memory, . . . our predecessors have very wisely reduced this whole force and scheme of saving doctrine to these four distinct heads: the Apostles' Creed; the Sacraments; the Ten Commandments; and the Lord's Prayer. In the doctrine of the Creed are contained all things which are to be held according to the discipline of the Christian Faith,

whether they regard the knowledge of God, or the creation and government of the world, or the redemption of the human race, or the rewards of the good and the punishments of the wicked. The doctrine of the Seven Sacraments comprehends the signs and as it were the instruments for obtaining divine grace. In the Decalogue is laid down whatever has reference to the Law, 'the end' whereof 'is charity'. Finally, in the Lord's Prayer is contained whatever can be desired, hoped, or salutarily prayed for by men. It follows that these four commonplaces, as it were, of Sacred Scripture being explained, there can scarcely be wanting anything to be learned by a Christian man" (ib., xii). It must be borne in mind that catechetical instruction should be elementary; but this of course is a relative term, according as the pupil is an adult or a child. This difference has been dealt with above in speaking of the persons concerned in catechizing. It may be pointed out here, however, that elementary knowledge is not the same as partial knowledge. Even young children should be taught something of each of the four divisions mentioned above, viz., that they have to believe in God and to do God's will, and to obtain His grace by means of prayer and the sacraments. Further instruction will consist in developing each of these heads. Besides what is ordinarily understood by Christian doctrine, catechizing should treat of Christian history and Christian worship. Christian history will include the story of the Old Testament, the New Testament, and the Church. Christian worship will include the Church's calendar (the feasts and fasts) and her services and devotions. These three—doctrine, history, and worship—are not altogether distinct, and may often be best taught together. For example, the second article of the Creed should be taught in such a way as to bring out the doctrine of the Incarnation, the beautiful story of Christ's birth and childhood, and the meaning and the services of Advent and Christmas. The Bible history and the history of the Church will afford countless instances bearing on the various doctrines and heresies of the doctrinal part of the catechism, and the virtues and contrary vices of the practical part.

The question of catechetical methods is difficult and has given rise to much controversy. Father Furniss long ago, in his "Sunday School or Catechism?" and Bishop Bellord later on, in his "Religious Education and its Failures", passed a wholesale condemnation on our present method, and attributed to it the falling away of so many Catholics from the Faith. "The chief cause of the 'leakage' is the imperfection of our systems of religious instruction. Those methods seem to be antiquated, injudicious, wasteful, sometimes positively injurious to the cause" (Bp. Bellord, op. cit., p. 7). Part of the blame is laid upon catechizing, and part upon the catechisms. Of the latter we shall speak presently. Again, the blame is twofold and is not altogether consistent. The children are declared not to know their religion, or, knowing it quite well, not to put it into practice. In either case they are of course lost to the Church when they grow up. Both the bishop and the Redemptorist complain that religious instruction is made a task, and so fails either to be learnt at all, or, if it is learnt, it is learnt in such a way as to become hateful to the child and to have no bearing on his conduct in after-life. Both are especially severe on the attempt to make the children learn by heart. The bishop quotes a number of experienced missionary priests who share his views. It seems to us that, in considering the methods of catechizing, we have to bear in mind two very different sets of conditions. In some countries religious instruction forms part of the daily curriculum, and is mainly given on weekdays by trained teachers. Where this is the case it is not difficult to secure that the children shall learn by heart some official textbook. With this as a foundation the priest (who will by no means restrict his labours to Sunday work) will be able to explain and illustrate and enforce what they have learnt by heart. The teachers' business will be chiefly to put the catechism into the child's head; the priest must get it into his heart. Very different are the conditions which Father Furniss and Bishop Bellord are dealing with. Where the priest has to get together on a Sunday, or one day in the week, a number of children of all ages, who are not obliged to be present; and when he has to depend upon the assistance of lay persons who have no training in teaching; it is obvious that he should do his best to make the instruction as simple, as interesting, and as devotional as possible. As in other branches of instruction we may follow either the analytical or the synthetical method. In the former we take a textbook, a catechism, and explain it word for word to the scholar and make him commit it to memory. The book is of prime importance; the teacher occupies quite a secondary place. Though it might convey a wrong impression to call this the Protestant method, yet it is exactly in accordance with the Protestant system of religious teaching generally. The written, printed word (Bible or Catechism) is to them all in all. The synthetical method, on the other hand, puts the teacher in the forefront. The scholars are bidden to look up to him and listen to his voice, and receive his words on his authority. "Faith cometh by hearing." After they have thoroughly learnt their lesson in this way, a book may be then set before them, and be explained to them and committed to memory, as containing in a fixed form the substance of what they have received by word of mouth. Whatever may be said of the relative advantages of the two methods in the teaching of secular subjects, there can be no doubt that the synthetical method is the proper one for catechetical instruction. The office of catechizing belongs to the Church's *magisterium* (teaching authority), and so is best exercised by the living voice. "The *lips* of the priest shall keep knowledge, and they shall seek the law at his *mouth*" (Mal., ii, 7).

(a) *The Sulpician Method* of catechizing is celebrated throughout the world, and has produced wonderful fruits wherever it has been employed. We cannot, therefore, do better than give a short account of it here.

The whole catechism consists of three principal exercises and three secondary ones. The principal are: (1) the recitation of the letter of the catechism, with an easy explanation of it by way of question and answer; (2) the instruction; (3) the reading of the Gospel and the homily. The secondary exercises are: (1) the admonitions from the head catechist; (2) the hymns; (3) prayers. These should be interspersed with the former. The duration fixed by St. Francis de Sales for a complete catechism is two hours. The place should be the church, but in a separate chapel rather than in the body of the church. Great importance is attached to the "game of the good mark" (*le jeu du bon point*) and the *analyses*. The former consists in selecting the child who has answered best in the first part (the questioning on the catechism), and putting to him a series of short, clear, and definite questions upon the matter in hand, and doing this as a sort of challenge to the child. The other children are roused to interest at the notion of a contest between the catechist and one of themselves, and this gives occasion for a better understanding of the subject under treatment. If the child is considered to have won, he receives a small card of reward (*le bon point*). "For the success of the game of the *bon point* it is important to prepare beforehand and to write down the questions which are to be put to the children, even the commonest ones." The children should be made to write out a short account of the instruction given after the questioning. These *analyses* should be corrected by the teacher, and a mark ("fair", "good", "very good")

should be attached to each. In order to secure regular attendance, registers should be carefully kept, and rewards (pictures, medals, etc.) should be given to those who have not missed a catechism. Treats and feasts should also be given. The spirit of emulation should be encouraged both for attendance and good answering and analyses. Various minor offices should be conferred upon the best children. Punishment should very seldom be resorted to.

Though the Sulpician method insists upon a thorough knowledge of the letter of the catechism, it is clear that the teacher is of prime importance rather than the book. Indeed, the success or failure of the catechism may be said to depend entirely upon him. It is he who has to do the questioning and give the instruction and the homily on the Gospel. Unless he can keep the attention of the children fixed upon him, he is bound to fail. Hence, the greatest care should be taken in selecting and training the catechists. These are sometimes seminarists or nuns, but lay persons must often be taken. By far the larger portion of "The Method of Saint Sulpice" is devoted to the instruction of the catechists (cap. iv, "Of the instruction of the children"; cap. v, "Of the sanctification of the children"; cap. vi, "Of the necessity of making the catechism pleasant to the children, and some means for attaining this object"; cap. vii, "How to turn the catechism into exercises of emulation"; cap. viii, "How to maintain good order and ensure the success of the catechisms").

So far the "Method" has dealt with the catechisms generally. Next comes the division of the catechisms. These are four in number: the Little Catechism, the First-Communion Catechism, the Weekday Catechism, and the Catechism of Perseverance. The Weekday Catechism is the only one which requires any explanation here. A certain time before the period of first Communion a list is made out of such children as are to be admitted to the Holy Table, and these are prepared by more frequent exercises, held on weekdays as well as on Sundays. As a rule, only children who have attended for twelve months are admitted to the weekday catechisms, and the usual age is twelve years. The weekday catechism is held on two days of the week and for about three months. The order is much the same as that of the Sunday catechism, except that the Gospel and the homily are omitted. The children are examined twice during the weekday catechisms: the first time about the middle of the course; the second, a week before the retreat. Those who have often been absent without cause or who have answered badly, or whose conduct has been unsatisfactory, are rejected.

A complete account of the method will be found in "The Method of Saint Sulpice" (Tr.), and also in "The Ministry of Catechising" (Tr.) by Mgr. Dupanloup.

(b) *The Munich Method.*—In 1898 Dr. A. Weber, editor of the "Katechetische Blätter" of Munich, urged the adaptation of the Herbart-Ziller system in teaching Christian doctrine. This system requires, "first, a division of the catechetical matter into strict methodical units, so that those questions are co-ordinated which are essentially one. Secondly, it insists on a methodical following of the three essential steps, viz., Presentation, Explanation, and Application—with a short Preparation before Presentation, then Combination after Explanation, as more or less non-essential points. *It therefore never begins with the catechetical questions, but always with an objective Presentation*—in the form of a story from life or the Bible, a catechetical, Biblical or historical picture, a point of liturgy, church history, or the lives of the saints, or some such objective lesson. Out of this objective lesson only will the catechetical concepts be evolved and abstracted, then combined into the catechism answer and formally applied to life. These catechists aim at capturing the child's interest from the start and preserving his good-will and attention throughout" (Amer. Eccl. Rev., March, 1908, p. 342). "*Preparation* turns the attention of the pupil in a definite direction. The pupil hears the lesson-aim in a few well-chosen words. At this stage of the process the pupil's ideas are also corrected and made clearer. *Presentation* gives an object-lesson. If at all possible, use one such object only. There are sound psychological reasons for this, although it becomes occasionally useful to employ several. *Explanation* might also be called concept-formation. Out of the objective lesson are here construed, or evolved, the catechetical concepts. From the concrete objective presentation we here pass to the general concept. *Combination* gathers all the ideas derived from the lesson into the text of the catechism. *Application* finally strengthens and deepens the truths we have gathered and variously widens them for purposes of life. We can here insert further examples, give additional motives, apply the lessons to the actual life of the child, train the child in judging his own moral conduct, and end with some particular resolution, or an appropriate prayer, song, hymn, or quotation" (Amer. Eccl. Rev., Apr., 1908, p. 465). In the same number of the Review (p. 460) will be found an excellent lesson on "Sin", drawn up on the lines of the Munich Method. Further information will be found in Weber's "Die Münchener katechetische Methode", and Göttler's "Der Münchener katechetische Kurs, 1905".

Instruction of Converts.—The careful instruction of those who apply for admission into the Church, or who wish information about her doctrines and practices, is a sacred duty incumbent at times on almost every priest. No one may prudently embrace the Christian religion unless he sees clearly that it is credible. Hence the motives of credibility, the sure arguments that convince the understanding and move the will to command the assent of faith, must be clearly set forth. The higher the social or intellectual position of inquirers, the more thorough and diligent should be the instruction. Each one is to be guided not merely to understand the Church's dogmas, as far as he can, but to practise the exercises of Christian perfection. Before the usual profession of faith, converts ought to be examined on their knowledge of all matters that must be known in order to be saved. This should be done with great care, for at this time they are docile. After their admission to the sacraments some may easily fancy themselves fully instructed, and for want of further study remain ignorant until death, unable to train properly their children or dependents. In the case of uneducated persons who are drawn to the Church, the prudent director will avoid such controversy as might lead his pupil to defend errors hitherto unknown. Better educated inquirers are to be fully satisfied on all points that they have held against Catholic doctrine and must be provided with the means of resisting both internal and external temptations. The length of time and the character of the instruction will vary with each individual.

It follows from what has been said that the times and places will vary according to the different sorts of persons to be instructed and the habits of the different countries. Speaking generally, however, at least some instruction should be given on Sundays and in the church, so as to bring out the religious character of catechizing.

III. Modern Catechisms.—When speaking of the history of catechetics we saw that, though the method was originally and properly oral, the custom soon arose of composing catechisms—i. e. short manuals of elementary religious instruction, usually by means of questions and answers.

A catechism is of the greatest use both to the teacher and the scholar. To the teacher it is a guide as to the subjects to be taught, the order of dealing with them,

and the choice of words in which the instruction should be conveyed; above all, it is the best means of securing uniformity and correctness of doctrinal and moral teaching. The use which the teacher should make of it must be understood in connexion with what has been said above about the methods of catechizing. To the scholar a catechism gives in a brief form a summary of what the teacher has been imparting to him; and by committing it to memory he can be sure that he has grasped the substance of his lesson. As already observed, this is not a difficult matter where there are Catholic schools under trained expert teachers accustomed to making the children learn by heart; but where the teaching has to be done in evening or Sunday schools by inexperienced persons, and the scholars are not under the same control as in the day schools, the portions to be committed to memory must be reduced to a minimum.

A good catechism should conform strictly to the definition given above. That is to say, it should be elementary, not a learned treatise of dogmatic, moral, and ascetical theology; and it should be simple in language, avoiding technical expressions as far as consistent with accuracy. Should the form of question and answer be maintained? No doubt it is not an interesting form for grown-up persons; but children prefer it because it lets them know exactly what they are likely to be asked. Moreover, this form keeps up the idea of a teacher and a disciple, and so is most in conformity with the fundamental notion of catechizing. What form the answers should take—*Yes* or *No*, or a categorical statement—is a matter of disagreement among the best teachers. It would seem that the decision depends on the character of the different languages and nations; some of them making extensive use of the affirmative and negative particles, while others reply by making statements. Archbishop Walsh of Dublin, in his instructions for the revision of the catechism, recommended "the introduction of short reading lessons, one to be appended to each chapter of the catechism. These reading lessons should deal, in somewhat fuller form, with the matter dealt with in the questions and answers of the catechism. The insertion of such lessons would make it possible to omit without loss many questions the answers to which now impose a heavy burden on the memory of the children. . . . If these lessons are written with care and skill, and in a style attractive as well as simple, the children will soon have them learned by heart, from the mere fact of repeatedly reading them, and without any formal effort at committing them to memory" (Irish Eccl. Record, Jan., 1892). An excellent means of assisting the memory is the use of pictures. These should be selected with the greatest care; they should be accurate as well as artistic. The catechism used in Venice when Pius X was patriarch was illustrated.

As there are three stages of catechetical instruction, so there should be three catechisms corresponding with these. The first should be very short and simple, but should give the little child some information about all four parts of religious knowledge. The second catechism, for those preparing for first Communion, should embody, word for word, without the slightest change, all the questions and answers of the first catechism. Further questions and answers, dealing with a more extensive knowledge, should be added in their proper places, after the earlier matter; and these will have special reference to the sacraments, more particularly the Holy Eucharist. The third catechism, for those who have made their first Communion, should in like manner embody the contents of the first and second catechisms, and add instruction belonging to the third stage mentioned above. For scholars beyond the elementary stages this third catechism may be used, with additions not in the form of question and answer and not necessarily to be learnt by heart. The great idea running through all the catechisms should be that the later ones should grow out of the earlier ones, and that the children should not be confused by differently worded answers to the same questions. Thus, the answer to the questions: What is charity? What is a sacrament? should be exactly the same in all the catechisms. Further information can be introduced by fresh questions. In some rare cases additions may be made at the end of the earlier answers, but never in the middle.

It was mentioned in the historical portion of this article that at the time of the Vatican Council a proposal was made for the introduction of a uniform catechism for use throughout the Church. As the proposal was not carried out, we may here discuss the advantages and disadvantages of a universal catechism. There can be no doubt that the present system of allowing each bishop to draw up a catechism for use in his diocese is open to strong objection. Happily, in these days there is no difficulty on the head of diversity of doctrine. The difficulty arises rather from the importance attached to learning the catechism by heart. People do not nowadays remain stationary in the neighbourhood in which they were born. Their children, in passing from one diocese to another, are obliged to unlearn the wording of one catechism (a most difficult process) and learn the different wording of another. Even where all the dioceses of a province or country have the same catechism the difficulty arises in passing into a new province or country. A single catechism for universal use would prevent all this waste of time and confusion, besides being a strong bond of union between the nations. At the same time it must be recognized that the conditions of the Church vary considerably in the different countries. In a Catholic country, for instance, it is not necessary to touch upon controversial questions, whereas in non-Catholic countries these must be thoroughly gone into. This will notably be the case with regard to the introduction of texts in the actual words of the Holy Scriptures. Thus, in the Valladolid Catechism there is not a single quotation from the Old or New Testament except the Our Father and the first part of the Hail Mary—and even of these the source is not mentioned. The Commandments are not given in the words of Scripture. There is no attempt to prove any doctrine; everything is stated dogmatically on the authority of the Church. A catechism on these lines is clearly unsuited for children living among Protestants. As already pointed out, the instruction of those who have made their first Communion should embrace proof as well as statement. The Fathers of the Vatican Council recognized the difficulty, and endeavoured to meet it by a compromise. A new catechism, based upon Bellarmine's Catechism and other catechisms of approved value, was to be drawn up in Latin, and was to be translated into the different vernaculars with the authority of the bishops, who were empowered to make such additions as they might think fit; but these additions were to be kept quite distinct from the text. The unhappy events of the latter part of the year 1870 prevented this proposal from being carried out.

(a) The present pontiff, Pius X, has prescribed a catechism for use in the Diocese of Rome and in its ecclesiastical province, and has expressed a desire that it should be adopted throughout Italy. It has been translated into English, French, Spanish, and German, and a movement has begun with a view to extending its use to other countries besides Italy, especially to Spain, where the conditions are similar. (See "Irish Eccl. Record", March, 1906, p. 221; "Amer. Eccl. Rev.", Nov., 1906.) This catechism consists of two parts, or rather two distinct books: one for "lower classes" and one for "higher classes". The first, or "Shorter Catechism", is meant for those who have not made their first Communion; the second, or "Longer Catechism", for those who have already been through the other. Both are constructed on the same lines: an introduc-

tory portion, and then five sections treating in turn of the Creed, Prayer, the Commandments, the Sacraments, the Virtues, etc. The "Longer Catechism" contains, in addition, in catechetical form, an instruction on the feasts of Our Lord, the Blessed Virgin, and the Saints, and a short "History of Religion" (the Old Testament, the New Testament, and the Church) in the form of a narrative. But though the two catechisms are on the same main lines, they have very little connexion with each other. Hardly any of the questions and answers are the same; so that a knowledge of the wording of the first is of little use, but rather an obstacle, in learning the second. It is worthy of note that, though texts of Scripture are not quoted, the second catechism contains a large number of questions and answers relating to the Holy Scriptures, among others the following: "Is the reading of the Bible necessary to all Christians?—The reading of the Bible is not necessary to all Christians, because they are taught by the Church; still, the reading of it is very useful and recommended to all." Many of the answers in the second catechism are much longer than those in other catechisms. The catechism itself, without counting the lengthy instruction on the feasts and the "History of Religion", fills more than 200 pages 12mo in Bishop Byrne's translation.

(b) Throughout Great Britain only one catechism is officially in use. It was drawn up by a committee appointed by the Second Provincial Council of Westminster (1855), and is based upon the Douai Catechism. It has undergone several revisions, the last of these being for the purpose of eliminating the particles *Yes* and *No*, and making all the answers distinct categorical statements. It is remarkable for its frequent appeal to proofs from Holy Scripture. Though it has been subject to many attacks, it is justly considered to be a clear and logical statement of Catholic belief and practice, fitted to the needs of both children and grown-up persons seeking instruction. Perhaps it has this latter class too much in view, and hence it is sometimes wanting in simplicity. The omission of *Yes* and *No* and the avoidance of pronouns in the answers have been carried to a pedantic excess. Besides this ordinary catechism there is a smaller catechism, for younger children, which goes over the whole ground in a more elementary form; it is to some extent free from the objection just mentioned; but this advantage involves some verbal differences between the answers of the two catechisms. There is no official advanced catechism. For the more advanced classes a number of excellent "Manuals" are in use, e. g. "Instructions in Christian Doctrine"; Wenham's "Catechumen"; Carr's "Lamp of the Word"; Cafferata's "The Catechism, Simply Explained"; Fander's (Deharbe's) "Catechism". Howe's "Catechist" and Spirago's "Method of Christian Doctrine" (ed. Messmer) are used by those who are being trained to be teachers. Short Bible Histories, none of them official, are used in the more elementary classes, especially Formby's volumes; in the higher classes, Wenham's "New Testament Narrative", Richards' "Scripture History", and Knecht's "Practical Commentary". There are also separate books of the New Testament, edited by Mgr. Ward and by Father Sydney Smith, etc. It should be added that the elementary schools and the training colleges, besides many of the secondary schools and colleges, are examined in religious knowledge by inspectors appointed by the bishops.

(c) In Ireland the catechism most commonly used at the present time is the "Catechism ordered by the National Synod of Maynooth .... for General Use throughout the Irish Church". After a short Introduction on God and the creation of the world and on man and the end of his creation, it treats in turn of the Creed, the Commandments, Prayer, and the Sacraments. The answers are short and clear, and, though *Yes* and *No* are excluded, the form of the answers is not always a rigid repetition of the words of the question. Various important improvements have been suggested by Archbishop Walsh (see "Irish Eccl. Record", Jan., 1892, and following numbers). There is also a smaller edition of the Maynooth Catechism. The manuals used in the advanced classes are much the same as those used in Great Britain, together with the "Companion to the Catechism" (Gill). Religious inspection is general.

(For the United States, see above under HISTORY OF CATECHETICS.)

(d) The First Provincial Council of Quebec (1852) ordered two catechisms for use in Canada: Butler's Catechism for those speaking English, and a new French catechism for those speaking French. The latter is called "The Quebec Catechism", and is also issued in an abridged form.

(e) In Australia the Maynooth Catechism is generally used. But the bishops in the Plenary Council of 1885 decreed that a new catechism should be drawn up for use throughout Australia.

From this enumeration it will be seen how far we are from having any uniform catechism for the English-speaking peoples. If we consider the Continent of Europe, we find that in France, Germany, and Spain different catechisms are in use in the different dioceses. In the German-speaking provinces of Austria there is one single catechism for all the dioceses, approved by the whole episcopate in 1894. It is issued in three forms: small, middle, and large. All of these are arranged on exactly the same lines: a short introduction, Faith and the Apostles' Creed, Hope and Prayer, Charity and the Commandments, Grace and the Sacraments, Justification and the Last Things. The middle catechism contains all the questions and answers of the small, in exactly the same words, and adds a considerable number of fresh ones. In like manner, the large catechism makes further additions. The small catechism has no texts from Scripture; the other two contain many texts, usually placed in notes at the foot of the page. The chief difference between the middle and large catechisms is that the latter deals more with reasons and proofs, and consequently gives a greater number of Scripture texts. Austria is, therefore, better off than most countries in the matter of the catechism. She has none of the difficulties arising from a multiplicity of manuals, and her single textbook is in the three forms described above as the ideal for all countries. Schuster's excellent Bible History is also in universal use, and is arranged by means of different type and signs so as to be accommodated to the three stages of the catechism. Religious training in Austria has, however, been severely criticized by Dr. Pichler, a high authority in that country. He considers the catechism as cumbersome, the work of a good theologian but a poor catechist; he advocates the compilation of a new Bible History on the lines of Knecht's manual; and he advocates the adoption of inductive methods. See "Unser Religionsunterricht, seine Mängel und deren Ursachen".

One of the best of the German catechisms is that of the Diocese of Augsburg, mainly the work of Kinsel and Hauser, and published in 1904. It is on the lines of Deharbe, but much simplified, and copiously illustrated. So, too, is the new Hungarian catechism (1907), which is issued in three editions: one for the first and second grade of elementary schools, one for the remaining four grades, and one for the high schools. Bishop Mailath of Transylvania has had the direction of the work. Poland has not been behindhand in reforming her catechetical teaching. A catechism has just been drawn up for the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades by Bishop Likowski and Valentine Gadowski. The answers to be learnt by heart are limited to forty in each year, and are short and simple. Each is followed by a fairly long explanation. This catechism contains 215 illustrations.

It should be noted that all Continental reformers have dropped the idea of making the answers theologically complete. The subsequent explanations supply what may be wanting. The answers are complete sentences, *Yes* and *No* being seldom used by themselves, and the order of the words in the answers follows that in the questions.

On the History of Catechetics: BAREILLE, *Le Catéchisme Romain, Introduction* (Montréjeau, 1906); HÉZARD, *Histoire du catéchisme depuis la naissance de l'Eglise jusqu'à nos jours;* THALHOFER, *Entwicklung des katholischen Katechismus in Deutschland von Canisius bis Deharbe;* PROBST, *Geschichte der katholischen Katechese* (Paderborn, 1887); SPIRAGO, *Method of Christian Doctrine,* tr. MESSMER (New York, 1901), vi; BAREILLE in *Dict. de théol. cath.,* s. v. *Catéchèse;* MANGENOT, *ibid.,* s. v. *Catéchisme;* KNECHT in *Kirchenlex.,* s. vv. *Katechese, Katechetik, Katechismus.*

On Catechizing, Methods, etc.: DUPANLOUP, *Method of Catechising* (tr.); *The Method of S. Sulpice* (tr.); SPIRAGO, *ut supra;* WALSH, *Irish Eccl. Record,* Jan., 1892; LAMBING, *The Sunday School Teacher's Manual* (1873); FURNISS, *How to Teach at Catechism; Sunday School or Catechism?*; BELLORD, *Religious Education and its Failures* (Notre Dame, 1901); BAREILLE, MANGENOT, and KNECHT, *ut supra;* GLANCY, *Preface* to KNECHT, *Bible Commentary for Schools* (Freiburg, 1894); GIBSON, *The Catechism made Easy* (London, 1882); CARR, *A Lamp of the Word and Instructor's Guide* (Liverpool, 1892); HOWE, *The Catechist: or Headings and Suggestions for the Explanation of the Catechism* (Newcastle-on-Tyne, 1895); SLOAN, *The Sunday School Teacher's Guide to Success* (New York, 1907); *Amer. Eccl. Rev.,* Jan.–May, 1908; WEBER, *Die Münchener katechetische Methode;* GÖTTLER, *Der Münchener katechetische Kurs, 1905* (1906).

Catechisms, Manuals, etc. —It would not be possible to give anything like a complete list of these. We shall content ourselves with mentioning a few of the best-known in use in English-speaking countries. Some have already been mentioned in the article.—*A Catechism of Christian Doctrine, prepared and enjoined by order of the Third Council of Baltimore* (1885); *The Catechism ordered by the National Synod of Maynooth and approved of by the Cardinal, the Archbishops, and the Bishops of Ireland for General Use throughout the Irish Church* (Dublin, s. d.); *A Short Catechism extracted from the Catechism ordered,* etc. (Dublin, s. d.); *A Catechism of Christian Doctrine approved by Cardinal Vaughan and the Bishops of England* (London, 1902); *The Explanatory Catechism of Christian Doctrine* (the same with notes); *The Little Catechism; an Abridgement of the Catechism of Christian Doctrine* (London, s. d.); BUTLER, *Catechism* (Dublin, 1845); DEHARBE, *Catechism of the Christian Religion* (also known as *Fander's Catechism*) (New York, 1887); *Companion to The Catechism* (Dublin); SPIRAGO, *The Catechism Explained,* ed. CLARKE; GERARD, *Course of Religious Instruction for Catholic Youth* (London, 1901); DE ZULUETA, *Letters on Christian Doctrine;* CAFFERATA, *The Catechism Simply Explained* (London, 1897); *A Manual of Instruction in Christian Doctrine*—approved by Card. Wiseman and Card. Manning, much used in the higher schools and training colleges in the British Isles (London, 1861, 1871); WENHAM, *The Catechumen, an Aid to the intelligent knowledge of the Catechism* (London, 1881); POWER, *Catechism: Doctrinal, Moral, Historical, and Liturgical* (5th ed., Dublin, 1880).

Anglican: MACLEAR, *A Class Book of the Catechism of the Church of England* (London, 1886).

There are many Bible Histories in use, but none of them officially recommended, though published with episcopal approval. The best-known are: *The Children's Bible History for Home and School Use* (a small elementary work of which nearly a million and a half have been printed; it is capable of improvement) (London, 1872); FORMBY, *Pictorial Bible and Church History Stories,* including Old Testament History, the Life of Christ, and Church History (London, 1871); KNECHT, *Bible Commentary for Schools,* ed. GLANCY (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1894); WENHAM, *Readings from the Old Testament, New Testament Narrative* (London, 1907); RICHARDS, *Manual of Scripture History* (London, 1885); COSTELLO, *The Gospel Story* (London, 1900); *Scripture Manuals for Catholic Schools,* ed. SMITH (London, 1899); *St. Edmund's College Series of Scripture Manuals,* WARD ed. (London, 1897).

T. B. SCANNELL.

Doctrine, DEVELOPMENT OF. See REVELATION.

Doctrine of Addai (Lat. *Doctrina Addæi*), a Syriac document which relates the legend of the conversion of Edessa. It begins with the story of the letter of King Abgar to Christ (see ABGAR) and the reply of the latter, with some variations from the account drawn by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., I, xiii) from the Edessene archives. The reply was not a letter, as Eusebius says, but a verbal message, together with a portrait of Christ (not in Eusebius). After the Ascension Judas Thomas sent Addai, one of the seventy-two Disciples, to Abgar. Addai (Thaddeus in Eusebius) healed the king of his sickness, and preached before him, relating the discovery of the True Cross by Protonice, wife of the Emperor Claudius; this, with all that follows, is later than Eusebius, being founded on the story of St. Helena. Addai then preaches to the people, who are converted. The heathen altars are thrown down, and the people are baptized. King Abgar induces the Emperor Tiberius to chastise the Jews for having crucified the Saviour. Churches are built by Addai, and he makes deacons and priests. On his death-bed he appoints Aggai his successor, ordains the deacon Palut priest, and gives his last admonitions. He was buried in the sepulchre of the king's ancestors. Many years after his death, Aggai, who ordained holy priests for the country, was martyred as he taught in the church by a rebellious son of Abgar. His successor, Palut, was obliged to go to Antioch in order to get episcopal consecration, which he received from Serapion, Bishop of Antioch, who "himself also received the hand from Zephyrinus, Bishop of the city of Rome, from the succession of the hand of the priesthood of Simon Cephas, which he received from Our Lord, who was there Bishop of Rome twenty-five years, in the days of the Cæsar, who reigned there thirteen years" (evidently Nero is meant, who reigned from October, 54, to June, 68). The anxiety of the writer to connect the Edessene succession with Rome is interesting; its derivation from the Petrine See of Antioch does not suffice him.

The doctrine of the book is not unorthodox, though some expressions might be understood in an Apollinarian sense. The mention of Holy Scripture must be noticed: "They read in the Old Testament and the New, and the Prophets, and the Acts of the Apostles, every day they meditated on them"; "a large number of people assembled day by day and came to the prayer of the service, and to [the reading] of the Old and New Testament, of the Diatessaron"; "But the Law and the Prophets and the Gospel, which ye read every day before the people, and the Epistles of Paul, which Simon Peter sent us from the city of Rome, and the Acts of the twelve Apostles, which John, the son of Zebedee, sent us from Ephesus, these books read ye in the Churches of Christ, and with these read not any others, as there is not any other in which the truth that ye hold is written, except these books, which retain you in the faith to which ye have been called." The canon therefore excludes the Apocalypse and all the Catholic Epistles; in this it agrees with Aphraates, Theodore of Mopsuestia, the Syriac stichometrical list of Cod. Sin. 10 (in Mrs. Lewis's Catalogue of Sinai MSS.), and probably with Ephrem. The Syriac Church, indeed, never accepted the Apocalypse and the four shorter Catholic Epistles; the three longer were admitted at all events later than 400, at an uncertain date. The Diatessaron was employed by the Syriac Church from its composition by Tatian c. 160 until it was proscribed by the famous Bishop of Edessa, Rabbula (d. 435).

We seem to find firm historical ground in the statement that Palut was consecrated bishop by Serapion, who was Bishop of Antioch c. 191–212 and really a contemporary of Pope Zephyrinus. But this shows that Addai, who made Palut a priest, was not one of the seventy-two Disciples of Christ. The first Christian King of Edessa was in reality Abgar IX (179–214) who was converted soon after 201, and this date tallies with that of Palut. It is possible that Palut was the first Bishop of Edessa; but it is surely more likely that there was already a Church and a bishop under the pagan kings in so important a city. An early date for the Abgar legend is sometimes based upon the promise in the message of Christ: "Thy city shall be blessed, and no enemy shall again become master of it for ever." It is argued that this could not have been invented after the sacking of the city under Trajan in 116; but the writer might have passed over this event after a century and a half. The confusion of dates can hardly have arisen before the latter half of the third century, and the Edessene Acts used by Euse-

bius were probably not very old when he wrote. The "Doctrine of Addai" is yet later. The Finding of the Cross must be dated some time later than St. Helena; the miraculous picture of Christ was not seen by the Abbess Etheria when she visited Edessa c. 385. Hence the date of the work may be c. 400.

The "Doctrine of Addai" was first published in Syriac in a fragmentary form by Cureton, "Ancient Syriac documents" (London, 1864, a posthumous work), with a translation; another translation in "Ante-Nicene Chr. Libr.", XX. The full Syriac text was published by Phillips, with a translation (London, 1876). An Armenian version and (separately) a French translation, by the Mechitarist Father Leo Alishan, "Laboubnia, Lettre d'Abgar" (Venice, 1868).

The literature of the subject (including the Abgar legend, the Finding of the Cross, the Greek legend in the *Acta Thaddæi*, and the origins of the Church of Edessa) is very large. The following works may be specially mentioned: LIPSIUS, *Die edessenische Abgarsage kritisch untersucht* (Brunswick, 1880); TIXERONT, *Les origines de l'Eglise d'Edesse et la légende d'Abgar* (Paris, 1888); MARTIN, *Les origines de l'Eglise d'Edesse et des églises syriennes* (extr. from *Revue des sc. eccl.*, Paris, 1889); BURKITT, *Early Eastern Christianity* (London, 1904); NESTLE, *De sancta cruce* (Berlin, 1889); on the picture of Christ, VON DOBSCHÜTZ, *Christusbilder* (Leipzig, 1899). Further references will be found in BARDENHEWER, *Gesch. der altkirchl. Litt.*, I, 458; CHEVALIER, *Répertoire*, s. v. *Abgar*.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles. See DIDACHE.

Dodd, CHARLES. See TOOTELL, HUGH.

Dodone. See BODONE.

Doering, HENRY. See POONA.

Dogma.—I. DEFINITION.—The word *dogma* (Gr. δόγμα, from δοκεῖν) signifies, in the writings of the ancient classical authors, sometimes, an opinion or that which seems true to a person; sometimes, the philosophical doctrines or tenets, and especially the distinctive philosophical doctrines, of a particular school of philosophers (cf. Cic. Ac., ii, 9); and sometimes, a public decree or ordinance, as δόγμα ποιεῖσθαι. In Sacred Scripture it is used, at one time, in the sense of a decree or edict of the civil authority, as in Luke, ii, 1: "And it came to pass, that in those days there went out a decree [*edictum*, δόγμα] from Cæsar Augustus" (cf. Acts, xvii, 7; Esther, iii, 3); at another time, in the sense of an ordinance of the Mosaic Law, as in Eph., ii, 15: "Making void the law of commandments contained in decrees" (δόγμασιν); and again, it is applied to the ordinances or decrees of the first Apostolic Council in Jerusalem: "And as they passed through the cities, they delivered unto them the decrees [*dogmata*] for to keep, that were decreed by the apostles and ancients who were at Jerusalem" (Acts, xvi, 4). Among the early Fathers the usage was prevalent of designating as dogmas the doctrines and moral precepts taught or promulgated by the Saviour or by the Apostles; and a distinction was sometimes made between Divine, Apostolical, and ecclesiastical dogmas, according as a doctrine was conceived as having been taught by Christ, by the Apostles, or as having been delivered to the faithful by the Church. But according to a long-standing usage a dogma is now understood to be a truth appertaining to faith or morals, revealed by God, transmitted from the Apostles in the Scriptures or by tradition, and proposed by the Church for the acceptance of the faithful. It might be described briefly as a revealed truth defined by the Church; but private revelations do not constitute dogmas, and some theologians confine the word *defined* to doctrines solemnly defined by the pope or by a general council, while a revealed truth becomes a dogma even when proposed by the Church through her ordinary magisterium or teaching office. A dogma therefore implies a twofold relation: to Divine revelation and to the authoritative teaching of the Church.

Theologians distinguish three classes of revealed truths: truths formally and explicitly revealed; truths revealed formally, but only implicitly; and truths only virtually revealed. A truth is said to be formally revealed, when the speaker or revealer really means to convey that truth by his language, to guarantee it by the authority of his word. The revelation is formal and explicit, when made in clear express terms. It is formal but only implicit, when the language is somewhat obscure, when the rules of interpretation must be carefully employed to determine the meaning of the revelation. And a truth is said to be revealed only virtually, when it is not formally guaranteed by the word of the speaker, but is inferred from something formally revealed. Now, truths formally and explicitly revealed by God are certainly dogmas in the strict sense when they are proposed or defined by the Church. Such are the articles of the Apostles' Creed. Similarly, truths revealed by God formally, but only implicitly, are dogmas in the strict sense when proposed or defined by the Church. Such, for example, are the doctrines of Transubstantiation (q. v.), papal infallibility (q. v.), the Immaculate Conception (q. v.), some of the Church's teaching about the Saviour, the sacraments, etc. All doctrines defined by the Church as being contained in revelation are understood to be formally revealed, explicitly or implicitly. It is a dogma of faith that the Church is infallible in defining these two classes of revealed truths; and the deliberate denial of one of these dogmas certainly involves the sin of heresy. There is a diversity of opinion about virtually revealed truths, which has its roots in a diversity of opinion about the material object of faith (see FAITH). It is enough to say here that, according to some theologians, virtually revealed truths belong to the material object of faith and become dogmas in the strict sense when defined or proposed by the Church; and according to others, they do not belong to the material object of faith prior to their definition, but become strict dogmas when defined; and, according to others, they do not belong to the material object of Divine faith at all, nor become dogmas in the strict sense when defined, but may be called mediately-Divine or ecclesiastical dogmas. In the hypothesis that virtually revealed conclusions do not belong to the material object of faith, it has not been defined that the Church is infallible in defining these truths; the infallibility of the Church, however, in relation to these truths is a doctrine of the Church theologically certain, which cannot lawfully be denied; and though the denial of an ecclesiastical dogma would not be heresy in the strict sense, it could entail the sundering of the bond of faith and expulsion from the Church by the Church's anathema or excommunication.

II. DIVISIONS.—The divisions of dogma follow the lines of the divisions of faith. Dogmas can be (1) general or special; (2) material or formal; (3) pure or mixed; (4) symbolic or non-symbolic; (5) and they can differ according to their various degrees of necessity.—(1) General dogmas are a part of the revelation meant for mankind and transmitted from the Apostles; while special dogmas are the truths revealed in private revelations. Special dogmas, therefore, are not, strictly speaking, dogmas at all; they are not revealed truths transmitted from the Apostles; nor are they defined or proposed by the Church for the acceptance of the faithful generally.—(2) Dogmas are called material (or Divine, or dogmas in themselves, *in se*) when abstraction is made from their definition by the Church, when they are considered only as revealed; and they are called formal (or Catholic, or "in relation to us", *quoad nos*) when they are considered both as revealed and defined. Again, it is evident that material dogmas are not dogmas in the strict sense of the term.—(3) Pure dogmas are those which can be known only from revelation, as the Trinity (q. v.), Incarnation (q. v.), etc.; while mixed dogmas are truths which can be known from revelation or from philosophical reasoning, as the existence and attributes of God.

Both classes are dogmas in the strict sense, when considered as revealed and defined.—(4) Dogmas contained in the symbols or creeds of the Church are called symbolic; the remainder are non-symbolic. Hence all the articles of the Apostles' Creed are dogmas; but not all dogmas are called technically articles of faith, though an ordinary dogma is sometimes spoken of as an article of faith.—(5) Finally, there are dogmas belief in which is absolutely necessary as a means to salvation, while faith in others is rendered necessary only by Divine precept; and some dogmas must be explicitly known and believed, while with regard to others implicit belief is sufficient.

III. Objective Character of Dogmatic Truth; Intellectual Belief in Dogma.—As a dogma is a revealed truth, the intellectual character and objective reality of dogma depend on the intellectual character and objective truth of Divine revelation. We will here apply to dogma the conclusions developed at greater length under the heading of revelation (q. v.). Are dogmas, considered merely as truths revealed by God, real objective truths addressed to the human mind? Are we bound to believe them with the mind? Should we admit the distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental dogmas?

(1) Rationalists deny the existence of Divine supernatural revelation, and consequently of religious dogmas. A certain school of mystics has taught that what Christ inaugurated in the world was "a new life". The "Modernist" theory by reason of its recent condemnation calls for fuller treatment. There are different shades of opinion among Modernists. Some of them do not, apparently, deny all intellectual value to dogma (cf. Le Roy, "Dogme et Critique"). Dogma, like revelation, they say, is expressed in terms of action. Thus when the Son of God is said "to have come down from heaven", according to all theologians He did not come down, as bodies descend or as angels are conceived to pass from place to place, but the hypostatic union is described in terms of action. So when we profess our faith in God the Father, we mean, according to M. Le Roy, that we have to act towards God as sons; but neither the fatherhood of God, nor the other dogmas of faith, such as the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Resurrection of Christ, etc. imply of necessity any objective intellectual conception of fatherhood, Trinity, Resurrection, etc., or convey any idea to the mind. According to other writers, God has addressed no revelation to the human mind. Revelation, they say, began as a consciousness of right and wrong; and the evolution or development of revelation was but the progressive development of the religious sense until it reached its highest level, thus far, in the modern liberal and democratic State. Then, according to these writers, the dogmas of faith, considered as dogmas, have no meaning for the mind; we need not believe them mentally; we may reject them; it is enough if we employ them as guides for our actions. (See Modernism.) Over against this doctrine the Church teaches that God has made a revelation to the human mind. There are, no doubt, relative Divine attributes, and some of the dogmas of faith may be expressed under the symbolism of action, but they also convey to the human mind a meaning distinct from action. The fatherhood of God may imply that we should act towards Him as children towards a father; but it also conveys to the mind definite analogical conceptions of our God and Creator. And there are truths, such as the Trinity, the Resurrection of Christ, His Ascension, etc. which are absolute objective facts, and which could be believed even if their practical consequences were ignored or were deemed of little value. The dogmas of the Church, such as the existence of God, the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Resurrection of Christ, the sacraments, a future judgment, etc. have an objective reality and are facts as really and truly as it is a fact that Augustus was Emperor of the Romans, and that George Washington was first President of the United States.

(2) Abstracting from the Church's definition, we are bound to render to God the homage of our assent to revealed truth once we are satisfied that He has spoken. Even atheists admit, hypothetically, that if there be an infinite Being distinct from the world, we should pay Him the homage of believing His Divine word.

(3) Hence it is not permissible to distinguish revealed truths as fundamental and non-fundamental in the sense that some truths, though known to have been revealed by God, may be lawfully denied. But while we should believe, at least implicitly, every truth attested by the word of God, we are free to admit that some are in themselves more important than others, more necessary than others, and that an explicit knowledge of some is necessary while an implicit faith in others is sufficient.

IV. Dogma and the Church.—Revealed truths become formally dogmas when defined or proposed by the Church. There is considerable hostility, in modern times, to dogmatic religion when considered as a body of truths defined by the Church, and still more when considered as defined by the pope. The theory of dogma which is here expounded depends for its acceptance on the doctrine of the infallible teaching office of the Church and of the Roman pontiff. It will be sufficient to notice the following points; (1) the reasonableness of the definition of dogmas; (2) the immutability of dogma; (3) the necessity for Church unity of belief in dogma; (4) the inconveniences which are alleged to be associated with the definition of dogma.

(1) Against the theory of interpretation of Scripture by private judgment, Catholics regard as absolutely unacceptable the view that God revealed a body of truths to the world and appointed no official teacher of revealed truth, no authoritative judge of controversy; this view is as unreasonable as would be the notion that the civil legislature makes laws, and then commits to individual private judgment the right and the duty of interpreting the laws and deciding controversies. The Church and the supreme pontiff are endowed by God with the privilege of infallibility in discharge of the duty of universal teacher in the sphere of faith and morals; hence we have an infallible testimony that the dogmas defined and delivered to us by the Church are the truths contained in Divine revelation.

(2) The dogmas of the Church are immutable. Modernists hold that religious dogmas, as such, have no intellectual meaning, that we are not bound to believe them mentally, that they may be all false, that it is sufficient if we use them as guides to action; and accordingly they teach that dogmas are not immutable, that they should be changed when the spirit of the age is opposed to them, when they lose their value as rules for a liberal religious life. But in the Catholic doctrine that Divine revelation is addressed to the human mind and expresses real objective truth, dogmas are immutable Divine truths. It is an immutable truth for all time that Augustus was Emperor of Rome and George Washington first President of the United States. So according to Catholic belief, these are and will be for all time immutable truths: that there are three Persons in God, that Christ died for us, that He arose from the dead, that He founded the Church, that He instituted the sacraments. We may distinguish between the truths themselves and the language in which they are expressed. The full meaning of certain revealed truths has been only gradually brought out; the truths will always remain. Language may change or may receive a new meaning; but we can always learn what meaning was attached to particular words in the past.

(3) We are bound to believe revealed truths irrespective of their definition by the Church, if we are satisfied that God has revealed them. When they are proposed or defined by the Church, and thus become dogmas, we are bound to believe them in order to maintain the bond of faith (see HERESY).

(4) Finally, Catholics do not admit that, as is sometimes alleged, dogmas are the arbitrary creations of ecclesiastical authority, that they are multiplied at will, that they are devices for keeping the ignorant in subjection, that they are obstacles to conversions. Some of these are points of controversy which cannot be settled without reference to more fundamental questions. Dogmatic definitions would be arbitrary if there were no Divinely instituted infallible teaching office in the Church; but if, as Catholics maintain, God has established in His Church an infallible office, dogmatic definitions cannot be considered arbitrary. The same Divine Providence which preserves the Church from error will preserve her from inordinate multiplication of dogmas. She cannot define arbitrarily. We need only observe the life of the Church or of the Roman pontiffs to see that dogmas are not multiplied inordinately. And as dogmatic definitions are but the authentic interpretation and declaration of the meaning of Divine revelation, they cannot be considered devices for keeping the ignorant in subjection, or reasonable obstacles to conversions; on the contrary, the authoritative definition of truth and condemnation of error, are powerful arguments leading to the Church those who seek the truth earnestly.

V. DOGMA AND RELIGION.—It is sometimes charged that in the Catholic Church, in consequence of its dogmas, religious life consists merely in speculative beliefs and external sacramental formalities. It is a strange charge, arising from prejudice or from lack of acquaintance with Catholic life. Religious life in conventual and monastic establishments is surely not a merely external formality. The external religious exercises of the ordinary Catholic layman, such as public prayer, confession, Holy Communion, etc. suppose careful and serious internal self-examination and self-regulation, and various other acts of internal religion. We need only to observe the public civic life of Catholics, their philanthropic works, their schools, hospitals, orphanages, charitable organizations, to be convinced that dogmatic religion does not degenerate into mere external formalities. On the contrary, in non-Catholic Christian bodies a general decay of supernatural Christian life follows the dissolution of dogmatic religion. Were the dogmatic system of the Catholic Church, with its authoritative infallible head, done away with, the various systems of private judgment would not save the world from relapsing into and following pagan ideals. Dogmatic belief is not the be-all and end-all of Catholic life; but the Catholic serves God, honours the Trinity, loves Christ, obeys the Church, frequents the sacraments, assists at Mass, observes the Commandments, because he believes mentally in God, in the Trinity, in the Divinity of Christ, in the Church, in the sacraments and the Sacrifice of the Mass, in the duty of keeping the Commandments; and he believes in them as objective immutable truths.

VI. DOGMA AND SCIENCE.—But, it is objected, dogma checks investigation, antagonizes independence of thought, and makes scientific theology impossible. This difficulty may be supposed to be put by Protestants or by unbelievers. We will consider it from both points of view.

(1) Beyond scientific investigation and freedom of thought, Catholics recognize the guiding influence of dogmatic beliefs. But Protestants also profess to adhere to certain great dogmatic truths which are supposed to impede scientific investigation and to conflict with the findings of modern science. Old difficulties against the existence of God or its demonstrability, against the dogma of Creation, miracles, the human soul, and supernatural religion, have been dressed in a new garb and urged by a modern school of scientists principally from the discoveries in geology, palæontology, biology, astronomy, comparative anatomy, and physiology. But Protestants, no less than Catholics, profess to believe in God, in the Creation, in the soul, in the Incarnation, in the possibility of miracles; they too, maintain that there can be no discord between the true conclusions of science and the dogmas of the Christian religion rightly understood. Protestants, therefore, cannot consistently complain that Catholic dogmas impede scientific investigation. But it is urged that in the Catholic system beliefs are not determined by private judgment; behind the dogmas of the Church there is the living bulwark of her episcopate. True, behind dogmatic beliefs Catholics recognize ecclesiastical authority; but this puts no further restraint on intellectual freedom; it only raises the question as to the constitution of the Church. Catholics do not believe that God revealed a body of truths to mankind and appointed no living authority to unfold, to teach, to safeguard that body of Divine truths, to decide controversies; but the authority of the episcopate under the supreme pontiff to control intellectual activity is correlative with, and arises from their authority to teach supernatural truth. The existence of judges and magistrates does not extend the range of our civil laws; they are rather a living authority to interpret and apply the laws. Similarly, episcopal authority has for its range the truth of revelation, and it prohibits only what is inconsistent with the full scope of that truth.

(2) In discussing the question with unbelievers we note that science is "the observation and classification, or co-ordination, of the individual facts or phenomena of nature". Now a Catholic is absolutely free in the prosecution of scientific research according to the terms of this definition. There is no prohibition or restriction on Catholics in regard to the observation and co-ordination of the phenomena of Nature. But some scientists do not confine themselves to science as defined by themselves. They propound theories often unwarranted by experimental observation. One will maintain as a "scientific" truth that there is no God, or that His existence is unknowable; another that the world has not been created; another will deny in the name of "science" the existence of the soul; another, the possibility of supernatural revelation. Surely these denials are not warranted by scientific methods. Catholic dogma and ecclesiastical authority limit intellectual activity only so far as may be necessary for safeguarding the truths of revelation. If non-believing scientists in their study of Catholicism would apply the scientific method, which consists in observing, comparing, making hypotheses, and perhaps formulating scientific conclusions, they would readily see that dogmatic belief in no way interferes with the legitimate freedom of the Catholic in scientific research, the discharge of civic duty, or any other form of activity that makes for true enlightenment and progress. The service rendered by Catholics in every department of learning and of social endeavour, is a fact which no amount of theorizing against dogma can set aside. (See FAITH, INFALLIBILITY, REVELATION, SCIENCE, TRUTH.)

Acta et Decreta Concilii Vaticani in *Coll. Lac.* (Freiburg im Br., 1870–90), VII; SUAREZ, *Opera Omnia: De Fide Theologicâ;* DE LUGO, *Opera: De fide;* VACANT, *Etudes théologiques sur les constitutions du concile du Vatican* (Paris, 1895); GRANDERATH, *Constitutiones dogmaticæ Sacrosancti Œcumenici Concilii Vaticani ex ipsis ejus actis explicatæ atque illustratæ* (Freiburg im Br., 1892); SCHEEBEN, *Handbuch der katholischen Dogmatik* (Freiburg im Br., 1873); SCHWANE, *Dogmengeschichte* (2nd ed., Freiburg, 1895); MAZZELLA, *De Virtutibus Infusis* (Rome, 1884); BILLOT, *Tractatus de Ecclesiâ Christi* (Rome, 1903); IDEM, *De Virtutibus Infusis* (Rome, 1905); NEWMAN, *Idea of a University* (London, 1899).

DANIEL COGHLAN.

Dogmatic Facts.—(1) *Definition.*—By a dogmatic fact, in wider sense, is meant any fact connected with a dogma and on which the application of the dogma to a particular case depends. The following questions involve dogmatic facts in the wider sense: Is Pius X, for instance, really and truly Roman pontiff, duly elected and recognized by the Universal Church? This is connected with dogma, for it is a dogma of faith that every pontiff duly elected and recognized by the Universal Church is a successor of Peter. Again Was this or that council œcumenical? This, too, is connected with dogma, for every œcumenical council is endowed with infallibility and jurisdiction over the Universal Church. The question also whether canonized saints really died in the odour of sanctity is connected with dogma, for every one who dies in the odour of sanctity is saved. In the stricter sense the term *dogmatic fact* is confined to books and spoken discourses, and its meaning will be explained by a reference to the condemnation by Innocent X of five propositions taken from the posthumous book of Jansenius, entitled "Augustinus". It might be asked, for example, whether the pope could define that Jansenius was really the author of the book entitled "Augustinus". It is conceded that he could not. He may speak of it as the work of Jansenius, because, in general repute, at least, it was regarded as the work of Jansenius. The precise authorship of a book is called a personal fact. The question turned on the doctrine of the book. The Jansenists admitted that the doctrine enunciated in the condemned propositions was heretical; but they maintained that the condemned doctrine was not taught in the "Augustinus". This brings us to what are called "particular facts of doctrine". Thus it is a fact that God exists, and that there are three Persons in God; here the same thing is fact and dogma. The Jansenists admitted that the pope is competent to deal with particular facts of doctrine, but not to determine the meaning of a book. The controversy was then carried to the meaning of the book. Now it is conceded that the pope cannot define the purely internal, subjective, perhaps singular meaning, which an author might attach to his words. But the pope, in certain cases, can determine the meaning of a book judged by the general laws of interpretation. And when a book or propositions from a book are condemned, "in the sense of the author", they are condemned in the sense in which the book or propositions would be understood when interpreted according to the ordinary laws of language. The same formula may be condemned in one author and not in another, because, interpreted by the context and general argument of the author, it may be unorthodox in one case and not in the other. In the strict sense, therefore, a dogmatic fact may be defined as "the orthodox or heterodox meaning of a book or proposition"; or as a "fact that is so connected with dogma that a knowledge of the fact is necessary for teaching and conserving sound doctrine". When we say that a book contains unorthodox doctrine, we convey that a certain doctrine is contained in the book and that the doctrine is unorthodox; here we have close connexion between fact and dogma.

(2) *The Church and Dogmatic Facts.*—Jansenists distinguished between "fact" and "dogma". They held that the Church is infallible in defining revealed truth and in condemning errors opposed to revealed truth; but that the Church is not infallible in defining facts which are not contained in Divine revelation, and consequently that the Church was not infallible in declaring that a particular doctrine, in a particular sense, was found in the "Augustinus" of Jansenius. This would confine the infallible teaching of the Church to mere abstract doctrines, a view that cannot be accepted. Theologians are unanimous in teaching that the Church, or the pope, is infallible, not only in defining what is formally contained in Divine revelation, but also in defining virtually revealed truths, or generally in all definitions and condemnations which are necessary for safe-guarding the body of revealed truth. Whether it is to be regarded as a defined doctrine, as a doctrine *de fide*, that the Church is infallible in definitions about dogmatic facts, is disputed among theologians. The reason of this difference of opinion will appear below (3). The Church, in all ages, has exercised the right of pronouncing with authority on dogmatic facts; and this right is essential to her teaching office. She has always claimed the right of defining that the doctrine of heretics, in the sense in which it is contained in their books, or in their discourses, is heretical; that the doctrine of an orthodox writer, in the sense in which it is contained in his writings, is orthodox. We can scarcely imagine a theory like that of the Jansenists advanced within the sphere of the civil authority. We can scarcely conceive it to be held that a judge and a jury may pronounce on an abstract proposition of libel, but cannot find that a particular paragraph in a book or newspaper is libellous in the sense in which it is written. If the Church could not define the orthodox or unorthodox sense of books, sermons, conferences, and discourses generally, she might still be infallible in regard to abstract doctrine, but she could not fulfil her task as practical teacher of humanity, nor protect her children from actual concrete dangers to their faith and morals.

(3) *Faith and Dogmatic Facts.*—The more extreme Jansenists, distinguishing between dogma and fact, taught that the dogma is the proper object of faith but that to the definition of fact only respectful silence is due. They refused to subscribe the formula of the condemnation of Jansenism, or would subscribe only with a qualification, on the ground that subscription implied internal assent and acquiescence The less extreme party, though limiting the Church's infallibility to the question of dogma, thought that the formula might be signed absolutely and without qualification, on the ground that, by general usage, subscription to such a formula implied assent to the dogma, but, in relation to the fact, only external reverence. But the definitions of dogmatic facts demand real internal assent; though about the nature of the assent and its relation to faith theologians are not unanimous. Some theologians hold that definitions of dogmatic facts, and especially of dogmatic facts in the wider acceptation of the term, are believed by Divine faith. For instance, the proposition, "every pope duly elected is the successor of Peter", is formally revealed. Then, say these theologians, the proposition, "Pius X has been duly elected pope", only shows that Pius X is included in the general revealed proposition that "every pope duly elected is the successor of Peter". And they conclude that the proposition, "Pius X is successor to Peter", is a formally revealed proposition; that it is believed by Divine faith; that it is a doctrine of faith, *de fide;* that the Church, or the pope, is infallible in defining such doctrines. Other theologians hold that the definitions of dogmatic facts, in the wider and stricter acceptation, are received, not by Divine faith, but by ecclesiastical faith, which some call mediate Divine faith. They hold that in such syllogisms as this: "Every duly elected pontiff is Peter's successor; but Pius X, for example, is a duly elected pontiff; therefore he is a successor of Peter", the conclusion is not formally revealed by God, but is inferred from a revealed and an unrevealed proposition, and that consequently it is believed, not by Divine, but by ecclesiastical faith. It would then also be held that it has not been formally defined *de fide* that the Church is infallible in the definition of dogmatic facts. It would be said technically to be theologically certain that the Church is infallible in these definitions; and this infallibility cannot lawfully be questioned. That all are bound to give internal assent to Church definitions of dogmatic

facts is evident from the correlative duties of teacher and persons taught. As it belongs to the duty of supreme pastor to define the meaning of a book or proposition, correlatively it is the duty of the subjects who are taught to accept this meaning. (See DOGMA, FAITH, INFALLIBILITY, JANSENISM.)

HUNTER, *Outlines of Dogmatic Theol.*, I; BOLGENI, *Fatti dommatici, etc.* (Brescia, 1788); SCHEEBEN in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Facta Dogmatica;* NEWMAN, *Apologia;* see also the various treatises *De Ecclesiâ.*

DANIEL COGHLAN

Dogmatic Theology. See THEOLOGY.

Dol and Saint-Malo, DIOCESE OF. See RENNES, DIOCESE OF.

Dolbeau, JEAN, Recollect friar, b. in the Province of Anjou, France, 12 March, 1586; d. at Orléans, 9 June, 1652. He entered the order at the age of nineteen at Balmette, near Angers, and was one of the four Recollects who were the first missionaries of Canada. He landed at Quebec in May, 1615, and celebrated the first Mass ever said there. He became commissionary provincial of the mission in 1618 and preached the first jubilee accorded to Canada. This zealous missionary built the first monastery of the Recollects at Quebec in 1620. He returned to France in 1625, taking with him a young Indian boy who was later baptized at Angers. Endowed with many striking qualities, Father Dolbeau was remarkable for extraordinary spiritual insight and profound humility. He was successively master of novices, guardian, definitor, and provincial delegate at the general chapter of the order held in Spain in 1633. He died in the forty-seventh year of his religious life.

Biographical notices, seventeenth Century MSS. (Public Library, Orléans); SAGARD, *Hist. du Canada* (Paris, 1636); ed. TROSS (1866); LECLERCQ, *Premier établissement de la foi dans la Nouvelle France* (Paris, 1691); SHEA tr. (New York, 1881).

ODORIC M. JOUVE.

MADONNA AND CHILD
Corsini Gallery, Rome

PORTRAIT OF HIMSELF
Uffizi Gallery, Florence

ST. CASIMIR OF POLAND
Pitti Palace, Florence

CARLO DOLCI

Dolci, CARLO, painter, b. in Florence, Italy, 25 May, 1616; d. 17 January, 1686. The grandson of a painter, he seems to have inherited a talent for art. He studied under J. Vignali, and when only eleven years old he attracted attention by the excellence of his work, notably a figure of Saint John and a head of the Infant Jesus. The precocious youth made a carefully-finished picture of his mother, and thereafter was kept busy filling the numerous commissions he received in Florence, a city he seldom left during his long life, which he devoted to art. Dolci was one of the few masters whose pictures were eagerly sought for by his countrymen during his lifetime. He was very pious and painted religious works exclusively. It is recorded that in every Passion week he painted a picture of the Saviour. He limited his brush to heads—usually of Christ and the Virgin—and seldom undertook a large-sized canvas. He is celebrated for the soft, gentle, and tender expression of his faces, the transparency of his colour, the excellent management of chiaroscuro, and the careful and ivory-like finish of his pictures. The simplicity and tranquillity on the faces of his paintings of Christ and the Virgin seem little short of inspired. Hinds calls him mawkish and affected; but Dolci was the last of the Florentine School, the last real "master of the Renaissance"; and as decadent sweetness permeated all Italian art, his pictures but reflected the dominant character of the close of the seventeenth century. Patient and slow, he painted pictures that are perfectly finished in every detail. His masterpiece (1646) is "St. Andrew praying before his Crucifixion" (Pitti Gallery, Florence). It is one of the few works where his figures, always well drawn and standing out in beautiful relief, are life-size. Next in excellence to this is the "St. John writing his Gospel" (Berlin). His "Mater Dolorosa" called "Madonna del Dito" (of the thumb) is known throughout the civilized world because of its many reproductions. In 1662 Dolci saw with chagrin Giordano accomplish in a few hours what would have taken him weeks, and it is said he was thereupon seized with melancholy which ultimately led to his death. Loma, Mancini, Mariani, and Agnese Dolci (his daughter) were a few of his pupils and imitators. Contemporary copyists have filled European collections with spurious Dolcis. Agnese Dolci, who died the same year as her father, not only made marvellous copies of the master's pictures, but was herself an excellent painter. Her "Consecration of the Bread and Wine" is in the Louvre. Other works by him are: "Virgin and Child", National Gallery, London; "The Saviour seated with Saints", Florence; "Madonna and Child", Borghese Gallery, Rome.

BLANC, *Ecole florentine* (Paris, 1877); MORELLI, *Italian Masters in German Galleries* (London, 1883); CROWE AND CAVALCASELLE, *Hist. of Painting in Italy* (London, 1871).

LEIGH HUNT.

Doliche, a titular see of Commagene (Augusto-Euphratesia). It was a small city on the road from Germanicia to Zeugma (Ptolemy, V, 15, 10; Itiner. Anton., 184, 189, 191, 194; Tab. Peuting.), famous for its temple of Zeus Dolichenus; it struck its own coins from Marcus Aurelius to Caracalla. The ruins stand at Tell Dülük, three miles northwest of Aïntab, in the vilayet of Aleppo. Doliche was at an early date an

episcopal see suffragan of Hierapolis (Mabboug, Mêmbîdj). Lequien (Or. Christ., II, 937) mentions eight Greek bishops: Archelaus, present at Nicæa in 325, and at Antioch in 341; Olympius at Sardica in 344; Cyrion at Seleucia in 359; Maris at Constantinople in 381; Abibus, a Nestorian, in 431, deposed in 434; Athanasius, his successor; Timothy, a correspondent of Theodoret, present at Antioch in 444 and at Chalcedon in 451; Philoxenus, a nephew of the celebrated Philoxenus of Hierapolis, deposed as a Severian in 518, reinstated in 533 (Brooks, The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus, London, 1904, II, 89, 90, 345–350, 352). The see figures in the first "Notitia Episcopatuum" ed. Parthey, about 840. At a later time Doliche took the place of Hierapolis as metropolis (Vailhé, in Echos d'Orient, X, 94 sqq. and 367 sqq.). For a list of fourteen Jacobite Bishops of Doliche (eighth to ninth century), see "Revue de l'Orient chrétien", VI, 195. S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Döllinger, JOHANN JOSEPH IGNAZ VON, historian and theologian, b. at Bamberg, Bavaria, 28 February, 1799; d. at Munich, 10 January, 1890.

FAMILY AND EDUCATION.—Döllinger's father was a professor of medicine in the University of Bamberg, and his son was influenced, in an unusual degree, by the family traditions and his whole environment. The medical faculty of the University of Bamberg owed its foundation to his grandfather, whose son, the father of Ignaz (as Döllinger was usually called), became regular professor of medicine in the same university in 1794, but in 1803 was called to Würzburg. It was only natural that amid surroundings predominantly academic the youthful Ignaz should acquire a strong love of books, the best of which were then written in French, which language the future historian of the Church learned from his father. In the gymnasium he acquired a knowledge of Italian. A Benedictine monk taught him English privately, and he learned Spanish at the university. An orderly acquisition of learning and the full development of all his rich gifts would have led to extraordinary achievements. He had also sufficient means to satisfy any reasonable wishes for foreign travel and the purchase of books. All these circumstances, doubtless, combined to render his mind particularly receptive; at the same time the multitude of impressions daily made on the young student led him to outline a plan of studies by far too comprehensive.

On entering the University of Würzburg at the age of sixteen, he took up at once history, philosophy, philology, and the natural sciences. In this choice there is already evident a certain mental irregularity, the more remarkable if we recall what he said, two years later, apropos of his choice of a vocation, viz., that, "no professor in the faculty of philosophy had been able to attract him to his particular science". The conversion of such men as Eckhart, Werner, Schlegel, Stolberg, and Winkelmann turned his thoughts to theology, which he took up in 1818, but without abandoning botany, mineralogy, and entomology, to which studies he continued for many years to devote considerable time. We quote from Friedrich the following noteworthy utterance of Döllinger: "To most other students theology was only a means to the end. To me, on the contrary, theology, or science in general based on theology, was the end, the choice of a vocation only the means." During his student days he seldom attended the regular lectures on theology, but he was assiduous at the lectures in the faculty of philosophy and law; privately, however, he read many works on theology. His studies were better regulated when in 1820 he entered the ecclesiastical seminary at Bamberg and followed the theological courses given at the lyceum. The year and a half spent in this manner made up, but not sufficiently, for the previous lack of a systematic training in theology. He was ordained priest 22 April, 1822, spent the summer at his home, and in November, was appointed chaplain at Marktscheinfeldt in Middle Franconia. Despite the profound grasp of dogma and moral theology that his works at times exhibit, his career gives evidence enough that he never took the pains to round out satisfactorily the insufficiency of his early training in theology. The elder Döllinger had hoped to see his son follow an academic career and opposed his choice of the priesthood; among the reasons for his opposition was the conviction, openly expressed (and then prevalent enough among the German clergy), that for physiological reasons a celibate life was impossible.

CAREER.—Döllinger's father soon obtained (November, 1823) for him a place as professor of canon law and church history in the lyceum of Aschaffenburg. It was here that in 1826 he published his first work, "Die Eucharistie in den drei ersten Jahrhunderten", an eloquent and solid treatise, still much appreciated. It obtained for him from the theological faculty of the Bavarian University of Landshut the title of Doctor of Theology *in absentiâ*. In the same year he was called to Munich as professor extraordinary of canon law and church history, and in 1827 was made professor in ordinary. In 1839 the king gave him a canonry in the royal chapel (*Hofkollegiatstift*) of St. Cajetan at Munich, and on 1 Jan., 1847, he was made mitred provost or head of that body of canons. In the same year he was dismissed from his chair, in punishment of his protest as representative of the university in the Bavarian Landtag, to which he had been appointed in 1844, against the dismissal of several university professors. But in 1848 he was chosen representative to the Frankfort Parliament and remained in attendance until the middle of 1849. Then followed (24 Dec., 1849; according to some authorities 1 Jan., 1850) his reappointment as professor, which office he held until 18 April, 1871, when Archbishop von Scherr publicly excommunicated him. Thereupon he laid down his ecclesiastical charges, recognized the binding force of his excommunication and, though he held his professorate another year, taught only a course of modern history. In 1868 King Louis II of Bavaria had appointed him royal councillor, and maintained him in his office as provost of St. Cajetan, even after his excommunication; practically, this meant only the continuance to him of the revenue of the position. Döllinger received in 1873 another evidence of the royal favour, when, on the death of the famous chemist Liebig, he was named by the king to the presidency of the Royal Bavarian Academy of Sciences and general conservator of the scientific collections of the State. As early as 1837 he had been made member extraordinary of the Academy, in 1843 a regular member, and from 1860 was secretary of its historical section.

Many attempts were made, by ecclesiastics and laymen, to induce Döllinger to return to the Church. The personal conviction of the latter may be read in his correspondence (edited by Friedrich, Munich, 1899–1901) with Archbishop Steichele and the nuncio, Monsignor Ruffo-Scilla. In 1886 and 1887 both of these prelates together with Bishop von Hefele of Rottenburg besought Döllinger to abandon his Old-Catholic attitude and be reconciled with the Church. His response to the archbishop contained these words: "Ought I (in obedience to your suggestion) to appear before the Eternal Judge, my conscience burdened with a double perjury?" At the end of his letter to the nuncio he said: "I think that what I have written so far will suffice to make clear to you that with such convictions one may stand even on the threshold of eternity in a condition of inner peace and spiritual calm". He died aged ninety-one, still outside the communion of the Church.

LIFE AND WRITINGS.—It was at Munich that Döllinger began his life-work. Formally, he was pro-

fessor of canon law and ecclesiastical history, but was soon burdened with the teaching of dogma and New-Testament exegesis, a task to which a weaker or inferior mind would not have proved equal. He declined, in 1829, a call to Breslau, although King Louis I heartily wished him out of Bavaria; he also refused a later call to Freiburg in the Breisgau. He was offered, in 1839, a professorship at an English college, but preferred to remain in Munich. To facilitate the coming of Johann Adam Möhler from Tübingen to Munich (1835), he gave over to him the courses of ecclesiastical history and New-Testament exegesis, and when Möhler died (12 April, 1838) he collected a number of essays of this great theologian which for the most part were already in print, but were widely scattered, and published them in two volumes (1839) under the title of "Gesammelte Schriften und Aufsätze". While Möhler taught at Munich, Döllinger lectured on the history of dogma (*Historische Dogmatik*). At the request of Abel, Minister of the Interior, Döllinger began, in 1838, a course of lectures in the Faculty of Philosophy on the philosophy of religion in opposition to the teaching of the honorary professor Von Baader, the theosophist, and of Schelling. He continued, however, to lecture on dogma and ecclesiastical history. From November, 1846, to February, 1848, Bavarian public affairs were disturbed by the royal attachment to Lola Montez, a Spanish ballerina; the Abel ministry was dismissed, and professors Lasaulx, Moy, Phillips, Höfler, and Deutinger either dismissed or reprimanded; Döllinger, finally, as stated above, was removed from his office. After his restoration in 1850 he continued to the end as professor of church history. In 1862 he was made Knight of the Order of Maximilian for science and art.

Apart from his aforesaid offices of canon and provost, Döllinger held but one other ecclesiastical office in Munich. After the conflict concerning mixed marriages (1832), he was made *defensor matrimonii* in the matrimonial court of first instance, later in that of second instance, which office he held until 1862. His circle of friends was from the beginning quite extensive; the physicians and professors of the natural sciences who frequented his father's house were themselves men of distinction. As a student he formed the acquaintance of the poet, Graf von Platen, and of Victor Aimé Huber. Later, Platen wished to study Sanskrit with Döllinger, and visited him twice at Marktscheinfeld. In the ecclesiastical seminary of Bamberg he met Prince Alexander von Hohenlohe (q. v.), of whose miraculous cures he said later: "Cures there were, but such as often happen in the history of the Church; the deep stirring of the emotions suffices easily enough to explain them", a remark that fails to account for the presence of deep emotions in the absent sick. On a visit to Platen at Erlangen, in 1822, he met Pfaff, Schubert, and Schelling, the last a friend of his father. In his early days at Munich he was much in the company of the above-mentioned philosopher, Franz von Baader. When, in 1827, the famous Joseph Görres came to Munich as professor of history, there formed about him at once a sympathetic circle of scholars, among them the youthful Döllinger. Döllinger's relations with Lamennais, more particularly with Count Montalembert, gave occasion in 1832 to a violent attack in the Bavarian Parliament on Görres and his friends. Lamennais at that time contemplated the establishment at Munich of a house of studies for young Frenchmen (*Œuvre des études allemandes*), who might thus come under the influence of Görres, Baader, and others, and on their return to France stand manfully for the defence of the Church. In the meantime Döllinger had met Andreas Räss, the founder (1821) of "Der Katholik" (still published at Mainz), who in 1828 was rector of the ecclesiastical seminary at Strasburg as well as professor of dogma and homiletics; with Döllinger he projected various literary enterprises which, through pressure of other work, were never realized.

At this time Monsignor Wiseman, later Cardinal, and Archbishop of Westminster, then professor at the Roman University (Sapienza) and rector of the English College, saw the necessity of strengthening Catholicism in the development of its new opportunities in England, and for this reason was minded to effect closer relations with the learned clergy of Germany. Döllinger seemed to him the proper mediator; he therefore visited Munich in 1835, made the acquaintance of the distinguished professor, and spoke with him of his hopes and plans. Wiseman, already well known in Europe by his "Horæ Syriacæ", aroused in Döllinger so deep an interest, that the next year the latter visited England. His biographer, Friedrich, describes the result of this visit as follows: "Döllinger had a life-long hatred of bureaucracy both in Church and State; the large independence, therefore, of English public life delighted him and filled him with an admiration that was often excessive. Thenceforth he remained always in close touch with England, kept constantly in his home, and at considerable sacrifice, a number of young English students, and directed the studies of others whom he could not keep under his own roof." In 1850 the youthful Sir John Emerich Edward Acton (q. v.) entered his house as a student, to become later his intimate friend. Later, as John Lord Acton and Regius Professor of modern history at Cambridge, he remained in close touch with the Old Catholics, though he never formally severed his connexion with the Church. We do not as yet possess accurate knowledge concerning Acton's share in the work known as "Letters from Rome" concerning the Vatican Council (Römische Briefe vom Konzil), published by Döllinger in the Augsburg "Allgemeine Zeitung".

DÖLLINGER

As a rule Döllinger observed with his pupils a strict academic dignity and reserve; among the few whom he treated as intimate friends Acton was easily the foremost. Among those who in this early period exerted the greatest influence over Döllinger was Karl Ernest Jarcke, founder and editor (since 1832) of the Berlin "Politische Wochenblätter", confidant of Metternich, and a frequent visitor to the Bavarian capital. In 1838 came the foundation of the "Historisch-politische Blätter" by Guido Görres, Phillips, and Jarcke; the new organ soon greatly augmented the influence of Görres and his circle of friends, the most loyal and earnest of whom at this time was Döllinger.

The dispute over the question of mixed marriages in Prussia, known as the *Kölner Streit* (1831), followed close upon that in Bavaria (1831); both were fought out dramatically, and brought Döllinger and his Munich friends to the front as vigorous defenders of Catholic rights. The first estrangement of Döllinger from Görres and his friends came about through the publication of an important manual of canon law by Phillips (from 1834 to 1847 professor of canon law at Munich). To Döllinger it seemed that the latter emphasized excessively the extent of the papal pre-

rogative. Nevertheless, he continued for a decade to collaborate on the "Historisch-politische Blätter"; it was only slowly and almost imperceptibly that the change in his opinions came about. Gradually, owing to his opposition to the Jesuits and particularly to the Roman Curia, he sought and found new friends in Liberal circles. As member of the Frankfort Parliament (1848) he sat with the Right, among men like Radowitz, Lichnowsky, Schwerin, Vincke, and others; he also belonged to the Club "Zum steinernen Haus".

The change that had come about in Döllinger's views during the preceding years may best be measured by the fact that his colleagues in Frankfort obtained his consent to the following plan. General von Radowitz, in the name of the Catholic deputies, was to make this declaration in Parliament: "The orders, including the Jesuit Order, are not a part of the living organism of the Catholic Church; the Jesuit Order is no wise necessary in Germany; the German episcopate and the German clergy do not need its help to fulfil their obligations; German learning [*die deutsche Wissenschaft*] needs no aid of this nature. The possible advantages for the Catholic Church accruing from the co-operation of the Jesuit Order would be greatly outweighed by the disturbances and perils that its presence would create. If it were proposed to introduce the Jesuits into any German State, moved by the higher interests of the Catholic Church, we would protest most decidedly against the execution of any such plan."

The relations of Döllinger with the German episcopate were frequent, particularly after the meeting of the German and Austrian prelates at Würzburg (22 Oct. to 16 Nov., 1848). His report concerning the national Church and national synods, as submitted to this important assembly, aroused deep interest, was received with approval in many episcopal circles, and assured him the leadership in the acute ecclesiastico-political discussions then impending. Between 1852 and 1854 he visited Northern and Central Italy, and in 1857 Rome. Apart from his learned researches on these occasions, he profited by these journeys to strengthen his existing relations with numerous Italians, ecclesiastics and laymen, also to make new acquaintances and friendships. While Döllinger sought in every way to retain the favour of King Maximilian II, the cleft between him and his former friends as well as his own past continued to widen. For a while the famous professor seemed to stand almost alone, particularly after the stormy scenes of the Munich Congress of Catholic savants (28 Sept. to 1 Oct., 1863). Daniel Bonifatius von Haneberg, Abbot of St. Boniface in Munich, opened this Congress of eighty-four members, mostly German theologians, on which occasion Döllinger delivered his famous discourse, "Die Vergangenheit und Gegenwart der katholischen Theologie" (The Past and Present of Catholic Theology). Many of those present, among them Haneberg, saw with sorrow that they could not follow Döllinger along the new path he was taking. He held no longer to the universal idea of Catholicism as a world-religion; in its place, nourished by the court atmosphere he loved so well, arose a strictly nationalistic concept of the Catholic Church. All ecclesiastical measures he henceforth criticized from the narrow angle of Gallicanism, and ridiculed in anonymous articles and other writings. He was daily in closer communion with the principal Bavarian statesmen, and amid these relations conceived an idea of the Church's office which in the end could not be other than un-Catholic. It may be noted here, that his intimacy with the philosopher Johann Huber, a disciple of Schelling, had attracted attention long before this. Nevertheless (and it was a sign of the strong tension of those days and the mental temper of many) a number of German bishops still held to Döllinger, although they had long since parted company with Joseph Hubert Reinkens, professor of church history at Breslau and later first bishop of the Old Catholics. It was not until 18 July, 1870, when the dogma of Papal Infallibility was proclaimed at Rome, that there was a sharp division in the ranks of German Catholics. This compelled Döllinger henceforth to seek friends and allies exclusively among the leaders of the *Kulturkampf* and the Old Catholics, as also among anti-Catholic statesmen and princes.

Döllinger, as is well known, wrote much and admirably, and his writings exhibit, with a rare fidelity, every phase of his mental conflict. He was still a young man when his profound learning and brilliant diction, coupled with an unusual ease and rapidity in the critical treatment of whatever historical thesis lay before him, earned for him an international reputation. He lacked, however, the methodical training necessary for the scientific editing of original texts and documents, in which respect his deficiencies were occasionally only too evident. He was not content with bare investigation of the facts and problems of Christian antiquity, or of medieval and modern history, but sought always a satisfactory solution for the difficulties that confronted the student. His diction was always charming, whether the subject were one demanding a strictly scientific and well-ordered narrative or the light and rapid style called for by the pressing, but ephemeral, needs of the hour. He was likewise skilful as a public speaker, not only when delivering a carefully prepared discourse, but also when called on for an extemporaneous address. A typical example of his ability in this respect was his extempore discourse in St. Paul's Church, Frankfort, on Church and State, apropos of Article III of the fundamental articles (*Grundrechte*) of the Constitution: several of the best speakers had preceded him, and, in order to closely follow their line of thought, his whole address had to be extemporized; nevertheless, it was admitted by all that, both in form and logic, his address was by far the best delivered on that occasion. The admiration of his students, no doubt, was due in great measure to the beautiful diction in which he was wont to dress the facts of history.

The writings of Döllinger may be divided into purely scientific and political or ecclesiastico-political. They exhibit for the most part, however, a mutual interdependence and often complete one another. To avoid repetition, it seems better to follow the chronological order. It is worthy of note that when writing anonymously his tone was frequently bitter, occasionally even violent; writing over his own name he usually avoided such extremes. His first work (1826), "Die Eucharistie in den drei ersten Jahrhunderten", has already been mentioned. In 1828 he published the first volumes of Hortig's "Kirchengeschichte", from the Reformation to the end of the eighteenth century. He also wrote frequently at this time for "Eos", a new review founded by his friends, Baader and Görres; most of the articles dealt with contemporary subjects. According to Friedrich he also prepared "Umrisse zu Dante's Paradies von P. von Cornelius", i. e. an introduction to that writer's edition of Dante's "Paradiso". His journalistic activity, however, was far from pleasing to the ministerial councillor, Joseph Freiherr von Hormayr, a somewhat erratic, but influential, person, who so influenced the king that he wished Döllinger well out of Bavaria, as has been seen in the case of his call to Breslau.

In these years, also, he defended with vigour the matrimonial legislation of the Church, in connexion with the "Mixed Marriages" conflict (1831) in the Upper House of the Bavarian Parliament, and he was author of an anonymous work "Ueber die gemischten Ehen"; at the same time he suggested as a means of avoiding all conflict, that the civil marriage be separated from the religious ceremony. Meanwhile he continued to collect the material for his scientific works. In 1833 and 1835 respectively he published the first and second parts of his "Handbuch der Kirch-

engeschichte" (to the end of the seventh century). The next year (1836) he brought out the first volume, and in 1838 the first half of the second volume of his "Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte" (to the end of the fifteenth century). The essay "Muhammeds Religion, eine historische Betrachtung" was read before the Munich Academy about the time he published the aforesaid work on mixed marriages; early in 1838 he published his "Beurtheilung der Darlegung des geheimen Rathes Bunsen: eine Stimme zum Frieden". A long controversy with Professor Thiersch followed this entrance of Döllinger into the Prussian conflict over mixed marriages (*Kölner Streit*); his articles were printed in the Augsburg "Allgemeine Zeitung", and are apparently his earliest contributions to the journal in which thirty-one years later he was to consummate his apostasy. Karl von Abel, Minister of the Interior, now asked him to publish a popular "Weltgeschichte", or universal history, from the Catholic point of view, also a manual of religion (*Religionslehrbuch*) for the gymnasia or high-schools; he began these works, but, feeling himself unsuited to their composition, persuaded the minister to relieve him from the undertaking. Later on, he undertook to explain his failure in the Parliament; his explanation, however, seems quite improbable, and may be looked on as either a meaningless piece of malice or a case of self-deception.

A royal order (1838) that compelled all soldiers to genuflect before the Blessed Sacrament was soon the cause of much friction; in 1843 the matter came before the Upper House, where representatives of the non-Catholic soldiers protested against the measure as contrary to liberty of conscience. Döllinger defended the king and the Government in an anonymous work entitled: "Die Frage der Kniebeugung der Protestanten von der religiösen und staatsrechtlichen Seite erwogen", wherein he treated the question from both the religious and political point of view; this was followed by a long controversy with the Protestant deputy, Harless. In the meantime he was chosen by the University of Munich as its representative in the Bavarian Parliament, where he protested against the admission of the Jesuits and defended the emancipation of the Jews, both of which acts drew upon him the enmity of many.

During this political agitation, and while Lola Montez still held the king infatuated, appeared the first volume of his great work "Die Reformation, ihre innere Entwicklung und ihre Wirkungen im Umfange des lutherischen Bekenntnisses", i. e. on the origin, development, and consequences of the Reformation in Lutheran circles; the second volume appeared in 1847, the third in 1848. A second edition of the first volume was printed in 1851. This work unfortunately remained incomplete; Friedrich says that Döllinger's friends prevented him from publishing the corresponding three volumes, i. e. an account of the conditions within the Catholic Church in the same period. This work long exercised a powerful influence and still retains its value. Johannes Janssen (q. v.) was inspired by it to undertake the exhaustive studies which have done so much to destroy the traditional legends that so long did duty as a history of the Reformation.

The foolish attempt of some zealots to have the temporal power of the pope proclaimed a dogma (*Dogmatisierung des Kirchenstaates*) excited Döllinger to an extraordinary degree. He became firmly persuaded that theological science could be saved only by the German Catholic Church, not by the Catholic Church in Germany. By theological science he meant chiefly historical theology. All other ecclesiastical interests seemed to this great scholar quite subordinate. His aversion to the education of the clergy in seminaries, later quite pronounced, was another result of this mental attitude, the trend of which he revealed on various occasions at the Frankfort Parliament, and in the above-mentioned report (1848) of the Würzburg meeting of the German and Austrian bishops. Gradually he came to be looked upon as a Gallican, nor was this because of his frequently expressed and strong dislike of the Jesuits. Many persons, among them the best and most loyal supporters of the Church, looked henceforth with a certain anxiety on the course of Döllinger. It could not be said that the nuncios at Munich admired him unreservedly. On the other hand, throughout the ranks of the German and Austrian clergy there was still only a mediocre theological knowledge, the legacy of an earlier period of infidelity and rationalism, and the concept of Catholic doctrine and discipline differed widely from the true ecclesiastical ideal of both.

To understand fully the profound changes working in the mind of Döllinger during the critical years from 1847 to 1852, it is well to recall his discourses at the general meetings of the "Katholischer Verein" at Ratisbon (1849) and Linz (1850), also those in the Upper House of the Bavarian Parliament, in St. Paul's at Frankfort, and at the meetings of the German hierarchy at Würzburg (1849) and Freising (1850). To some extent, also, disappointment was responsible for his new mental attitude; his friends and admirers had tried in vain to obtain for him an important German see. It is worthy of note also that about 1855 the author of the work on the Reformation began gradually to modify his views to such an extent that eventually (in 1889) he wrote a panegyric on Protestantism.

The Greek patristic text entitled "Philosophoumena, or Refutation of all Heresies", discovered in 1842 and edited by Miller (Oxford, 1851), at once fascinated Döllinger, and he devoted to its study all the rich powers of his erudition, critical skill, and insight. In 1853 he published the result of his labours in "Hippolytus und Kallistus, oder die römische Kirche in der ersten Hälfte des dritten Jahrhunderts", etc. a study of the Roman Church from 200 to 250, in reply to the interpretations of the "Philosophoumena" published by Bunsen, Wordsworth, Baur, and Gieseler. Despite the contrary arguments of De Rossi, Döllinger's opinion has prevailed, and it is now generally acknowledged that Hippolytus is the author of the work in question. Döllinger's essay in the "Historisch-Politische Blätter" (1853) entitled "Betrachtungen über die Frage der Kaiserkrönung", considerations on the imperial coronation, contributed not a little to deter Pius IX from crowning Napoleon III. Concerning the definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception Döllinger exhibited a prejudiced mind and a rather superficial historical grasp of the question; the defects in his theological equipment were here most noticeable. Indeed, he was much less concerned with the doctrine itself than with the person who wished to proclaim it as a dogma of faith. It was also his first open protest against a pope who was soon to proclaim that Papal Infallibility which seemed to Döllinger an utterly intolerable doctrine, from his view-point of exaggerated esteem for historical theology.

The year 1857 was marked by the appearance of his "Heidenthum und Judenthum, Vorhalle des Christenthums" (Heathenism and Judaism, the Vestibule of Christianity), the first part of his long contemplated history of the Church; the second part followed in 1860 (2nd ed., 1868) as "Christenthum und Kirche in der Zeit der Grundlegung", dealing with the Apostolic period. The work, as he had planned, was never completed. Most of the abundant material he had collected for an exhaustive history of the papacy was afterwards utilized in an ephemeral journalistic way. The work itself he never undertook, and had he done so, it is possible that he would have come into conflict with the Holy See much sooner than he did.

In 1861 some of the principal ladies of Munich requested him to deliver a series of public discourses on

the Temporal Power; to this he acceded with pleasure, and the discourses given in the royal Odeum were followed with deep attention by crowded audiences. His utterances, however, were so imprudent and so clearly inspired by Liberalism that in the midst of one of them the papal nuncio, Monsignor Chigi, arose with indignation and left the hall. The impression made by these discourses on the Catholic world was painful in the extreme. Döllinger was himself deeply troubled by the agitation aroused; to justify himself in some measure, also to strengthen his position, now seriously compromised, he composed in great haste and issued during the same year his "Kirche und Kirchen, Papstthum und Kirchenstaat". It seems incredible that the opinions and judgments one reads in this work are really Döllinger's own; the reader is haunted by the suspicion that he has before him a remarkable mixture of Byzantinism and hypocrisy.

The Catholic academic circles of Germany were in the meantime deeply agitated by the discussions incident to the renaissance of Scholasticism (see NEO-SCHOLASTICISM) in theology and philosophy, and those over the merits of the episcopal seminaries as against the theological faculties of the universities for the education of candidates for the priesthood. There were excesses on both sides that intensified the situation, whereupon it seemed to many that an academical congress would be a helpful measure. An assembly of Catholic scholars met in 1863 at Munich, before which, as already stated, Döllinger delivered (28 September) the discourse "Die Vergangenheit und Gegenwart der katholischen Theologie" (The Past and Present of Catholic Theology). His views, as expressed on this occasion, were calculated to irritate and embitter his opponents, and a reconciliation seemed farther away than before. Shortly afterwards, in the thirteenth thesis of the papal Syllabus of 8 Dec., 1864 (see QUANTA CURA), certain opinions of Döllinger were condemned.

It was unfortunate, but not surprising, therefore, that the "Papstfabeln des Mittelalters", medieval fables about the popes (Munich, 1863; 2nd ed., 1890), received no impartial appreciation from his opponents; the pages (131–53) on the Monothelism of Pope Honorius were considered particularly offensive. From this period to the publication of the "Janus" letters, the pen of Döllinger produced mostly anonymous articles, in which his approaching apostasy was daily more clearly foreshadowed. He gave also much thought to the plan of a universal German biography, the present "Allgemeine deutsche Biographie". Though it was finally von Ranke who induced the Munich Academy to undertake the now practically finished work which, unfortunately, still shows frequent traces of partisanship, it was Döllinger's ardour and insistence that first moved the Academy to consider the proposition. There is even yet a very widespread conviction, and it was believed by the great Christian archæologist De Rossi, who was quite accurately informed on all the details of the Vatican Council, that Döllinger would scarcely have left the Church if he had been invited to take an honourable share in the preliminary work for the council. Nor does this seem at all improbable to those who understand his character. It is, in any case, very regrettable that on this point the influence of Cardinal Reisach should have outweighed that of Cardinal Schwarzenberg, and availed to exclude the Munich historian.

Scarcely had the first detailed accounts of the council's proceedings appeared, when Döllinger published in the Augsburg "Allgemeine Zeitung" his famous "March articles", reprinted anonymously in August of that year under the title: "Janus, der Papst, und das Konzil." The accurate knowledge of papal history here manifested easily convinced most readers that only Döllinger could have written the work. At this time he provoked the "Hohenlohe theses" and followed them up with an anonymous work, "Erwägungen für die Bischöfe des Konzils über die Frage der Unfehlbarkeit", considerations concerning papal infallibility for the bishops of the council. This work was translated into French, and a copy sent to every bishop. In the meantime Cardinal Schwarzenberg, in unison with French sympathizers, urged him to be present at Rome in his private capacity during the council; he preferred, however, to remain at Munich, where he prepared for the aforesaid "Allgemeine Zeitung", with materials sent him regularly from Rome (even by bishops), the well-known Roman correspondence (Briefe vom Konzil), each letter of which fell in Rome like a bomb, but whose real author no one knew. When Döllinger wrote for the same journal, over his own name, the articles "Einige Worte über die Unfehlbarkeitsaddresse der Konzilsmajorität" (a few words on the address of the majority of the bishops concerning papal infallibility) and "Die neue Geschäftsordnung im Konzil" (the council's new order of business), he was denounced in Rome as a heretic. Bishop Ketteler addressed to him an open letter quite brusque in tone, while other bishops urged him to keep silent. Döllinger yielded, and on 18 July, 1870, the personal infallibility of the pope and his universal pastoral office were declared articles of faith. The foregoing presentation of the actual situation in that critical time is taken from the life of Döllinger by Johann Friedrich, the theologian of Cardinal Hohenlohe during the council, and to whom, despite his oath of silence concerning the affairs of the council, Döllinger was indebted for the materials of the "Letters". The declaration of papal infallibility meant naturally for Döllinger a severe internal conflict. The facts, however, do not justify the statement that he had long previously determined never to accept the dogma. The Archbishop of Munich, however, insisted on a public declaration of his attitude, and Döllinger weakly yielded to the pressure of those who were bent on apostasy, and wrote to the archbishop, 29 March, 1871, declaring his refusal to accept the dogma and stating his reasons in his character as Christian, theologian, historian, and citizen.

Leo XIII and Pius X have both declared, with all due formality and solemnity, that Church and State, each within its own limits, are mutually independent; the Döllinger portrait of an infallible pope domineering over the State is, therefore, a caricature. For the great scholar it was *dies ater* when he wrote these words, for the theologian a period of profound mental confusion, for the Christian a succumbing to spiritual arrogance, for the citizen a full confession of the bureaucratic omnipotence of the State, a kind of belated resurrection of the memories of his youth.

Döllinger had definitely severed connexion with the Church. Three weeks later (18 April, 1871) both Döllinger and Friedrich were publicly declared excommunicate. The action of the archbishop, under the circumstances unavoidable, aroused much feeling; on the one side it was hailed as a decisive step that ended a situation grown scandalous and intolerable, on the other many rejoiced that the world-renowned scholar had not bent his neck under the yoke of Rome. This marked the rise of the sect of the Old Catholics. At Pentecost of the same year (1871) a declaration was published, chiefly the work of Döllinger, setting forth the need of an ecclesiastical organization. Döllinger also signed a petition to the Government asking for one of the churches of Munich. Hitherto the opposition of this party to the Church had been mostly of a philosophico-historical character, and the dominant statesmen of the time could turn it to little practical account. It was now the hour for a number of inimical canonists whose opportunity lay in the anti-Catholic tendencies of the governments of the period. Prince Bismarck's plan of a National German Catholic Church, as independent of Rome as it was possible to

make it (foreshadowed by Döllinger in 1849), corresponded now with the wishes of the apostate Catholics, henceforth governed absolutely by the canonist von Schulte (see Old Catholics). The first assembly of these opponents of the Vatican Council was held at Munich, 22–24 Sept., 1871. On the suggestion of von Schulte, and despite the opposition and warnings of Döllinger, it was decided to establish the "Old Catholic Church". Thenceforth Döllinger followed a policy of vacillation, avoiding on the one hand any formal relationship to the new Church, on the other helpful to it by counsel and deeds; at one time disapproving positively important decisions of the sect, and again placing at its disposal all his influence and prestige. The new "Church" lacked distinction and was personally very distasteful to him; in public, however, though with measured reserve, he defended it. Henceforth formally excommunicated from the Catholic Church, he recognized the validity and legality of that act; at the same time he held it beneath his dignity to submit to the jurisdiction of Bishop Reinkens, for whom the Old Catholics had obtained consecration from the Jansenists in Holland. He stood, therefore, between the two camps, and looked on it as almost a calumny that the most insignificant members of the new sect considered him, more or less, an intimate adherent and a sharer of their trials.

The next seven years he spent in pacifying his conscience, or, in his own words, in a process of internal criticism; until 1887 he did nothing of importance, apart from a few essays, his academic discourses, and the work "Ungedruckte Berichte und Tagebücher zur Geschichte des Konzils von Trient", unedited reports and diaries useful for a history of the Council of Trent (1876). In 1887 he edited, with Reusch, the autobiography of Bellarmine up to 13 June, 1613, in German; with Reusch also he published (1889–90) in two volumes "Geschichte der Moralstreitigkeiten in der römisch-katholischen Kirche seit dem sechszehnten Jahrhundert, mit Beiträgen zur Geschichte und Carakteristik des Jesuitenordens", or a history of the moral-theological discussions in the Roman Catholic Church since the sixteenth century, including studies on the history and characteristics of the Jesuit Order. About the same time he published in two volumes his "Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters"; after his death appeared (1891) the third volume of his "Akademische Vorträge", or academic discourses.

He retained to the end a remarkable physical and mental strength. Though his latest writings met with a kindly reception in scientific circles, they were not considered as superior in merit, either from the viewpoint of scientific criticism or as historical narrative. Seldom has it been so clearly proven that whenever a man turns completely from a glorious and honourable past, however stormy, his fate is irrevocably sealed.

Von Kobell, *Ignaz von Döllinger, Erinnerungen* (Munich, 1891); Friedrich, *Ignaz von Döllinger. Sein Leben auf Grund seines schriftlichen Nachlasses* (Munich, 1899–1901); cf. *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie* (Leipzig, 1904), LXVIII, whence the above-quoted excerpts from Döllinger; Michael, *Ignaz von Döllinger, eine Charakteristik* (Innsbruck, 1894); *Zeitschrift für Kirchengesch.* (Gotha, 1903), XXIV; *Revue du Clergé français* (1903), XXXVI; *Kirchliches Handlex.* (Munich, 1907), s. v.; Marshall, *Döllinger and the Old Catholics* in *Am. Cath Quart. Review* (Philadelphia, 1890), 267 sqq., also files of the London *Tablet* and *Dublin Review* (1870–1871).

Paul Maria Baumgarten.

Dolman, Charles, publisher and bookseller, b. at Monmouth, England, 20 Sept., 1807; d. in Paris, 31 December, 1863. He was the only son of Charles Dolman, a surgeon of Monmouth, and Mary Frances his wife, daughter of Thomas Booker, a Catholic publisher in London. Educated at St. Gregory's, the Benedictine college at Downside, near Bath, he later, while residing at Preston, Lancashire, studied architecture under Joseph A. Hansom, intending to follow that profession, but abandoned the idea on being invited by the Bookers, publishers and booksellers, into which family his father had married, to go to London. When Joseph Booker died in 1837, he was induced to carry on the business with his aunt, Mary Booker, and his cousin, Thomas Booker. In 1840 the name of the firm was changed to Booker & Dolman and finally the business was continued in his name only. His career as a publisher of periodical literature began when in 1838 he brought out a new series of "The Catholic Magazine", which up to that time had been known as "The Edinburgh Catholic Magazine", in contradistinction to "The Catholic Magazine", a much older publication which had gone out of existence in 1835. Dolman's publication was discontinued in June, 1844, but his name had become so widely known that in March, 1845, he brought out a new periodical called "Dolman's Magazine and Monthly Miscellany of Criticism". This was at first under the sole management of its publisher, but later the Rev. Edward Price succeeded him. Like the others it was short-lived and in 1849 it was merged with "The Catholic Weekly and Monthly Orthodox" under the title of "The Weekly Register". It first appeared under the new name, 4 August, 1849, published by Thomas Booker. From this time on Dolman abandoned the publication of periodicals and devoted himself solely to works that had never before been brought out by the Catholic press. His many efforts to raise the standard of the Catholic press ended in failure. Disheartened by his ill-success and broken down in health, he retired to Paris, where he died. He was survived by his wife and an only son, the Very Rev. Charles Vincent Dolman, of Hereford, canon of Newport.

Gillow, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.; Kent in *Dict. of Nat. Biog.*, s.v.

Thomas Gaffney Taaffe.

Dolores Mission (or Mission San Francisco de Asis de los Dolores), in point of time the sixth in the chain of twenty-one California Indian Missions; formally opened 9 Oct., 1776. The date intended for the celebration was 4 Oct., the feast of St. Francis of Asissi, but owing to the absence of the military commander of the neighbouring presidio, which had been established on 17 Sept., the feast of the Stigmata of St. Francis, the formal founding was delayed. The first Mass on or near the site was celebrated in a tent by Father Francisco Palou, on the feast of the Apostles Peter and Paul, 29 June, and on 28 July the first Mass was offered up in the temporary chapel. Father Palou on the title pages of the mission records gives 1 August as the day of foundation. The early missionaries, however, always celebrated the 4th of October as the patronal feast of the mission. The appellation "Dolores" was added because the mission was established on a streamlet which Father Pedro Font, O.F.M., and Captain Juan Bautista de Anza had discovered on 28 March, 1776, and in honour of the Blessed Virgin had called Arroyo de Nuestra Señora de los Dolores. In all official documents, reports, and in the records, the mission bears no other name than San Francisco de Asis; but after 1824, when the Mission San Francisco Solano was established at Sonóma, to avoid confusion it was popularly called Dolores, that is to say, the mission on the Dolores. The founders of the mission were Father Francisco Palou, the historian, and Father Pedro Benito Cambon. The other missionaries stationed here in the course of time were the Franciscan Fathers Tomás de la Peña, Miguel Giribet, Vincente de Santa María, Matías Noriega, Norberto de Santiago, Diego García, Faustino de Solá, Antonio Dantí, Martín de Landaeta, Diego de Noboa, Manuel Fernández, José de Espí, Ramón Abella, Luis Gil, Juan Sainz, Vincente Oliva, Juan Cabot, Blas Ordaz, José Altimira, Tomás Esténega, Lorenzo Quijas, José Gutierrez, José Mercado, José Real, Miguel Muro. The Rev. Prudencio Santillan, the first secular priest, took charge in 1846.

The cornerstone of the present church, the oldest

building in San Francisco, and which survived the earthquake of 1906 practically without damage, was laid in 1782 and finished with a thatched roof. In 1795 tiles replaced the thatch. The mission buildings as usual were erected in the form of a square. The church stood in the south-east corner fronting the east. The wings of the square contained the rooms of the missionaries, two of whom were always there until about June, 1828, the shops of the carpenters, smiths, saddlers, rooms for melting tallow and making soap, for agricultural implements, for spinning wool and weaving coarse fabrics. There were twenty looms in constant operation, and two mills moved by mule-power ground the grain. Most of the neophytes were engaged in agriculture and stock-raising. Owing to the barren nature of the soil and the high winds in the neighbourhood, sowing and planting was done ten or twelve miles down the peninsula. The stock also grazed far away from the mission. About one hundred yards from the church stood the neophyte village, composed of eight rows of one-story dwellings. The girls lived at the mission proper under the care of a matron (see CALIFORNIA MISSIONS). A school was in operation in 1818. The highest number of Indians living at the mission was reached in 1820, when 1242 neophytes made their home with the missionaries and received food, clothing, and instruction. The first baptism of an Indian occurred on 24 June, 1777. From that date till October, 1845, when the last Franciscan departed, 7200 names entered into the baptismal record, about 500 of which represented white people. During the same period 5503 deaths occurred, and 2156 marriages were blessed; about eighty of the latter were those of white couples. From 1785 to the end of 1832, for which period we have the reports, the mission raised 120,000 bushels of wheat, 70,226 bushels of barley, 18,260 bushels of corn, 14,386 bushels of beans, 7296 bushels of peas, and 905 bushels of lentils and garvanzos or horse beans. The largest number of animals owned by the mission was as follows: cattle, 11,340 head in 1809; sheep, 11,324 in 1814; goats, 65 in 1786; horses, 1239 in 1831; mules, 45 in 1813.

DOLORES MISSION, SAN FRANCISCO

Records of Mission San Francisco, Ms.; *Archives of Mission Santa Barbara*, Ms.; FONT, *Diario at Berkeley University*, Ms. (Berkeley, Cal.); PALOU, *Noticias* (San Francisco, 1874), II, IV; PALOU, *Vida del Fray Junípero Serra* (Mexico, 1787); BANCROFT, *History of California* (San Francisco, 1886), I, V; ENGELHARDT, *The Franciscans in California* (Harbor Springs, Mich., 1897).

ZEPHYRIN ENGELHARDT.

Dolours of the Blessed Virgin Mary. See SORROWS OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY.

Dolphin (Lat. *delphinus*).—The use of the dolphin as a Christian symbol is connected with the general ideas underlying the more general use of the fish (q. v.). The particular idea is that of swiftness and celerity symbolizing the desire with which Christians, who are thus represented as being sharers in the nature of Christ the true Fish, should seek after the knowledge of Christ. Hence the representation is generally of two dolphins tending towards the sacred monogram or some other emblem of Christ. In other cases the particular idea is that of love and tenderness. Aringhi (Roma Subterr., II, 327) gives an example of a dolphin with a heart, and other instances have some such motto as PIGNUS AMORIS HABES (i. e. thou hast a pledge of love). It is sometimes used as an emblem of merely conjugal love on funeral monuments. With an anchor the dolphin occurs frequently on early Christian rings, representing the attachment of the Christian to Christ crucified. Speaking generally, the dolphin is the symbol of the individual Christian, rather than of Christ Himself, though in some instances the dolphin with the anchor seems to be intended as a representation of Christ upon the Cross.



DOLPHINS ON THE BALERIA LATOBIA TOMBSTONE

MAMACHI, *De Orig. et Ant. Chr.*, iii; MARTIGNY, *Dict. des Ant. Chr.*, s. v.; SMITH AND CHEETHAM, ed., *Dict. of Christian Antiq.*, s. v.; see especially WILPERT, *Le Pitture delle Catacombe Romane* (Freiburg, 1903); and DALTON, *Catalogue of Early Christian Antiquities etc. in the British Museum* (London, 1901).

ARTHUR S. BARNES.

Dom. See BENEDICTINE ORDER.

Dome (Lat. *domus*, a house), an architectural term often used synonymously with cupola. Strictly speaking it signifies the external part of a spherical or polygonal covering of a building, of which the cupola (q. v.) is the inner structure, but in general usage dome means the entire covering. It is also loosely used, as in the German *Dom* and Italian *Duomo*, to designate a cathedral, or, at times, to signify some other building of importance. A dome may be of any material, wood, stone, metal, earthenware, or it may be built of a single mass or of a double or even triple series of concentric coverings. The dome is a roof, the base of which is a circle, an ellipsis, or a polygon, and its vertical section a curved line, concave towards the interior. Hence domes are called circular, elliptical or polygonal, according to the figure of the base. The most usual form is the spherical, in which case its plan is a circle, the section a segment of a circle. Domes are sometimes semi-elliptical, pointed, often in curves of contrary flexure, bell-shaped, etc. Except in the earlier period of the development of the dome, the interior and exterior forms were not often alike, and, in the space between, a staircase to the lantern was generally made.

Domes are of two kinds, simple and compound. In the simple dome, the dome and the pendentives are in one, and the height is only a little greater than that of an intersecting vault formed by semicircular arches. The dome over the central part of the tomb of Galla Placidia, at Ravenna, and those over some of the aisles of Saint Sophia, Constantinople, are of this description. In the compound dome two methods were followed. In both methods greater height is obtained, and the compound dome was consequently the one used on all important buildings of the later period. In one, the dome starts directly from the top of the circle formed by the pendentives; in the other, a cylindrical wall or "drum" intervenes between the pendentives and the dome, thus raising the latter considerably. In churches with domes without drums, the windows are in the dome itself immediately above the springing; otherwise, they are in the drum, and the surface of the dome is generally unbroken. At

the monastery of St. Luke, Phocis, Greece, are two churches of the eleventh century, side by side, the smaller of which has a drum with windows in it, whereas the larger church has no drum, and the windows are in the dome. The drum is universal in all domed churches of the Renaissance, at which time it received special treatment and became a most important feature. Many of these drums are not circular in plan externally, but are many-sided, and the angles are often enriched by marble shafts, etc. The carrying-up of the walls vertically is a good expedient constructionally, as it provides weight above the haunches of the dome and helps to neutralize its thrusts. In the churches of the second period, at Constantinople, Salonica, Athens, and other parts of Greece, in which the true drum occurs, it is of considerable height and is generally eight-sided. Windows come at each side, and over the windows are arches which cut into the dome itself.

A primitive form of the dome and the barrel vault is of great antiquity. In some districts men were compelled to build in stone or brick or mud, because there was no wood, as in Assyria; in other districts because they had not the tools to work wood. In all such cases some form of dome or tunnel vault had to be devised for shelter. In tracing the growth of the dome in historical times, it has been regarded as an outcome of the architecture of the Eastern Empire, because it was at Constantinople and in the Byzantine provinces that it was first employed in ecclesiastical structures. But it was the Romans who in reality developed the use of the dome, as of all other applications of the semicircular arch. From Rome it was carried to Constantinople and from the same source to different parts of the Western Empire. In Eastern Christendom the dome became the dominant factor in church design; whether a single dome, as at Saint Sophia, Constantinople (built, 532–537), or a central dome encircled by other domes, as at St. Mark's, Venice, or a row of domes, as at Angoulême. The plan and domes of Angoulême are reproduced in the new Catholic cathedral at Westminster. The Roman dome was a hemisphere supported by a circular wall. Its finest example was the Pantheon, Rome. Equally characteristic, though smaller, examples abound, e. g. at Rome, the temple of Minerva Medica, the tomb of Constantia, now the church of Santa Costanza, etc. Viollet-le-Duc in writing of the dome of the Pantheon says, "This majestic cupola is the widest, the most beautiful, the best constructed, and most stable of all the great domes of the world". The inside diameter of the dome is 142½ feet. Previous to the building of the Pantheon in its present domical form, during the reign of Hadrian about A. D. 123, the history of the dome is for the most part a blank.

The primitive Eastern dome seems to have been on a very small scale, and to have been used for subordinate purposes only. It was a common architectural feature in ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia. In later times the dome was largely employed in architecture by the Persian Sassanids, Mohammedans, and the Byzantines. From the first domed churches built for Christian worship sprang Byzantine architecture and its offshoots. The builder of the earliest domed church of any magnitude was Constantine; its locality the famous city of Antioch in Syria. The problem of the Christian domed church, so far at least as its interior is concerned, received in Saint Sophia its full solution. The dome is the prevailing conception of Byzantine architecture, and M. Choisy, in his "Art de bâtir chez les Byzantins" traces the influence of this domical construction on Greek architecture to show how from their fusion the architecture of the Eastern Empire became possible. Domes were now, from the time of the construction of Saint Sophia, placed over square apartments, their bases being brought to a circle by means of pendentives, whereas, in Roman architecture, domes as a rule were placed over a circular apartment. The grouping of small domes round a large central one was very effective, and one of the peculiarities of Byzantine churches was that the dome had no additional outer covering. The dome was rarely used by medieval builders except when under oriental influence, hence it was practically confined to Spain and Italy. The dome of the cathedral at Pisa, the first model of the Tuscan style of architecture, was begun in the eleventh century, and in the thirteenth was founded the cathedral at Florence. Its dome equals in size that of St. Peter's at Rome, and was its model. During the Italian Renaissance, domed construction became again of the first importance, possibly on account of its classical precedent, and it is interesting to note that the Pantheon became once more the starting-point of a new development which culminated in the domes of St. Peter's, Rome, and St. Paul's, London.

The substructure of the dome of St. Peter's is a round drum, which serves as a stylobate and lifts it



Interior of the Pantheon, Rome

above the surrounding roofs. On this stands the ringwall of the drum, decorated with a Corinthian order and carrying an attic; on this sits the oval mass of the noblest dome in the world. The drum, fifty feet high, is pierced by sixteen square-headed windows. The enormous thickness of the stylobate allows an outside offset to receive the buttresses which are set between the windows, in the shape of spur-walls with engaged columns at the corners, over which the entablature is broken. The curve of the dome is of extraordinary beauty. Between its ribs, corresponding to the buttresses below, are three diminishing tiers of small dormer windows. The lantern above, with an Ionic order, repeats the arrangement of windows and buttresses in the drum below, and is surmounted by a Latin cross rising 448 feet above the pavement. The foremost Renaissance church in Florence is the church of the Annunziata, and is remarkable for a fine dome carried on a drum resting directly on the ground. To the latest time of the Renaissance in Venice belongs the picturesque domed church of Santa Maria della Salute. The two finest domes in France are those of the Hôtel des Invalides and the Panthéon (formerly the church of Sainte-Geneviève) at Paris. Domes built in the early part of the twelfth century are to be found at Valencia, Zamora, Salamanca, Clermont, Le Puy, Cahors. They are also found in Poitou, Périgord, and Auvergne; at Aachen, Cologne, Antwerp, and along the banks of the Rhine; at Aosta, Pavia, Como, Parma, Piacenza, Verona, Milan, etc. There are, besides, the bulbous domes of Russia and the flattened cupolas of the Saracens. The dome became the lantern in English Gothic, and the octagon of Ely cathedral is said to be

the only true Gothic dome in existence. The central octagon of the Houses of Parliament, London, is the best specimen of a modern Gothic dome. Arab domes are mostly of the pointed form such as are derived from the rotation of the Gothic arch or bulbous, the section being a horse-shoe arch. Very beautiful examples are seen in the buildings known as the tombs of the caliphs at Cairo. Among the finest examples of domed buildings in the East are the Tombs of Mohammedan sultans in the south of India and at Agra. The largest dome in America is that of the Capitol at Washington. It is built of iron.

FLETCHER, *A History of Architecture* (New York, 1905); BOND, *Gothic Architecture in England* (New York, 1906); CUMMINGS, *A History of Architecture in Italy* (Boston, 1901); BROWN, *From Schola to Cathedral* (Edinburgh, 1886); SMITH, *Architecture, Gothic and Renaissance* (London, 1898); SIMPSON, *A History of Architectural Development* (New York, 1905); WALCOTT, *Sacred Archæology* (London, 1868).

THOMAS H. POOLE.

ST. JEROME (Detail)
Domenichino, Vatican

Domenech, EMMANUEL-HENRI-DIEUDONNÉ, Abbé, missionary and author, b. at Lyons, France, 4 November, 1826; d. in France, June, 1886. In the spring of 1846, before completing his seminary studies and when not yet twenty years of age, he left France in response to an urgent appeal for missionaries to help develop the Church in the wilds of Texas, then rapidly filling up with American and European immigration. He went first to St. Louis, where he spent two years completing his theological course, studying English and German, and gathering knowledge of missionary requirements. In May, 1848, he was assigned to duty at the new German settlement of Castroville in Texas, from which he was transferred later to Brownsville. The war with Mexico was just concluded; raiding bands of Mexicans and rangers were ravaging on both sides of the Rio Grande, while outlaws from the border States and almost equally lawless discharged soldiers filled the new towns, and hostile Indians hovered constantly in the background. A cholera epidemic added its horrors. Nevertheless, the young priest went bravely to work with such energy that he soon became an efficient power for good throughout all Southern Texas. In 1850 he visited Europe and was received by the pope. Returning to Texas, he continued in the mission field two years longer, when he returned to France with health broken and was appointed titulary canon of Montpellier. When the French troops were dispatched to Mexico in 1861 he was selected to accompany the expedition as almoner to the army and chaplain to the Emperor Maximilian. After the return to France he devoted his remaining years to European travel, study, and writing, and the exercise of his ecclesiastical functions. In 1882–3 he again visited America.



DOMENICHINO
By himself, Uffizi Gallery, Florence

Among his numerous works dealing with travel, history, and theology, may be noted: "Journal d'un missionnaire au Texas et au Mexique" (Paris, 1857); "Voyage dans les solitudes américaines" (Paris, 1858); "Histoire du jansénisme"; "Histoire du Mexique" (Paris, 1868); "Souvenirs d'outre-mer" (Paris, 1884). His principal works have appeared also in English translation. In regard to his much-controverted "Manuscrit pictographique américain" (Paris, 1860), an examination of the supposed Indian pictographs leaves no doubt that in this case the unsuspecting missionary was grossly deceived.

Consult his own works, with introductions; also PETZHOLDT, *Le livre des sauvages* (Brussels, 1861).

JAMES MOONEY.

Domenichino, properly DOMENICO ZAMPIERI, an Italian painter, b. in Bologna, 21 Oct., 1581; d. in Naples, 16 April, 1641. He began his art studies in the school of Calvaert, but being ill-treated there, his father, a poor shoemaker, placed him in the Carracci Academy, where Guido Reni and Albani were also students. Domenichino was a slow, thoughtful, plodding youth whom his companions called the "Ox", a nickname also borne by his master Ludovico. He took the prize for drawing in the Carracci Academy, gaining thereby both fame and hatred. Stimulated by success, he studied unremittingly, particularly the expression of the human face, so that Bellori says "he could delineate the soul".

His student days over, he first visited Parma and Modena to study Correggio, and then went to Rome, where his earliest friend and patron, Cardinal Agucchi, commissioned him to decorate his palace. In Rome he assisted the Carracci with their frescoes in the palace of Cardinal Farnese, who became such an admirer of Domenichino that he had him execute many of the pictures in the Basilian Abbey of Grotta Ferrata. Domenichino's best frescoes are in this church. With Guido he painted, for Cardinal Borghese, in S. Gregorio; for Cardinal Aldobrandini he executed ten frescoes at Villa Frascati; for Cardinal Montalto he decorated S. Andrea della Valle; and for Cardinal Bandini he painted four pictures for S. Silvestro which rank among his best productions.

He immortalized his name by painting (1614) for the altar of S. Girolamo della Carità, the "Communion of St. Jerome", a copy of which, in mosaics, is in St. Peter's. This is one of the great pictures of the world and was considered second only to Raphael's "Transfiguration". He received about fifty dollars for it. Napoleon took it to Paris but the Allies returned it. Jealousy of Domenichino long accumulating now burst forth, and he was accused of copying his masterpiece from Agostino Carracci. Weary of attacks, the



DOMES

MOSQUE OF KAIT BEY, OLD CAIRO
CHURCH OF S. MARIA DELLA SALUTE, VENICE

THE TAJ MAHAL, AGRA, INDIA
THE PANTHEON, ROME

CATHEDRAL OF BASIL THE BEATIFIED, MOSCOW
CHURCH OF THE INVALIDES, PARIS

THE COMMUNION OF ST. JEROME—DOMENICHINO

THE VATICAN, ROME

artist went to Bologna but later returned to Rome, where Pope Gregory XV made him painter and architect of the Apostolic Camera (pontifical treasury). In 1630 he settled in Naples and there opened a school, but was harassed, as in Rome, by envious artists (cabal of Naples), who disfigured his paintings. Mental suffering, perhaps poison, hastened his death. Domenichino, although not a master of great originality and inspiration, was a prominent figure in the Bolognese School. Potent in fresco he also excelled in decorative landscapes; his colour was warm and harmonious, his style simple, his chiaroscuro superbly managed, and his subordinate groups and accessaries well adjusted and of great interest. The most famous masters of the burin engraved his works, which are: "Portrait of Cardinal Agucchi", Uffizi, Florence; "Life of St. Nilus" (fresco) in Grotta Ferrata near Rome; "Condemnation of Adam and Eve", Louvre, Paris; "St. George and the Dragon", National Gallery, London; "St. John", Hermitage, St. Petersburg.

RICHTER, *Catalogue of the Dulwich Gallery* (London, 1880); DOHMER, *Kunst and Künstler des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit* (Leipzig, 1877); BRYAN, *Dictionary of Painters and Engravers.*

LEIGH HUNT.

Domesday Book is the name given to the record of the great survey of England made by order of William the Conqueror in 1085–86. The name first occurs in the famous "Dialogus de Scaccario", a treatise compiled about 1176 by Richard Fitznigel, which states that the English called the book of the survey "Domesdei", or "Day of Judgment", because the inquiry was one which none could escape, and because the verdict of this register as to the holding of the land was final and without appeal. Certain it is that the native English resented William's inquisition. "It is shame to tell", wrote the chronicler, "what he thought it no shame for him to do. Ox, nor cow, nor swine was left that was not set down upon his writ." The returns give full information about the land of England, its ownership both in 1085 and in the time of King Edward, its extent, nature, value, cultivators, and villeins. The survey embraced all England except the northernmost counties. The results are set down in concise and orderly fashion in two books called the "Exchequer Domesday". Another volume, containing a more detailed account of Wilts, Dorset, Somerset, Devon, and Cornwall, is called the "Exon Domesday", as it is in the keeping of the cathedral chapter of Exeter.



ENTRIES IN DOMESDAY BOOK

The chief interest of the Domesday Book for us here lies in the light which it throws upon church matters. As Professor Maitland has pointed out, a comparison of Domesday with our earliest charters shows not only that the Church held lands of considerable, sometimes of vast, extent, but that she had obtained these lands by free grant from kings or underkings during the Saxon period. We find, for example, that four minsters, Worcester, Evesham, Pershore, and Westminster, were lords of seven-twelfths of the soil of Worcestershire, and that the Church of Worcester alone was lord of one-quarter of that shire besides other holdings elsewhere. It is probable, however, that this did not imply absolute ownership, but only superiority and a right to certain services (Maitland, "Domesday Book and Beyond", pp. 236–42). This must be borne in mind when we see it stated, and so far correctly, on the authority of Domesday, that the possessions of the Church represented twenty-five per cent of the assessment of the country in 1066 and twenty-six and one-half per cent of its cultivated area in 1086. These lands were in any case very unequally distributed, the proportion of church land being much greater in the South of England. The record does not enable us to tell clearly how far the parochial system had developed, and though in Norfolk and Suffolk all the churches seem to have been entered, amounting to 243 in the former, and 364 in the latter, county, the same care to note the churches was obviously not exercised in the West of England. Much church property seems to have been of the nature of a tenancy held from the king upon condition of some service to be rendered, often of a spiritual kind. Thus we read; "Alwin the priest holds the sixth part of a hide", at Turvey, Beds, "and held it tempore regis Edwardi, and could do what he liked with it; King William afterwards gave it to him in alms, on condition that he should celebrate two ferial masses [ferias missas] for the souls of the King and Queen twice a week." Valuable as is the information which the Domesday Book supplies, many questions suggested by it remain obscure and are still keenly debated. A facsimile of the whole record was brought out some years ago by photozincography, and at the end of the eighteenth century an edition was printed in type specially cast to represent the contractions of the original manuscript.

The most convenient introduction to the subject is BALLARD, *The Domesday Inquest* (London, 1906). The more advanced student may be referred to MAITLAND, *Domesday Book and Beyond* (new ed., London, 1907); to ROUND, *Feudal England* (London, 1895); and to EYTON, *Domesday Studies.* But there are many minor essays dealing with questions of local interest.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Domestic Prelate. See PRELATE.

Domicile (Lat. *jus domicilii*, right of habitation, residence).—The canon law has no independent and original theory of domicile; both the canon law and all modern civil codes borrowed this theory from the Roman law; the canon law, however, extended and perfected the Roman theory by adding thereto that of quasi-domicile. For centuries ecclesiastical legislation contained no special provision in regard to domicile, adapting itself quite unreservedly on this point both to Roman and Barbarian law. It was only in the thirteenth century, after the revival at Bologna of the study of Roman law, that legists and then the canonists, returned to the Roman theory of domicile, introducing it first into the schools and then into practice. Not that the Church had "canonized", so to speak, this particular point of Roman law more than others, but civil law, being more ancient, formed a basis for canon law, which accepted it, at least in so far

as it was not at variance with later decrees of pontifical law. So true is this that there exists no document in which the theory of domicile has been completely and officially expounded by an ecclesiastical legislator.

I. Roman Law.—We must therefore revert to Roman law, which established domicile as the extension or communication of a pre-existent legal status of individuals—origin (*origo*, *jus originis*). In the theory of the Roman lawyers each man belongs to his municipality, to his city, where, as he contributes his share to the expenses and taxes, so he has a right to the common advantages. Children naturally follow their father's condition and belong likewise to the city, even though born at a distance. Such is the Roman *origo*, quite akin to what we call nationality, except that the *origo* relates to the restricted locality of one's birth, and nationality to one's native land. Hence it is birth, the legal birthplace, that determines one's *origo*, i. e. not the actual site of birth but the place where each one should have been born, the municipality to which the father belonged (L. 1. ff. Ad municip.). Let us now suppose a man settled for a long time in a city of which he is not a native. Partly in return for the taxes he pays, and partly to permit him to exercise local civic duties, he is granted the *status* of a real citizen, without loss, however, of his own *origo* or municipal right. Such, then, is the primitive concept of domicile in Roman law: the communication to a man, born in one municipality but residing permanently in another, of the civil rights normally reserved to citizens who are natives of the locality. To become as one of the latter, the stranger must create for himself a domicile, and it was this that necessarily led jurists to define domicile and the conditions upon which it could be acquired. Hence the celebrated definition of domicile given by the Emperors Diocletian and Maximianus (L. 7, C. de incol.): "It is certain that each one has his domicile in the place where he has established his home and business and has his possessions; a residence which he does not intend to abandon, unless called elsewhere, from which he departs only as a traveller and by returning to which he ceases to be a traveller." The juridical element constitutive of domicile is the intention, the will definitively to settle oneself in a place, this will being deduced from the circumstances and especially the conditions of installation. It implies indefinite stability, not perpetuity in the restricted sense of the word, as though one renounced the right to change domicile. Another domicile may at any time be acquired on the same conditions as the first; it is lost when the intention of abandoning it is coupled with the fact of desertion. Since, therefore, domicile conferred the same rights as *origo*, its importance became gradually more and more marked.

We can now better understand the words that so often recur in Roman law and have been adopted by canonists: those who belong to a municipality by right of birth are citizens (*cives*); those who come from elsewhere, but have become its members by domicile are inhabitants (*incolæ*), though these terms are used almost synonymously by legists and canonists; those who have spent a sufficient time there without, however, acquiring a domicile, are strangers (*advenæ*), though to them canonists concede a quasi-domicile. Finally, those who make but a passing sojourn there are transients (*peregrini;* cf. L. 239, de Verb. sign.). To these categories canonists have added one which the Roman *origo*, being permanent, could not recognize, namely the wanderers (*vagi*), who have no fixed residence or who, having definitely abandoned one domicile, have not as yet acquired another.

II. Development of "Domicile" in Canon Law.—In the troublous times that prevailed after the Barbarian invasions, the domicile of Roman law was lost sight of, and even the word itself disappeared from the juridical language of the time. However, this does not mean that persons inhabiting certain limited districts had wholly ceased to be connected with local authority, whether civil or religious, nor that all acts were regulated exclusively, after the barbarian concept, by a personal code. The material fact of habitation could not, it is true, be ignored, but it no longer served for a theory of domicile. The medieval ecclesiastical canons say that each Catholic (*fidelis*) should pay his tithes in the church where he was baptized and that his obsequies should be held wherever he pays his tithes, etc., but there is no mention of domicile.

The Roman theory was again restored to honour by the glossarists of the Bolognese School, especially by Accursius in the beginning of the thirteenth century. Whether it was because they mistook the real meaning of *origo* or desired to explain it in a way that suited the customs of their time, they interpreted it as a sort of domicile resulting from one's birthplace, and if one were born there *per accidens*, from the place of one's father's birth. Except for this inaccuracy, the Roman theory was well expounded. Moreover, according to the favourite principles of their time, the glossarists brought into prominence the double constitutive element of domicile (or, properly speaking, of acquired domicile): the material element (*corpus*), i. e. habitation, and the juridical or formal element (*animus*), i. e. the intention to remain in this habitation indefinitely. Although they did not contribute directly to this revival of domicile, canonists nevertheless adopted it and it was definitively admitted in the gloss of "Liber Sextus" (cc. 2 and 3, de sepult.). They applied these rules to the acts of Christian life: baptism, paschal Communion and Viaticum, confession, extreme unction, funerals, interments, then also to ordination and judicial competency. The actual canonical rules on domicile are about the same.

In the meantime almost the only development of canon law in this matter has been the creation of the quasi-domicile theory, foreign alike to Roman and modern civil law. As its name implies, quasi-domicile is closely patterned on domicile and consists in a sojourn in some one place during a sufficient length of time. Not only does it not call for abandonment of the real domicile, but can co-exist with the latter and even supposes the intention of returning thither. It was evident that the ordinary acts of the Christian life, the rights and obligations of a parishioner, could not be confined to permanent residents only; hence the necessity of assimilating to such residents those who sojourn in the place for a certain length of time. The canonists soon concluded that whoever has a quasi-domicile in a place may receive there the sacraments and perform there legitimately all the acts of the Christian life without forfeiting any of his rights in the place of his real domicile; he may even thus become subject to the judicial authority of his place of quasi-domicile. The only restrictions are, as we shall see, for ordinations and, to a certain extent, for funerals. For a long time, however, the theory remained vague and undetermined. Authors could scarcely agree as to precisely what was meant by the "sufficient length" of time (*non breve tempus*) required for quasi-domicile, and they hesitated to pronounce on the various possible reasons for a sojourn and the degree in which they could create presumption of an intention to acquire quasi-domicile. Strictly speaking, the question was really important only in regard to those marriages whose validity depended on the existence of a quasi-domicile in countries where the Tridentine decree "Tametsi" had been published; in this way, as we shall see below, new legislation became necessary. The quasi-domicile theory was not definitively settled until the appearance of the Instruction of the Holy Office addressed to the Bishops of England and the United States, 7 June, 1867, in which quasi-domicile is

patterned as closely as possible on domicile. Like the latter, it is made up of the double element of fact and right, i. e. of residence and the intention of abiding in it for a sufficient length of time, this time being clearly stated as a period covering more than six months—*per majorem anni partem*. As soon as these two conditions coexist, quasi-domicile is acquired and immediately involves the legal use of rights and competencies resulting therefrom. (See below for a recent restriction in regard to marriage.) Finally, quasi-domicile is lost by the simultaneous cessation of both its constitutive elements, i. e. by the abandonment of residence without any intention of returning to it. Suffice it to add that in this matter the canon law, yielding to custom, tends easily to adapt itself to the provisions of civil law, e. g. as regards the legal domicile of minors, wards, and other analogous provisions.

III. Present Law.—From the preceding explanation there results a very important conclusion which throws a strong light on canonical legislation concerning domicile and which we must now set forth. It is this: the law does not deal with domicile for its own sake, but rather on account of its consequences; in other words, on account of the personal rights and obligations attached thereto. This explains why domicile must meet divers requirements more or less severe according to the case in point, e. g. marriage, ordination, judicial competency. Keeping therefore in view the legal consequences of domicile and its various forms it may be defined as a stable residence which entails submission to local authority and permits the exercise of acts for which this authority is competent. To this definition the laws and their commentators confine themselves, without touching on the legal effects of domicile. As we have already seen, domicile, properly so called, is the place one inhabits indefinitely (*locus perpetuæ habitationis*), such perpetuity being quite compatible with more or less transitory residence elsewhere. It matters not whether one be the owner or simply the occupant of the house in which one dwells or whether one owns more or less property in the locality. The place of one's domicile is not the house wherein one resides but the territorial district in which the house or home stands. This district is usually the smallest territory possessing a distinct, self-governing organization. All authors agree that, from a civil viewpoint, the municipality is the place of domicile and, canonically considered, the parish or territorial division replacing it, e. g. mission or station. It is in the municipality that the acts and rights of civil life are exercised, and in the parish those of the Christian life. Strictly speaking, one cannot acquire domicile in a ward or hamlet or in any territorial division which does not form a self-governing group. Of course there are certain acts that do not depend, or that no longer depend, on local authority; in this sense, it is possible to speak of domicile in a diocese when it is question e. g. of ordination, or of domicile in a province apropos of the competency of a tribunal. But these exceptions are merely apparent; they imply that one has a domicile in some parish within a given diocese. The canon law has never recognized as domicile an unstable residence in different parts of a diocese, without intent to establish oneself in some particular parish. Canon law (c. 2, de sepult. in VI), like Roman law (L. 5, 7, 27, Ad municip.), allows a double domicile, provided there be in both places a morally equal installation; the most ordinary example of this being a winter domicile in the city and a summer domicile in the country.—There are three kinds of domicile: domicile of origin, domicile of residence or acquired domicile, and necessary or legal domicile. The domicile of origin, a somewhat inexact imitation of the Roman *origo*, is that assigned to each individual by his place of nativity unless he be accidentally born outside of the place where his father dwells; practically it is the paternal domicile for legitimate and the maternal domicile for illegitimate children. Again, in reference to the spiritual life, domicile of nativity is the place where adults and abandoned children are baptized.—The domicile of residence or acquired domicile is that of one's own choice, the place where one establishes a residence for an indefinite period. It is acquired by the fact of material residence joined to the intention of there remaining as long as one has no reason for settling elsewhere; this intention being manifested either by an express declaration or by circumstances. Once acquired, domicile subsists, despite more or less prolonged absences, until one leaves it with the intention of not returning.—Finally, necessary or legal domicile is that imposed by law; for prisoners or exiles it is their prison or place of banishment; for a wife it is the domicile of the husband which she retains even after becoming a widow; for children under age it is that of the parents who have authority over them; for wards it is that of their guardians; lastly, for whoever exercises a perpetual charge, e. g. a bishop, canon, or parish priest, etc., it is the place where he discharges his functions.

Quasi-domicile is of one kind only, namely of residence and choice and cannot be acquired in any other way. It is acquired and lost on the same conditions as domicile itself and is deduced mainly from such reasons as justify a sojourn of at least six months, e. g. the pursuit of studies, or even for an indefinite period, as in the case of domestics. Quasi-domicile is presumed, especially for marriage, after a month's sojourn according to the Constitution "Paucis abhinc" of Benedict XIV, 19 March, 1758; but this presumption yields to contrary proof, except however when it is transformed into a presumption *juris et de jure*, which admits of no contrary proof; such is the case for the United States in virtue of the indult of 6 May, 1886, granted at the request of the Council of Baltimore in 1884 (Acta et Decreta, p. cix) and extended to the Diocese of Paris, 20 May, 1905. This being so, quasi-residents are regarded as subjects of the local authority just as are permanent residents, being therefore parishioners bound by local laws and possessing the same rights as residents, with this difference, that, if they so choose, they may go and use their rights in their own domicile. They can, therefore, apply to the local parish priest, as to their own parish priest, not only for those sacraments administered to every one who presents himself, e. g. Holy Eucharist and penance, but also for the baptism of their children, for first Communion, paschal Communion, Viaticum, and extreme unction. Their nuptials may also be solemnized in his presence and, except when they have chosen to be buried elsewhere, their funerals should take place from the parish church of their quasi-domicile. Finally, the quasi-domicile permits of their legitimate citation before a judge competent for the locality. As regards marriage, the quasi-domicile affected its validity in parishes subject to the decree "Tametsi" until the decree "Ne temere" of 2 August, 1907, rendered the competency of the parish priest exclusively territorial, so that all marriages contracted in his presence, within his parochial territory, are valid; for a licit marriage, however, one of the two betrothed must have dwelt within the parish for at least a month.

On the other hand those who have neither a domicile nor a quasi-domicile in a parish, who are only there as transients (*peregrini*), are not counted as parishioners; the parish priest is not their pastor and they should respect the pastoral rights of their own parish priest at least in so far as possible. The restrictions of former times, it is true, have been greatly lessened and at present no one would dream of claiming parochial rights for annual confession, paschal Communion or the Viaticum. Something, however, still remains: for marriage transients must ask the delegation or authorization of the parish priest of their domi-

(regularly of the bride) if the contracting parties have not already sojourned for a month within the parish where they seek to contract marriage; funerals also belong to the parish priest of the domicile, i. e. if the interested parties desire to, and can transport to his parish church the body of the deceased; in any event the parish priest may demand the parochial dues known as *quarta funeralis*. Generally speaking, transients (*peregrini*) are not subjects of the local ecclesiastical authority; they are not held to the observance of local laws except inasmuch as these affect public order, nor do they become subjects of the local judicial authority.

As to the domicile requisite for ordination there are special rules formulated by Innocent XII, in his Constitution "Speculatores", 4 November, 1694. The candidate for orders depends upon a bishop, first by reason of his origin, that is to say, of the place where his father had a domicile at the time of his son's birth; second by reason of his own acquired domicile. But the conditions which this domicile must satisfy are rather severe: the candidate must have already resided in the diocese for ten years or else have transported most of his movable goods to a house in which he has resided for three years; moreover, in both cases, he must affirm under oath his intention of definitively establishing himself in the diocese. This is a qualified domicile, the conditions of which must not be extended to other cases.

BENEDICT XIV, *Ep. Paucis abhinc; Id., Instit. Can.* 33, 88; SANCHEZ, *De matrim.*, III; FAGNANUS, *Comment. in Decretal.* in cap. *Significavit*, III, tit. xxix; BASSIBEY, *La clandestinité dans le mariage* (Bordeaux, 1904); FOURNERET, *Le domicile matrimonial* (Paris, 1906); D'ANNIBALE, *Summula Theologiæ moralis* (Rome, 1908), I, n. 82–86; O'NEILL in *Am. Eccles. Rev.* (Philadelphia, April, 1908).

A. BOUDINHON.

Dominic, SAINT, founder of the Order of Preachers, commonly known as the Dominican Order; b. at Calaroga, in Old Castile, c. 1170; d. 6 August, 1221. His parents, Felix Guzman and Joanna of Aza, undoubtedly belonged to the nobility of Spain, though probably neither was connected with the reigning house of Castile, as some of the saint's biographers assert. Of Felix Guzman, personally, little is known, except that he was in every sense the worthy head of a family of saints. To nobility of blood Joanna of Aza added a nobility of soul which so enshrined her in the popular veneration that in 1828 she was solemnly beatified by Leo XII. The example of such parents was not without its effect upon their children. Not only Saint Dominic but also his brothers, Antonio and Manes, were distinguished for their extraordinary sanctity. Antonio, the eldest, became a secular priest and, having distributed his patrimony to the poor, entered a hospital where he spent his life ministering to the sick. Manes, following in the footsteps of Dominic, became a Friar Preacher, and was beatified by Gregory XVI.

The birth and infancy of the saint were attended by many marvels forecasting his heroic sanctity and great achievements in the cause of religion. From his seventh to his fourteenth year he pursued his elementary studies under the tutelage of his maternal uncle, the archpriest of Gumiel d'Izan, not far distant from Calaroga. In 1184 Saint Dominic entered the University of Palencia. Here he remained for ten years prosecuting his studies with such ardour and success that throughout the ephemeral existence of that institution he was held up to the admiration of its scholars as all that a student should be. Amid the frivolities and dissipations of a university city, the life of the future saint was characterized by a seriousness of purpose and an austerity of manner which singled him out as one from whom great things might be expected in the future. But more than once he proved that under this austere exterior he carried a heart as tender as a woman's. On one occasion he sold his books, annotated with his own hand, to relieve the starving poor of Palencia. His biographer and contemporary, Bartholomew of Trent, states that twice he tried to sell himself into slavery to obtain money for the liberation of those who were held in captivity by the Moors. These facts are worthy of mention in view of the cruel and saturnine character which some non-Catholic writers have endeavoured to foist upon one of the most charitable of men. Concerning the date of his ordination his biographers are silent; nor is there anything from which that date can be inferred with any degree of certainty. According to the deposition of Brother Stephen, Prior Provincial of Lombardy, given in the process of canonization, Dominic was still a student at Palencia when Don Martin de Bazan, the Bishop of Osma, called him to membership in the cathedral chapter for the purpose of assisting in its reform. The bishop realized the importance to his plan of reform of having constantly before his canons the example of one of Dominic's eminent holiness. Nor was he disappointed in the result. In recognition of the part he had taken in converting its members into canons regular, Dominic was appointed sub-prior of the reformed chapter. On the accession of Don Diego d'Azevedo to the Bishopric of Osma in 1201, Dominic became superior of the chapter with the title of prior. As a canon of Osma, he spent nine years of his life hidden in God and rapt in contemplation, scarcely passing beyond the confines of the chapter house.

In 1203 Alfonso IX, King of Castile, deputed the Bishop of Osma to demand from the Lord of the Marches, presumably a Danish prince, the hand of his daughter on behalf of the king's son, Prince Ferdinand. For his companion on this embassy Don Diego chose Saint Dominic. Passing through Toulouse in the pursuit of their mission, they beheld with amazement and sorrow the work of spiritual ruin wrought by the Albigensian heresy. It was in the contemplation of this scene that Dominic first conceived the idea of founding an order for the purpose of combating heresy and spreading the light of the Gospel by preaching to the ends of the then known world. Their mission having ended successfully, Diego and Dominic were dispatched on a second embassy, accompanied by a splendid retinue, to escort the betrothed princess to Castile. This mission, however, was brought to a sudden close by the death of the young woman in question. The two ecclesiastics were now free to go where they would, and they set out for Rome, arriving there towards the end of 1204. The purpose of this journey was to enable Diego to resign his bishopric that he might devote himself to the conversion of unbelievers in distant lands. Innocent III, however, refused to approve this project, and instead sent the bishop and his companion to Languedoc to join forces with the Cistercians, to whom he had entrusted the crusade against the Albigenses. The scene that confronted them on their arrival in Languedoc was by no means an encouraging one. The Cistercians, on account of their worldly manner of living, had made little or no headway against the Albigenses. They had entered upon their work with considerable pomp, attended by a brilliant retinue, and well provided with the comforts of life. To this display of worldliness the leaders of the heretics opposed a rigid asceticism which commanded the respect and admiration of their followers. Diego and Dominic quickly saw that the failure of the Cistercian apostolate was due to the monks' indulgent habits, and finally prevailed upon them to adopt a more austere manner of life. The result was at once apparent in a greatly increased number of converts. Theological disputations played a prominent part in the propaganda of the heretics. Dominic and his companion, therefore, lost no time in engaging their opponents in this kind of theological exposition. Whenever the opportunity

offered, they accepted the gage of battle. The thorough training that the saint had received at Palencia now proved of inestimable value to him in his encounters with the heretics. Unable to refute his arguments or counteract the influence of his preaching, they visited their hatred upon him by means of repeated insults and threats of physical violence. With Prouille for his head-quarters, he laboured by turns in Fanjeaux, Montpellier, Servian, Béziers, and Carcassonne. Early in his apostolate around Prouille the saint realized the necessity of an institution that would protect the women of that country from the influence of the heretics. Many of them had already embraced Albigensianism and were its most active propagandists. These women erected convents, to which the children of the Catholic nobility were often sent—for want of something better—to receive an education, and, in effect, if not on purpose, to be tainted with the spirit of heresy. It was needful, too, that women converted from heresy should be safeguarded against the evil influence of their own homes. To supply these deficiencies, Saint Dominic, with the permission of Foulques, Bishop of Toulouse, established a convent at Prouille in 1206. To this community, and afterwards to that of Saint Sixtus, at Rome, he gave the rule and constitutions which have ever since guided the nuns of the Second Order of Saint Dominic.

The year 1208 opens a new epoch in the eventful life of the founder. On 15 January of that year Pierre de Castelnau, one of the Cistercian legates, was assassinated. This abominable crime precipitated the crusade under Simon de Montfort, which led to the temporary subjugation of the heretics. Saint Dominic participated in the stirring scenes that followed, but always on the side of mercy, wielding the arms of the spirit while others wrought death and desolation with the sword. Some historians assert that during the sack of Béziers, Dominic appeared in the streets of that city, cross in hand, interceding for the lives of the women and children, the aged and the infirm. This testimony, however, is based upon documents which Touron regards as certainly apocryphal. The testimony of the most reliable historians tends to prove that the saint was neither in the city nor in its vicinity when Béziers was sacked by the crusaders. We find him generally during this period following the Catholic army, reviving religion and reconciling heretics in the cities that had capitulated to, or had been taken by, the victorious de Montfort. It was probably 1 September, 1209, that Saint Dominic first came in contact with Simon de Montfort and formed with him that intimate friendship which was to last till the death of the brave crusader under the walls of Toulouse (25 June, 1218). We find him by the side of de Montfort at the siege of Lavaur in 1211, and again in 1212, at the capture of La Penne d'Ajen. In the latter part of 1212 he was at Pamiers labouring, at the invitation of de Montfort, for the restoration of religion and morality. Lastly, just before the battle of Muret, 12 September, 1213, the saint is again found in the council that preceded the battle. During the progress of the conflict, he knelt before the altar in the church of Saint-Jacques, praying for the triumph of the Catholic arms. So remarkable was the victory of the crusaders at Muret that Simon de Montfort regarded it as altogether miraculous, and piously attributed it to the prayers of Saint Dominic. In gratitude to God for this decisive victory, the crusader erected a chapel in the church of Saint-Jacques, which he dedicated, it is said, to Our Lady of the Rosary. It would appear, therefore, that the devotion of the Rosary (q. v.), which tradition says was revealed to Saint Dominic, had come into general use about this time. To this period, too, has been ascribed the foundation of the Inquisition by Saint Dominic, and his appointment as the first Inquisitor. As both these much controverted questions will receive special treatment elsewhere in this work, it will suffice for our present purpose to note that the Inquisition was in full operation in 1198, or seven years before the saint took part in the apostolate in Languedoc, and while he was still an obscure canon regular at Osma. If he was for a certain time identified with the operations of the Inquisition, it was only in the capacity of a theologian passing upon the orthodoxy of the accused (see INQUISITION, SPANISH). Whatever influence he may have had with the judges of that much maligned institution was always employed on the side of mercy and forbearance, as witness the classic case of Ponce Roger.

In the meantime, the saint's increasing reputation for heroic sanctity, apostolic zeal, and profound learning caused him to be much sought after as a candidate for various bishoprics. Three distinct efforts were made to raise him to the episcopate. In July, 1212, the chapter of Béziers chose him for their bishop. Again, the canons of Saint-Lizier wished him to succeed Garcias de l'Orte as Bishop of Comminges. Lastly, in 1215 an effort was made by Garcias de l'Orte himself, who had been transferred from Comminges to Auch, to make him Bishop of Navarre. But Saint Dominic absolutely refused all episcopal honours, saying that he would rather take flight in the night, with nothing but his staff, than accept the episcopate. From Muret Dominic returned to Carcassonne, where he resumed his preaching with unqualified success. It was not till 1214 that he returned to Toulouse. In the meantime the influence of his preaching and the eminent holiness of his life had drawn around him a little band of devoted disciples eager to follow wherever he might lead. Saint Dominic had never for a moment forgotten his purpose, formed eleven years before, of founding a religious order to combat heresy and propagate religious truth. The time now seemed opportune for the realization of his plan. With the approval of Bishop Foulques of Toulouse, he began the organization of his little band of followers. That Dominic and his companions might possess a fixed source of revenue Foulques made him chaplain of Fanjeaux and in July, 1215, canonically established the community as a religious congregation of his diocese, whose mission was the propagation of true doctrine and good morals, and the extirpation of heresy. During this same year Pierre Seila, a wealthy citizen of Toulouse, who had placed himself under the direction of Saint Dominic, put at their disposal his own commodious dwelling. In this way the first convent of the Order of Preachers was founded on 25 April, 1215. But they dwelt here only a year when Foulques established them in the church of Saint Romanus. Though the little community had proved amply the need of its mission and the efficiency of its service to the Church, it was far from satisfying the full purpose of its founder. It was at best but a diocesan congregation, and Saint Dominic had dreamed of a world-order that would carry its apostolate to the ends of the earth. But, unknown to the saint, events were shaping themselves for the realization of his hopes. In November, 1215, an œcumenical council was to meet at Rome "to deliberate on the improvement of morals, the extinction of heresy, and the strengthening of the faith". This was identically the mission Saint Dominic had determined on for his order. With the Bishop of Toulouse, he was present at the deliberations of this council. From the very first session it seemed that events conspired to bring his plans to a successful issue. The council bitterly arraigned the bishops for their neglect of preaching. In canon x they were directed to delegate capable men to preach the word of God to the people. Under these circumstances it would reasonably appear that Dominic's request for the confirmation of an order designed to carry out the mandates of the council would be joy-

fully granted. But while the council was anxious that these reforms should be put into effect as speedily as possible, it was at the same time opposed to the institution of any new religious orders, and had legislated to that effect in no uncertain terms. Moreover, preaching had always been looked upon as primarily a function of the episcopate. To bestow this office on an unknown and untried body of simple priests seemed too original and too bold in its conception to appeal to the conservative prelates who influenced the deliberations of the council. When, therefore, his petition for the approbation of his infant institute was refused, it could not have been wholly unexpected by Saint Dominic.

Returning to Languedoc at the close of the council in December, 1215, the founder gathered about him his little band of followers and informed them of the wish of the council that there should be no new rules for religious orders. Thereupon they adopted the ancient rule of Saint Augustine, which, on account of its generality, would easily lend itself to any form they might wish to give it. This done, Saint Dominic again appeared before the pope in the month of August, 1216, and again solicited the confirmation of his order. This time he was received more favourably, and on 22 December, 1216, the Bull of confirmation was issued.

Saint Dominic spent the following Lent preaching in various churches in Rome, and before the pope and the papal court. It was at this time that he received the office and title of Master of the Sacred Palace, or Pope's Theologian, as it is more commonly called. This office has been held uninterruptedly by members of the order from the founder's time to the present day. On 15 August, 1217, he gathered the brethren about him at Prouille to deliberate on the affairs of the order. He had determined upon the heroic plan of dispersing his little band of seventeen unformed followers over all Europe. The result proved the wisdom of an act which, to the eye of human prudence at least, seemed little short of suicidal. To facilitate the spread of the order, Honorius III, on 11 Feb., 1218, addressed a Bull to all archbishops, bishops, abbots, and priors, requesting their favour on behalf of the Order of Preachers. By another Bull, dated 3 Dec., 1218, Honorius III bestowed upon the order the church of Saint Sixtus in Rome. Here, amid the tombs of the Appian Way, was founded the first monastery of the order in Rome. Shortly after taking possession of Saint Sixtus, at the invitation of Honorius, Saint Dominic began the somewhat difficult task of restoring the pristine observance of religious discipline among the various Roman communities of women. In a comparatively short time the work was accomplished, to the great satisfaction of the pope. His own career at the University of Palencia, and the practical use to which he had put it in his encounters with the Albigenses, as well as his keen appreciation of the needs of the time, convinced the saint that to ensure the highest efficiency in the work of the apostolate, his followers should be afforded the best educational advantages obtainable. It was for this reason that on the occasion of the dispersion of the brethren at Prouille he dispatched Matthew of France and two companions to Paris. A foundation was made in the vicinity of the university, and the friars took possession in October, 1217. Matthew of France was appointed superior and Michael de Fabra was placed in charge of the studies with the title of Lecturer. On 6 August of the following year, Jean de Barastre, dean of Saint-Quentin and professor of theology, bestowed on the community the hospice of Saint-Jacques, which he had built for his own use. Having effected a foundation at the University of Paris, Saint Dominic next determined upon a settlement at the University of Bologna. Bertrand of Garrigua, who had been summoned from Paris, and John of Navarre, set out from Rome, with letters from Pope Honorius, to make the desired foundation. On their arrival at Bologna, the church of Santa Maria della Mascarella was placed at their disposal. So rapidly did the Roman community of Saint Sixtus grow that the need of more commodious quarters soon became urgent. Honorius, who seemed to delight in supplying every need of the order and furthering its interests to the utmost of his power, met the emergency by bestowing on Saint Dominic the basilica of Santa Sabina.

Towards the end of 1218, having appointed Reginald of Orléans his vicar in Italy, the saint, accompanied by several of his brethren, set out for Spain Bologna, Prouille, Toulouse, and Fanjeaux were visited on the way. From Prouille two of the brethren were sent to establish a convent at Lyons. Segovia was reached just before Christmas. In February of the following year he founded the first monastery of the order in Spain. Turning southward, he established a convent for women at Madrid, similar to the one at Prouille. It is quite probable that on this journey he personally presided over the erection of a convent in connexion with his alma mater, the University of Palencia. At the invitation of the Bishop of Barcelona, a house of the order was established in that city. Again bending his steps towards Rome he recrossed the Pyrenees and visited the foundations at Toulouse and Paris. During his stay in the latter place he caused houses to be erected at Limoges, Metz, Reims, Poitiers, and Orléans, which in a short time became centres of Dominican activity. From Paris he directed his course towards Italy, arriving in Bologna in July, 1219. Here he devoted several months to the religious formation of the brethren he found awaiting him, and then, as at Prouille, dispersed them over Italy. Among the foundations made at this time were those at Bergamo, Asti, Verona, Florence, Brescia, and Faenza. From Bologna he went to Viterbo. His arrival at the papal court was the signal for the showering of new favours on the order. Notable among these marks of esteem were many complimentary letters addressed by Honorius to all those who had assisted the Fathers in their various foundations. In March of this same year Honorius, through his representatives, bestowed upon the order the church of San Eustorgio in Milan. At the same time a foundation at Viterbo was authorized. On his return to Rome, towards the end of 1219, Dominic sent out letters to all the convents announcing the first general chapter of the order, to be held at Bologna on the feast of the following Pentecost. Shortly before, Honorius III, by a special Brief, had conferred upon the founder the title of Master General, which till then he had held only by tacit consent. At the very first session of the chapter in the following spring the saint startled his brethren by offering his resignation as master general. It is needless to say the resignation was not accepted and the founder remained at the head of the institute till the end of his life.

Soon after the close of the chapter of Bologna, Honorius III addressed letters to the abbeys and priories of San Vittorio, Sillia, Mansu, Floria, Vallombrosa, and Aquila, ordering that several of their religious be deputed to begin, under the leadership of Saint Dominic, a preaching crusade in Lombardy, where heresy had developed alarming proportions. For some reason or other the plans of the pope were never realized. The promised support failing, Dominic, with a little band of his own brethren, threw himself into the field, and, as the event proved, spent himself in an effort to bring back the heretics to their allegiance to the Church. It is said that 100,000 unbelievers were converted by the preaching and the miracles of the saint. According to Lacordaire and others, it was during his preaching in Lombardy that the saint instituted the Militia of Jesus Christ, or the third order, as it is commonly called, consisting of men and women living in the world, to protect the rights and property of the

Church. Towards the end of 1221 Saint Dominic returned to Rome for the sixth and last time. Here he received many new and valuable concessions for the order. In January, February, and March of 1221 three consecutive Bulls were issued commending the order to all the prelates of the Church. The thirtieth of May, 1221, found him again at Bologna presiding over the second general chapter of the order. At the close of the chapter he set out for Venice to visit Cardinal Ugolino, to whom he was especially indebted for many substantial acts of kindness. He had scarcely returned to Bologna when a fatal illness attacked him. He died after three weeks of sickness, the many trials of which he bore with heroic patience. In a Bull dated at Spoleto, 13 July, 1234, Gregory IX made his cult obligatory throughout the Church.

The life of St. Dominic was one of tireless effort in the service of God. While he journeyed from place to place he prayed and preached almost uninterruptedly. His penances were of such a nature as to cause the brethren, who accidentally discovered them, to fear the effect upon his life. While his charity was boundless he never permitted it to interfere with the stern sense of duty that guided every action of his life. If he abominated heresy and laboured untiringly for its extirpation it was because he loved truth and loved the souls of those among whom he laboured. He never failed to distinguish between sin and the sinner. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, if this athlete of Christ, who had conquered himself before attempting the reformation of others, was more than once chosen to show forth the power of God. The failure of the fire at Fanjeaux to consume the dissertation he had employed against the heretics, and which was thrice thrown into the flames; the raising to life of Napoleone Orsini; the appearance of the angels in the refectory of Saint Sixtus in response to his prayers, are but a few of the supernatural happenings by which God was pleased to attest the eminent holiness of His servant. We are not surprised, therefore, that, after signing the Bull of canonization on 13 July, 1234, Gregory IX declared that he no more doubted the saintliness of Saint Dominic than he did that of Saint Peter and Saint Paul.

CASTIGLIO, *Historia Generale di San Domenico e del Ordine suo* (Venice, 1529); DE LA ROCHE, *Vie de Saint Dominique* (Fribourg, 1619); MALVENDA, *Annales Ordinis Prædicatorum* (Naples, 1627); DE RECHAC, *Vie de Saint Dominique* (Paris, 1647); NANNI, *Vita del glorioso Patriarcha S. Domenico* (Urbino, 1650); BENOIST, *Suite de l'Histoire des Albigeois* (Toulouse, 1693); TOURON, *La Vie de Saint Dominique* (Paris, 1739); BOLLANDISTS, *Acta S. Dominici Confessoris* (Venice, 1750), I, 358–658; MAMACHI, *Annales Ordinis Prædicatorum* (Rome, 1756); LACORDAIRE, *Vie de Saint Dominique* (Paris, 1840); tr. HAZELAND (London, 1883); DANZAS, *Études sur les temps primitifs de l'Ordre des Frères Prêcheurs* (Poitiers, 1877); BERNARD, *Les Dominicains dans l'Université de Paris* (Paris, 1883); DRANE, *The History of Saint Dominic* (London, 1891); JORDANUS DE SAXONIA, *Opera Ad Res Ordinis Prædicatorum Spectantia* (Fribourg, 1891); DE FRACHETO, *Vitæ Fratrum Ordinis Prædicatorum* (Louvain, 1896); BALME AND LELAIDIER, *Cartulaire ou Histoire diplomatique de Saint Dominique* (Paris, 1898); REICHERT, *Litteræ Encyclicæ Magistrorum Generalium Ordinis Prædicatorum* (Rome, 1900), 1–9; GUIRAUD, *Saint Dominique* (Paris, 1901); tr. DE MATTOS (London, 1901); MORTIER, *Histoire des Maîtres Généraux des Frères Prêcheurs* (Paris, 1903), I, 1-135.

JOHN B. O'CONNOR.

Dominic, RULE OF SAINT. See PREACHERS, ORDER OF.

Dominical Letter, a device adopted from the Romans by the old chronologers to aid them in finding the day of the week corresponding to any given date, and indirectly to facilitate the adjustment of the "Proprium de Tempore" to the "Proprium Sanctorum" when constructing the ecclesiastical calendar for any year. The Church, on account of her complicated system of movable and immovable feasts (see CALENDAR, CHRISTIAN), has from an early period taken upon herself as a special charge to regulate the measurement of time. To secure uniformity in the observance of feasts and fasts, she began, even in the patristic age, to supply a *computus*, or system of reckoning, by which the relation of the solar and lunar years might be accommodated and the celebration of Easter determined. Naturally she adopted the astronomical methods then available, and these methods and the terminology belonging to them, having become traditional, are perpetuated in a measure to this day, even after the reform of the calendar, in the *prolegomena* to the Breviary and Missal.

The Romans were accustomed to divide the year into *nundinæ*, periods of eight days; and in their marble *fasti*, or calendars, of which numerous specimens remain, they used the first eight letters of the alphabet to mark the days of which each period was composed. When the Oriental seven-day period, or week, was introduced, in the time of Augustus, the first seven letters of the alphabet were employed in the same way to indicate the days of this new division of time. In fact, fragmentary calendars on marble still survive in which both a cycle of eight letters—A to H—indicating *nundinæ*, and a cycle of seven letters —A to G—indicating weeks, are used side by side (see "Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum", 2nd ed., I, 220. —The same peculiarity occurs in the Philocalian Calendar of A.D. 356, ibid., p. 256). This device was imitated by the Christians, and in their calendars the days of the year from 1 January to 31 December were marked with a continuous recurring cycle of seven letters: A, B, C, D, E, F, G. A was always set against 1 January, B against 2 January, C against 3 January, and so on. Thus F fell to 6 January, G to 7 January; A again recurred on 8 January, and also, consequently, on 15 January, 22 January, and 29 January. Continuing in this way, 30 January was marked with a B, 31 January with a C, and 1 February with a D. Supposing this to be carried on through all the days of an ordinary year (i. e. not a leap year), it will be found that a D corresponds to 1 March, G to 1 April, B to 1 May, E to 1 June, G to 1 July, C to 1 August, F to 1 September, A to 1 October, D to 1 November, and F to 1 December—a result which Durandus recalled by the following distich:—

Alta Domat Dominus, Gratis Beat Equa Gerentes
Contemnit Fictos, Augebit Dona Fideli.

Now, as a moment's reflection shows, if 1 January is a Sunday, all the days marked by A will also be Sundays; if 1 January is a Saturday, Sunday will fall on 2 January, which is a B, and all the other days marked B will be Sundays; if 1 January is a Monday, then Sunday will not come until 7 January, a G, and all the days marked by a G will be Sundays. This being explained, the Dominical Letter of any year is defined to be that letter of the cycle, A, B, C, D, E, F, G, which corresponds to the day upon which the first Sunday (and every subsequent Sunday) falls.

It is plain, however, that when leap year occurs, a complication is introduced. February has then twenty-nine days. According to the Anglican and civil calendars this extra day is added to the end of the month; according to the Catholic ecclesiastical calendar 24 February is counted twice. But in either case 1 March is then one day later in the week than 1 February, or, in other words, for the rest of the year the Sundays come a day earlier than they would in a common year. This is expressed by saying that a leap year has two Dominical Letters, the second being the letter which precedes that with which the year started. For example, 1 January, 1907, was a Tuesday; the first Sunday fell on 6 January, or an F. F was, therefore, the Dominical Letter for 1907. The first of January, 1908, was a Wednesday, the first Sunday fell on 5 January, and E was the Dominical Letter, but as 1908 was leap year, its Sundays after February came a day sooner than in the normal year and were D's. The year 1908, therefore, had a double Dominical Letter, E-D. In 1909, 1 January is a Friday and the Dominical Letter is C. In 1910 and 1911,

1 January falls respectively on Saturday and Sunday and the Dominical Letters are B and A.

This, of course, is all very simple, but the advantage of the device lies, like that of an algebraical expression, in its being a mere symbol adaptable to any year. By constructing a table of letters and days of the year, A always being set against 1 January, we can at once see the relation between the days of the week and the day of any month, if only we know the Dominical Letter. This may always be found by the following rule of De Morgan's, which gives the Dominical Letter for any year, or the second Dominical Letter if it be leap year:—

I. Add 1 to the given year.
II. Take the quotient found by dividing the given year by 4 (neglecting the remainder).
III. Take 16 from the centurial figures of the given year if that can be done.
IV. Take the quotient of III divided by 4 (neglecting the remainder).
V. From the sum of I, II, and IV, subtract III.
VI. Find the remainder of V divided by 7: this is the number of the Dominical Letter, supposing A, B, C, D, E, F, G to be equivalent respectively to 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, 0.

For example, to find the Dominical Letter of the year 1913:—

(I, II, IV) 1914+478+0=2392.
(III) 19−16=3.
(V) 2392−3=2389.
(VI) 2389÷7=341, remainder 2.

Therefore the Dominical Letter is E.

But the Dominical Letter had another very practical use in the days before the "Ordo divini officii recitandi" was printed annually and when, consequently, a priest had often to determine the "Ordo" for himself (see DIRECTORIES, CATHOLIC). As will be shown in the articles EPACT and EASTER CONTROVERSY, Easter Sunday may be as early as 22 March or as late as 25 April, and there are consequently thirty-five possible days on which it may fall. It is also evident that each Dominical Letter allows five possible dates for Easter Sunday. Thus, in a year whose Dominical Letter is A (i. e. when 1 January is a Sunday), Easter must be either on 26 March, 2 April, 9 April, 16 April, or 23 April, for these are all the Sundays within the defined limits. But according as Easter falls on one or another of these Sundays we shall get a different calendar, and hence there are five, and only five, possible calendars for years whose Dominical Letter is A. Similarly, there are five possible calendars for years whose Dominical Letter is B, five for C, and so on, thirty-five possible combinations in all. Now, advantage was taken of this principle in the arrangement of the old Pye or *directorium* which preceded our present "Ordo". The thirty-five possible calendars were all included therein and numbered, respectively, *primum A*, *secundum A*, *tertium A*, etc.; *primum B*, *secundum B*, etc. Hence for anyone wishing to use the Pye the first thing to determine was the Dominical Letter of the year, and then by means of the Golden Number or the Epact, and by the aid of a simple table, to find which of the five possible calendars assigned to that Dominical Letter belonged to the year in question. Such a table as that just referred to, but adapted to the reformed calendar and in more convenient shape, will be found at the beginning of every Breviary and Missal under the heading, "Tabula Paschalis nova reformata".

The Dominical Letter does not seem to have been familiar to Bede in his "De Temporum Ratione", but in its place he adopts a similar device of seven numbers which he calls *concurrentes* (De Temp. Rat., cap. liii). This was of Greek origin. The Concurrents are numbers denoting the day of the week on which 24 March falls in the successive years of the solar cycle, 1 standing for Sunday, 2 (*feria secunda*) for Monday, 3 for Tuesday, and so on. It is sufficient here to state that the relation between the Concurrents and the Dominical Letter is the following:—

Concurrents	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Dominical Letter	F	E	D	C	B	A	G

BUTCHER, *The Ecclesiastical Calendar: its Theory and Construction* (Dublin, 1845); DE MORGAN, *Companion to the British Almanac for 1845*; IDEM, *The Book of Almanacs* (3d ed., London, 1907); LUNN in the appendixes to MAYDESTON'S *Directorium Sacerdotum* (Henry Bradshaw Soc., London, 1902), vol. II, pp. 673–702; GROTEFEND in *Grundriss der Geschichtswissenschaft* (Leipzig, 1906), vol. I, pp. 267–319; SICKEL in *Sitzungsberichte* of the Vienna Academy, vol. XXXVIII, pp. 200 sqq.; and especially the great work of CLAVIUS, *Romani Calendarii a Gregor. XIII restituti explicatio* (Rome, 1603); and the *Art de vérifier les dates* by the BENEDICTINES of St-Maur, vol. I.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Dominican Republic, THE (SAN DOMINGO, SANTO DOMINGO), is the eastern, and much the larger, political division of the island now comprehensively known as Haiti, which is the second in size of the Greater Antilles. The territory of this republic, estimated at 18,045 square miles, is divided from that of the Republic of Haiti, on the west, by a serpentine line running from the mouth of the Yaqui River, on the north coast, to a point not far from Cape Beata, on the south; its northern shores are washed by the Atlantic Ocean, its southern by the Caribbean Sea, while on the east, the Mona Passage separates it from the island of Porto Rico. In proportion to its size San Domingo is much less densely settled than Haiti. Ethnologically, the Dominicans contrast with the Haitians in being a Spanish-speaking people, mostly of mixed negro and European descent, the Haitians being pure negro and speaking French. The climate of San Domingo is in some parts bad, in others remarkably good, notably in and around the city of San Domingo where, in spite of poor sanitation, it is said that "nobody need die of anything but old age". During the dry season (November to March) the mean diurnal variation of temperature on the south coast is from 70 to 80 degrees Fahr.; during the rainy seasons (summer and autumn) it is from 80 to 92. These figures, like most statistics of contemporary San Domingo, are necessarily conjectural.

GENERAL HISTORY.—From the date of its discovery until the era of the French Revolution the civil and the ecclesiastical history of the territory now occupied by the Dominican Republic are inseparably conjoined. In December, 1492, Christopher Columbus, having failed in his expectation of identifying the island of Cuba with Japan (*Cipango*), had shaped his course homeward, when the accident of the prevailing wind brought him in sight of the island which he named Hispaniola (Little Spain). On 6 December, 1492, he landed at Môle St. Nicholas (now Haitian territory), then, passing along the north coast of the island to the Gulf of Samana, landed again and penetrated inland as far as the summit of Santo Cerro (Holy Hill), where, looking down upon the magnificent upland plain which he named La Vega Real, he planted a wooden cross to commemorate his discovery. His first landing had been unopposed, but at the eastern end of Hispaniola the Ciguayen tribe received the Spaniards with a volley of arrows, from which adventure the gulf now called Samana was named by Columbus *Golfo de las Flechas* (Gulf of Arrows). The island had been known to its aboriginal inhabitants as Haiti; they were of the Arawak stock and accustomed to fight against the piratical Caribs, though themselves of a rather pacific character. That they worshipped idols appears from the fact that the first Bishop of San Domingo sent an idol of aboriginal workmanship as a present to Leo X (Moroni, Dizionario, XX, s. v. Domingo).

The first Spanish settlement, Isabella, was on the north coast. But in 1496, when Miguel Diaz reported to the admiral the existence of much gold in

and about the Hayna River, as well as the remarkable salubrity of the country of the Ozamas, on the south coast, Isabella, which had been found unhealthy, was abandoned. At the mouth of the Ozama River and on its left bank, Bartolomé Colón began the settlement of Nueva Isabella, which was not long afterwards replaced by San Domingo, on the opposite bank. Thus, the present capital of the Dominican Republic,

Façade of the Cathedral, San Domingo

the oldest Christian city in the New World, was already established as the capital of the "New Spains" in the last year of the fifteenth century. Leo X erected the See of San Domingo—the mother church of all Spanish America, and the oldest bishopric in the New World—in 1513. In 1514, under Alessandro Giraldini, its first bishop, the present cathedral church of San Domingo was begun; it was completed in 1540. In this cathedral, about 200 feet in length by 90 in width, the remains of several members of the Columbus family—possibly even of the great admiral himself—still repose; here, too, is still reverently preserved a fragment of the cross which Columbus set up on Santo Cerro, and about which miraculous legends have grown up in the course of four centuries. The catalogue of *adelantados* of the island includes the names of Diego Colón (immediate successor to his uncle Bartolomé), of Bobadilla, and Ovando. There Columbus himself lived for many years, there he was imprisoned by his enemies, and thence he set out upon his last voyage to Spain. To San Domingo Ojeda returned from his last expedition of discovery and conquest in 1509. His grave is still shown in the main doorway of the ruined Franciscan church. In 1547 Paul III made San Domingo the metropolitan see of the New World. Meanwhile houses of the Friars Preachers, the Franciscans, and the Mercedarians sprang up rapidly, and in this West Indian port, the population of which could never have exceeded 20,000, the ruins of not fewer than half a dozen ancient convents are still to be seen. The Jesuit college, now used as a theatre, was not founded until a later period.

While all this activity lasted, the seeds of social and political decay were being sown in Hispaniola. The aborigines were either killed or driven into hiding among the Cibao mountains; the importation of negro slaves became a regular institution. The Spanish settlers were men of the losing, not the conquering, type; their blood mingled with that of the negro and, in some degree, the aboriginal, to produce the San Domingan of modern times. In 1586 Francis Drake drove the Spanish garrison out of San Domingo and burned section after section of the city until a ransom of 30,000 crowns was paid to him. In the next century French adventurers—the original *boucaniers*—began to use the little island of Tortuga, near the north-west coast of Hispaniola, as a piratical rendezvous; from Tortuga they gradually spread over the eastern end of Hispaniola, creating a claim of occupation which Spain recognized in the Treaty of Ryswick (1691). It was in April, 1655, that an English force, conveyed thither on the fleet commanded by Admiral Penn, was driven away, after effecting a landing about thirty miles west of the capital. The natural resources of Hispaniola still enriched Spain, and the mint at Concepcion de la Vega continued to coin gold from the Hayna. After the Peace of Ryswick, Hispaniola might almost have been forgotten if an English cabinet-maker had not (about the year 1766) discovered the value of mahogany. The demand, at first created by a shipment from Jamaica, was largely supplied by the Spanish island.

The French Revolution reacted upon Hispaniola. The whites and mulattos of San Domingo, under Spanish leaders, attempted to restore the old regime in the French colony, but in 1795 all Hispaniola was ceded to France. The Spanish authorities transferred San Domingo to the representative of the French Republic, who was the mulatto General Toussaint L'Ouverture. Until the Treaty of Paris (1814) the French whites, the white and coloured partisans of Spain, the blacks of Haiti, and, now and then, a British expeditionary force fought for supremacy in San Domingo. The treacherous capture of L'Ouverture and his mysterious death in prison at Besançon, in 1803, were followed by a general massacre of the whites in Haiti in March, 1804. The Haitian blacks now compelled the submission of San Domingo to the authority of their first president, Dessalines. At last, in 1814, the Treaty of Paris restored to Spain her oldest possession in the New World.

Actual Conditions.—Out of the political chaos, which had lasted for more than half a century, arose the present Dominican Republic. Its constitution was proclaimed 18 November, 1844, and its first president was Pedro Santana; it was recognized by France in 1848, and by Great Britain in 1850. An attempt to restore Spanish rule, in 1861, in defiance of the Monroe Doctrine, ended with a final Spanish evacuation in 1865. In 1897 the foreign debt of the republic had reached the amount of more than $21,000,000, the interest on which was supposed to be secured by customs receipts; following a default of interest (1 April, 1899), the Government of the United States intervened to obtain an equitable settlement, and its efforts led to the convention of 1905 (ratified 1907), by which an agent, always a citizen of the United States, is to be permanently empowered to act as general receiver of the Dominican customs in the interest of the foreign bondholders. Since 9 June, 1905, all lands owned by the Dominican Government have been open for settlement, free for ten years, and after that at a rent of 5 cents per acre. Although there can be little doubt that the national resources of the republic still include large quantities of gold, silver, and copper ore,

Gothic Chapel in the Cathedral, San Domingo
In which the relics of Columbus are preserved

and even iron, the actual products are only vegetable: sugar (183,754 acres under cultivation in 1906); tobacco (nearly 15,000,000 lbs. of leaf exported annually); cocoa; coffee. The actual timber output is insignificant. In 1907 the total length of railroad was 112 miles.

The Constitution of the Dominican Republic is said to be modelled on that of Venezuela; the president, elected for four years, is assisted by a council of ministers; the legislature is a single chamber elected by popular vote in twenty-four departments. The supreme court of the republic (a president and four judges) is appointed by the national congress, its "minister fiscal", however, being appointed by the chief executive; for courts of first instance, the republic is divided into eleven judicial districts, each presided over by an alcalde. By the terms of the Constitution education is gratuitous and compulsory.

THE HOMENAJE TOWER, SAN DOMINGO
In which Diego Columbus was imprisoned

The ancient city of San Domingo (population, 16,000) is still the seat of the civil government, as well as the see of the archbishop, who, however, no longer has any suffragans. The relations between Church and State are (1908) very cordial. The Constitution of the Republic, in which religious liberty is an article, guarantees to the Church freedom of action, which, nevertheless, is curtailed by the law providing that the civil solemnization of marriages must precede the canonical. The municipal cemeteries are consecrated in accordance with the Church's requirements, though in some important centres of population there are non-Catholic cemeteries besides. In the Dominican Republic (with which the Archdiocese of San Domingo is coextensive) there are 600,000 Catholics, upwards of 1000 Protestants, and very few Jews, while the Masonic lodges number about thirteen. The total number of parishes is 56, each with its own church, in addition to which there are 13 chapels and 82 mission stations. The (ecclesiastical) Conciliar seminary, at the capital, is under the care of the Eudist Fathers (Congregation of Jesus and Mary), who also administer the cathedral parish. Another college under ecclesiastical control is that of San Sebastian in La Vega. A diocesan congregation of religious women numbers 30 members, distributed among four houses; these sisters, who have charge of a hospital, care for orphan children and the infirm aged.

KEIM, *San Domingo* (Philadelphia, 1870); HAZARD, *Santo Domingo, Past and Present* (New York, 1873); DEL MONTE Y TEJADA, *Historia de S. Domingo* (Madrid, 1860); MORONI, *Dizionario*, s. v. *Domingo;* SCHOMBURGK, *Notes on St Domingo* in *Proceedings of British Association, 1851; Statesman's Year-Book*, 1908.

E. MACPHERSON.

Dominicans. See PREACHERS, ORDER OF.

Dominici, GIOVANNI, BLESSED (BANCHINI or BACCHINI was his family name), Cardinal, statesman, and writer, b. at Florence, 1356; d. at Buda, 10 July, 1420. He entered the Dominican Order at Santa Maria Novella in 1372 after having been cured, through the intercession of St. Catherine of Siena, of an impediment of speech for which he had been refused admission to the order two years before. On his return from Paris, where he completed his theological studies, he laboured as professor and preacher for twelve years at Venice. With the sanction of the master general, Blessed Raymond of Capua, he established convents of strict observance of his order at Venice (1391) and Fiesole (1406), and founded the convent of Corpus Christi at Venice for the Dominican Nuns of the Strict Observance. He was sent as envoy of Venice to the conclave of 1406 in which Gregory XII was elected; the following year the pope, whose confessor and counsellor he was, appointed him Archbishop of Ragusa, created him cardinal in 1408 and sent him as ambassador to Hungary, to secure the adhesion of Sigismund to the pope. At the Council of Constance Dominici read the voluntary resignation which Gregory XII had adopted, on his advice, as the surest means of ending the schism. Martin V appointed him legate to Bohemia on 19 July, 1418, but he accomplished little with the followers of Hus, owing to the supineness of King Wenceslaus. He was declared blessed by Gregory XVI in 1832 and his feast is observed 10 June. Dominici was not only a prolific writer on spiritual subjects but also a graceful poet, as his many vernacular hymns, or *Laudi*, show. His "Regola del governo di cura familiare", written between 1400 and 1405, is a valuable pedagogical work (edited by Salvi, Florence, 1860) which treats, in four books, of the faculties of the soul, the powers and senses of the body, the uses of earthly goods, and the education of children. This last book has been translated into German by Rösler (Herder's Bibliothek der katholischen Pädagogik, VII, Freiburg, 1894). His "Lucula Noctis" (R. Coulon, O. P., Latin text of the fifteenth century with an introduction, Paris, 1908) in reply to a letter of Nicola di Piero Salutati, is the most important treatise of that day on the study of the pagan authors. Dominici does not flatly condemn classical studies, but strenuously opposes the paganizing humanism of the day.

RÖSLER, *Cardinal Johannes Dominici, O. Pr.* (Freiburg, 1893); QUÉTIF AND ECHARD, *SS. O. P.*, I, 757, 768, II, 822; SAUERLAND, *Cardinal Johannes Dominici und sein Verhalten zu den kirchlichen Unionsbestrebungen während der Jahre 1406–1415* in *Briegersche Zeitschrift*, IX; MANDONNET in *Historisches Jahrbuch*, V; PASTOR, *Geschichte der Päpste*, III, 22 sq.; MORTIER, *Histoire des Maîtres Généraux de l'ordre des Frères Prêcheurs*, III, 551 sq.; BISCIONI, *Lettere di Santi e Beati Fiorentini* (1736), III; CORMIER, *Beati Raymundi Litteræ et Opuscula.*

THOS. M. SCHWERTNER.

Dominic Loricatus, SAINT. See FONTE AVELLANA.

Dominic of Jesus-Mary, VENERABLE. See THOMAS OF JESUS.

Dominic of Mangazaki, BLESSED. See MARTYRS, JAPANESE.

Dominic of Prussia, a Carthusian monk and ascetical writer, b. in Poland, 1382; d. at the monastery of St. Alban near Trier, 1461. According to the account he wrote of himself his first teacher was the parish priest, a pious Dominican; later he was a student at the University of Cracow where he was noted for his intelligence. Falling into bad habits he led a vagabond life until twenty-five years of age, when he reformed through the influence of Adolf of Essen, prior of the Carthusian monastery of St. Alban, near Trier. Dominic now became a Carthusian, entering the order in 1409. His monastic life was one of severe penance and religious fervour. The spiritual favours he received were numerous, and many visions are ascribed to him. Among the positions he filled were those of master of novices at Mainz and vicar of the monastery of St. Alban, where he died. As an author Dominic composed seventeen treatises, which have been preserved in various libraries. In the "Libri duo experientiarum" he relates the events of his own life; the "Tractatus de Contemptu mundi", "Remedium tentationum", "De verâ obedientiâ", and "Sonus epulantis" he prepared during his solitary repasts. A further work is his "Letters of Direction".

Dominic of Prussia is frequently mentioned in the

discussions as to the origin of the Rosary, and what has been improperly called "the Carthusian Rosary" is ascribed to him. To the one hundred and fifty Ave Marias which in those days formed the "Psalter of Mary" he had the thought of adding meditations on the life of Christ and of His Holy Mother. As in his time the Ave Maria terminated with the words: "Fructus ventris tui, Jesus", he joined to each a sentence to recall to mind the mystery, such as "quem Angelo nuntiante de Sancto Spiritu concepisti", "quo concepto, in montana ad Elizabeth ivisti", etc. Both Dominic and his friend Adolf sought to spread the use of this form of prayer in the Carthusian Order and among the laity. For these reasons it is held by some authors that the "Psalter" of Dominic was the form, or one of the original forms, from which the present Rosary developed.

LE COUTEULX, *Annales Ord. Cart.* (Montreuil, 1888), ad. an. 1426; LE VASSEUR, *Ephemerid. Ord. Cart.*, under 21 December (Montreuil, 1890); TAPPERT, *Der heilige Bruno* (Luxemburg, 1872), 74–85; MARX, *Geschichte des Erzstiftes Trier* (Trier, 1862), II, 331; ESSER, *Beitrag zur Geschichte des Rosenkranzes* in *Der Katholik* (Mainz, Oct., Nov., Dec., 1897); THURSTON, *The Rosary* in *The Month* (November, 1900).

AMBROSE MOUGEL.

Dominic of the Mother of God (called in secular life DOMENICO BARBERI), a member of the Passionist Congregation and theologian, b. near Viterbo, Italy, 22 June, 1792; d. near Reading, England, 27 August, 1849. His parents were peasants and died while Dominic was still a small boy. There were six children, and Dominic, the youngest child, was adopted by his maternal uncle, Bartolomeo Pacelli. As a boy he was employed to take care of sheep, and when he grew older he did farm work. He was taught his letters by a kind Capuchin priest, and learned to read from a country lad of his own age; although he read all the books he could obtain, he had no regular education until he entered the Congregation of the Passion. He was deeply religious from childhood, felt himself distinctly called to join the institute he entered, and believed that God, by a special manifestation, had told him that he was destined to announce the Gospel truth and to bring back stray sheep to the way of salvation.

He was received into the Congregation of the Passion in 1814, and ordained priest, 1 March, 1818. After completing the regular course of studies, he taught philosophy and theology to the students of the congregation as lector for a period of ten years. He then held in Italy the offices of rector, provincial consultor, and provincial, and fulfilled the duties of these positions with ability. At the same time he constantly gave missions and retreats. He founded the first Passionist Retreat in Belgium at Ere near Tournai in 1840; in 1842, after twenty-eight years of effort, he established the Passionists in England, at Aston Hall, Staffordshire. During the seven years of his missionary life in England he established three houses of the congregation. He died at a small railway station near Reading and was buried under the high altar of St. Anne's Retreat, Sutton, St. Helen's. Among the remarkable converts whom he received into the Church may be mentioned John Dobree Dalgairns, John Henry Newman, and Newman's two companions, E. S. Bowles and Richard Stanton, all of whom were afterwards distinguished Oratorians. The reception in 1845 of Newman and his friends must have been the greatest happiness of his life. In 1846 Father Dominic received the Hon. George Spencer, in religion Father Ignatius of St. Paul, into the Congregation of the Passion.

Among Father Dominic's works are: courses of philosophy and moral theology; a volume on the Passion of Our Lord; a work for nuns on the Sorrows of the Blessed Virgin, "Divina Paraninfa"; a refutation of de Lamennais; three series of sermons; various controversial and ascetical works. In 1841 he addressed a Latin letter to the professors of Oxford in which he answered the objections and explained the difficulties of Anglicans. An English translation of the letter is given in the appendix to the life of Father Dominic by Father Pius Devine.

Lives of Father Dominic: Italian, by PADRE FELIPPO (1860); LUCCA DI SAN GIUSEPPE (Genoa, 1877); English, by PIUS DEVINE (London, 1898); CAMM, *Father Dominic and the Conversion of England* in Catholic Truth Society publications (1900); Father Dominic's letters and correspondence concerning his mission to England are published as a supplement to the 3d vol. of the Oratorian life of St. Paul of the Cross (London, 1853).

ARTHUR DEVINE.

Dominis, MARCO ANTONIO DE, a Dalmatian ecclesiastic, apostate, and man of science, b. on the island of Arbe, off the coast of Dalmatia, in 1566; d. in the Castle of Sant' Angelo, Rome, September, 1624. Educated at the Illyrian College at Loreto and at the University of Padua, he entered the Society of Jesus and taught mathematics, logic, and rhetoric at Padua and Brescia. On leaving the Jesuits (1596), he was, through imperial influence, appointed Bishop of Zengg (Segna, Seng) and Modrus in Dalmatia (Aug., 1600), and transferred (Nov., 1602) to the archiepiscopal See of Spalato. He sided with Venice, in whose territory his see was situated, during the quarrel between Paul V and the Republic (1606–7). That fact, combined with a correspondence with Fra Paolo Sarpi and conflicts with his clergy and fellow-bishops which culminated in the loss of an important financial case in the Roman Curia, led to the resignation of his office in favour of a relative and his retirement to Venice. Threatened by the Inquisition, he prepared to apostatize, entered into communication with the English ambassador to Venice, Sir Henry Wotton, and having been assured of a welcome, left for England in 1616. On his way there, he published at Heidelberg a violent attack on Rome: "Scogli del Cristiano naufragio", afterwards reprinted in England. He was received with open arms by James I, who quartered him upon Archbishop Abbot of Canterbury, called on the other bishops to pay him a pension, and granted him precedence after the Archbishops of Canterbury and York. De Dominis wrote a number of anti-Roman sermons, published his often reprinted chief work, "De Republicâ Ecclesiasticâ contra Primatum Papæ" (Vol. I, 1617; vol. II, 1620, London; Vol. III, 1622, Hanover), and took part, as assistant, in the consecration of George Montaigne as Bishop of Lincoln, 14 Dec., 1617. In that same year, James I made him Dean of Windsor and granted him the Mastership of the Savoy.

In 1619 De Dominis published in London the first edition of Fra Paolo Sarpi's "History of the Council of Trent"; the work appeared in Italian, with an anti-Roman title page and letter dedicatory to James I. His vanity, avarice, and irascibility, however, soon lost him his English friends; the projected Spanish marriage of Prince Charles made him anxious about the security of his position in England, and the election of Gregory XV (9 Feb., 1621) furnished him with an occasion of intimating, through Catholic diplomatists in England, his wish to return to Rome. The king's anger was aroused when De Dominis announced his intention (16 Jan., 1622), and Star-Chamber proceedings for illegal correspondence with Rome were threatened. Eventually he was allowed to depart, but his chests of hoarded money were seized by the king's men, and only restored in response to a piteous personal appeal to the king. Once out of England his attacks upon the English Church were as violent as had been those on the See of Rome, and in "Sui Reditus ex Angliâ Consilium" (Paris, 1623) he recanted all he had written in his "Consilium Profectionis" (London, 1616), declaring that he had deliberately lied in all that he had said against Rome. After a stay of six months in Brussels, he proceeded to Rome, where he lived on a pension assigned him by the

pope. On the death of Gregory XV (8 July, 1623) the pension ceased, and irritation loosened his tongue. Coming into conflict with the Inquisition he was declared a relapsed heretic, was confined to the Castle of Sant' Angelo, and there died a natural death. His case was continued after his death, his heresy declared manifest, and his body burned together with his works on 21 Dec., 1624.

In 1611 he published, at Venice, a scientific work entitled: "Tractatus de radiis visus et lucis in vitris, perspectivis et iride", in which, according to Newton, he was the first to develop the theory of the rainbow, by drawing attention to the fact that in each raindrop the light undergoes two refractions and an intermediate reflection. His claim to that distinction is, however, disputed in favour of Descartes.

Much information may be obtained from his own works; GOODMAN, *The Court of King James the First*, ed. BREWER (London, 1839), I, 336–354; FULLER, *Church History of Britain*, ed. NICHOLS (London, 1868), III, 332–343; WHEWELL, *History of the Inductive Sciences* (London, 1837), II, 347 sqq.; PERRY in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; VON REUMONT, *Beiträge zur ital. Geschichte* (1857), VI, 315–329; REUSCH, *Index d. verbot. Bücher*, II, 402, 904.

EDWARD MYERS.

Dominus ac Redemptor. See SOCIETY OF JESUS.

Dominus Vobiscum, an ancient form of devout salutation, incorporated in the liturgy of the Church, where it is employed as a prelude to certain formal prayers. Its origin is evidently Scriptural, being clearly borrowed from Ruth, ii, 4, and II Par., xv, 2. The same idea is also suggested in the New Testament, e. g. in Matt., xxviii, 20: "Ecce ego vobiscum sum", etc. The ecclesiastical usage dates probably from Apostolic times. Mention of it is made (ch. iii) by the Council of Braga (563). It also appears in the sixth or seventh-century "Sacramentarium Gelasianum". The phrase is pregnant with a deep religious significance, and therefore intensely expressive of the highest and holiest wishes. For is not the presence of the Lord—the Source of every good and the Author of every best gift—a certain pledge of Divine protection and a sure earnest of the possession of all spiritual peace and consolation? In the mouth, therefore, of the priest, who acts as the representative and delegate of the Church, in whose name and with whose authority he prays, this deprecatory formula is pre-eminently appropriate. Hence its frequent use in the public prayers of the Church's liturgy. During the Mass it occurs eight times, namely, before the priest ascends the altar, before the two Gospels, the collects, the Offertory, the Preface, the Post-Communion *oratio*, and the blessing. On four of these occasions the celebrant, whilst saying it, turns to the people, extending and joining his hands; on the other four he remains facing the altar. In the Divine Office this formula is said before the principal *oratio* of each Hour by priests, even in private recitation, because they are supposed to pray in union with, and in behalf of, the Church. Deacons say it only in the absence of a priest or with his permission if present (Van der Stappen, De officio divino, 43), but subdeacons use instead the "Domine exaudi orationem meam". Contrary to general usage, the "Dominus Vobiscum" does not precede the prayer of the Blessed Sacrament before Benediction is given. Gardellini (Comment. in Inst. Clem., §31, n. 5) explains this anomaly on the ground that the blessing with the Sacred Host in the monstrance effectively contains all that is implied in the formula. Bishops use the "Pax Vobis" (q. v.) before the collects in Masses where the Gloria is said. The response to the "Dominus Vobiscum" is "Et cum spiritu tuo" (cf. II Tim., iv, 22; Gal., vi, 18; Phil., iv, 23). Formerly this answer was rendered back with one voice by the entire congregation. Among the Greeks there is a corresponding form "Pax omnibus" (Liturgy of St. Basil). The Council of Braga, already mentioned, ordained (Mansi, IX, 777) that priests, as well as bishops, to whom alone the Priscillianists sought to restrict it, should adopt this formula.

EMPEROR DOMITIAN, VATICAN

SAINT PETER DAMIAN, treatise on the "Dominus Vobiscum" in *P. L.*, CXLV, 231 sqq.; ANGELUS ROCCA, *De Salutatione Sacerdotis in Missâ et in divinis officiis*, I, 236, in his *Thesaurus Antiquitatum* (2nd ed., Rome, 1745); BONA, *Rerum Liturgicarum Libri duo* (Turin, 1747), II, v; GIHR in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; VAN DER STAPPEN, *De officio Divino* (Mechlin, 1904); BERNARD, *Cours de Liturgie Romaine: Le Bréviaire* (Paris, 1887), II, 168–73; KRÜLL in KRAUS, *Real-Encyk.*, s. v.

PATRICK MORRISROE.

Domitian (TITUS FLAVIUS DOMITIANUS), Roman emperor and persecutor of the Church, son of Vespasian and younger brother and successor of the Emperor Titus; b. 24 Oct., A.D. 51, and reigned from 81 to 96. In spite of his private vices he set himself up as a reformer of morals and religion. He was the first of the emperors to deify himself during his lifetime by assuming the title of "Lord and God". After the revolt of Saturninus (93) he organized a series of bloodthirsty proscriptions against all the wealthy and noble families. A conspiracy, in which his wife joined, was formed against him, and he was murdered, 18 Sept., 96.

When the Acts of Nero's reign were reversed after his death, an exception was made as to the persecution of the Christians (Tertullian, Ad Nat., i, 7). The Jewish revolt brought upon them fresh unpopularity, and the subsequent destruction of the Holy City deprived them of the last shreds of protection afforded them by being confounded with the Jews. Hence Domitian in his attack upon the aristocratic party found little difficulty in condemning such as were Christians. To observe Jewish practices was no longer lawful; to reject the national religion, without being able to plead the excuse of being a Jew, was atheism. On one count or the other, as Jews or as atheists, the Christians were liable to punishment. Among the more famous martyrs in this Second Persecution were Domitian's cousin, Flavius Clemens, the consul, and M' Acilius Glabrio who had also been consul. Flavia Domitilla, the wife of Flavius, was banished to Pandataria. But the persecution was not confined to such noble victims. We read of many others who suffered death or the loss of their goods (Dio Cassius, LXVII, iv). The book of the Apocalypse was written in the midst of this storm, when many of the Christians had already perished and more were to follow them (St. Irenæus,

Adv. Hæres., V, xxx). Rome, "the great Babylon", "was drunk with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus" (Apoc., xvii, 5, 6; ii, 10, 13; vi, 11; xiii, 15; xx, 4). It would seem that participation in the feasts held in honour of the divinity of the tyrant was made the test for the Christians of the East. Those who did not adore the "image of the beast" were slain. The writer joins to his sharp denunciation of the persecutors' words of encouragement for the faithful by foretelling the downfall of the great harlot "who made drunk the earth with the wine of her whoredom", and steeped her robe in their blood. St. Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians was also written about this time; here, while the terrible trials of the Christians are spoken of, we do not find the same denunciations of the persecutors. The Roman Church continued loyal to the empire, and sent up its prayers to God that He would direct the rulers and magistrates in the exercise of the power committed to their hands (Clem., Ep. ad Cor., c. lxi; cf. St. Paul, Rom., xiii, 1; I Pet., ii, 13). Before the end of his reign Domitian ceased to persecute. (See PERSECUTIONS.)

EUSEBIUS, *H. E.*, III, xvii sqq. in *P. G.*, XX; IRENÆUS, *Adv. Hæreses*, V in *P. G.*, VII; ALLARD, *Hist. des Persécutions pendant les deux premiers siècles* (Paris, 1892); *Ten Lectures on the Martyrs* (tr. London, 1907); *Le Christianisme et l'Empire Romain* (Paris, 1898).

T. B. SCANNELL.

Domitilla, CATACOMBS OF SAINT. See CEMETERY.

Domitiopolis, a titular see of Isauria in Asia Minor. The former name of this city is unknown; it was called Domitiopolis or Dometioupolis after L. Domitius Ahenobarbus (Ramsay, in Revue numismatique, 1894, 168 sqq.). Ptolemy (V, vii, 5) places it in Cilicia; according to Constantine Porphyrogenitus (De themat., I, 15) it was one of the ten cities of the Isaurian Decapolis (cf. Georgius Cyprius, ed. Gelzer, 852). It figures in Parthey's "Notitiæ episcopatuum", I and III, and in Gelzer's "Nova Tactica", 1618, as a suffragan of Seleucia. Lequien (Oriens christ., II, 1023) mentions five bishops, from 451 to 879. Domitiopolis is to-day Dindebol, a village on the Ermenek Su, in the vilayet of Adana (cf. Sterrett, in Papers of the American School, Athens, III, 80).

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Domnus, POPE. See DONUS.

Domnus Apostolicus (DOMINUS APOSTOLICUS), a title applied to the pope, which was in most frequent use between the sixth and the eleventh centuries. The pope is styled Apostolic because he occupies an Apostolic see, that is, one founded by an Apostle, as were those of Ephesus, Philippi, Corinth, etc. (cf. Tertullian, De præscript., xxxvi). Rome being the only Apostolic Church of the West, *Sedes apostolica* meant simply the Roman See, and *Domnus Apostolicus* the Bishop of Rome. In Gaul, however, as early as the fifth century the expression *sedes apostolica* was applied to any episcopal see, bishops being successors of the Apostles (cf. Sidonius Apollinaris, Epp., lib. VI, i, etc.). By the sixth century the term was in general use, and many letters from the Merovingian kings are addressed *Domnis sanctis et apostolicâ sede dignissimis*. Thus the bishops of Gaul were given the title of *Domnus Apostolicus* (cf. Venantius Fortunatus, "Vita S. Mart.", IV; "Formulæ Marculfi", II, xxxix, xliii, xlix). Many examples are also found in wills and deeds (e. g. P. L., LXXX, 1281, 1314, etc.), and one occurs in a letter of introduction given by Charlemagne to St. Boniface (Epp. Bonifac., xi). However, in the Acts of Charlemagne and of the councils held during his time, even outside the Frankish Empire, as in England, the term *Domnus Apostolicus*, in its exact usage, meant simply the pope. Perhaps the only example of it found in Greek authors is in the second letter of Theodore the Studite to Leo III, *κυρίῳ ἀποστολικῷ*. Long before this, however, the word *Apostolicus* alone had been employed to designate the pope. Probably the earliest example is in the list of popes compiled at the time of Pope Vigilius (d. 555), which begins "Incipiunt nomina Apostolicorum" (P. L., LXXVIII, 1405). The expression recurs frequently in documents of the Carlovingian kings, as well as in Anglo-Saxon writings. Claude of Turin gives a curious explanation—*Apostoli custos*. At the Council of Reims held in 1049 the Bishop of Compostela was excommunicated "quia contra fas sibi vendicaret culmen apostolici nominis" (because he wrongly claimed for himself the prestige of an Apostolic name), thinking himself the successor of St. James the Greater, and it was thereupon laid down "quod solus Romanus Pontifex universalis Ecclesiæ Primas esset et Apostolicus" (that only the pontiff of the Roman See was primate of the universal Church and Apostolicus). To-day the title is found only in the Litany of the Saints. There are also the expressions *apostolicatus* (pontificate) and the ablative absolute *apostolicante* (during the pontificate of). It is to be noted that in ecclesiastical usage the abbreviated form *domnus* signifies a human ruler as against *Dominus*, the Divine Lord. Thus at meals monastic grace was asked from the superior in the phrase *Jube Domne benedicere*, i. e.: "Be pleased sir to give the blessing."

DU CANGE, *Gloss. med. et infim. Lat.*, ed. FAVRE (Paris-Niort, 1833–88), s. v.

U. BENIGNI.

Donahoe, PATRICK, publisher, b. at Munnery, County Cavan, Ireland, 17 March, 1811; d. at Boston, U. S. A., 18 March, 1901. He emigrated to Boston when ten years of age with his parents, and at fourteen was apprenticed to a printer. He worked on "The Jesuit" when that paper was started by Bishop Fenwick in 1832, and after the bishop relinquished its ownership, he carried it on for some time with H. L. Devereaux under the new title of "The Literary and Catholic Sentinel". In 1836 he began the publication of "The Pilot", a weekly paper devoted to Irish American and Catholic interests, which in succeeding years became the organ of Catholic opinion in New England, and had a wide circulation all over the United States. He established in connexion with it a publishing and book-selling house from which were issued a large number of Catholic books. Later he organized a bank. All his ventures proved successful and the wealth he acquired was generously given to advance Catholic interests. The great Boston fire of 1872 destroyed his publishing plant. Another fire in the following year and injudicious loans to friends made him lose so much more that his bank failed in 1876. Archbishop Williams purchased "The Pilot" to help to pay the depositors of the bank, and Mr. Donahoe then started a monthly "Donahoe's Magazine" and an exchange and passenger agency. In 1881 he was able to buy back "The Pilot" and devoted his remaining years to its management. During the Civil War he actively interested himself in the organization of the Irish regiments that volunteered from New England. In 1893 the University of Notre Dame gave him the Lætare Medal for signal services to American Catholic progress.

Pilot (Boston), 23 March, 1901 and files; LEAHY, *Hist. Cath. Ch. in New England States* (Boston, 1899), I.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Donahue, PATRICK JAMES. See WHEELING.

Donatello (DONATO DI NICOLÒ DI BETTO BARDI), one of the great Tuscan sculptors of the Renaissance, b. at Florence, c. 1386; d. there, 13 Dec., 1466. He was the son of Nicolò di Betto Bardi, and was early apprenticed to a goldsmith to learn design. At the age of seventeen he accompanied his friend Brunellesco to Rome, and the two youths devoted themselves to drawing and to making excavations in their pursuit of the antique. Half the week they spent chiselling

for a livelihood. Brunellesco's occupation was architecture; Donatello, though understanding the interrelation of the two arts, always, whether in conjunction with Brunellesco or, as later, with Michelozzo, made sculpture paramount. It is hard to place his work chronologically. While still a mere boy, he carved the wooden crucifix in Santa Croce, Florence. On his return from Rome to Florence he was engaged for years on the statues for Giotto's belfry and the buildings then in progress. For the Campanile he did "The Baptist", "Jeremias", "Habakkuk", a group representing Abraham and Isaac, and the famous "David" called the "Zuccone" (Bald-head), so lifelike that Donatello is said to have himself cried to it, "Why don't you speak?"; for the Duomo, "St. John the Evangelist" and "The Singing-gallery"; for Or San Michele, "St. Peter" and "St. Mark", and the "St. George", which he executed at the order of the Guild of Armourers—Donatello's most ideal and perfect work. The socle-relief of "St. George and the Dragon and the King of Cappadocia's Daughter" is absolutely Greek in simplicity and plastic beauty. Other fine reliefs are the bronze doors for the sacristy of San Lorenzo; the medallions for the ceiling; and the "Annunciation" in the same church, with its noble figures of the Blessed Virgin and the archangel. In the Loggia de' Lanzi is the somewhat ill-proportioned group of "Judith and Holofernes". The marble "David" in the Bargello, uniting the delicacy of the adolescent "Baptist" of Casa Martelli with a classic fashion of wreath-bound hair, seems a link between two of the phases in Donatello's development. Purely Renaissance and yet conceived in the antique spirit are the "Amorino" (Cupid) and the bronze "David" of the National Museum, Florence. Both are instinct with life and the potent vitality of youth, jubilant or contained. Pope John XXIII, a personal friend of the sculptor, died in Florence, 1419. Donatello made his tomb, a recumbent portrait-statue in the baptistery. In the Duomo of Siena he performed the same office for Bishop Pecci. In Siena also he made several rare statuettes and reliefs for the christening-font of San Giovanni. At Prato, for the open-air pulpit of the Duomo, he carved the casement with groups of playing children (*putti*). He is believed to have been in Rome again in 1433. A tabernacle of the Blessed Virgin in St. Peter's is said to be by Donatello, and also the tombstone of Giovanni Crivelli in Santa Maria in Ara Cœli. In 1443 he went to Padua to build the choir-gallery, and remained there some ten years. First he carved his "Christ on the Cross", the head a marvel of workmanship and expression; then statuettes of the Blessed Virgin, St. Francis of Assisi, St. Anthony, and other saints; also a long series of reliefs for the high altar. While in Padua Donatello was commissioned to make a monument to the Venetian Condottiere (General) Gattamelata (Erasmo de' Narni), and he blocked out the first great equestrian statue since classic times. The last known statue of Donatello is "St. Louis of Toulouse" in the interior of Santa Croce.

Donatello became bedridden in his latter years, and some of his works were completed by his pupils. Piero de' Medici provided for him. Donatello had always been lavish with his fellow-workers and assistants, and took no forethought for himself. His character was one of great openness and simplicity, and he had an ingenuous appreciation of his own value as an artist. Unassuming as he was, his pride of craft and independence of spirit would lead him to destroy a masterpiece at one blow if his modest price were haggled over. He was buried beside his patron Cosimo de' Medici in the church of San Lorenzo in Florence. Donatello was a thorough realist and one of the first modellers with whom character and personality in the subject meant more than loveliness. His Apostles and saints were generally close likenesses of living persons. He had a vivid faculty for individual traits and expression and a method of powerful handling that makes it impossible to forget his creations. In such figures as the "Baptist" and the "Magdalen" of the baptistery of Florence he apparently studied emaciation for its anatomic value. His busts of contemporaries (such as that of Nicolò da Uzzano, "Youth with Breastplate", etc.) look like casts from life. One of the most graceful pieces is the "San Giovannino", a relief of a child, in sandstone, in the Bargello, Florence. Minor works are the "Marzocco" (original in the National Museum, Florence)—the lion, the emblem of Florence, with the *fleur-de-lys florencée* shield—and the Martelli escutcheon on the staircase of their house.

LÜBKE, *History of Sculpture* (tr. London, 1872); PERKINS, *Handbook of Italian Sculpture* (New York, 1883); REA, *Donatello* (London, 1900); BALCARRES, *Donatello* (London, 1903); MÜNTZ, *Les Précurseurs de la Renaissance* (Paris, 1900); VASARI, *Lives of the Painters* (tr. London, 1881).

M. L. HANDLEY.

Donation (IN CANON LAW), the gratuitous transfer to another of some right or thing. When it consists in placing in the hands of the donee some movable object it is known as a gift of hand (*donum manuale*, an offering or *oblatio*, an alms). Properly speaking, however, it is a voluntary contract, verbal or written, by which the donor expressly agrees to give, without consideration, something to the donee, and the latter in an equally express manner accepts the gift. In Roman law and in some modern codes this contract carries with it only the obligation of transferring the ownership of the thing in question; actual ownership is obtained only by the real *traditio* or handing over of the thing itself, or by the observation of certain juridically prescribed formalities (L. 20, C. De pactis, II, 3). Such codes distinguish between conventional (or imperfect) and perfect donation, i. e. the actual transfer of the thing or right. In some countries the contract itself transfers ownership. A donation is called remunerative when inspired by a sentiment of gratitude for services rendered by the donee. Donations are also described as *inter vivos* if made while the donor yet lives, and *causâ mortis*, when made in view or contemplation of death; the latter are valid only after the death of the donor and until then are at all times revocable. They much resemble testaments and codicils. They are, however, on the same footing as donations *inter vivos* once the donor has renounced his right to revoke. In the pursuit of its end the Church needs material aid; it has the right therefore to acquire such aid by donation no less than by other means. In its quality of a perfect and independent society the Church may also decide under what forms and on what conditions it will accept donations made to works of religion (*donationes ad pias causas*); it pertains to the State to legislate for all other donations.

HISTORY OF ECCLESIASTICAL DONATIONS.—Even before the Edict of Milan (313) the Church was free to acquire property by donation either as a juridically recognized association (*collegium*) or as a society *de facto* tolerated (note that the right to acquire property by last will and testament dates only from 321 in the reign of Constantine). Nevertheless, the Church was held to observe the pertinent civil legislation, though on this head it enjoyed certain privileges; thus, even before the *traditio*, or handing over, of the donation to a church or a religious institution, the latter acquired real rights to the same (L. 23, C. De sacrosanctis ecclesiis, I, 2). Moreover, the *insinuatio* or declaration of the gift before the public authority was required only for donations equivalent in value to 500 *solidi* (nearly twenty-six hundred dollars) or more, a privilege later on extended to all donations (L. 34, 36, C. De donationibus, VIII, 53). Finally, bishops, priests, and deacons yet under parental power were allowed to dis-

ST. GEORGE
MUSEO NAZIONALE, FLORENCE

DONATELLO
GATTAMELATA (ERASMO DA NARNI)
PADUA

JUDITH AND HOLOFERNES
LOGGIA DE' LANZI, FLORENCE

pose freely, even in favour of the Church, of property acquired by them after ordination [L. 33 (34) C. De episcopis et clericis, I, 3]. The Franks, long quite unaccustomed to dispose of their property by will, were on the other hand generous in donations, especially *cessiones post obitum*, similar to the Roman law donations in view of death but carrying with them the renunciation on the donor's part of his right of revocation; other Frankish donations to the Church reserved the usufruct. The institution known as *precaria ecclesiastica* was quite favourable to the growth of donations. At the request of the donor the Church granted him the use of the donated object for five years, for his life, or even a use transferable to the heirs of the first occupant. Synods of this epoch assert to some extent the validity of pious donations even when the legal requisites had not been observed, though as a rule they were not omitted. Generally speaking, the consent of the civil authority (*princeps*) was not indispensable for the acquisition of property by religious corporations. The restrictions known as the "right of amortization" (see MORTMAIN) are of later date, and are the outcome of theories elaborated in the Middle Ages but carried to their logical issue in the modern civil legislation (of Continental countries) concerning *biens de mainmorte*, or property held by inalienable tenure, i. e. the property of religious corporations, they being perpetual. The Church does not accept such legislation; nevertheless the faithful may act accordingly in order to secure to their donations the protection of the law.

CANONICAL LEGISLATION.—Donations are valid and obligatory when made by persons capable of disposing of their property and accepted by the administrators of ecclesiastical institutions. No other formality is required, neither notarial act nor authorization of the civil power. The declaration before the public authority, required by Roman law, is not obligatory in canon law. Nor are the faithful obliged to heed the restrictions which are placed by some modern civil codes in the way of a free disposition of their property. On the other hand the donation must be accepted by the donee; it is not true, as some have maintained, that every donation for works of religion (*ad pias causas*) implies a vow, i. e. an act in itself obligatory independently of the acceptance of the donee. If the administrators of an ecclesiastical institution refuse to accept a donation, that institution can always obtain in canon law a *restitutio in integrum*, whereby it is again put in a condition to accept the refused donation. The canonical motives for the revocation or diminution of a donation are the birth of children to the donor and the *donatio inofficiosa*, or excessive generosity on the latter's part, whereby he diminishes the share of inheritance that legitimately belongs to his children. In both cases, however, the donation is valid in canon law to the degree in which it respects the legitimate share of the donor's children. It is worthy of note that while ecclesiastical and religious establishments may give alms, they are bound in the matter of genuine donations by the provisions of the canon law concerning the alienation of ecclesiastical property.

CIVIL LEGISLATION.—In most European countries the civil authority restricts in three ways the right of the Church to accept donations: (1) by imposing the forms and conditions that the civil codes prescribe for donations; (2) by reserving to itself the right of saying what institutions shall have civil personality and be thereby authorized to acquire property; (3) by exacting the approval of the civil authority, at least for important donations. Austria recognizes a juridical personality not only in those religious institutions which are charged with the maintenance of public worship, but also, through easily granted approval, in religious associations of any kind. The so-called amortization laws (against the traditional inalienability of tenure on the part of religious corporations) have so far remained only a threat, though the Government reserves the right to establish such legislation. Religious communities, however, are required to make known to the civil authorities all their acquisitions of property. In Germany, even since the promulgation of the Civil Code of the Empire (1896), the legislation varies from State to State. In all, however, property rights are recognized by the law in only those ecclesiastical institutions that are recognized by the State. As a rule, donations must be authorized by the civil power if they exceed the value of five thousand marks (1250 dollars, or 250 pounds sterling) though in some states this figure is doubled. In Prussia civil authorization is requisite for all acquisition of real property by a diocese, a chapter, or any ecclesiastical institution. In Italy every donation must be approved by the civil authority, and only the institutions recognized by the State are allowed to acquire property; note, however, that simple benefices (see BENEFICE) and religious orders cannot acquire this latter privilege. With few exceptions, ecclesiastical institutions in Italy are not allowed to invest in any other form of property than Government bonds. In France the *associations cultuelles*, or worship-associations, are recognized by the State as civil entities for the conduct of public worship; it is well known, however, that Pius X forbade the Catholics of France to form such associations. That country, it is true, recognizes the civil personality of licit associations organized for a non-lucrative purpose, but declares illicit every religious congregation not approved by a special law. At the same time, it refuses to approve the religious congregations which have sought this approval, and is gradually suppressing all those which were formerly approved. (See PROPERTY, ECCLESIASTICAL.)

FÉNELON, *Les fondations et les établissements ecclésiastiques* (Paris, 1902); FOURNERET, *Ressources dont l'Eglise dispose pour reconstituer son patrimoine* (Paris, 1902); KNECHT, *System des justinianischen Kirchenvermögensrechtes* (Stuttgart, 1905); BONDROIT, *De capacitate possidendi ecclesiæ ætate merovingicâ* (Louvain, 1900); LOENING, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenrechts* (Strasburg, 1898), II, 653 sq.; SCHMALZGRUEBER, *Jus ecclesiasticum universum* (Rome, 1844), III, ii, 430–460; SANTI, *Prælectiones juris canonici* (Rome, 1898), III, 206; WERNZ, *Jus Decretalium* (Rome, 1901), III, 270 sq.; AICHNER, *Compendium juris ecclesiastici* (Brixen, 1900), 814–815; SILBERNAGL, *Lehrbuch des katholischen Kirchenrechts* (Ratisbon, 1903), 692 sq.; GEIGER, *Der kirchenrechtliche Inhalt der bundesstaatlichen Ausführungsgesetze zum bürgerlichen Gesetzbuch für das deutsche Reich* in *Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht* (Mainz, 1901), LXXXI, 650.—For the juridical condition of the Church in the different nations of the world in respect of property see the articles on various countries in THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA; also a series of articles in *Revue catholique des institutions et du droit* (Paris, 1907), Series II, vols. XXXVIII and XXXIX; also in *Bulletin de la société de législation comparée* (Paris, 1905–1907), XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVI.

A. VAN HOVE.

Donation (IN CIVIL JURISPRUDENCE), the gratuitous transfer, or gift (Lat. *donatio*), of ownership of property. The Latin word *munus* also signified a gift, but "a gift on some special occasion such as births or marriages" (Roby, Roman Private Law, Cambridge, 1902, I, 86). The person transferring ownership by donation is termed the donor, the person to whom the transfer is made, the donee. In contemplation of law donation is "based upon the fundamental right every one has of disposing of his property as he wills" (125 New York Court of Appeals Reports, p. 579), a right, however, deemed from ancient times an appropriate subject for legal regulation and restraint (see Johns, Babylonian and Assyrian Laws, etc., New York, 1904, XXI). Donation requires the consent not only of the donor to transfer the ownership, but also that of the donee to accept and assume it, "as I cannot", remarks Pothier (Treatise on Obligations, 4), "by the mere act of my own mind transfer to another a right in my goods, without a concurrent intention on his part to accept them". Donations are usually classified as (1)

inter vivos (among the living) and (2) *mortis causa* (in view of death).

(1) *Inter Vivos.*—Sir William Blackstone explains (in his Commentaries, II, 441) that in English law mutual consent to give and to accept is not a gift, but is an imperfect contract void for want of consideration. Yet delivery and acceptance being added to the ineffectual consent, the transaction becomes an irrevocable transfer by donation *inter vivos*, regarded in law as an executed contract, just as if the preliminary consents had constituted an effectual "act in the law" (see Pollock, Principles of Contract, New York, 1906, 2). "Every gift", remarks Chancellor Kent, "which is made perfect by delivery, and every grant, are executed contracts, for they are founded on the mutual consent of the parties in reference to a right or interest passing between them" (Commentaries on American Law, II, 437); and Milton (Paradise Lost, XII, 67) says:—

> He gave us only over beast, fish, fowl,
> Dominion absolute; that right we hold
> By his donation.

According to English law, writing under seal, known as a deed, so far transfers personal property without actual delivery that ownership vests upon execution of the deed, and the donation is irrevocable until disclaimed by the donee (J. W. Smith, The Law of Contracts, 36, Philadelphia, 1885). Not only movable things, defined in English law as personal property, but land (real estate) may be the subject of this donation (24 Vermont Reports, 591; 115 New York Court of Appeals Reports, 295). The legislation of the Emperor Justinian abolished requirements which by Roman law had previously been necessary to perfect a donation, and thenceforth, by force of this legislation, the donor's informal agreement to give, bound him to make delivery. Donations, were, however, rendered revocable by the same legislation for a failure to comply with their conditions, and also for gross ingratitude (Leage, Roman Private Law, London, 1906, 145). The English law "controls", to quote Chancellor Kent, "gifts when made to the prejudice of existing creditors" (Commentaries, II, 440); and a donation may be avoided if the donor "were under any legal incapacity . . . or if he were drawn in, circumvented or imposed upon by false pretences, ebriety or surprise" (Blackstone, Commentaries, II, 441). But English law does not annul donations for ingratitude nor for various other causes mentioned in the Roman law. English law "does not", according to Chancellor Kent, "indulge in these refinements" (op. cit.). Donations between husband and wife were contrary to the policy of the Roman law which permitted *donatio propter nuptias* before marriage only (Leage, op. cit., 95). By English common law there accrued to a husband full ownership of his wife's personal property, and possession for their joint lives of her real property. And because English law deemed husband and wife one person (Bishop, Commentaries on the Law of Married Women, Boston, 1873, I, 231), a gift of personal property from husband to wife was "impossible according to the old and technical common law" (ibid., 730). But the commentator adds that "it is otherwise in equity" (ibid., 731). By the French Code Civil, donations *inter vivos*, designated *entre vifs*, are recognized; but they are subjected to many restrictions.

(2) *Mortis Causa.*—A donation of this kind is made when a person "in his last sickness", to quote Blackstone (Commentaries, II, 514), "apprehending his dissolution near, delivers or causes to be delivered to another the possession of any personal goods . . . to keep in case of his decease". The same donation may also be made in presence of any other impending peril of death. The "Institutes" of Justinian cite a classic example: *sic et apud Homerum Telemachus donat Pirœo* (II, VII). This donation differs strikingly from donation *inter vivos* in not being absolute, but conditional on the donor failing to recover from the sickness or to escape the peril; also in being dependent on his not having exercised the right which remains to him, of revoking the donation. The transfer is thus perfected by death only. Roman law permitted such donations between husband and wife because these were donations *quæ conferuntur in tempus soluti matrimonii* (Pothier, Pandectæ Justinianeæ, XXIV, t. i, xix). Nor were donations of this kind from husband to wife forbidden by the English common law (24 Vermont Reports, 596). As the danger in view of which the donation is made must be actually present, therefore a transfer from an owner "not terrified by fear of any present peril, but moved by the general consideration of man's mortality", cannot be sustained as a donation *mortis causa*. A transfer of ownership of real estate cannot be effected by this form of donation. And any donation *mortis causa* expressly embracing the whole of the donor's property has been said to be illegal, being deemed to be an attempt to escape disposition by last will (American Law Register, I, 25). The grounds already referred to on which a donation *inter vivos* may be avoided seem also grounds for avoiding a donation *mortis causa*. In every instance the evidence establishing such a donation as against a donor's representatives must "be clear and convincing, strong and satisfactory" (125 New York Court of Appeals Reports, 757). For this "death-bed disposition of property", as it is termed by Blackstone (op. cit.), is not a favourite of the law. Many years ago a lord chancellor of England, profoundly learned in the law and noted for his conservatism suggested that if "this *donatio mortis causa* was struck out of our law altogether it would be quite as well" (American Law Register, I, II). And by the Code Civil it has been "struck out" of the law of France.

Story, *Commentaries on Equity Jurisprudence* (Boston, 1886), 607, 608; Parsons, *The Law of Contracts* (Boston, 1904), I, 254–60; *2 Vesey Jrs. Reports* (Boston, 1844), 119; *4 Wheaton's Reports, Sup. Ct. U. S.* (New York, 1819), 518; *49 New York Court of Appeals Reports*, 17; *La Grande Encyc.*, s. v.

Charles W. Sloane.

Donation of Constantine (Lat. *Donatio Constantini*).—By this name is understood, since the end of the Middle Ages, a forged document of Emperor Constantine the Great, by which large privileges and rich possessions were conferred on the pope and the Roman Church. In the oldest known (ninth century) manuscript (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, MS. Latin 2777) and in many other manuscripts the document bears the title: "Constitutum domni Constantini imperatoris". It is addressed by Constantine to Pope Sylvester I (314–35) and consists of two parts. In the first (entitled "Confessio") the emperor relates how he was instructed in the Christian Faith by Sylvester, makes a full profession of faith, and tells of his baptism in Rome by that pope, and how he was thereby cured of leprosy. In the second part (the "Donatio") Constantine is made to confer on Sylvester and his successors the following privileges and possessions: the pope, as successor of St. Peter, has the primacy over the four Patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, and Jerusalem, also over all the bishops in the world. The Lateran basilica at Rome, built by Constantine, shall surpass all churches as their head, similarly the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul shall be endowed with rich possessions. The chief Roman ecclesiastics (*clerici cardinales*), among whom senators may also be received, shall obtain the same honours and distinctions as the senators. Like the emperor the Roman Church shall have as functionaries *cubicularii*, *ostiarii*, and *excubitores*. The pope shall enjoy the same honorary rights as the emperor, among them the right to wear an imperial crown, a purple cloak and tunic, and in general all imperial insignia or signs of distinction; but as Sylvester refused to put on

his head a golden crown, the emperor invested him with the high white cap (*phrygium*). Constantine, the document continues, rendered to the pope the service of a *strator*, i. e. he led the horse upon which the pope rode. Moreover, the emperor makes a present to the pope and his successors of the Lateran palace, of Rome and the provinces, districts, and towns of Italy and all the Western regions (*tam palatium nostrum, ut prelatum est, quamque Romæ urbis et omnes Italiæ seu occidentalium regionum provincias loca et civitates*). The document goes on to say that for himself the emperor has established in the East a new capital which bears his name, and thither he removes his government, since it is inconvenient that a secular emperor have power where God has established the residence of the head of the Christian religion. The document concludes with maledictions against all who dare to violate these donations and with the assurance that the emperor has signed them with his own hand and placed them on the tomb of St. Peter.

This document is without doubt a forgery, fabricated somewhere between the years 750 and 850. As early as the fifteenth century its falsity was known and demonstrated. Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa (De Concordantiâ Catholicâ, III, ii, in the Basle ed. of his Opera, 1565, I) spoke of it as a *dictamen apocryphum*. Some years later (1440) Lorenzo Valla (De falso credita et ementita Constantini donatione declamatio, Mainz, 1518) proved the forgery with certainty. Independently of both his predecessors, Reginald Pecocke, Bishop of Chichester (1450–57), reached a similar conclusion in his work, "The Repressor of over much Blaming of the Clergy", Rolls Series, II, 351–366. Its genuinity was yet occasionally defended, and the document still further used as authentic, until Baronius in his "Annales Ecclesiastici" (ad an. 324) admitted that the "Donatio" was a forgery, whereafter it was soon universally admitted to be such. It is so clearly a fabrication that there is no reason to wonder that, with the revival of historical criticism in the fifteenth century, the true character of the document was at once recognized. The forger made use of various authorities, which Grauert and others (see below) have thoroughly investigated. The introduction and the conclusion of the document are imitated from authentic writings of the imperial period, but formulæ of other periods are also utilized. In the "Confession" of faith the doctrine of the Holy Trinity is explained at length, afterwards the Fall of man and the Incarnation of Christ. There are also reminiscences of the decrees of the Iconoclast Synod of Constantinople (754) against the veneration of images. The narrative of the conversion and healing of the emperor is based on the apocryphal Acts of Sylvester (Acta or Gesta Sylvestri), yet all the particulars of the "Donatio" narrative do not appear in the hitherto known texts of that legend. The distinctions conferred on the pope and the cardinals of the Roman Church the forger probably invented and described according to certain contemporary rites and the court ceremonial of the Roman and the Byzantine emperors. The author also used the biographies of the popes in the Liber Pontificalis (q. v.), likewise eighth-century letters of the popes, especially in his account of the imperial donations.

The authorship of this document is still wrapped in obscurity. Occasionally, but without sufficient reason, critics have attributed it to the author of the False Decretals (q. v.) or to some Roman ecclesiastic of the eighth century. On the other hand, the time and place of its composition have lately been thoroughly studied by numerous investigators (especially Germans), though no sure and universally accepted conclusion has yet been reached. As to the place of the forgery Baronius (Annales, ad. an. 1081) maintained that it was done in the East by a schismatic Greek; it is, indeed, found in Greek canonical collections. Natalis Alexander opposed this view, and it is no longer held by any recent historian. Many of the recent critical students of the document locate its composition at Rome and attribute the forgery to an ecclesiastic, their chief argument being an intrinsic one: this false document was composed in favour of the popes and of the Roman Church, therefore Rome itself must have had the chief interest in a forgery executed for a purpose so clearly expressed. Moreover, the sources of the document are chiefly Roman. Nevertheless, the earlier view of Zaccaria and others that the forgery originated in the Frankish Empire has quite recently been ably defended by Hergenröther and Grauert (see below). They call attention to the fact that the "Donatio" appears first in Frankish collections, i. e. in the False Decretals and in the above-mentioned St-Denis manuscript; moreover the earliest certain quotation of it is by Frankish authors in the second half of the ninth century. Finally, this document was never used in the papal chancery until the middle of the eleventh century, nor in general is it referred to in Roman sources until the time of Otto III (983–1002, i. e. in case the famous "Diploma" of this emperor be authentic). The first certain use of it at Rome was by Leo IX in 1054, and it is to be noted that this pope was by birth and training a German, not an Italian. The writers mentioned have shown that the chief aim of the forgery was to prove the justice of the *translatio imperii* to the Franks, i. e. the transfer of the imperial title at the coronation of Charlemagne in 800; the forgery was, therefore, important mainly for the Frankish Empire. This view is rightly tenable against the opinion of the majority that the forgery originated at Rome.

A still greater divergency of opinion reigns as to the time of its composition. Some have asserted (more recently Martens, Friedrich, and Bayet) that each of its two parts was fabricated at different times. Martens holds that the author executed his forgery at brief intervals; that the "Constitutum" originated after 800 in connexion with a letter of Adrian I (778) to Charlemagne wherein the pope acknowledged the imperial position to which the Frankish king by his own efforts and fortune had attained. Friedrich (see below), on the contrary, attempts to prove that the "Constitutum" was composed of two really distinct parts. The gist of the first part, the so-called "Confessio", appeared between 638 and 653, probably 638–641, while the second, or "Donatio" proper, was written in the reign of Stephen II, between 752 and 757, by Paul, brother and successor of Pope Stephen. According to Bayet the first part of the document was composed in the time of Paul I (757–767); the latter part appeared in or about the year 774. In opposition to these opinions most historians maintain that the document was written at the same time and wholly by one author. But when was it written? Colombier decides for the reign of Pope Conon (686–687), Genelin for the beginning of the eighth century (before 728). But neither of these views is supported by sufficient reasons, and both are certainly untenable. Most investigators accept as the earliest possible date the pontificate of Stephen II (752–757), thus establishing a connexion between the forgery and the historical events that led to the origin of the States of the Church and the Western Empire of the Frankish kings. But in what year or period from the above-mentioned pontificate of Stephen II until the reception of the "Constitutum" in the collection of the False Decretals (c. 840–50) was the forgery executed? Nearly every student of this intricate question maintains his own distinct view. It is necessary first to answer a preliminary question: Did Pope Adrian I in his letter to Charlemagne of the year 778 (Codex Carolinus, ed. Jaffé, Ep. lxi) exhibit a knowledge of the "Constitutum"? From a passage of this letter (Sicut temporibus beati Silvestri Romani pontificis a sanctæ recorda-

tionis piissimo Constantino magno imperatore per eius largitatem sancta Dei Catholica et Apostolica Romana ecclesia elevata et exaltata est et potestatem in his Hesperiæ partibus largiri dignatus, ita et in his vestris felicissimis temporibus atque nostris sancta Dei ecclesia, id est beati Petri apostoli, germinet atque exultet. . . .) several writers, e. g. Döllinger, Langen, Meyer, and others have concluded that Adrian I was then aware of this forgery, so that it must have appeared before 778. Friedrich assumes in Adrian I a knowledge of the "Constitutum" from his letter to Emperor Constantine VI written in 785 (Mansi, Concil. Coll., XII, 1056). Most historians, however, rightly refrain from asserting that Adrian I made use of this document; from his letters, therefore, the time of its origin cannot be deduced.

Most of the recent writers on the subject assume the origin of the "Donatio" between 752 and 795. Among them, some decide for the pontificate of Stephen II (752–757) on the hypothesis that the author of the forgery wished to substantiate thereby the claims of this pope in his negotiations with Pepin (Döllinger, Hauck, Friedrich, Böhmer). Others lower the date of the forgery to the time of Paul I (757–767), and base their opinion on the political events in Italy under this pope, or on the fact that he had a special veneration for St. Sylvester, and that the "Donatio" had especially in view the honour of this saint (Scheffer-Boichorst, Mayer). Others again locate its origin in the pontificate of Adrian I (772–795), on the hypothesis that this pope hoped thereby to extend the secular authority of the Roman Church over a great part of Italy and to create in this way a powerful ecclesiastical State under papal government (Langen, Loening). A smaller group of writers, however, remove the forgery to some date after 800, i. e. after the coronation of Charlemagne as emperor. Among these, Martens and Weiland assign the document to the last years of the reign of Charlemagne, or the first years of Louis the Pious, i. e. somewhere between 800 and 840. They argue that the chief purpose of the forgery was to bestow on the Western ruler the imperial power, or that the "Constitutum" was meant to indicate what the new emperor, as successor of Constantine the Great, might have conferred on the Roman Church. Those writers also who seek the forger in the Frankish Empire maintain that the document was written in the ninth century, e. g. especially Hergenröther and Grauert. The latter opines that the "Constitutum" originated in the monastery of St-Denis, at Paris, shortly before or about the same time as the False Decretals, i. e. between 840 and 850.

Closely connected with the date of the forgery is the other question concerning the primary purpose of the forger of the "Donatio". Here, too, there exists a great variety of opinions. Most of the writers who locate at Rome itself the origin of the forgery maintain that it was intended principally to support the claims of the popes to secular power in Italy; they differ, however, as to the extent of the said claims. According to Döllinger the "Constitutum" was destined to aid in the creation of a united Italy under papal government. Others would limit the papal claims to those districts which Stephen II sought to obtain from Pepin, or to isolated territories which, then or later, the popes desired to acquire. In general, this class of historians seeks to connect the forgery with the historical events and political movements of that time in Italy (Mayer, Langen, Friedrich, Loening, and others). Several of these writers lay more stress on the elevation of the papacy than on the donation of territories. Occasionally it is maintained that the forger sought to secure for the pope a kind of higher secular power, something akin to imperial supremacy as against the Frankish Government, then solidly established in Italy. Again, some of this class limit to Italy the expression *occidentalium regionum provincias*, but most of them understand it to mean the whole former Western Empire. This is the attitude of Weiland, for whom the chief object of the forgery is the increase of papal power over the imperial, and the establishment of a kind of imperial supremacy of the pope over the whole West. For this reason also he lowers the date of the "Constitutum" no further than the end of the reign of Charlemagne (814). As a matter of fact, however, in this document Sylvester does indeed obtain from Constantine imperial rank and the emblems of imperial dignity, but not the real imperial supremacy. Martens therefore sees in the forgery an effort to elevate the papacy in general; all alleged prerogatives of the pope and of Roman ecclesiastics, all gifts of landed possessions, and rights of secular government are meant to promote and confirm this elevation, and from it all the new Emperor Charlemagne ought to draw practical conclusions for his behaviour in relation to the pope. Scheffer-Boichorst holds a singular opinion, namely that the forger intended primarily the glorification of Sylvester and Constantine, and only in a secondary way a defence of the papal claims to territorial possessions. Grauert, for whom the forger is a Frankish subject, shares the view of Hergenröther, i. e. the forger had in mind a defence of the new Western Empire from the attacks of the Byzantines. Therefore it was highly important for him to establish the legitimacy of the newly founded empire, and this purpose was especially aided by all that the document alleges concerning the elevation of the pope. From the foregoing it will be seen that the last word of historical research in this matter still remains to be said. Important questions concerning the sources of the forgery, the place and time of its origin, the tendency of the forger, yet await their solution. New researches will probably pay still greater attention to textual criticism, especially that of the first part or "Confession" of faith.

As far as the evidence at hand permits us to judge, the forged "Constitutum" was first made known in the Frankish Empire. The oldest extant manuscript of it, certainly from the ninth century, was written in the Frankish Empire. In the second half of that century the document is expressly mentioned by three Frankish writers. Ado, Bishop of Vienne, speaks of it in his Chronicle (De sex ætatibus mundi, ad an. 306, in P. L., CXXIII, 92); Æneas, Bishop of Paris, refers to it in defence of the Roman primacy (Adversus Græcos, c. ccix, op. cit., CXXI, 758); Hincmar, Archbishop of Reims, mentions the donation of Rome to the pope by Constantine the Great according to the "Constitutum" (De ordine palatii, c. xiii, op. cit., CXXV, 998). The document obtained wider circulation by its incorporation with the False Decretals (840–850, or more specifically between 847 and 852; Hinschius, Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianæ, Leipzig, 1863, p. 249). At Rome no use was made of the document during the ninth and the tenth centuries, not even amid the conflicts and difficulties of Nicholas I with Constantinople, when it might have served as a welcome argument for the claims of the pope. The first pope who used it in an official act and relied upon it, was Leo IX; in a letter of 1054 to Michael Cærularius, Patriarch of Constantinople, he cites the "Donatio" to show that the Holy See possessed both an earthly and a heavenly *imperium*, the royal priesthood. Thenceforth the "Donatio" acquires more importance and is more frequently used as evidence in the ecclesiastical and political conflicts between the papacy and the secular power. Anselm of Lucca and Cardinal Deusdedit inserted it in their collections of canons. Gratian, it is true, excluded it from his "Decretum", but it was soon added to it as "Palea". The ecclesiastical writers in defence of the papacy during the conflicts of the early part of the twelfth century quoted it as authoritative (Hugo of Fleury, De regiâ potestate et ecclesiasticâ dignitate, II; Placidus of

Nonantula, De honore ecclesiæ, cc. lvii, xci, cli; Disputatio vel defensio Paschalis papæ; Honorius Augustodunensis, De summâ gloriæ, c. xvii; cf. Mon. Germ. Hist., Libelli de lite, II, 456, 591, 614, 635; III, 71). St. Peter Damian also relied on it in his writings against the antipope Cadalous of Parma (Disceptatio synodalis, in Libelli de lite, I, 88). Gregory VII himself never quoted this document in his long warfare for ecclesiastical liberty against the secular power. But Urban II made use of it in 1091 to support his claims on the island of Corsica. Later popes (Innocent III, Gregory IX, Innocent IV) took its authenticity for granted (Innocent III, Sermo de sancto Silvestro, in P. L., CCXVII, 481 sqq.; Raynaldus, Annales, ad an. 1236, n. 24; Potthast, Regesta, no. 11,848), and ecclesiastical writers often adduced its evidence in favour of the papacy. The medieval adversaries of the popes, on the other hand, never denied the validity of this appeal to the pretended donation of Constantine, but endeavoured to show that the legal deductions drawn from it were founded on false interpretations. The authenticity of the document, as already stated, was doubted by no one before the fifteenth century. It was known to the Greeks in the second half of the twelfth century, when it appears in the collection of Theodore Balsamon (1169 sqq.); later on another Greek canonist, Matthæus Blastares (about 1335), admitted it into his collection. It appears also in other Greek works. Moreover, it was highly esteemed in the Greek East. The Greeks claimed, it is well known, for the Bishop of New Rome (Constantinople) the same honorary rights as those enjoyed by the Bishop of Old Rome. But now, by virtue of this document, they claimed for the Byzantine clergy also the privileges and prerogatives granted to the pope and the Roman ecclesiastics. In the West, long after its authenticity was disputed in the fifteenth century, its validity was still upheld by the majority of canonists and jurists who continued throughout the sixteenth century to quote it as authentic. And though Baronius and later historians acknowledged it to be a forgery, they endeavoured to marshal other authorities in defence of its content, especially as regards the imperial donations. In later times even this was abandoned, so that now the whole "Constitutum", both in form and content, is rightly considered in all senses a forgery. See FALSE DECRETALS; SYLVESTER I; STATES OF THE CHURCH; TEMPORAL POWER.

The text of the *Donatio* has often been printed, e. g. in LABBE, *Concil.*, I, 1530; MANSI, *Concil. col.*, II, 603; finally by GRAUERT (see below) and ZEUMER in *Festgabe für Rudolf von Gneist* (Berlin, 1888), 39 sqq. See HALLER, *Die Quellen zur Geschichte der Entstehung des Kirchenstaats* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1907), 241–250; CENNI, *Monumenta dominationis Pontificiæ* (Rome, 1760), I, 306 sqq.; cf. *Origine della Donazione di Costantino* in *Civiltà Cattolica*, ser. V, X, 1864, 303 sqq. The following are non-Catholic: ZINKEISEN, *The Donation of Constantine as applied by the Roman Church* in *Eng. Hist. Review* (1894), IX, 625–32; SCHAFF, *Hist. of the Christ. Church* (New York, 1905), IV, 270–72; HODGKIN, *Italy and Her Invaders* (Oxford, 1899), VII, 135 sqq. See also COLOMBIER, *La Donation de Constantin* in *Etudes Religieuses* (1877), XI, 800 sqq.; BONNEAU, *La Donation de Constantin* (Lisieux, 1891); BAYET, *La fausse Donation de Constantin* in *Annuaire de la Faculté des lettres de Lyon* (Paris, 1884), II, 12 sq.; DÖLLINGER, *Papstfabeln des Mittelalters* (Munich, 1863, Stuttgart, 1890), 72 sqq.; HERGENRÖTHER, *Katholische Kirche und christlicher Staat* (Freiburg im Br., 1872), I, 360 sqq.; GENELIN, *Das Schenkungsversprechen und die Schenkung Pippins* (Leipzig, 1880), 36 sqq.; MARTENS, *Die römische Frage unter Pippin und Karl dem Grossen* (Stuttgart, 1881), 327 sqq.; IDEM, *Die falsche Generalkonzession Konstantins des Grossen* (Munich, 1889); IDEM, *Beleuchtung der neuesten Kontroversen über die römische Frage unter Pippin und Karl dem Grossen* (Munich, 1898), 151 sqq.; GRAUERT, *Die konstantinische Schenkung* in *Historisches Jahrbuch* (1882), 3 sqq. (1883), 45 sqq., 674 sqq. (1884), 117 sqq.; LANGEN, *Entstehung und Tendenz der konstantinischen Schenkungsurkunde* in *Historische Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht* (1889), 137 sqq., 185 sqq.; BRUNNER, *Das Constitutum Constantini* in *Festgabe für R. von Gneist* (Berlin, 1888), 3 sqq.; FRIEDRICH, *Die konstantinische Schenkung* (Nördlingen, 1889); SCHEFFER-BOICHORST, *Neuere Forschungen über die konstantinische Schenkung* in *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österr. Geschichtsforsch.* (1889), 302 sqq. (1890), 128 sqq.; LAMPRECHT, *Die römische Frage von König Pippin bis auf Kaiser Ludwig den Frommen* (Leipzig, 1889), 117 sqq.; LOENING, *Die Entstehung der konstantinischen Schenkungsurkunde* in *Histor. Zeitschrift* (1890), 193 sqq.; BÖHMER, *Konstantinische Schenkung* in *Realencyklopädie für prot. Theol.* (Leipzig, 1902), XI, 1 sqq.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Donatists.—The Donatist schism in Africa began in 311 and flourished just one hundred years, until the conference at Carthage in 411, after which its importance waned.

CAUSES OF THE SCHISM.—In order to trace the origin of the division we have to go back to the persecution under Diocletian. The first edict of that emperor against Christians (24 Feb., 303) commanded their churches to be destroyed, their Sacred Books to be delivered up and burnt, while they themselves were outlawed. Severer measures followed in 304, when the fourth edict ordered all to offer incense to the idols under pain of death. After the abdication of Maximian in 305, the persecution seems to have abated in Africa. Until then it was terrible. In Numidia the governor, Florus, was infamous for his cruelty, and, though many officials may have been, like the proconsul Anulinus, unwilling to go further than they were obliged, yet St. Optatus is able to say of the Christians of the whole country that some were confessors, some were martyrs, some fell, only those who were hidden escaped. The exaggerations of the highly strung African character showed themselves. A hundred years earlier Tertullian had taught that flight from persecution was not permissible. Some now went beyond this, and voluntarily gave themselves up to martyrdom as Christians. Their motives were, however, not always above suspicion. Mensurius, the Bishop of Carthage, in a letter to Secundus, Bishop of Tigisi, then the senior bishop (primate) of Numidia, declares that he had forbidden any to be honoured as martyrs who had given themselves up of their own accord, or who had boasted that they possessed copies of the Scriptures which they would not relinquish; some of these, he says, were criminals and debtors to the State, who thought they might by this means rid themselves of a burdensome life, or else wipe away the remembrance of their misdeeds, or at least gain money and enjoy in prison the luxuries supplied by the kindness of Christians. The later excesses of the Circumcellions show that Mensurius had some ground for the severe line he took. He explains that he had himself taken the Sacred Books of the Church to his own house, and had substituted a number of heretical writings, which the persecutors had seized without asking for more; the proconsul, when informed of the deception, refused to search the bishop's private house. Secundus, in his reply, without blaming Mensurius, somewhat pointedly praised the martyrs who in his own province had been tortured and put to death for refusing to deliver up the Scriptures; he himself had replied to the officials who came to search: "I am a Christian and a bishop, not a *traditor*." This word *traditor* became a technical expression to designate those who had given up the Sacred Books, and also those who had committed the worse crimes of delivering up the sacred vessels and even their own brethren.

It is certain that relations were strained between the confessors in prison at Carthage and their bishop. If we may credit the Donatist Acts of the forty-nine martyrs of Abitene, they broke off communion with Mensurius. We are informed in these Acts that Mensurius was a traditor by his own confession, and that his deacon, Cæcilian, raged more furiously against the martyrs than did the persecutors themselves; he set armed men with whips before the door of the prison to prevent their receiving any succour; the food brought by the piety of Christians was thrown to the dogs by these ruffians, and the drink provided was spilled in the street, so that the martyrs, whose condemnation the mild proconsul had deferred, died in prison of hunger and thirst. This story is recognized by Du-

chesne and others as exaggerated. It would be better to say that the main point is incredible; the prisoners would not have been allowed by the Roman officials to starve; the details—that Mensurius confessed himself a traditor, that he prevented the succouring of the imprisoned confessors—are simply founded on the letter of Mensurius to Secundus. Thus we may safely reject all the latter part of the Acts as fictitious. The earlier part is authentic: it relates how certain of the faithful of Abitene met and celebrated their usual Sunday service, in defiance of the emperor's edict, under the leadership of the priest Saturninus, for their bishop was a traditor and they disowned him; they were sent to Carthage, made bold replies when interrogated, and were imprisoned by Anulinus, who might have condemned them to death forthwith. The whole account is characteristic of the fervid African temperament. We can well imagine how the prudent Mensurius and his lieutenant, the deacon Cæcilian, were disliked by some of the more excitable among their flock.

We know in detail how the inquiries for sacred books were carried out, for the official minutes of an investigation at Cirta (afterwards Constantine) in Numidia are preserved. The bishop and his clergy showed themselves ready to give up all they had, but drew the line at betraying their brethren; even here their generosity was not remarkable, for they added that the names and addresses were well known to the officials. The examination was conducted by Munatius Felix, perpetual flamen, curator of the colony of Cirta. Having arrived with his satellites at the bishop's house—in Numidia the searching was more severe than in Proconsular Africa—the bishop was found with four priests, three deacons, four subdeacons and several *fossores* (diggers). These declared that the Scriptures were not there, but in the hands of the lectors; and in fact the bookcase was found to be empty. The clergy present refused to give the names of the lectors, saying they were known to the notaries; but, with the exception of the books, they gave in an inventory of all possessions of the church: two golden chalices, six of silver, six silver cruets, a silver bowl, seven silver lamps, two candlesticks, seven short bronze lamp-stands with lamps, eleven bronze lamps with chains, eighty-two women's tunics, twenty-eight veils, sixteen men's tunics, thirteen pairs of men's boots, forty-seven pairs of women's boots, nineteen countrymen's smocks. Presently the subdeacon Silvanus brought forth a silver box and another silver lamp, which he had found behind a jug. In the dining-room were four casks and seven jugs. A subdeacon produced a thick book. Then the houses of the lectors were visited: Eugenius gave up four volumes, Felix, the mosaic-worker, gave up five, Victorinus eight, Projectus five large volumes and two small ones, the grammarian Victor two codices and five quinions, or gatherings of five leaves; Euticius of Cæsarea declared that he had no books; the wife of Coddeo produced six volumes, and said she had no more, and a search was without further result. It is interesting to notice that the books were all codices (in book form), not rolls, which had gone out of fashion in the course of the preceding century.

It is to be hoped that such disgraceful scenes were infrequent. A contrasting instance of heroism is found in the story of Felix, Bishop of Tibiuca, who was haled before the magistrate on the very day, 5 June, 303, when the decree was posted up in that city. He refused to give up any books, and was sent to Carthage. The proconsul Anulinus, unable by close confinement to weaken his determination, sent him on to Rome to Maximian Hercules.

In 305 the persecution had relaxed, and it was possible to unite fourteen or more bishops at Cirta in order to give a successor to Paul. Secundus presided as primate, and in his zeal he attempted to examine the conduct of his colleagues. They met in a private house, for the church had not yet been restored to the Christians. "We must first try ourselves", said the primate, "before we can venture to ordain a bishop". To Donatus of Mascula he said: "You are said to have been a traditor." "You know", replied the bishop, "how Florus searched for me that I might offer incense, but God did not deliver me into his hands, brother. As God forgave me, do you reserve me to His judgment." "What then", said Secundus, "shall we say of the martyrs? It is because they did not give up anything that they were crowned." "Send me to God," said Donatus, "to Him will I give an account." (In fact, a bishop was not amenable to penance and was properly "reserved to God" in this sense.) "Stand on one side", said the president, and to Marinus of Aquæ Tibilitanæ he said: "You also are said to be a traditor." Marinus said: "I gave papers to Pollux; my books are safe." This was not satisfactory, and Secundus said: "Go over to that side"; then to Donatus of Calama: "You are said to be a traditor." "I gave up books on medicine." Secundus seems to have been incredulous, or at least he thought a trial was needed, for again he said: "Stand on one side." After a gap in the Acts, we read that Secundus turned to Victor, Bishop of Russicade: "You are said to have given up the Four Gospels." Victor replied: "It was the curator, Valentinus; he forced me to throw them into the fire. Forgive me this fault, and God will also forgive it." Secundus said: "Stand on one side." Secundus (after another gap) said to Purpurius of Limata: "You are said to have killed the two sons of your sister at Mileum" (Milevis). Purpurius answered with vehemence: "Do you think I am frightened by you as the others are? What did you do yourself when the curator and his officials tried to make you give up the Scriptures? How did you manage to get off scot-free, unless you gave them something, or ordered something to be given? They certainly did not let you go for nothing! As for me I have killed and I kill those who are against me; do not provoke me to say any more. You know that I do not interfere where I have no business." At this outburst a nephew of Secundus said to the primate: "You hear what they say of you? He is ready to withdraw and make a schism; and the same is true of all those whom you accuse; and I know they are capable of turning you out and condemning you, and you alone will then be the heretic. What is it to you what they have done? Each must give his account to God." Secundus (as St. Augustine points out) had apparently no reply ready against the accusation of Purpurius, so he turned to the two or three bishops who remained unaccused: "What do you think?" These answered: "They have God to Whom they must give an account." Secundus said: "You know and God knows. Sit down." And all replied: *Deo gratias.*

These minutes have been preserved for us by St. Augustine. The later Donatists declared them forged, but not only could St. Optatus refer to the age of the parchment on which they were written, but they are made easily credible by the testimonies given before Zenophilus in 320. Seeck, as well as Duchesne (see below), upholds their genuineness. We hear from St. Optatus of another fallen Numidian bishop, who refused to come to the council on the pretext of bad eyes, but in reality for fear his fellow-citizens should prove that he had offered incense, a crime of which the other bishops were not guilty. The bishops proceeded to ordain a bishop, and they chose Silvanus, who, as a subdeacon, assisted in the search for sacred vessels. The people of Cirta rose up against him, crying that he was a traditor, and demanded the appointment of a certain Donatus. But country people and gladiators were engaged to set him in the episcopal chair, to which he was carried on the back of a man named Mutus.

CÆCILIAN AND MAJORINUS.—A certain Donatus of

Casæ Nigræ is said to have caused a schism in Carthage during the lifetime of Mensurius. In 311 Maxentius obtained dominion over Africa, and a deacon of Carthage, Felix, was accused of writing a defamatory letter against the tyrant. Mensurius was said to have concealed his deacon in his house and was summoned to Rome. He was acquitted, but died on his return journey. Before his departure from Africa, he had given the gold and silver ornaments of the church to the care of certain old men, and had also consigned an inventory of these effects to an aged woman, who was to deliver it to the next bishop. Maxentius gave liberty to the Christians, so that it was possible for an election to be held at Carthage. The bishop of Carthage, like the pope, was commonly consecrated by a neighbouring bishop, assisted by a certain number of others from the vicinity. He was primate not only of the proconsular province, but of the other provinces of North Africa, including Numidia, Byzacene, Tripolitana, and the two Mauretanias, which were all governed by the vicar of prefects. In each of these provinces the local primacy was attached to no town, but was held by the senior bishop, until St. Gregory the Great made the office elective. St. Optatus implies that the bishops of Numidia, many of whom were at no great distance from Carthage, had expected that they would have a voice in the election; but two priests, Botrus and Cælestius, who each expected to be elected, had managed that only a small number of bishops should be present. Cæcilian, the deacon who had been so obnoxious to the martyrs, was duly chosen by the whole people, placed in the chair of Mensurius, and consecrated by Felix, Bishop of Aptonga or Abtughi. The old men who had charge of the treasure of the church were obliged to give it up; they joined with Botrus and Cælestius in refusing to acknowledge the new bishop. They were assisted by a rich lady named Lucilla, who had a grudge against Cæcilian because he had rebuked her habit of kissing the bone of an uncanonized (*non vindicatus*) martyr immediately before receiving Holy Communion. Probably we have here again a martyr whose death was due to his own ill-regulated fervour.

Secundus, as the nearest primate, came with his suffragans to Carthage to judge the affair, and in a great council of seventy bishops declared the ordination of Cæcilian to be invalid, as having been performed by a traditor. A new bishop was consecrated, Majorinus, who belonged to the household of Lucilla and had been a lector in the deaconry of Cæcilian. That lady provided the sum of 400 *folles* (more than 11,000 dollars), nominally for the poor; but all of it went into the pockets of the bishops, one-quarter of the sum being seized by Purpurius of Limata. Cæcilian had possession of the basilica and the cathedra of Cyprian, and the people were with him, so that he refused to appear before the council. "If I am not properly consecrated", he said ironically, "let them treat me as a deacon, and lay hands on me afresh, and not on another." On this reply being brought, Purpurius cried: "Let him come here, and instead of laying hands on him, we will break his head in penance." No wonder that the action of this council, which sent letters throughout Africa, had a great influence. But at Carthage it was well known that Cæcilian was the choice of the people, and it was not believed that Felix of Aptonga had given up the Sacred Books. Rome and Italy had given Cæcilian their communion. The Church of the moderate Mensurius did not hold that consecration by a traditor was invalid, or even that it was illicit, if the traditor was still in lawful possession of his see. The council of Secundus, on the contrary, declared that a traditor could not act as a bishop, and that any who were in communion with traditors were cut off from the Church. They called themselves the Church of the martyrs, and declared that all who were in communion with public sinners like Cæcilian and Felix were necessarily excommunicate.

THE CONDEMNATION BY POPE MELCHIADES.—Very soon there were many cities having two bishops, the one in communion with Cæcilian, the other with Majorinus. Constantine, after defeating Maxentius (28 October, 312) and becoming master of Rome, showed himself a Christian in his acts. He wrote to Anulinus, proconsul of Africa (was he the same as the mild proconsul of 303?), restoring the churches to Catholics, and exempting clerics of "the Catholic Church of which Cæcilian is president" from civil functions (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., X, v, 15, and vii, 2). He also wrote to Cæcilian (ibid., X, vi, 1) sending him an order for 3000 *folles* to be distributed in Africa, Numidia, and Mauretania; if more was needed, the bishop must apply for more. He added that he had heard of turbulent persons who sought to corrupt the Church; he had ordered the proconsul Anulinus and the vicar of prefects to restrain them, and Cæcilian was to appeal to these officials if necessary. The opposing party lost no time. A few days after the publication of these letters, their delegates, accompanied by a mob, brought to Anulinus two bundles of documents, containing the complaints of their party against Cæcilian, to be forwarded to the emperor. St. Optatus has preserved a few words from their petition, in which Constantine is begged to grant judges from Gaul, where under his father's rule there had been no persecution, and therefore no traditors. Constantine knew the Church's constitution too well to comply and thereby make Gallic bishops judges of the primate of Africa. He at once referred the matter to the pope, expressing his intention, laudable, if too sanguine, of allowing no schisms in the Catholic Church. That the African schismatics might have no ground of complaint, he ordered three of the chief bishops of Gaul, Reticius of Autun, Maternus of Cologne, and Marinus of Arles, to repair to Rome, to assist at the trial. He ordered Cæcilian to come thither with ten bishops of his accusers and ten of his own communion. The memorials against Cæcilian he sent to the pope, who would know, he says, what procedure to employ in order to conclude the whole matter in accordance with justice (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., X, v, 18). Pope Melchiades summoned fifteen Italian bishops to sit with him. From this time forward we find that in all important matters the popes issue their decretal letters from a small council of bishops, and there are traces of the custom even before this. The ten Donatist bishops (for we may now give the party its eventual name) were headed by a Bishop Donatus of Casæ Nigræ. It was assumed by Optatus, Augustine, and the other Catholic apologists that this was "Donatus the Great", the successor of Majorinus as schismatic Bishop of Carthage. But the Donatists of St. Augustine's time were anxious to deny this, as they did not wish to admit that their protagonist had been condemned, and the Catholics at the conference of 411 granted them the existence of a Donatus, Bishop of Casæ Nigræ, who had distinguished himself by active hostility to Cæcilian. Modern authorities agree in accepting this view. But it seems inconceivable that, if Majorinus was still alive, he should not have been obliged to go to Rome. It would be very strange, further, that a Donatus of Casæ Nigræ should appear as the leader of the party, without any explanation, unless Casæ Nigræ was simply the birthplace of Donatus the Great. If we assume that Majorinus had died and had been succeeded by Donatus the Great just before the trial at Rome, we shall understand why Majorinus is never again mentioned.

The accusations against Cæcilian in the memorial were disregarded, as being anonymous and unproved. The witnesses brought from Africa acknowledged that they had nothing against him. Donatus, on the other hand, was convicted by his own confession of having

rebaptized and of having laid his hands in penance on bishops—this was forbidden by ecclesiastical law. On the third day the unanimous sentence was pronounced by Melchiades: Cæcilian was to be maintained in ecclesiastical communion. If Donatist bishops returned to the Church, in a place where there were two rival bishops, the junior was to retire and be provided with another see. The Donatists were furious. A hundred years later their successors declared that Pope Melchiades was himself a traditor, and that on this account they had not accepted his decision; though there is no trace of this having been alleged at the time. But the nineteen bishops at Rome were contrasted with the seventy bishops of the Carthaginian Council, and a fresh judgment was demanded.

THE COUNCIL OF ARLES.—Constantine was angry, but he saw that the party was powerful in Africa, and he summoned a council of the whole West (that is, of the whole of his actual dominions) to meet at Arles on 1 August, 314. Melchiades was dead, and his successor, St. Sylvester, thought it unbecoming to leave Rome, thus setting an example which he repeated in the case of Nicæa, and which his successors followed in the cases of Sardica, Rimini, and the Eastern œcumenical councils. Between forty and fifty sees were represented at the council by bishops or proxies; the Bishops of London, York, and Lincoln were there. St. Sylvester sent legates. The council condemned the Donatists and drew up a number of canons; it reported its proceedings in a letter to the pope, which is extant; but, as in the case of Nicæa, no detailed Acts remain, nor are any such mentioned by the ancients. The Fathers in their letter salute Sylvester, saying that he had rightly decided not to quit the spot "where the Apostles daily sit in judgment"; had he been with them, they might perhaps have dealt more severely with the heretics. Among the canons, one forbids rebaptism (which was still practised in Africa), another declares that those who falsely accuse their brethren shall have communion only at the hour of death. On the other hand, traditors are to be refused communion, but only when their fault has been proved by public official acts; those whom they have ordained are to retain their positions. The council produced some effect in Africa, but the main body of the Donatists was immovable. They appealed from the council to the emperor. Constantine was horrified: "O insolent madness!" he wrote, "they appeal from heaven to earth, from Jesus Christ to a man."

THE POLICY OF CONSTANTINE.—The emperor retained the Donatist envoys in Gaul, after at first dismissing them. He seems to have thought of sending for Cæcilian, then of granting a full examination in Africa. The case of Felix of Aptonga was in fact examined by his order at Carthage in February, 315 (St. Augustine is probably wrong in giving 314). The minutes of the proceedings have come down to us in a mutilated state; they are referred to by St. Optatus, who appended them to his book with other documents, and they are frequently cited by St. Augustine. It was shown that the letter which the Donatists put forward as proving the crime of Felix, had been interpolated by a certain Ingentius; this was established by the confession of Ingentius, as well as by the witness of Alfius, the writer of the letter. It was proved that Felix was actually absent at the time the search for Sacred Books was made at Aptonga. Constantine eventually summoned Cæcilian and his opponents to Rome; but Cæcilian, for some unknown reason, did not appear. Cæcilian and Donatus the Great (who was now, at all events, bishop) were called to Milan, where Constantine heard both sides with great care. He declared that Cæcilian was innocent and an excellent bishop (Augustine, Contra Cresconium, III, lxxi). He retained both in Italy, however, while he sent two bishops, Eunomius and Olympius, to Africa, with an idea of putting Donatus and Cæcilian aside, and substituting a new bishop, to be agreed upon by all parties. It is to be presumed that Cæcilian and Donatus had assented to this course; but the violence of the sectaries made it impossible to carry it out. Eunomius and Olympius declared at Carthage that the Catholic Church was that which is diffused throughout the world and that the sentence pronounced against the Donatists could not be annulled. They communicated with the clergy of Cæcilian and returned to Italy. Donatus went back to Carthage, and Cæcilian, seeing this, felt himself free to do the same. Finally Constantine ordered that the churches which the Donatists had taken should be given to the Catholics. Their other meeting-places were confiscated. Those who were convicted (of calumny?) lost their goods. Evictions were carried out by the military. An ancient sermon on the passion of the Donatist "martyrs", Donatus and Advocatus, describes such scenes. In one of them a regular massacre occurred, and a bishop was among the slain, if we may trust this curious document. The Donatists were proud of this "persecution of Cæcilian", which "the Pure" suffered at the hands of the "Church of the Traditors". The *Comes* Leontius and the *Dux* Ursacius were the special objects of their indignation.

In 320 came revelations unpleasant to the "Pure". Nundinarius, a deacon of Cirta, had a quarrel with his bishop, Silvanus, who caused him to be stoned—so he said in his complaint to certain Numidian bishops, in which he threatened that if they did not use their influence in his behalf with Silvanus, he would tell what he knew of them. As he got no satisfaction he brought the matter before Zenophilus, the consular of Numidia. The minutes have come down to us in a fragmentary form in the appendix of Optatus, under the title of "Gesta apud Zenophilum". Nundinarius produced letters from Purpurius and other bishops to Silvanus and to the people of Cirta, trying to have peace made with the inconvenient deacon. The minutes of the search at Cirta, which we have already cited, were read, and witnesses were called to establish their accuracy, including two of the *fossores* then present and a lector, Victor the grammarian. It was shown not only that Silvanus was a traditor, but that he had assisted Purpurius, together with two priests and a deacon, in the theft of certain casks of vinegar belonging to the treasury, which were in the temple of Serapis. Silvanus had ordained a priest for the sum of 20 *folles* (500 to 600 dollars). It was established that none of the money given by Lucilla had reached the poor for whom it was ostensibly given. Thus Silvanus, one of the mainstays of the "Pure" Church, which declared that to communicate with any traditor was to be outside the Church, was himself proved to be a traditor. He was exiled by the consular for robbing the treasury, for obtaining money under false pretences, and for getting himself made bishop by violence. The Donatists later preferred to say that he was banished for refusing to communicate with the "Cæcilianists", and Cresconius even spoke of "the persecution of Zenophilus". But it should have been clear to all that the consecrators of Majorinus had called their opponents traditors in order to cover their own delinquencies.

The Donatist party owed its success in great part to the ability of its leader Donatus, the successor of Majorinus. He appears to have really merited the title of "the Great" by his eloquence and force of character. His writings are lost. His influence with his party was extraordinary. St. Augustine frequently declaims against his arrogance and the impiety with which he was almost worshipped by his followers. In his lifetime he is said to have greatly enjoyed the adulation he received, and after death he was counted as a martyr and miracles were ascribed to him.

In 321 Constantine relaxed his vigorous measures, having found that they did not produce the peace he

had hoped for, and he weakly begged the Catholics to suffer the Donatists with patience. This was not easy, for the schismatics broke out into violence. At Cirta, Silvanus having returned, they seized the basilica which the emperor had built for the Catholics. They would not give it up, and Constantine found no better expedient than to build another. Throughout Africa, but above all in Numidia, they were numerous. They taught that in all the rest of the world the Catholic Church had perished, through having communicated with the traditor Cæcilian; their sect alone was the true Church. If a Catholic came into their churches, they drove him out, and washed with salt the pavement where he had stood. Any Catholic who joined them was forced to be rebaptized. They asserted that their own bishops and ministers were without fault, else their ministrations would be invalid. But in fact they were convicted of drunkenness and other sins. St. Augustine tells us on the authority of Tichonius that the Donatists held a council of two hundred and seventy bishops in which they discussed for seventy-five days the question of rebaptism; they finally decided that in cases where traditors refused to be rebaptized they should be communicated with in spite of this; and the Donatist bishops of Mauretania did not rebaptize traditors until the time of Macarius. Outside Africa the Donatists had a bishop residing on the property of an adherent in Spain, and at an early period of the schism they made a bishop for their small congregation in Rome, which met, it seems, on a hill outside the city, and had the name of "Montenses". This antipapal "succession without a beginning" was frequently ridiculed by Catholic writers. The series included Felix, Boniface, Encolpius, Macrobius (c. 370), Lucian, Claudian (c. 378), and again Felix in 411.

THE CIRCUMCELLIONS.—The date of the first appearance of the Circumcellions is uncertain, but probably they began before the death of Constantine. They were mostly rustic enthusiasts, who knew no Latin, but spoke Punic; it has been suggested that they may have been of Berber blood. They joined the ranks of the Donatists, and were called by them *agonistici* and "soldiers of Christ", but in fact were brigands. Troops of them were to be met in all parts of Africa. They had no regular occupation, but ran about armed, like madmen. They used no swords, on the ground that St. Peter had been told to put his sword into its sheath; but they did continual acts of violence with clubs, which they called "Israelites". They bruised their victims without killing them, and left them to die. In St. Augustine's time, however, they took to swords and all sorts of weapons; they rushed about accompanied by unmarried women, played, and drank. Their battle-cry was *Deo laudes*, and no bandits were more terrible to meet. They frequently sought death, counting suicide as martyrdom. They were especially fond of flinging themselves from precipices; more rarely they sprang into the water or fire. Even women caught the infection, and those who had sinned would cast themselves from the cliffs, to atone for their fault. Sometimes the Circumcellions sought death at the hands of others, either by paying men to kill them, by threatening to kill a passer-by if he would not kill them, or by their violence inducing magistrates to have them executed. While paganism still flourished, they would come in vast crowds to any great sacrifice, not to destroy the idols, but to be martyred. Theodoret says a Circumcellion was accustomed to announce his intention of becoming a martyr long before the time, in order to be well treated and fed like a beast for slaughter. He relates an amusing story (Hær. Fab., IV, vi) to which St. Augustine also refers. A number of these fanatics, fattened like pheasants, met a young man and offered him a drawn sword to smite them with, threatening to murder him if he refused. He pretended to fear that when he had killed a few, the rest might change their minds and avenge the death of their fellows; and he insisted that they must all be bound. They agreed to this; when they were defenceless, the young man gave each of them a beating and went his way.

When in controversy with Catholics, the Donatist bishops were not proud of their supporters. They declared that self-precipitation from a cliff had been forbidden in their councils. Yet the bodies of these suicides were sacrilegiously honoured, and crowds celebrated their anniversaries. Their bishops could not but conform, and they were often glad enough of the strong arms of the Circumcellions. Theodoret, soon after St. Augustine's death, knew of no other Donatists than the Circumcellions; and these were the typical Donatists in the eyes of all outside Africa. They were especially dangerous to the Catholic clergy, whose houses they attacked and pillaged. They beat and wounded them, put lime and vinegar on their eyes, and even forced them to be rebaptized. Under Axidus and Fasir, "the leaders of the Saints" in Numidia, property and roads were unsafe, debtors were protected, slaves were set in their masters' carriages, and the masters made to run before them. At length the Donatist bishops invited a general named Taurinus to repress these extravagances. He met with resistance in a place named Octava, and the altars and tablets to be seen there in St. Optatus's time testified to the veneration given to the Circumcellions who were slain; but their bishops denied them the honour due to martyrs. It seems that in 336–7 the *præfectus prætorio* of Italy, Gregory, took some measures against the Donatists, for St. Optatus tells us that Donatus wrote him a letter beginning: "Gregory, stain on the senate and disgrace to prefects".

THE "PERSECUTION" OF MACARIUS.—When Constantine became master of the East by defeating Licinius in 323, he was prevented by the rise of Arianism in the East from sending, as he had hoped, Eastern bishops to Africa to adjust the differences between the Donatists and the Catholics. Cæcilian of Carthage was present at the Council of Nicæa in 325, and his successor, Gratus, was at that of Sardica in 342. The *conciliabulum* of the Easterns on that occasion wrote a letter to Donatus, as though he were the true Bishop of Carthage; but the Arians failed to gain the support of the Donatists, who looked upon the whole East as cut off from the Church, which survived in Africa alone. The Emperor Constans was as anxious as his father to give peace to Africa. In 347 he sent thither two commissioners, Paulus and Macarius, with large sums of money for distribution. Donatus naturally saw in this an attempt to win over his adherents to the Church by bribery; he received the envoys with insolence: "What has the emperor to do with the Church?" said he, and he forbade his people to accept any largess from Constans. In most parts, however, the friendly mission seems to have been not unfavourably received. But at Bagai in Numidia the bishop, Donatus, assembled the Circumcellions of the neighbourhood, who had already been excited by their bishops. Macarius was obliged to ask for the protection of the military. The Circumcellions attacked them, and killed two or three soldiers; the troops then became uncontrollable, and slew some of the Donatists. This unfortunate incident was thereafter continually thrown in the teeth of the Catholics, and they were nicknamed Macarians by the Donatists, who declared that Donatus of Bagai had been precipitated from a rock, and that another bishop, Marculus, had been thrown into a well. The existing Acts of the latter "martyr" do not seem to deserve credit, and the African Catholics believed that the two bishops had sought their own deaths. The Acts of two other Donatist martyrs of 347, Maximian and Isaac, are preserved; they apparently belong to Carthage, and are attributed by Harnack to the Antipope Macrobius. It

seems that after violence had begun, the envoys ordered the Donatists to unite with the Church whether they willed or no. Many of the bishops took to flight with their partisans; a few joined the Catholics; the rest were banished. Donatus the Great died in exile. A Donatist named Vitellius composed a book to show that the servants of God are hated by the world.

A solemn Mass was celebrated in each place where the union was completed, and the Donatists set about a rumour that images (obviously of the emperor) were to be placed on the altar and worshipped. As nothing of the sort was found to be done, and as the envoys merely made a speech in favour of unity, it seems that the reunion was effected with less violence than might have been expected. The Catholics and their bishops praised God for the peace that ensued, though they declared that they had no responsibility for the action of Paulus and Macarius. In the following year Gratus, the Catholic Bishop of Carthage, held a council, in which the reiteration of baptism was forbidden, while, to please the rallied Donatists, traditors were condemned anew. It was forbidden to honour suicides as martyrs.

THE RESTORATION OF DONATISM BY JULIAN.—The peace was happy for Africa, and the forcible means by which it was obtained were justified by the violence of the sectaries. But the accession of Julian the Apostate in 361 changed the face of affairs. Delighted to throw Christianity into confusion, Julian allowed the Catholic bishops who had been exiled by Constantius to return to the sees which the Arians were occupying. The Donatists, who had been banished by Constans, were similarly allowed to return at their own petition, and received back their basilicas. Scenes of violence were the result of this policy both in the East and the West. "Your fury", wrote St. Optatus, "returned to Africa at the same moment that the devil was set free", for the same emperor restored supremacy to paganism and the Donatists to Africa. The decree of Julian was considered so discreditable to them, that the Emperor Honorius in 405 had it posted up throughout Africa for their shame. St. Optatus gives a vehement catalogue of the excesses committed by the Donatists on their return. They invaded the basilicas with arms; they committed so many murders that a report of them was sent to the emperor. Under the orders of two bishops, a party attacked the basilica of Lemellef; they stripped off the roof, pelted with tiles the deacons who were round the altar, and killed two of them. In Mauretania riots signalized the return of the Donatists. In Numidia two bishops availed themselves of the complaisance of the magistrates to throw a peaceful population into confusion, expelling the faithful, wounding the men, and not sparing the women and children. Since they did not admit the validity of the sacraments administered by traditors, when they seized the churches they cast the Holy Eucharist to the dogs; but the dogs, inflamed with madness, attacked their own masters. An ampulla of chrism thrown out of a window was found unbroken on the rocks. Two bishops were guilty of rape; one of these seized the aged Catholic bishop, and condemned him to public penance. All Catholics whom they could force to join their party were made penitents, even clerics of every rank, and children, contrary to the law of the Church, some for a year, some for a month, some but for a day. In taking possession of a basilica, they destroyed the altar, or removed it, or at least scraped the surface. They sometimes broke up the chalices, and sold the materials. They washed pavements, walls, and columns. Not content with recovering their churches, they employed pagan functionaries to obtain for them possession of the sacred vessels, furniture, altar-linen, and especially the books (how did they purify the books? asks St. Optatus), sometimes leaving the Catholic congregation with no books at all. The cemeteries were closed to the Catholic dead.

The revolt of Firmus, a Mauretanian chieftain who defied the Roman power and eventually assumed the style of emperor (366–72), was undoubtedly supported by many Donatists. The imperial laws against them were strengthened by Valentinian in 373 and by Gratian, who wrote in 377 to the vicar of prefects, Flavian (himself a Donatist), ordering all the basilicas of the schismatics to be given up to the Catholics. St. Augustine shows that even the churches which the Donatists themselves had built were included. The same emperor required Claudian, the Donatist bishop at Rome, to return to Africa; as he refused to obey, a Roman council had him driven a hundred miles from the city. It is probable that the Catholic Bishop of Carthage, Genethlius, caused the laws to be mildly administered in Africa.

ST. OPTATUS.—The Catholic champion, St. Optatus, Bishop of Milevis, published his great work "De schismate Donatistarum" in answer to that of the Donatist Bishop of Carthage, Parmenianus, under Valentinian and Valens, 364–75 (so St. Jerome). Optatus himself tells us that he was writing after the death of Julian (363) and more than sixty years after the beginning of the schism (he means the persecution of 303). The form which we possess is a second edition, brought up to date by the author after the accession of Pope Siricius (Dec., 384), with a seventh book added to the original six. In the first book he describes the origin and growth of the schism; in the second he shows the notes of the true Church; in the third he defends the Catholics from the charge of persecuting, with especial reference to the days of Macarius. In the fourth book he refutes Parmenianus's proofs from Scripture that the sacrifice of a sinner is polluted. In the fifth book he shows the validity of baptism even when conferred by sinners, for it is conferred by Christ, the minister being the instrument only. This is the first important statement of the doctrine that the grace of the sacraments is derived from the *opus operatum* of Christ independently of the worthiness of the minister. In the sixth book he describes the violence of the Donatists and the sacrilegious way in which they had treated Catholic altars. In the seventh book he treats chiefly of unity and of reunion, and returns to the subject of Macarius.

He calls Parmenianus "brother", and wishes to treat the Donatists as brethren, since they were not heretics. Like some other Fathers, he holds that only pagans and heretics go to hell; schismatics and all Catholics will eventually be saved after a necessary purgatory. This is the more curious, because before him and after him in Africa Cyprian and Augustine both taught that schism is as bad as heresy, if not worse. St. Optatus was much venerated by St. Augustine and later by St. Fulgentius. He writes with vehemence, sometimes with violence, in spite of his protestations of friendliness; but he is carried away by his indignation. His style is forcible and effective, often concise and epigrammatic. To this work he appended a collection of documents containing the evidence for the history he had related. This *dossier* had certainly been formed much earlier, at all events before the peace of 347, and not long after the latest document it contains, which is dated Feb., 330; the rest are not later than 321, and may possibly have been put together as early as that year. Unfortunately these important historical testimonies have come down to us only in a single mutilated MS., the archetype of which was also incomplete. The collection was freely used at the conference of 411 and is often quoted at some length by St. Augustine, who has preserved many interesting portions which would otherwise be unknown to us.

THE MAXIMIANISTS.—Before Augustine took up the mantle of Optatus together with a double portion of his spirit, the Catholics had gained new and victorious arguments from the divisions among the Donatists

themselves. Like so many other schisms, this schism bred schisms within itself. In Mauretania and Numidia these separated sects were so numerous that the Donatists themselves could not name them all. We hear of Urbanists; of Claudianists, who were reconciled to the main body by Primianus of Carthage; of Rogatists, a Mauretanian sect, of mild character, because no Circumcellions belonged to it; the Rogatists were severely punished whenever the Donatists could induce the magistrates to do so, and were also persecuted by Optatus of Timgad. But the most famous sectaries were the Maximianists, for the story of their separation from the Donatists reproduces with strange exactitude that of the withdrawal of the Donatists themselves from the communion of the Church; and the conduct of the Donatists towards them was so inconsistent with their avowed principles, that it became in the skilled hands of Augustine the most effective weapon of all his controversial armoury.

Primianus, Donatist Bishop of Carthage, excommunicated the deacon Maximianus. The latter (who was, like Majorinus, supported by a lady) got together a council of forty-three bishops, who summoned Primianus to appear before them. The primate refused, insulted their envoys, tried to have them prevented from celebrating the Sacred Mysteries, and had stones thrown at them in the street. The council summoned him before a greater council, which met to the number of a hundred bishops at Cebarsussum in June, 393. Primianus was deposed; all clerics were to leave his communion within eight days; if they should delay till after Christmas, they would not be permitted to return to the Church even after penance; the laity were allowed until the following Easter, under the same penalty. A new bishop of Carthage was appointed in the person of Maximian himself, and was consecrated by twelve bishops. The partisans of Primianus were rebaptized, if they had been baptized after the permitted delay. Primianus stood out, and demanded to be judged by a Numidian council; three hundred and ten bishops met at Bagai in April, 394; the primate did not take the place of an accused person, but himself presided. He was of course acquitted, and the Maximianists were condemned without a hearing. All but the twelve consecrators and their abettors among the clergy of Carthage were given till Christmas to return; after this period they would be obliged to do penance. This decree, composed in eloquent style by Emeritus of Cæsarea, and adopted by acclamation, made the Donatists henceforward ridiculous through their having readmitted schismatics without penance. Maximian's church was razed to the ground, and after the term of grace had elapsed, the Donatists persecuted the unfortunate Maximianists, representing themselves as Catholics, and demanding that the magistrates should enforce against the new sectaries the very laws which Catholic emperors had drawn up against Donatism. Their influence enabled them to do this, for they were still far more numerous than the Catholics, and the magistrates must often have been of their party. In the reception of those who returned from the party of Maximian they were yet more fatally inconsequent. The rule was theoretically adhered to that all who had been baptized in the schism must be rebaptized; but if a bishop returned, he and his whole flock were admitted without rebaptism. This was allowed even in the case of two of the consecrators of Maximian, Prætextatus of Assur and Felicianus of Musti, after the proconsul had vainly tried to expel them from their sees, and although a Donatist bishop, Rogatus, had already been appointed at Assur. In another case the party of Primianus was more consistent. Salvius, the Maximianist Bishop of Membresa, was another of the consecrators. He was twice summoned by the proconsul to retire in favour of the Primianist Restitutus, as he was much respected by the people of Membresa, a mob was brought over from the neighbouring town of Abitene to expel him; the aged bishop was beaten, and made to dance with dead dogs tied round his neck. But his people built him a new church, and three bishops coexisted in this small town, a Maximianist, a Primianist, and a Catholic.

The leader of the Donatists at this time was Optatus, Bishop of Thamugadi (Timgad), called Gildonianus, from his friendship with Gildo, the Count of Africa (386–397). For ten years Optatus, supported by Gildo, was the tyrant of Africa. He persecuted the Rogatists and Maximianists, and he used troops against the Catholics. St. Augustine tells us that his vices and cruelties were beyond description; but they had at least the effect of disgracing the cause of the Donatists, for though he was hated throughout Africa for his wickedness and his evil deeds, yet the Puritan faction remained always in full communion with this bishop, who was a robber, a ravisher, an oppressor, a traitor, and a monster of cruelty. When Gildo fell in 397, after having made himself master of Africa for a few months, Optatus was thrown into a prison, in which he died.

Saint Augustine.—St. Augustine began his victorious campaign against Donatism soon after he was ordained priest in 391. His popular psalm or "Abecedarium" against the Donatists was intended to make known to the people the arguments set forth by St. Optatus, with the same conciliatory end in view. It shows that the sect was founded by traditors, condemned by pope and council, separated from the whole world, a cause of division, violence, and bloodshed; the true Church is the one Vine, whose branches are over all the earth. After St. Augustine had become bishop in 395, he obtained conferences with some of the Donatist leaders, though not with his rival at Hippo. In 400 he wrote three books against the letter of Parmenianus, refuting his calumnies and his arguments from Scripture. More important were his seven books on baptism, in which, after developing the principle already laid down by St. Optatus, that the effect of the sacrament is independent of the holiness of the minister, he shows in great detail that the authority of St. Cyprian is more awkward than convenient for the Donatists. The principal Donatist controversialist of the day was Petilianus, Bishop of Constantine, a successor of the traditor Silvanus. St. Augustine wrote two books in reply to a letter of his against the Church, adding a third book to answer another letter in which he was himself attacked by Petilianus. Before this last book he published his "De Unitate ecclesiæ" about 403. To these works must be added some sermons and some letters which are real treatises.

The arguments used by St. Augustine against Donatism fall under three heads. First we have the historical proofs of the regularity of Cæcilian's consecration, of the innocence of Felix of Aptonga, of the guilt of the founders of the "Pure" Church, also the judgments given by pope, council, and emperor, the true history of Macarius, the barbarous behaviour of the Donatists under Julian, the violence of the Circumcellions, and so forth. Second, there are the doctrinal arguments: the proofs from the Old and New Testaments that the Church is Catholic, diffused throughout the world, and necessarily one and united; appeal is made to the See of Rome, where the succession of bishops is uninterrupted from St. Peter himself; St. Augustine borrows his list of popes from St. Optatus (Ep. li), and in his psalm crystallizes the argument into the famous phrase: "That is the rock against which the proud gates of hell do not prevail." A further appeal is to the Eastern Church, and especially to the Apostolic Churches to which St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. John addressed epistles—they are not in communion with the Donatists. The validity of baptism conferred by heretics, the impiety of rebaptizing, are

important points. All these arguments were found in St. Optatus. Peculiar to St. Augustine is the necessity of defending St. Cyprian, and the third category is wholly his own. This third division comprises the *argumentum ad hominem* drawn from the inconsistency of the Donatists themselves: Secundus had pardoned the traditors; full fellowship was accorded to malefactors like Optatus Gildonianus and the Circumcellions; Tichonius turned against his own party; Maximian had divided from Primianus just as Majorinus from Cæcilian; the Maximianists had been readmitted without rebaptism.

This last method of argument was found to be of great practical value, and many conversions were now taking place, largely on account of the false position in which the Donatists had placed themselves. This point had been especially emphasized by the Council of Carthage of Sept., 401, which had ordered information as to the treatment of the Maximianists to be gathered from magistrates. The same synod restored the earlier rule, long since abolished, that Donatist bishops and clergy should retain their rank if they returned to the Church. Pope Anastasius I wrote to this council urging the importance of the Donatist question. Another council in 403 organized public disputations with the Donatists. This energetic action roused the Circumcellions to new violence. The life of St. Augustine was endangered. His future biographer, St. Possidius of Calama, was insulted and ill-treated by a party led by a Donatist priest, Crispinus. The latter's bishop, also named Crispinus, was tried at Carthage and fined ten pounds of gold as a heretic, though the fine was remitted by Possidius. This is the first case known to us in which a Donatist is declared a heretic, but henceforward it is the common style for them. The cruel and disgusting treatment of Maximianus, Bishop of Bagai, is also related by St. Augustine in detail. The Emperor Honorius was induced by the Catholics to renew the old laws against the Donatists at the beginning of 405. Some good resulted, but the Circumcellions of Hippo were excited to new violence. The letter of Petilianus was defended by a grammarian named Cresconius, against whom St. Augustine published a reply in four books. The third and fourth books are especially important, as in these he argues from the Donatists' treatment of the Maximianists, quotes the Acts of the Council of Cirta held by Secundus, and cites other important documents. The saint also replied to a pamphlet by Petilianus, "De unico baptismate".

THE "COLLATIO" OF 411.—St. Augustine had once hoped to conciliate the Donatists by reason only. The violence of the Circumcellions, the cruelties of Optatus of Thamugadi, the more recent attacks on Catholic bishops had all given proof that repression by the secular arm was absolutely unavoidable. It was not necessarily a case of persecution for religious opinions, but simply of the protection of life and property and the ensuring of freedom and safety for Catholics. Nevertheless the laws went much further than this. Those of Honorius were promulgated anew in 408 and 410. In 411 the method of disputation was organized on a grand scale by order of the emperor himself at the request of the Catholic bishops. Their case was now complete and unanswerable. But this was to be brought home to the people of Africa, and public opinion was to be forced to recognize the facts, by a public exposure of the weakness of the separatist position. The emperor sent an official named Marcellinus, an excellent Christian, to preside as *cognitor* at the conference. He issued a proclamation declaring that he would exercise absolute impartiality in his conduct of the proceedings and in his final judgment. The Donatist bishops who should come to the conference were to receive back for the present the basilicas which had been taken from them. The number of those who arrived at Carthage was very large, though somewhat less than the two hundred and seventy-nine whose signatures were appended to a letter to the president. The Catholic bishops numbered two hundred and eighty-six. Marcellinus decided that each party should elect seven disputants, who alone should speak, seven advisers whom they might consult, and four secretaries to keep the records. Thus only thirty-six bishops would be present in all. The Donatists pretended that this was a device to prevent their great numbers being known; but the Catholics did not object to all of them being present, provided no disturbance was caused.

The chief Catholic speaker, besides the amiable and venerable Bishop of Carthage, Aurelius, was of course Augustine, whose fame had already spread through the whole Church. His friend, Alypius of Tagaste, and his disciple and biographer, Possidius, were also among the seven. The principal Donatist speakers were Emeritus of Cæsarea in Mauretania (Cherchel) and Petilianus of Constantine (Cirta); the latter spoke or interrupted about a hundred and fifty times, until on the third day he was so hoarse that he had to desist. The Catholics made a generous proposal that any Donatist bishop who should join the Church, should preside alternately with the Catholic bishop in the episcopal chair, unless the people should object, in which case both might resign and a new election be made. The conference was held on 1, 3, and 8 June. The policy of the Donatists was to raise technical objections, to cause delay, and by all manner of means to prevent the Catholic disputants from stating their case. The Catholic case was, however, clearly enunciated on the first day in letters which were read, addressed by the Catholic bishops to Marcellinus and to their deputies to instruct them in their procedure. A discussion of important points was arrived at only on the third day, amid many interruptions. It was then evident that the unwillingness of the Donatists to have a real discussion was due to the fact that they could not reply to the arguments and documents brought forward by the Catholics. The insincerity as well as the inconsequence and clumsiness of the sectaries did them great harm. The main doctrinal points and historical proofs of the Catholics were made perfectly plain. The *cognitor* summed up in favour of the Catholic bishops. The churches which had been provisionally restored to the Donatists were to be given up; their assemblies were forbidden under grave penalties. The lands of those who permitted Circumcellions on their property were to be confiscated. The minutes of this great conference were submitted to all the speakers for their approval, and the report of each speech (mostly only a single sentence) was signed by the speaker as a guarantee of its accuracy. We possess these minutes in full only as far as the middle of the third day; for the rest only the headings of each little speech are preserved. These headings were composed by order of Marcellinus in order to facilitate reference. On account of the dullness and length of the full report, St. Augustine composed a popular résumé of the discussions in his "Breviculus Collationis", and he went with more detail into a few points in a final pamphlet, "Ad Donatistas post Collationem".

On 30 Jan., 412, Honorius issued a final law against the Donatists, renewing old legislation and adding a scale of fines for Donatist clergy, and for the laity and their wives: the *illustres* were to pay fifty pounds of gold, the *spectabiles* forty, the *senatores* and *sacerdotales* thirty, the *clarissimi* and *principales* twenty, the *decuriones, negotiatores,* and *plebeii* five, while Circumcellions were to pay ten pounds of silver. Slaves were to be reproved by their masters, *coloni* were to be constrained by repeated beatings. All bishops and clerics were exiled from Africa. In 414 the fines were increased for those of high rank: a proconsul, vicar, or count was fined two hundred pounds of gold, and a senator a

hundred. A further law was published in 428. The good Marcellinus, who had become the friend of St. Augustine, fell a victim (it is supposed) to the rancour of the Donatists; for he was put to death in 413, as though an accomplice in the revolt of Heraclius, Count of Africa, in spite of the orders of the emperor, who did not believe him guilty. Donatism was now discredited by the conference and proscribed by the persecuting laws of Honorius. The Circumcellions made some dying efforts, and a priest was killed by them at Hippo. It does not seem that the decrees were rigidly carried out, for Donatist clergy were still found in Africa. The ingenious Emeritus was at Cæsarea in 418, and at the wish of Pope Zosimus St. Augustine had a conference with him, without result. But on the whole Donatism was dead. Even before the conference the Catholic bishops in Africa were considerably more numerous than the Donatists, except in Numidia. From the time of the invasion of the Vandals in 430 little is heard of them until the days of St. Gregory the Great, when they seem to have revived somewhat, for that pope complained to the Emperor Maurice that the laws were not strictly enforced. They finally disappeared with the irruptions of the Saracens.

DONATIST WRITERS.—There seems to have been no lack of literary activity among the Donatists of the fourth century, though little remains to us. The works of Donatus the Great were known to St. Jerome, but have not been preserved. His book on the Holy Spirit is said by that Father to have been Arian in doctrine. It is possible that the Pseudo-Cyprianic "De singularitate clericorum" is by Macrobius; and the "Adversus aleatores" is by an antipope, either Donatist or Novatianist. The arguments of Parmenianus and Cresconius are known to us, though their works are lost; but Monceaux has been able to restore from St. Augustine's citations short works by Petilianus of Constantine and Gaudentius of Thamugadi, and also a *libellus* by a certain Fulgentius, from the citations in the Pseudo-Augustinian "Contra Fulgentium Donatistam". Of Tichonius, or Tyconius, we still possess the treatise "De Septem regulis" (P. L., XVIII; new ed. by Professor Burkitt, in Cambridge "Texts and Studies", III, 1, 1894) on the interpretation of Holy Scripture. His commentary on the Apocalypse is lost; it was used by Jerome, Primasius, and Beatus in their commentaries on the same book. Tichonius is chiefly celebrated for his views on the Church, which were quite inconsistent with Donatism, and which Parmenianus tried to refute. In the famous words of St. Augustine (who often refers to his illogical position and to the force with which he argued against the cardinal tenets of his own sect): "Tichonius, assailed on all sides by the voices of the holy pages, awoke and saw the Church of God diffused throughout the world, as had been foreseen and foretold of her so long before by the hearts and mouths of the saints. And seeing this, he undertook to demonstrate and assert against his own party that no sin of man, however villainous and monstrous, can interfere with the promises of God, nor can any impiety of any persons within the Church cause the word of God to be made void as to the existence and diffusion of the Church to the ends of the earth, which was promised to the Fathers and now is manifest" (Contra Ep. Parmen., I, i).

Among the great general histories, TILLEMONT's full account in his *Mémoires*, vol. VI, deserves special mention, as it has not yet been superseded. Among modern books: BRIGHT, *The Age of the Fathers* (London, 1903), II; FULLER in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v. *Donatism;* and the brilliant sketch in DUCHESNE, *Histoire Ancienne de l'Église* (Paris, 1907), II. Among monographs on Africa: SCHELSTRATE, *Ecclesia Africana* (Paris, 1679, and Antwerp, 1780); LEYDECKER, *Historia Ecclesiæ Africanæ* (Utrecht, 1690), II; MORCELLI, *Africa Christiana* (3 vols., Brescia, 1816–17); PALLU DE LESSERT, *Vicaires et Comtes d'Afrique* (Paris, 1892); IDEM, *Fastes des provinces africaines* (Paris, 1901); LECLERCQ, *L'Afrique Chrétienne* (2 vols., Paris, 1904); MONCEAUX, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique Chrétienne* (Paris, 1901—), I–III: the fourth volume will deal with Donatism. The following monographs are of less importance: ELLIES DU PIN, *Historia Donatistarum*, prefixed to his ed. of St. Optatus (Paris, 1700), reprinted in *P. L.*, XI; RIBBECK, *Donatus und Augustinus* (Elberfeld, 1858); DEUTSCH, *Drei Actenstücke zur Geschichte des Donatismus* (Berlin, 1875); VÖLTER, *Der Ursprung des Donatismus* (Freiburg and Tübingen, 1883); THÜMMEL, *Zur Beurtheilung des Donatismus* (Halle, 1893). On Donatist inscriptions, LECLERCQ, *op. cit.*, I. The genuineness of some of the documents appended by St. Optatus to his work and used by St. Augustine was questioned by VÖLTER, *op. cit.*, and that of all of them by SEECK in *Zeitschr. der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte* (1889), X, 1–44 and 177–251, and in *Quellen und Urkunden über die Anfänge des Donatismus* in *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.* (1888–9), X, 505–68; DUCHESNE replied to the former in the *Bulletin Critique* (1886), VII, 123, and in answer to the latter completely vindicated the documents in an admirable study, *Le Dossier du Donatisme* in *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome* (Paris and Rome, 1890), X, fasc. 4–5, 589–650. On the remains of Donatist writings, see MONCEAUX, *Les Ouvrages de Petilianus* in *Revue de Philologie*, XXX (1906), 218, 286, and XXXI (1907), 28; IDEM, *Le dossier de Gaudentius de Thamugadi*, *ibid.*, 111; IDEM, *Un ouvrage du Donatiste Fulgentius*, *ibid.*, 241. Among articles must be mentioned the famous article on St. Augustine and the Donatists by WISEMAN in *Dublin Review* (August, 1839), which had so remarkable an effect on Newman; SHARPE, *Tichonius and St. Augustine* in *Dublin Review*, CXXXII (Jan., 1903); O'DOWD, *Donatism and Anglicanism* in *Irish Eccles. Record*, 4th series, XVIII (August, 1905); MARTROYE, *Une tentative de révolution sociale en Afrique, Donatistes et Circoncellions* in *Revue des Questions Historiques* (1904), I; CHAPMAN, *Donatus the Great and Donatus of Casæ Nigræ* in *Revue Bénéd.*, Jan., 1909.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

Donatus of Bagai. See DONATISTS.

Donatus of Casæ Nigræ. See DONATISTS.

Donatus of Fiesole, Irish teacher and poet, Bishop of Fiesole about 829–876. In an ancient collection of the "Vitæ Patrum", of which an eleventh-century copy exists in the Laurentian library of Florence, there is an account of the life of Donatus, from which we glean the following facts. Donatus was born in Ireland, of a noble family. About 816 he visited the tombs of the Apostles in Rome. On his journey northwards he was led by Divine Providence to the city of Fiesole, which he entered at the moment when the people were grouped around their altars praying for a bishop to deliver them from the evils, temporal and spiritual, which afflicted them. Raised by popular acclaim to the See of Fiesole, Donatus instituted a revival of piety and learning in the Church over which he was placed. He himself did not disdain to teach "the art of metrical composition". The "Life" is interspersed with short poems written by the saintly bishop. The best known of these is the twelve-line poem in which he describes the beauty and fertility of his native land, and the prowess and piety of its inhabitants. Donatus also composed an epitaph in which he alludes to his birth in Ireland, his years in the service of the princes of Italy (Lothair and Louis), his episcopate at Fiesole, and his activity as a teacher of grammar and poetry.

TRAUBE, *Poetæ Ævi Carol.* (Berlin, 1896), III, 691; WARE-HARRIS, *Writers of Ireland* (Dublin, 1764), 57; OZANAM, *Documents inédits* (Paris, 1897), 48 sqq.; BOSSUE in *Acta SS.*, Oct., IX, 648–54.

WILLIAM TURNER.

Donatus the Great. See DONATISTS.

Donders, PETER, missionary among the lepers, b. at Tilburg in Holland, 27 Oct., 1807; d. 14 Jan., 1887. He desired from his early childhood to be a priest, but he had to begin life as a worker in a factory. He afterwards became a servant in a college where he learned a little and made great progress in virtue. Later a benefactor enabled him to pursue his theological studies in the College of Herlaar. A chance reading of the "Annals of the Propagation of the Faith" determined his vocation for foreign missions. He was accepted in 1839 for Dutch Guiana as a missionary, ordained priest the following year, and in 1842 arrived at Paramaribo to begin his long apostolic career. He laboured with success among the blacks in the plantations, and by 1850 had instructed and baptized 1200. In the epidemic of 1851 his labours were superhuman, till, like his fellow-priests, he too became a victim. Before he was convalescent he not

only resumed his work among the blacks, but extended it to the Indians of Saramaca. In 1855 he took up his residence in Batavia where for nearly thirty-two years he ministered to 600 lepers. He left them only to visit the blacks and Indians. In 1865 the whole colony was confided to the Redemptorist Fathers by the Holy See and the King of Holland. Father Donders at once asked to be of their number and was received in Paramaribo, in 1867, by Monsignor Swinkels, the first Redemptorist vicar Apostolic. After this he went back to his charge. He studied music to cheer his afflicted children, and though given an assistant he laboured to the end. The process for his beatification has been placed before the Congregation of Sacred Rites.

LOOYAARD, *Life* in MS.; *Un Apôtre des Lépreux* in *La Sainte Famille* (1894), 376 sqq. J. MAGNIER.

Dongan, THOMAS, second Earl of Limerick, b. 1634, at Castletown Kildrought, now Celbridge, County Kildare, Ireland; d. at London, 1715. He was the youngest son of Sir John Dongan, Baronet, Member of the Irish Parliament; an uncle, Richard Talbot, was afterwards created Earl of Tyrconnel, Lieutenant - Governor of Ireland; and another, Sir Robert, married Grace, daughter of Lord Calvert, Baron of Baltimore. At the death of Charles I, the family, devoted to the Stuarts, removed to France. Thomas served in an Irish regiment, participated in all Turenne's campaigns under the name of D'Unguent and rose to the rank of colonel in 1674. After the Treaty of Nimeguen (1678) he returned to England in obedience to the order of the English Government recalling all British subjects in French service. Through the Duke of York, a fellow-officer under Turenne, he was appointed to high rank in the army designated for service in Flanders, and was granted an annual pension of £500. The same year (1678) he was appointed Lieutenant-Governor of Tangiers. In 1682 the Duke of York, the Lord Proprietor, selected Dongan to govern the Province of New York, then bankrupt and in a state of rebellion. In this office Dongan proved himself an able lawgiver, and left an indelible mark on political and constitutional history. He convened the first representative assembly of New York Province on 14 Oct., 1683, at Fort James within the present boundaries of the city of New York. This assembly, under the wise supervision of Dongan, passed an act entitled "A Charter of Liberties"; decreed that the supreme legislative power under the Duke of York shall reside in a governor, council, and the people convened in general assembly; conferred upon the members of the assembly rights and privileges making them a body coequal to and independent of the British Parliament; established town, county, and general courts of justice; solemnly proclaimed the right of religious liberty; and passed acts enunciating certain constitutional liberties, e. g. no taxation without representation; taxes could be levied only by the people met in general assembly; right of suffrage; no martial law or quartering of the soldiers without the consent of the inhabitants; election by majority of votes; and the English law of real property.

THOMAS DONGAN

Thus to Dongan's term as governor can be dated the Magna Charta of American constitutional liberties, for his system of government became the programme of continuous political agitation by the colonists of New York Province during the eighteenth century. It developed naturally into the present state government, and many of its principles passed into the framework of the Federal Government. Moreover, a rare tribute to his genius, the government imposed by him on New York Province, 1683, was adopted by England after the American War of Independence as the framework of her colonial policy, and constitutes the present form of government in Canada, Australia, and the Transvaal. Dongan signed the Charter of Liberties 30 Oct., 1683, and on the following day solemnly proclaimed it at the City Hall of New York City. The Duke of York signed and sealed the Charter 4 Oct., 1684; but never returned it, probably for reasons of prudence, for at the time Charles II had, by a quo warranto proceeding, abolished the Charters of New England, and the Charter of Pennsylvania granted in 1684 distinctly admits the right of Parliament to tax the colonies. Dongan established the boundary lines of the province by settling disputes with Connecticut on the East, with the French Governor of Canada on the North, with Pennsylvania on the South, thus marking out the present limits of New York State. By treaty with the Indians made at Albany, New York, 1684, in presence of Lord Howard, Governor of Virginia, Dongan obtained the written submission of the Iroquois to the Great Sachem Charles, on two white deer-skins, and outlined the masterly Indian policy which kept the Five Nations friends of England and a barrier between the English and French possessions in North America, a policy afterwards maintained with success by Sir William Johnson. At the death of Charles II, 1685, James Duke of York was proclaimed king, and New York became a royal province.

The Board of Trade and Plantations, under whose supervision the province passed, vetoed the Charter of Liberties and James approved the veto. The colonists were disappointed, but such was the moral strength of Governor Dongan that we find no trace of popular resentment. In 1685 Dongan established a post office in New York for the better correspondence of the colonies in America. In 1686 he granted charters to the cities of New York and Albany; the former remained unchanged for 135 years and forms the basis of the existing city government; the latter was superseded only in 1870, notwithstanding the extraordinary development in civil and political institutions. Dongan established a college under the direction of the Jesuit Fathers Harvey (his own private chaplain), Harrison, and Gage in New York City, and advised that the King's Farm, a tract beyond the walls of the then existing city, be set aside for its maintenance. The king vetoed the grant, and in 1705 this land became the property of Trinity Church. He planned that a mission of English Jesuits be permanently established at Saratoga, New York, on land purchased by him for the purpose; that a settlement of Irish Catholics be founded in the centre of the Province; and that an expedition be made to explore the Mississippi River and take possession of the great valley then made known by the explorations of La Salle. These plans were set aside by the king.

In 1687, the Assembly of New York was dissolved by the king, and in 1688 Andros was appointed Governor of the consolidated Provinces of New York and New England. Dongan refused command of a regiment with the rank of major-general, retired to his estate on Staten Island, New York, but was obliged to flee for safety in the religious persecution aroused by Lesler in 1689. In 1691 he returned to England. By the death of his brother William (1698), late Governor of the Province of Munster, Ireland, whose only son,

Colonel Walter, Lord Dongan, was killed at the battle of the Boyne, Dongan became Earl of Limerick. In 1702 he was recognized as successor to his brother's estates, but only on payment of claims of the purchasers from the Earl of Athlone. Dongan died poor and without direct heirs. By will, dated 1713, he provided that he be buried at an expense of not over £100, and left the residue of his estate to his niece, wife of Colonel Nugent, afterwards Marshal of France. The tribute of history to his personal charm, his integrity, and character, is outspoken and universal. His public papers give evidence of a keen mind and a sense of humour. He was a man of courage, tact, and capacity, an able diplomat, and a statesman of prudence and remarkable foresight. In spite of the brief term of five years as Governor of New York Province, by virtue of the magnitude, of the enduring and far-reaching character of his achievements, he stands forth as one of the greatest constructive statesmen ever sent out by England for the government of any of her American colonial possessions.

Colonial Laws of New York State (Albany, 1894); *New York Colonial Documents*, III, *London Documents* (Albany, 1853); IX, *Paris Documents* (Albany, 1855); O'Callaghan, *Documentary History of New York*, 4 Vol. ed. (Albany, 1850), I, III; *Ecclesiastical Records of New York* (Albany), II, p. 877; Smith, *History of New York* (London, 1776); Brodhead, *History of State of New York* (New York, 1859), II; *Great Britain's Calendar of State Papers*, 1681–85; Colden, *History of the Five Nations* (3d ed., London, 1775), I; Chalmer, *Revolt of the Colonies* (Boston, 1845); Lamb, *History of City of New York* (New York, 1877); Wilson, *Memorial History of New York* (New York, 1892); Windsor, *Narrative and Critical History of America* (Boston, 1884), II; Doyle, *The Middle Colonies* (London, 1907); Danaher, *Thomas Dongan, Second Earl of Limerick* (Albany, 1889); Osgood, *The American Colonies in the XVII Century* (London, 1907), III; Bruce, *The Empire State in Three Centuries* (New York), I; Driscoll, *The Charter of Liberties and the New York Assembly of 1683*, in U. S. Catholic Historical Society, *Records and Studies* (New York, 1906), IV; Dealy in *Mag. of Am. Hist.* (Feb., 1882), p. 106; Clarke in *Catholic World*, IX, 767; *Journal of Co. Kildare Archæological Society*, IV, No. 5.

John T. Driscoll.

Donlevy, Andrew, educator, b. in 1694, probably in Sligo, Ireland; date and place of death uncertain. Little is known about his early life. With the penal laws then rigorously enforced it was difficult to obtain an education at home; and when he went abroad to study for the priesthood he must have gone in disguise, going abroad for any such purpose being a crime. However, he reached Paris in 1710 and became a student at the Irish College. His clerical course finished, he was ordained priest, and in 1728 was appointed prefect in the college, an office he held till 1746. He had also attended lectures at the university, graduating both in theology and law. While holding the office of prefect, he drew up a new code of rules for the government of the college, placing it under the control of the Archbishop of Paris and subject to the university. He also published in 1742 an Irish-English catechism of the Christian Doctrine, an edition of which appeared in Dublin in 1848.

Webb, *Compendium of Irish Biography* (Dublin, 1878); O'Reilly, *Irish Writers* (Dublin, 1820); Boyle, *The Irish College in Paris* (London and Dublin, 1901).

E. A. D'Alton.

Donnan, Saint.—There were apparently three or four saints of this name who flourished about the seventh century.

(1) St. Donnan, Abbot of Eigg, and St. Donnan of Auchterless are regarded by both the Bollandists and Dempster as different personages, but there is so much confusion in their chronology and repetition in what is known of them, that it seems more probable that they were identical. Reeves (Adamnan's Life of St. Columba), moreover, accepts them as the same without discussion. According to Irish annals St. Donnan was a friend and disciple of St. Columba, who followed him from Ireland to Scotland towards the end of the sixth century. Seeking a solitary retreat, he and his companions settled on the island of Eigg, off the west coast of Scotland, then used only to pasture sheep belonging to the queen of the country. Informed of this invasion, the queen ordered that all should forthwith be slain. Her agents, probably a marauding band of Picts, or pirates according to one account, arrived during the celebration of Mass on Easter eve. Being requested to wait until the Sacrifice was concluded, they did so, and then St. Donnan and his fifty-one companions gave themselves up to the sword. This was in 617. Reeves mentions eleven churches dedicated to St. Donnan; in that at Auchterless his pastoral staff was preserved up to the Reformation and is said to have worked miracles. The island of Eigg was still Catholic in 1703 and St. Donnan's memory venerated there (Martin, Journey to the Western Islands, London, 1716).

(2) Son of Liath, and nephew and disciple of St. Senan, in whose life it is related that by his uncle's direction he restored to life two boys who had been drowned. This St. Donnan succeeded St. Ciaran of Clonmacnoise as Abbot of Aingin, an island in Lough Ree, on the Shannon (now Hare Island). He flourished about the middle of the sixth century.

(3) St. Donnan the Deacon, son of Beoadh and brother of St. Ciaran. He was a monk in his brother's monastery at Cluain, or Clonmacnoise, in Ireland, in the sixth century.

Dempster, *Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot.* (Edinburgh, 1829); Reeves, *Adamnan's Life of St. Columba* (Edinburgh, 1874); Forbes, *Kal. Scott. Saints* (Edinburgh, 1872); Gammack in *Dict. Christ. Biog.* (London, 1877).

G. Cyprian Alston.

Donner, Georg Raphael, Austrian sculptor, b. at Essling, Austria, 25 May, 1692; d. at Vienna, 15 February, 1741. It is said his fancy was first kindled by the works of art at Heiligenkreuz. He received his technical training in the Academy at Vienna; in 1724 he entered the imperial service, and in 1729 passed to that of Prince Esterházy. Donner's work stands out with prominence in a period given over to mannerism, but he is sometimes more mindful of elegance than of character in his subject. He had a true sense of the beautiful, was lifelike and noble in his conceptions, and represents for South Germany and Austria a classic reaction against rococo methods. Among his productions are the marble statue of Charles VI and two bronze reliefs in the Belvedere at Vienna, the fountain for the old Town Hall, Vienna, representing "Andromeda and Perseus", the marble reliefs of "Hagar" and the "Samaritan Woman", and many busts and statues in different palaces and gardens. In Pressburg he made the equestrian statue of St. Martin, and the decorations for the burial chapel of the Primate Emmerich Esterházy. Youthful productions (1726) are the marble figures at Mirabell Castle, Salzburg. Donner is best known to-day by his famous fountain (1738–1739) of the Neuen Markt, Vienna; "Providence" or "Foresight", a classic female figure, forms the apex, while lower down four sporting children, each holding a water-spouting fish, embody the four rivers of Austria proper that flow into the Danube. Donner's two brothers, Sebastian and Matthäus, are generally numbered among his scholars. Sebastian was a talented sculptor, and produced various works, mostly in lead.

Donner, Matthäus, brother of the above, also a sculptor, b. 1704; d. 1756. He is known chiefly for his relief carvings and medals. He was appointed court-medallist, professor, and later rector of the Academy, and was employed by various princes. Among his medals may be mentioned one of Charles Albert of Bavaria, 1727, and various ones representing Maria Theresa. His medals are signed D. or M. D.

Lübke, *Outlines of the History of Art*, ed. Sturgis (New York, 1904); Marquand and Frothingham, *History of Sculpture*

(New York, 1896); BODE, *Geschichte der deutschen Plastik* (Berlin, 1887); NAGLER, *Künstlerlexikon* (Munich, 1836–52); MÜLLER, *Künstlerlexikon* (Stuttgart, 1857).

M. L. HANDLEY.

Donnet, FERDINAND-FRANÇOIS-AUGUSTE, a French cardinal, b. at Bourg-Argental (Loire), 1795; d. at Bordeaux, 1882. He studied in the seminary of St. Irenæus at Lyons, taught at the college of Belley, was ordained priest in 1819, and, after some time spent at the *Maison des hautes études* founded by Cardinal Fesch, went to Irigny as pastor. From 1821 to 1827 he engaged in missionary work and then returned to Lyons to be made pastor of Villefranche. Appointed coadjutor to the Bishop of Nancy, 1835, he evinced such sterling qualities that two years later he was called to the archiepiscopal See of Bordeaux. During the forty-one years of his administration he showed a prodigious activity in every line of work, religious, social, and even material. To him are due the resumption of provincial councils; the restoration of many shrines like Arcachon, Verdelais, Notre-Dame de la Fin-des-terres; the reconstruction of the Pey Berland tower, etc. Cardinal in 1852, and Senator of the Empire, he used his influence in favour of the pope, the liberty of teaching, and the repression of the irreligious press. At the Vatican Council he openly sided with the Ultramontanes like Plantier, Pie, etc. His affable disposition and cheerful character endeared him to his people, and few bishops have been loved and regretted as Donnet was. His eulogy was pronounced by Canon Laprie at the cathedral of Bordeaux, 1883, and by M. Boué at the academy of the same place, 1884. Cardinal Donnet's works comprise twelve volumes (8vo) of "Instructions pastorales, mandements, lettres, discours"; also "Lettres, discours et autres documents relatifs à la question romaine" (Bordeaux, 1865).

POUGEOIS, *Vie, apostolat et épiscopat du cardinal Donnet* (Paris, 1884); CASTAING in *Rev. Cath.* (1884), 453; PIONNEAU, *ibid.*, 33; JÉROME and LELIÈVRE, in *L'épiscopat français*, 1802–1905 (Paris, 1907), s. vv. *Nancy* and *Bordeaux*.

J. F. SOLLIER.

Donoso Cortés, JUAN FRANCISCO MARIA DE LA SALUDAD, Marquess of Valdegamas, author and diplomat, b. 6 May, 1809, at Valle de la Serena in the province of Estremadura, Spain; d. 3 May, 1853, at Paris. His father, Pedro Donoso Cortés, was a descendant of Hernando Cortés, the *conquistador*. At the age of eleven, Donoso Cortés had finished his humanities, and at twelve had begun the study of law at the University of Salamanca; at sixteen he received his degree of licentiate from the University of Seville, and at eighteen became professor of literature at the College of Caceres. Carried away by the rationalism prevalent in Spain following upon the French invasions, he ardently embraced the principles of Liberalism and fell under the influence of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, whom he later characterized as "the most eloquent of sophists". In 1830 he went to Madrid and, with his characteristic energy, engaged in the political controversies of the day, espousing the cause of the reigning dynasty. A memoir addressed to Ferdinand VII on the situation of the Spanish monarchy, advocating the abolishment of the Salic Law, attracted wide attention and procured for him an official position under the Minister of Justice. But the revolutionary events of 1834 led him to reconsider the ground of his political liberalism, and drew a second brochure from his pen scathingly criticizing the revolutionary movement. On the death of Ferdinand, he remained a faithful adherent of the queen-mother Maria Cristina and of her infant daughter Isabella, whose title was disputed by Don Carlos in virtue of the Salic Law against the succession in the female line to the Spanish throne. In 1836, under the ministry of Mendizabal, he became secretary of the Council. In this same year he gave a brilliant course of lectures on political rights at the Athenæum of Madrid. In 1837 he was elected deputy to the Cortes from Cadiz. In 1840, following upon the revolution headed by Espartero, Duke of Victoria, he followed the exiled queen Maria Cristina to Paris in the post of private secretary. He accompanied her on her return after the overthrow of Espartero, 1843, and was appointed to the office of secretary and director of the studies of the young queen, Isabella, was created Marquess of Valdegamas, and entered the Senate. For his eloquent advocacy of the "Spanish marriages" (the simultaneous alliance of Isabella with Francesco of Assisi and of her sister with the Duke of Montpensier) he was made an officer of the Legion of Honour by Louis Philippe.

DONOSO CORTÉS

The death of a dearly beloved brother at this time made a profound impression upon Donoso Cortés. The mystery of human destiny assumed for him a new aspect, and from this time he became an ardent champion of the Catholic Church. On the 4th of January, 1849, he pronounced a remarkable discourse in the Cortes in which he publicly repudiated his Liberalistic principles, branding them as "sterile and disastrous ideas in which are comprehended all the errors of the past three centuries, intended to disturb and disrupt human society". In 1849 he represented Spain as minister plenipotentiary at the court of Berlin, and afterwards at Paris (1850–53), where he died.

The complete works of Donoso Cortés, with a biographical sketch by Gabino Tejado, were published in 1854–55 (Madrid). A translation into French of his principal works, with an introduction by Louis Veuillot, was published at Paris (1858–59). His most notable work is his "Ensayo sobre El Catolicismo, El Liberalismo y El Socialismo" (English translation, Philadelphia, 1862; Dublin, ——). This work was written at the instance of Louis Veuillot, who was an intimate friend of the author, and places Donoso Cortés in the first rank of Catholic publicists. It is an exposition of the impotence of all human systems of philosophy to solve the problem of human destiny and of the absolute dependence of humanity upon the Catholic Church for its social and political salvation. Upon its publication the work was acrimoniously attacked by the Abbé Gaudel, Vicar-General of Orléans, in a series of articles in the "Ami de la Religion", and as vigorously defended by Louis Veuillot in "L'Univers". Donoso Cortés at once submitted his work to the Holy See, which refused to interdict it or any of the propositions declared heretical by the Abbé Gaudel. It remains to-day one of the most brilliant and profound expositions of the influence of Catholic truth upon human society from the pen of a publicist. In a notable series of letters, from 1849–53, to Count Raczyski, at that time Prussian ambassador at Madrid, Donoso Cortés gives a penetrating analysis of the social, political, and religious conditions of Europe, and with almost prophetic insight predicts the unification of Germany in a great empire under the Prussian monarchy as well as the political decadence of France and the latter's loss of Alsace and Lorraine.

TEJADO in *Preface* of complete works (Madrid, 1891); LEROUX in *Les Contemporains*, Année II, Vol. IV (Paris), p. 83.

CONDÉ B. PALLEN.

Dontenwill, AUGUSTINE. See NEW WESTMINSTER.

Donus (or DOMNUS), POPE, son of a Roman called Mauricius; he was consecrated Bishop of Rome 2 Nov., 676, to succeed Adeodatus II, after an interval of four months and seventeen days; d. 11 April, 678. Of his life and acts but little is known. The "Liber Pontificalis" informs us that he paved the atrium or quadrangle in front of St. Peter's with great blocks of white marble. He also restored the church of St. Euphemia on the Appian Way, and repaired the basilica of St. Paul Outside the Walls, or, according to Duchesne's conjecture, the little church on the road to St. Paul's, which marks the spot where Sts. Peter and Paul are said to have parted on their way to martyrdom. During the pontificate of Donus, Reparatus, the Archbishop of Ravenna, returned to the obedience of the Holy See, thus ending the schism created by Archbishop Maurus who had aimed at making Ravenna autocephalous. In the time of this pope a colony of Nestorian monks was discovered in a Syrian monastery at Rome—the Monasterium Boetianum. The pope is said to have dispersed them through the various religious houses of the city, and to have given over their monastery to Roman monks. After a brief reign of one year, five months, and ten days, Donus died and was buried in St. Peter's. His portrait in mosaic was at one time to be seen in the church of St. Martina in the Forum.

Liber Pontificalis, ed. DUCHESNE (Paris, 1886), I, 348 sq.; JAFFÉ, *Regesta Rom. Pont.* (Leipzig, 1885), I, 238; MANN, *The Lives of the Popes* (London, 1902), I, Pt. II, 20 sq.

THOMAS OESTREICH.

Doorkeeper. See PORTER.

Dora, a titular see of Palæstina Prima. The name (*Dôr*) in Semitic languages means "dwelling", "abode". On the coming of the Hebrews, the King of Dora or Dor entered into the confederation against Josue and was defeated with the confederates (Jos., xi, 2; xii, 23). The town was first allotted to the tribe of Aser (Jos., xvii, 11), then given to Manasses (Judges, i, 27; I Par., vii, 29), who failed to expel the inhabitants and imposed on them a tribute; the Israelites may have captured only the upper city (*Nafat Dôr*), called Napheddor or Phenaeddor by the Septuagint, and *regiones* or *provincia Dor* by the Vulgate. The Egyptian King Rameses III set up a Phœnician colony at Dora; according to Stephan of Byzantium the Phœnicians settled there because the coast abounded in the shells that produced the famous Tyrian purple dye. Dora was united by David to the Kingdom of Israel and governed under Solomon by Benabinadab, one of the twelve prefects (III Kings, iv, 11). Later it underwent successively the rule of the Persians, the Greeks, and the Lagides. In 217 B. C. it was unsuccessfully besieged by Antiochus the Great; at a later date it was taken by the kings of Syria. In 139 B. C. the usurper Tryphon, who had taken refuge at Dora, was besieged by Antiochus (VII) Sidetes with a fleet, 120,000 foot, and 8000 horse (I Mach., xv, 13). The city then fell into the hands of a private individual called Zoilus, at whose death it was added by Alexander Jannæus to his Kingdom of Judea. When Pompey conquered Syria, he granted Dora an autonomous constitution; from this time dates its peculiar era, 64–63 B. C., known chiefly through numerous coins. As Dora had suffered much from the Jews, Gabinius rebuilt it (56 B. C.). In 42 of the Christian Era its inhabitants were still disputing with the Jews, whom they seem to have specially hated. In the time of Pliny the town was in a state of utter decay; St. Jerome speaks of "the ruins of that city [Dora] which had been formerly so powerful". He may have exaggerated its decay, or the city may have risen from its ruins.

As early as the fifth century it was the residence of a bishop, Sidus, and suffragan to Cæsarea; there is record also of Barachius in 518, John in 536, Stephen, the friend of St. Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem and the great opponent of Monothelism. In the Middle Ages Dora was called Pirgul, a corruption of Greek πύργος, "tower", according to Foucher of Chartres (Gesta Dei per Francos, ed. Bongars, 396); it was also known as Merla (Rey, Les colonies franques de Syrie, Paris, 1883, 422). There are records of five Latin bishops during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (Eubel, I, 235; II, 161). Another is mentioned in "Revue bénédictine" (1904), p. 62. Its modern Arabic name is Tantourah. Dora is a village of about 1500 inhabitants, on the seashore between Caifa and Cæsarea, nearer the latter. The harbour is frequented by small boats; the old port, situated more to the north, was enclosed by two headlands lengthened by two piers. To the east are vast quarries and the ancient necropolis. The ruins of the ancient city cover a space about four-fifths of a mile long by one-third broad. Many Jewish colonists have recently settled in the vicinity.

GUÉRIN, *Description de la Palestine: Samarie* (Paris, 1875), II, 305–315; LEGENDRE in *Dict. de la Bible*, II, 1487–92; *Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs* (London, 1882), II, 7–11; *Palestine Exploration Fund, Quart. Statement* (1874), 12; (1887), 84.

S. VAILHÉ.

Dorbellus. See ORBELLIS, NICOLAS DE, O.S.F.

Dorchester, ABBEY OF, founded in 1140 by Alexander, Bishop of Lincoln, for Canons of the Order of St. Augustine (or Black Canons). Dorchester, an important Roman city of Mercia, about nine miles from Oxford, had been the seat of a bishopric from A. D. 634, when St. Birinus, the first bishop, was sent to that district by Pope Honorius, until 1085, when the See of Mercia was transferred to Lincoln. The abbey, founded fifty-five years later, was dedicated in honour of Sts. Peter, Paul, and Birinus, was richly endowed out of the lands and tithes of the former bishopric, and had twelve parishes subject to it, being included in the Peculiar of Dorchester, until the suppression of peculiars. The first abbot appears to have been Alured, whose name occurs in 1146 and again in 1163; the last was John Mershe, who was elected in 1533, and in the following year subscribed to the king's supremacy, with five of his canons, and was given a pension of £22 a year. The revenues of the abbey were valued at the time of its suppression at about £220. Henry VIII reserved the greater part of the property of the house for a college, erected by him in honour of the Holy Trinity, for a dean and prebendaries; but this was dissolved in the first year of his successor. No register or cartulary of Dorchester Abbey is now known to exist, and only a single charter, confirming the donation of a church by King John, is given by Dugdale. Edmund Ashefeld was the first impropriator of the abbey site and precincts, which afterwards passed through various hands. The stately church of Dorchester Abbey, as it stands today, was built entirely by the Augustinian Canons, although there are traces on the north side of Saxon masonry, probably part of the ancient cathedral. The whole length of the church is 230 feet, its width seventy, and its height fifty-five feet. The north transept with its doorway is of the Norman period; the north side of the nave and chancel arch, early English, the south side of nave, south aisle, and choir, Decorated; the south porch, late Perpendicular. The extraordinarily rich sanctuary, with its highly decorated windows (including the famous northern one known as the "Jesse" window) and beautifully carved sedilia and piscina, dates from 1330. One of the very few existing leaden fonts in England is in this church.

DUGDALE, *Monasticon Anglicanum*, VI, 323; PARKER, *History of Dorchester* (Oxford, 1882); WILLIS, *Mitred Abbeys*, II, 175; VICTORIA, *History of Oxfordshire* (London, 1907), II, 87–

89; ADDINGTON, *Hist. of Dorchester*, 64, 137; LINCOLN, *Episc. Regist. Mem.*, 48.

D. O. HUNTER-BLAIR.

Doré (AURATUS), PIERRE, controversialist, b. at Orléans about 1500; d. at Paris, 19 May, 1559. He entered the Dominican Order in 1514 and won his degrees at Paris, in 1532, after a brilliant examination. Though elected to the office of prior at Blois in 1545, Doré continued to preach throughout the provinces. At Châlons the bishop, who had been captivated by his zeal and eloquence, entrusted him with the reform of the Carthusian monastery of Val des Choux (Vallis Caulium). For the same reasons, Claude de Lorraine, Duke of Guise, and his consort, Antoinette de Bourbon, chose him as confessor. He wrote thirty-five ascetico-theological works, which some think are only redactions of his sermons. Chief among these is "Les voies du Paradis enseignées par notre Sauveur Jésus-Christ en son évangile", which appeared twice at Lyons in 1538 (Paris, 1540; Lyons, 1586; Rome, 1610). In his "Paradoxa ad profligandas hæreses ex divi Pauli epistolis selecta", he refuted the Huguenots, but soon turned to writing ascetical commentaries on the Psalms. When Henry II entered Paris in 1548, Doré wrote a Latin ode which won for him the post of court preacher and royal confessor. His famous defence of the Eucharist appeared in 1549, and two years later he published two other apologies on the same subject and another on the Mass. At the same time he prepared his defence of the Faith in three volumes, as also another refutation of the Calvinists. He closed his literary career with two works on Justification.

Though Doré used the vernacular very loosely, and indulged in far-fetched descriptions, which Rabelais (Pantagruel, ch. xxii) ridicules, his works have always been held in high esteem for originality and unassailable orthodoxy. His literal translations of the Eucharistic hymns of St. Thomas Aquinas, his Latin poems, and the Office for a Feast of St. Joseph, which he composed at the command of Paul III, have always been greatly admired.

ECHARD AND QUÉTIF, *SS. O. P.*, II, 203; FÉRET, *La Faculté de théologie de Paris et ses docteurs les plus célèbres, Epoque moderne*, II, 271–288; FOPPENS, *Bibliotheca Belgica*, II, 975; *Revue Bénédictine*, XV, 147.

THOS. M. SCHWERTNER.

Doria, ANDREA, Genoese admiral and statesman, b. at Oneglia, Italy, 1468; d. at Genoa, 1560. His family belonged to the *magnæ quatuor prosapiæ* who disputed among themselves for the supremacy in Genoa, but the Adorni and Fregosi of the opposing faction excluded the Doria from power. At first Genoa sought union with France; then, in 1464, Louis XI ceded it to the Duke of Milan. Doria's early years were trying ones; his father died young, and his mother placed him under the guardianship of a relation who was captain of the guard to Pope Innocent VIII. Thus began the active, adventurous career that was destined to make Andrea Doria one of the most important personages of Europe in the sixteenth century.

Like many Italians of his day, Doria was at first a *condottiere*. He commenced by serving (1487–1492) in the guards of Innocent VIII, then in the Neapolitan army of Alfonso of Aragon, to whom he alone remained faithful after the conquest of Naples by Charles VIII (1495). He next joined the Order of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem and made a pilgrimage to the Holy Land; after this he entered the service of Jean de La Rovère, leader of the French troops of the Kingdom of Naples, and had as his opponent Gonsalvo de Cordova, the most renowned general of the time. In 1503 Doria was able to re-enter Genoa, where order had been restored by Louis XII, and set out to subdue the Corsicans, then in revolt. On his return the Genoese entrusted him with the reorganization of their fleet. Doria now abandoned land service for that of the sea and, arming eight galleys at his own expense, constituted himself an independent naval power. During the years 1507 to 1519 he traversed the Western Mediterranean with his fleet, and, having overpowered the Barbary Corsairs and captured several of their chiefs, among them the famous Cadolin, returned to Genoa laden with booty.

On account of the civil discords in Genoa, Doria withdrew with twelve corsair galleys that he had seized, the crews of which would now acknowledge no other chief, and entered the service of Francis I, who appointed him "governor-general of the galleys of France". In 1524 he raised the blockade of Marseilles, then besieged by Charles V, and, after the battle of Pavia, gathered together the remnants of the French army (1525). He then became commander of the galleys of Clement VII; in 1527 re-entered the service of France and compelled Genoa to acknowledge the authority of Francis I. But in 1528 he quarrelled with the King of France, who did not pay him faithfully. Recalling Filippo Doria, his nephew, who was besieging Naples with his uncle's fleet, Andrea agreed to enter the service of Charles V, and began to re-establish order in Genoa, where he was received with enthusiasm (12 September, 1528). After breaking up the ancient noble clans, he set up a new social division and an aristocratic constitution which continued in force, with but few modifications, until 1798. Absolute head of the naval forces of the house of Austria, he directed the maritime struggle against the Turks and the Barbary pirates; in 1532, just when Solyman threatened Hungary, Doria landed on the coast of Greece, took Coron and Patras, and even meditated an attack on Constantinople. In 1535 he co-operated in the siege of Tunis; in 1536 as head of the united squadron, made up of the ships of the pope, Venice, and the Knights of Malta, he surprised the famous Barbarossa in the Gulf of Arta and then allowed him to escape. Loaded with honours by Charles V, Doria retired to the territory of Genoa and lived in the beautiful palace he had built at Fassolo, where he dispensed royal hospitality to Charles V and Philip II. He was greatly revered by his fellow-citizens, yet, in 1547, he suppressed with much cruelty the conspiracy formed by some discontented nobles, the Fieschi and the Cibò. Doria's tomb, decorated by Montorsoli, is in the church of San Matteo, but his colossal statue, which was erected in 1540, was overthrown and broken in 1797.

ANDREA DORIA
Sebastiano del Piombo,
Doria Palace, Rome

POHLER, *Bibliotheca historica militaris* (Leipzig, 1899), IV, 269; CAPELLONI, *Vita e gesti del principe Doria* (Venice, 1566.—The author lived between 1510 and 1590 and was one of Doria's protégés); SIGONIO, *De Vitâ et gestis Andreæ Doriæ . . .* (Genoa, 1586); BRANTÔME, *Les vies des grands capitaines estrangers* (edit. of the Soc. Hist. de France), II, 29–43; GIOVIO, *Historiarum . . . lib. XLV* (Florence, 1550); OLIVIERI, *Monete, medaglie e sigilli dei principi Doria* (Genoa, 1859); GUERRAZZI, *Vita di Andrea Doria* (Milan, 1874); JURIEN DE LA GRAVIÈRE, *Andrea Doria* (Paris, 1895); DE FOVILLE, *Gênes*, p. 62: *L'art au temps d'André Doria* in *Les villes d'art célèbres* (Paris, 1907).

LOUIS BRÉHIER.

Döring, MATTHIAS, historian and theologian, b. between 1390 and 1400, at Kyritz, in Brandenburg; d. there 24 July, 1469. He joined the Friars Minor in his native place, studied at Oxford, was graduated (1424) at Erfurt as doctor of theology, and for some years taught theology and Biblical exegesis. In 1427 he was elected provincial of his order for Saxony. In the disputes between the Conventuals and those of the Observance he took an active part. In 1443 at Berne the Conventuals elected him minister general. This position he held for six years, receiving approbation from the assembly of prelates still posing as the General Council of Basle. In this council he had been prominent since 1432 as an over-zealous reformer and an adherent of the supremacy of a general council over the pope. He was sent by it to Denmark, to win over the king and the people, and assisted in the deposition (1439) of Eugene IV and the election of the antipope, Felix V. Excommunicated by the Archbishop of Magdeburg he appealed to Rome. In 1461 he resigned his office and spent the last years of his life in literary work at the convent of Kyritz.

Döring is said to be the author of the "Confutatio primatus Papæ", written (1443) anonymously and without title. Name and title were added when the article was edited in 1550 by Matthias Flacius Illyricus. It is in part an extract from the "Defensor pacis" of Marsilius of Padua (printed in Goldast, Monarchia, I, 557 sqq.). Other works attributed to Döring are "Defensorium postillæ Nicolai Lyrani", against the Spanish bishop, Paul of Burgos, since 1481 frequently printed with the "Postillæ"; "Liber perplexorum Ecclesiæ" (lost); continuation (1420 to 1464) of the Chronicle of Dietrich Engelhus. He also wrote on the so-called "Donation of Constantine" and (1444) on the relics of the Precious Blood of Wilsnack.

PASTOR, *History of the Popes*, tr. ANTROBUS, II, 127; ALBERT, *Döring, ein Minorit des 15. Jahrh.* (Stuttgart, 1892); *Hist. Jahrb.* (1892), XI, 439; *Zeitschrift für kath. Theol.* (1894), 711; *Der Katholik* (1893), II, 16; MÄRK, *Forschungen*, XVI, 198; *Hist.-polit. Blätter* (1894), 114, 624.

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Dorman, THOMAS, theologian, b. at Berkhampstead, Hertfordshire, England, date uncertain; d. at Tournai, 1572 or 1577. He received his early education through his uncle, Thomas Dorman of Agmondesham, now Amersham, Buckinghamshire. His master at Berkhampstead was Richard Reeve, a noted Protestant schoolmaster. He was also known to Thomas Harding, the Catholic scholar, then professor of Hebrew at Oxford, who took great interest in the boy and sent him to Winchester school in 1547. From Winchester Dorman went to New College at Oxford, of which Harding was a fellow, and here he was elected a probationer fellow. During the Catholic revival under Mary he was appointed fellow of All Souls College (1554) and on 9 July, 1558, took the degree B.C.L. A year or two after Elizabeth's accession, finding that he could not live in England without conforming to the new religion, he sacrificed his fellowship and his patrimony and went to Antwerp, where he met Harding who was also an exile for the Faith. Harding persuaded him to resume his studies, and Dorman accordingly went to Louvain and devoted himself to the study of theology. In 1565 he became B.D. in the University of Douai and finally received the doctorate there. During this period he engaged in controversy with the Anglican divines, Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury, and Nowell, Dean of St. Paul's. In 1569, at the invitation of Dr. Allen, he joined the band of scholars at the newly founded English College at Douai which he assisted both by his services and his private means. He died at Tournai where he had been given an important benefice. His works are: "A proufe of certeyne articles in Religion denied by M. Juel" (Antwerp, 1564); "A Disproufe of M. Nowelle's Reproufe" (Antwerp, 1565); "A Request to Mr. Jewel that he keep his promise made by solemn Protestation in his late Sermon at Paul's Cross" (London, 1567; Louvain, 1567).

PITS, *De Angliæ Scriptoribus* (Paris, 1623), 914; DODD, *Church History* (Brussels, 1739), II, 88; WOOD, *Athenæ Oxon.*, BLISS ed., I, 434, 718; *Douay Diaries* (London, 1878), 272; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.* (London, 1885), II, 94; COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (London, 1888), XV, 244; CHURTON, *Life of Nowell* (London, 1809).

EDWIN BURTON.

Dornin, BERNARD, first publisher in the United States of distinctively Catholic books, b. in Ireland, 1761; d. in Ohio, 1836. He was forced to leave his native land, in 1803, because of political troubles and, arriving in New York soon after, began a book-selling and publishing concern. He got out a New Testament, printed for him in Brooklyn, in 1805, and an edition of Pastorini's "History of the Church", in 1807. He moved to Baltimore, in 1809, and from there to Philadelphia in 1817. During many years he was the leading Catholic publisher of the country, and as such enjoyed the friendship of Archbishop Carroll and of other members of the hierarchy, who esteemed him as a vigorous and gifted writer and editor. In the early thirties he disposed of his business in Philadelphia, where he had published a number of Catholic books, and went to Ohio to reside near his daughter.

THOMAS ALOYSIUS DORNIN, son of Bernard, b. in Ireland, 1800; d. at Savannah, Georgia, U. S. A., 22 April, 1874. He entered the United States Navy, 2 May, 1815, as a midshipman, from Maryland. Commissioned a lieutenant in 1825, he made a five-years' cruise around the world. In 1841 he was promoted commander and helped to successfully carry out an expedition to prevent the invasion of Mexican territory by the filibusterer William Walker. After being commissioned captain, in 1855, he engaged in destroying the slave-trade. During the Civil War he attained the rank of commodore on the retired list, 16 July, 1862, and at its close was put in charge of the fifth lighthouse district.

FINOTTI, *Bibliographia Catholica Americana* (New York, 1872); BAYLEY, *A Brief Sketch of the Early History of the Catholic Church on the Island of New York* (New York, 1870); *Register of the Navy of the U. S.*, s. v.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Dorothea, SAINT: (1) virgin and martyr, suffered during the persecution of Diocletian, 6 Feb., 311, at Cæsarea in Cappadocia. She was brought before the prefect Sapricius, tried, tortured, and sentenced to death. On her way to the place of execution the pagan lawyer Theophilus said to her in mockery: "Bride of Christ, send me some fruits from your bridegroom's garden." Before she was executed, she sent him, by a six-year-old boy, her headdress which was found to be filled with a heavenly fragrance of roses and fruits. Theophilus at once confessed himself a Christian, was put on the rack, and suffered death. This is the oldest version of the legend, which was later variously enlarged. Dorothea is represented with an angel and a wreath of flowers. She is regarded as the patroness of gardeners. On her feast trees are blessed in some places. In the West she has been venerated since the seventh century.

QUENTIN, *Les martyrologes historiques* (Paris, 1908), 156–157; *Acta SS.*, 6 Feb.; BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints.*

(2) DOROTHEA OF MONTAU, SAINT, recluse, b. at Montau, 6 Feb., 1347, d. at Marienwerder, 25 June, 1394. At the age of seventeen she married the sword-cutler Albrecht of Danzig, a hot-tempered man, whose nature underwent a change through her humility and gentleness. Both made frequent pilgrimages to Cologne, Aachen, and Einsiedeln, and they intended (1390) to visit Rome also; but Albrecht was prevented by illness and remained at home where he died, while Dorothea journeyed to Rome alone. Of their nine children all died, except one daughter who joined the Benedictines. In the summer of 1391 Dorothea moved to Marienwerder, and on

May, 1393, with the permission of the chapter and of the Teutonic Order, established a hermitage near the cathedral. She led a very austere life. Numerous visitors sought her advice and consolation, and she had wonderful visions and revelations. Her confessor, the deacon John of Marienwerder, a learned theologian, wrote down her communications and composed a Latin biography in seven books, "Septililium", besides a German life in four books. She was never canonized, but the people honoured her as the guardian of the country of the Teutonic Knights and "patroness of Prussia". Her feast is celebrated on 25 June, in some places on 30 Oct. The church at Marienwerder is now in the hands of the Lutherans; her relics cannot be found.

HIPLER, *Meister Joh. Marienwerder u. d. Klausnerin Dorothea v. Montau* (Braunsberg, 1865); IDEM, *Septililium B. Dorotheæ Montoviensis. Auctore Joh. Marienwerder* (Brussels, 1885); *Acta SS.*, 30 Oct.; KAULEN in *Kirchenlex.*, III, 1991–4.

GABRIEL MEIER.

Dorsal, ALTAR. See ALTAR (IN LITURGY), sub-title *Altar-curtain.*

Dorsey, ANNE HANSON, novelist, b. at Georgetown, District of Columbia, U. S. A., 1815; d. at Washington, 26 December, 1896. She was the daughter of the Rev. William McKenney, a chaplain in the United States Navy, and Chloe Ann Lanigan McKenney. In 1837 she was married to Lorenzo Dorsey, and in 1840 became a convert to the Catholic Faith. From this period, for more than half a century, she devoted her exceptional talent to Catholic fiction. She was a pioneer of light Catholic literature in the United States and a leading writer for the young. While deeply religious in tone, her stories are full of living interest and a knowledge of the world gained by clear insight and wide experience. Mrs. Dorsey's only son was killed while serving in the Union Army during the Civil War. She left three daughters. Pope Leo XIII twice sent her his benediction, and the University of Notre Dame conferred upon her the Lætare medal. Her chief works are: "The Student of Blenheim Forest"; "Flowers of Love and Memory"; "Guy, the Leper"; "Tears of the Diadem"; "Tale of the White and Red Roses"; "Woodreve Manor"; "Conscience, or the Trials of May Brooke"; "Oriental Pearl"; "Cocaina, the Rose of the Algonquins"; "The Flemings"; "Nora Brady's Vow"; "Mona, the Vestal"; "The Old Gray Rosary"; "Tangled Paths"; "The Old House at Glenarra"; "Adrift"; "Ada's Trust"; "Beth's Promise"; "The Heiress of Carrigmona"; "Warp and Woof"; "The Palms".

ANNE HANSON DORSEY

Cycl. of Am. Biog., II, 206; *A Round Table of American Catholic Novelists* (New York, 1896).

MARY T. WAGGAMAN.

Dort, SYNOD OF. See ARMINIANISM.

Dorylæum, a titular see of Phrygia Salutaris, in Asia Minor. This city already existed under the kings of Phrygia and is mentioned by most of the ancient geographers. It was situated at Karadja Hissar, six miles south-west of the modern Eski Shehir. About the end of the fourth century B. C. it was removed to Shehir Euyuk, at the ruins north of the same Eski Shehir; there it remained during the Byzantine period. Seven bishops are known from the fourth to the ninth century, the most famous being Eusebius, who denounced successively the heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches (Lequien, Oriens christ., I, 837). The see is mentioned as late as the twelfth century among the suffragans of Synnada, but must have been suppressed soon after. Dorylæum was taken and destroyed by the Seljuk Turks, probably in 1070. It was there (1 July, 1097) that the crusaders won their great victory over the Turks. The city was rebuilt in 1175 by Manuel Comnenus and fortified as well as possible. At this time John Cinnamus ("Histor.", VII, 2–3) and Nicetas Choniates ("De gestis Man. Comn.", VI, 1) write enthusiastically about it as one of the most beautiful cities of Asia Minor. The next year it fell again into the hands of the Turks; in 1240 it passed to Erthogroul, father of Othman, the founder of the Osmanli dynasty (his tomb is at Seughud near Eski Shehir). Meanwhile the city stretched away from the hill of Shehir Euyuk and developed along the Poursak (ancient Tembris or Thymbris), under the name of Eski Shehir. The modern town is situated at an altitude of 783 metres, on a vast and fertile plateau, about 400 kilometres from Constantinople. Eski Shehir is the chief town of a caza in the vilayet of Brusa. The population is about 40,000: 2000 Greeks, 2000 Armenians, 200 Latins, a few Catholic Armenians, Protestants, and Jews, the rest being Mussulmans. Since 1891 the Assumptionists have conducted a mission with a school for boys, and the Oblate Sisters of the Assumption two schools for girls. There is also a Catholic Armenian parish. Eski Shehir has hot springs that are used for baths. Fish, especially gigantic silures, swarm in the Poursak. The meerschaum industry flourishes there; the chief known mine of this mineral is at Mikhalitch in the district of Eski Shehir.

AINSWORTH, *Travels and Researches in Asia Minor*, II, 56–58; TEXIER, *Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1862), 408–411; RAMSAY, *Asia Minor* (London, 1890), 212; CUINET, *La Turquie d'Asie*, IV, 208–213; PREGER, *Dorylaion* in *Mittheilungen archaeol. Instituts* (Athens, 1894), XIX, 301–305; RADET, *En Phrygie* (Paris, 1895); *Echos d'Orient* (1897), 82–85; (1906), 356–360; (1907), 77–82.

S. VAILHÉ.

Dositheans, followers of Dositheus, a Samaritan who formed a Gnostic-Judaistic sect, previous to Simon Magus. Although the name of Dositheus is often coupled with that of Simon Magus as the first of all heretics, we possess but scant information concerning him. He is not mentioned in Justin or Irenæus, but first occurs in Pseudo-Tertullian's "Adv. Hær.", a Latin rendering of the lost "Syntagma" of Hippolytus (about A.D. 220). "I pass over in silence", says the author, "the heretics of Judaism, I mean Dositheus the Samaritan, who first dared to reject the Prophets, as not having spoken in the Holy Ghost. I pass over the Sadducees, who, springing from this root of error, dared in addition to this heresy to deny even the resurrection of the flesh" (ch. i). If, however, the Sadducees sprang from Dositheus, he must have begun to teach sometime previous to the Christian Era, and cannot properly be counted amongst heretics of Christianity. St. Jerome, who copied Pseudo-Tertullian, distinctly speaks of "those who before the coming of Christ undid the Law". An independent witness to the same fact is found in the Pseudo-Clementine "Recognitions", I, 54: "the author of this [Sadducee] opinion was first Dositheus and then Simon". On the other hand in "Recognitions", II, 8, we read that Dositheus founded a sect after the death of John the Baptist. Origen states that "Dositheus the Samaritan, after the time of Jesus, wished to persuade the Samaritans that he himself was the Messias prophesied by Moses" (Contra Celsum, VI, ii); and he classes him with John the Baptist, Theodas, and Judas of Galilee as people whom the Jews mistakenly held to be the Christ (Hom. xxv in Lucam; Contra Celsum, I, lvii). He informs us that the Dositheans gave out

that they possessed some books of Dositheus and told some tales about him as being still alive in this world, and he further accuses Dositheus of having mutilated the Scriptures. It is not certain, however, whether Origen did not confound Dositheus the Pseudo-Messias with an Encratite sectary who lived somewhat later. This is suggested especially by a passage in Origen's "De Principiis", IV, vii, where he ascribes to Dositheus the Samaritan and others some absurdly strict observance of the Sabbath. This is also, probably, the reason why Dositheus is placed by Hegesippus after Simon Magus instead of before. In Talmudic literature (Pirke d. R. Eliezer, xxxviii, and Tanhuma Vayyasheb, ii) there occurs a Samaritan of the Syro-Macedonian period named דוסתאי, and it has been plausibly argued that the patristic references which connect Dositheus with the Sadducees arise from a confusion of Dositheus the Samaritan Pseudo-Messias with this early Jewish heretic. If this be true, there would have been three persons of this name, one at the time of Alexander the Great, another at the time of Christ, and a third, a generation later. But the mention of a fourth at the time of Salmanasar (about 700 B. C.) makes one cautious of Talmudic information. It is certain, however, that a Jewish sect, mentioned by several Arabic and other historians under the name of Dusitamya or Dostân, continued to exist till the tenth century, and that they were considered similar to the Kutîm, or Samaritans. But they seem never to have possessed any importance in the Christian world, in which from the earliest times there existed but a vague reminiscence of their name, though they continue to be mentioned in descriptions and lists of heresies, such as the "Hæreses" of Epiphanius and similar collections.

GIOVANNI DOSSI
By himself, Uffizi Gallery, Florence

THE HOLY FAMILY
National Museum, Naples

VIRGIN ENTHRONED WITH SAINTS
Museum, Ferrara
GIOVANNI DOSSI

CIRCE THE ENCHANTRESS
Borghese Palace, Rome

KRAUSS, *Dosithée et les Dosithéens* in *Revue des Etudes Juives* (Paris, 1901), 27–42; BÜCHLER, *Les Dosithéens dans le Midrash*, *ibid.* (1901), 220–31 and (1902), 50–71; HILGENFELD, *Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums* (Leipzig, 1884), 155–161.

J. P. ARENDZEN.

Dosquet, PIERRE-HERMAN, fourth Bishop of Quebec, b. at Liège, Flanders, 1691; d. at Paris, 1777. He studied at the Seminary of Saint-Sulpice, Paris, and entered that congregation. After two years in Canada (1721–23) he was appointed superior of the Seminary of Lisieux in France, and helped to preserve that institution from Jansenism. While acting in Rome as procurator-general for the Oriental Missions of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, he was made vicar Apostolic of a portion of India and consecrated titular Bishop of Samos by Benedict XIII (1725). He remained in Rome until appointed coadjutor to Bishop Mornay of Quebec (1729). Bishop Dosquet had to solve many difficulties that had arisen towards the close of the life of Bishop St-Vallier. He legislated wisely in behalf of the religious communities of women and was zealous for the suppression of the liquor traffic. In 1733, after Bishop Mornay's resignation, he succeeded to the See of Quebec, where he promoted education, primary and classical. A patron and benefactor of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, he confided almost exclusively to its missionaries Acadia, the islands of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Cape Breton, Newfoundland, and probably Labrador. He rewarded that congregation by generous endowments, including Sarcelle, a property near Paris, which until the Revolution yielded an annual revenue of 3000 livres. In 1735 ill health forced him to leave Quebec, but his resignation was accepted only in 1739. Thenceforth he resided chiefly in Rome, attending to the interests of his former diocese, especially after the English conquest.

TÊTU, *Les évêques de Québec* (Quebec, 1889); GOSSELIN, *Le clergé canadien et la déclaration de 1732* (Ottawa, 1901).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

Dossel, ALTAR. See ALTAR (IN LITURGY), sub-title *Altar-curtain.*

Dossi, GIOVANNI, actually named GIOVANNI DI NICOLÒ DI LUTERO, but also called DOSSO DOSSI, an Italian painter, b. about 1479; d. at Ferrara in 1542. Dossi belonged to the School of Ferrara and was a pupil of Lorenzo Costa in Mantua. He is believed to have derived his name from the village of Dosso, in which it has been stated he was born. In conjunction with his brother Battista (1480–1548) Dossi visited Rome and Venice and passed eleven years in these places studying especially the works of Giorgione and Titian, but forming his own style, which was distinguished by

romantic treatment, imaginative power, rich, brilliant, and often novel colouring. He and his brother were frequently employed by Alfonso I, Duke of Ferrara, and by his successor, Ercole II. His greatest work is the altar-piece in the Ferrara Gallery. He also painted the cartoons for the tapestry in the cathedral of that city, for those in the church of San Francesco, and in the ducal palace at Modena. Many of his frescoes still remain in the ducal palace at Ferrara and his paintings can be studied in the cathedral and churches of Modena, in the Louvre, and in the galleries of Dresden, Berlin, Milan, and Vienna. He painted a portrait of Ariosto and the poet enrolled his name, in conjunction with those of Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo, Raphael, and Titian, in the poem of "Orlando Furioso", but the portrait cannot now be identified, although many other portraits by Dossi are still in existence. The landscape backgrounds of his pictures are marked by beauty of colouring and fine imaginative quality. On his return from Venice he appears to have settled down in Ferrara. His work has a close kinship with that of the Venetian School.

BARUFFALDI, *The Lives of the Ferrarese Artists* (MS. in Ferrara Library); SCANNELLI, *Il Microcosmo della Pittura* (Cesena, 1657); BRINTON, *The Renaissance in Italian Art* (London, 1898); KUGLER, *Italian Schools of Painting* (London, 1900).

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Douai (DOUAY, DOWAY), TOWN AND UNIVERSITY OF. —The town of Douai, in the department of Nord, France, is on the River Scarpe, some twenty miles south of Lille. It contains about 30,000 inhabitants and was formerly the seat of a university. It was strongly fortified, and the old ramparts have only been removed in recent years. The town flourished in the Middle Ages, and the church of Notre-Dame dates from the twelfth century.

To English Catholics, the name Douai will always be bound up with the college founded by Cardinal Allen (q. v.) during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, where the majority of the clergy were educated in penal times, and to which the preservation of the Catholic religion in England was largely due. Several other British establishments were founded there—colleges for the Scots and the Irish, and Benedictine and Franciscan monasteries—and Douai became the chief centre for those who were exiled for the Faith. The University of Douai may be said to date from 31 July, 1559, when Philip II of Spain (in whose dominions it was then situated) obtained a Bull from Pope Paul IV, authorizing its establishment, the avowed object being the preservation of the purity of the Catholic Faith from the errors of the Reformation. Paul IV died before he had promulgated the Bull, which was, however, confirmed by his successor, Pius IV, 6 January, 1560. The letters patent of Philip II, dated 19 January, 1561, authorized the establishment of a university with five faculties: theology, canon law, civil law, medicine, and arts. The formal inauguration took place 5 October, 1562, when there was a public procession of the Blessed Sacrament, and a sermon was preached in the market-place by the Bishop of Arras.

There were already a considerable number of English Catholics living at Douai, and their influence made itself felt in the new university. In its early years several of the chief posts were held by Englishmen, mostly from Oxford. The first chancellor of the university was Dr. Richard Smith, formerly Fellow of Merton and regius professor of divinity at Oxford; the regius professor of canon law at Douai for many years was Dr. Owen Lewis, Fellow of New College, who had held the corresponding post at Oxford; the first principal of Marchiennes College was Richard White, formerly Fellow of New College; while Allen himself, after taking his licentiate at Douai in 1570, became regius professor of divinity. It is reasonable to suppose that many of the traditions of Catholic Oxford were perpetuated at Douai. The university was, however, far from being even predominantly English; it was founded on the model of that of Louvain, from which seat of learning the majority of the first professors were drawn. The two features already mentioned—that the university was founded during the progress of the Reformation, to combat the errors of Protestantism, and that it was to a considerable extent under English influences—explain the fact that William Allen, when seeking a home for a projected English college abroad, turned his eyes towards Douai. The project arose from a conversation which he had with Dr. Vendeville, then regius professor of canon law in the University of Douai, and afterwards Bishop of Tournai, whom he accompanied on a pilgrimage to Rome in the autumn of 1567; and the foundation took definite shape when Allen made a beginning in a hired house on Michaelmas Day, 1568. His object was to gather some of the numerous body of English Catholics who, having been forced to leave England, were scattered in different countries on the Continent, and to give them facilities for continuing their studies, so that when the time came for the re-establishment of Catholicism, which Allen was always confident could not be far distant, there might be a body of learned clergy ready to return to their country. This was of course a very different thing from sending missionaries over in defiance of the law while England still remained in the hands of the Protestants. This latter plan was an afterthought and a gradual growth from the circumstances in which the college found itself, though eventually it became its chief work.

Allen's personality and influence soon attracted a numerous band of scholars, and a few years after the foundation of the college the students numbered more than one hundred and fifty. A steady stream of controversial works issued from Douai, some by Allen himself, others by such men as Thomas Stapleton, Richard Bristowe, and others almost equally well known. The preparation of the Douay Bible (q. v.) was among their chief undertakings. It is estimated that before the end of the sixteenth century more than three hundred priests had been sent on the English mission, nearly a third of whom suffered martyrdom; and almost as many had been banished. By the end of the persecution the college counted more than one hundred and sixty martyrs. Allen had at first no regular source of income, but depended on the generosity of a few friends, and especially upon the neighbouring monasteries of Saint-Vaast at Arras, Anchin, and Marchiennes, which, at the suggestion of Dr. Vendeville, had from time to time subscribed towards the work. Many private donations were also received from England. After a few years, seeing the extreme need of the college and the importance of the work it was doing, Allen applied to Pope Gregory XIII, who in 1575 granted a regular pension of one hundred gold crowns a month, which continued to be paid down to the time of the French Revolution. Allen himself gave his whole salary as regius professor of divinity. The work of the college was not allowed to proceed without opposition, which at one time became so strong that Allen's life was in danger, and in 1578 the English were all expelled from Douai. The college was established temporarily at Reims; but possession was retained of the house at Douai, and in 1593 it was found possible to return there. By this time Allen had been called to reside in Rome, where he died 16 Oct., 1594. Under his successor, Dr. Richard Barrett, the work was extended to include a preparatory course in humanities, so that it became a school as well as a college. In 1603 under Dr. Worthington, the third president, a regular college was built, opposite the old parish church of St-Jacques, in the Rue des Morts, so called on account of the adjoining cemetery. The town at this time formed a single parish. In the eighteenth century it was divided into four parishes, and the present church of St-Jacques dates from that time.

The English College was the first to be opened in connexion with the university. The Collège d'Anchin was opened a few months later, endowed by the Abbot of the neighbouring monastery of Anchin, and entrusted to the Jesuits. In 1570, the Abbot of Marchiennes founded a college for the study of law. The Abbot of Saint-Vaast founded a college of that name. Later on, we find the College of St. Thomas Aquinas, belonging to the Dominicans, the Collège du Roi, and others. The remaining British establishments were all exclusively for ecclesiastics. The Irish College was originally a Spanish foundation. It was established before the end of the sixteenth century, and endowed with 5,000 florins a year by the King of Spain. The course of studies lasted six years and the students attended lectures at the university. The Scots' College has an unfortunate notoriety in consequence of the long dispute between the Jesuits and the secular clergy which centred round it in later times. It was established in 1594, not as a new foundation, but as the continuation of a secular college at Pont-à-Mousson in Lorraine, which, owing to the unhealthfulness of the site, had to seek a new home. In 1596, however, it moved again, and it was not till after several further migrations that it settled finally at Douai in 1612. The college was devoid of resources, and it was due to the zealous efforts of Father Parsons in Rome and Madrid, and of Father Creighton in France and Flanders, that numerous benefactions were given, and it was placed on a permanent footing. For this reason, the Jesuits afterwards claimed the property as their own, although it was admitted that in its early years secular clergy had been educated there. Appeals and counter-appeals were made, but the question was still unsettled when the Jesuits were expelled from France in 1764. The French Government, however, recognized the claims of the Scotch secular clergy and allowed them to continue the work of the college under a rector chosen from their own body. The Benedictine and Franciscan houses at Douai were near together and were both bound up in their history with the restoration of the respective orders in England. The Franciscan monastery was founded mainly through the instrumentality of Father John Gennings, the brother of the martyr. It was established in temporary quarters in 1618, the students for the time attending the Jesuit schools; but by 1621 they had built a monastery and provided for all necessary tuition within their own walls. The Benedictines began in 1605, in hired apartments belonging to the Collège d'Anchin, but a few years later, through the generosity of Abbot Caravel of the monastery of Saint-Vaast, they obtained land and built a monastery, which was opened in 1611. The house acquired a high reputation for learning, and many of the professors of the university were at different times chosen from among its members.

Returning now to the English College, we come upon the unfortunate disputes between the seculars and regulars in the seventeenth century. Dr. Worthington, though himself a secular priest, was under the influence of Father Parsons, and for a long time the students attended the Jesuit schools and all the spiritual direction was in the hands of the society. A visitation of the college, however, laid bare many shortcomings in its administration and in the end Worthington was deposed. His successor, Dr. Kellison (1631–1641), succeeded in restoring the reputation of the college, while he gradually arranged for the necessary tuition to be given within its walls. In the latter half of the seventeenth and the early years of the eighteenth century, the English College went through a troubled time. During the presidency of Dr. Hyde (1646–1651), the University of Douai claimed certain controlling rights over the college, which claim, however, he successfully withstood. His successor, Dr. George Leyburn (1652–1670), fell out with the "Old Chapter", in the absence of a bishop, governing the Church in England. He attacked one Mr. White (alias Blacklo), a prominent member of their body, and procured a condemnation of his writings by the University of Douai. In the end, however, he himself found it necessary to retire in favour of his nephew, Dr. John Leyburn, who was afterwards vicar Apostolic. Hardly was the dispute with the "Blackloists" (as they were called) finished, when a further storm of an even more serious nature arose, the centre being Dr. Hawarden who was professor of philosophy and then of theology at the English College for seventeen years. His reputation became so great that when a vacancy occurred in 1702 he was solicited by the bishop, the chief members of the university, and the magistrates of the town to accept the post of regius professor of divinity. His candidature, however, was opposed by a party headed by the vice-chancellor. The Jesuits also declared against him, accusing him, and through him the English College, of Jansenism. In the end, Dr. Hawarden retired from Douai and went on the mission in England; and a visitation of the college, made by order of the Holy See, resulted in completely clearing it of the imputation. In 1677, Douai was taken by Louis XIV, and since that date has been under French control, except for the short time that it was held by the English after the siege of the Duke of Marlborough in 1710; but it was retaken by the French the following year.

During the rest of the eighteenth century, there were no important political changes until the Revolution broke out. The hopes which the English Catholics had rested on the Stuart family had now vanished, and the only prospect open to them lay in their foreign centres of which Douai was the chief. To these centres they devoted the greater part of their energy. Under the presidency of Dr. Witham (1715–1738) who is considered a second founder, the English College at Douai was rebuilt on a substantial scale and rescued from overwhelming debt; it had lost nearly all its endowment in the notorious Mississippi scheme, or "South Sea Bubble". The Irish College was rebuilt about the middle of the century, and the English Benedictine monastery between 1776 and 1781. But all were destined to come to an end a few years after this, under the Reign of Terror.

As a town, Douai suffered less than many others at the beginning of the Revolution. The university kept up its Catholic character to the end, and it was one of the five typical Catholic universities to which Pitt appealed for an authoritative declaration as to the Catholic doctrine on the "deposing power" of the pope. During the Reign of Terror, however, it suffered the same fate as many similar establishments. When all the clergy of the town were called upon in 1791 to take the "Civic Oath", the members of the British establishments claimed exemption in virtue of their nationality. The plea was allowed for a time; but after the execution of Louis XVI, when war was declared between England and France, it was not to be expected that this immunity would continue. The superiors and students of most of the British establishments took flight and succeeded in reaching England. The members of the English College, with their president, Rev. John Daniel, remained in the hope of saving the college; but in October, 1793, they were taken to prison at Doullens in Picardy, together with six Anglo-Benedictine monks who had remained for a similar purpose. After undergoing many dangers and hardships, they were allowed to return to Douai in November, 1794, and a few months later, by the exertions of Dr. Stapleton, President of St. Omer (who with his students had likewise been imprisoned at Doullens), they were set at liberty and allowed to return to England. The English collegians never returned to Douai. The Penal Laws had recently been repealed, and they founded two colleges to continue the work of Douai—Crook Hall (afterwards removed to Ushaw)

in the North, and St. Edmund's, Old Hall, in the South. The Roman pension was divided equally between these two until the French occupied Rome in 1799, when it ceased to be paid. Both these colleges exist at the present day. After the Revolution, Bonaparte united all the British establishments in France under one administrator, Rev. Francis Walsh, an Irishman. On the restoration of the Bourbons, a large sum of money was paid to the English Government to indemnify those who had suffered by the Revolution; but none of this ever reached Catholic hands, for it was ruled that as the Catholic colleges were carried on in France for the sole reason that they were illegal in England, they must be considered French, not English, establishments. The buildings, however, were restored to their rightful owners, and most of them were sold. The Anglo-Benedictines alone retained their ancient monastery; and as the community of St. Gregory was then permanently established at Downside, they handed over their house at Douai to the community of St. Edmund, which had formerly been located in Paris. These Benedictines carried on a school at Douai until 1903, when in consequence of the Associations' Law passed by the Government they were forced to leave. They returned to England, and settled at Woolhampton, near Reading.

DODD, *Church History of England;* IDEM, ed. TIERNEY; R. C., *Hist. of Eng. Col., Douay*, ed. DODD (1713); BUTLER, *Reminiscences* (1822); KNOX, *Douay Diaries* (1878); IDEM, *Letters of Cardinal Allen* (1882); J. GILLOW, *Haydock Papers* (1888); H. GILLOW, *Chapels of Ushaw;* WARD, *History of St. Edmund's College* (1893); HUSENBETH, *Eng. Colleges and Convents on the Continent* (1849); CAMERON, *The Catholic Church in Scotland* (Glasgow, 1869); BOYLE, *Irish College in Paris* (1901); BIRT, *Downside* (1902); THADDEUS, *Franciscans in England* (1898); *Calendar of English Martyrs* (1876); DAUCOISNE, *Établissements Britanniques à Douai* (Douai, 1881); HANDECŒUR, *Histoire du Collège Anglais, Douai* (Reims, 1898); TAILLIAR, *Chroniques de Douai* (1875); *Catholic Magazine* (1831). Also many unpublished MSS. in the Westminster archives, and in those of the "Old Brotherhood" (formerly the "Old Chapter").

BERNARD WARD.

Douay Bible.—The original Douay Version, which is the foundation on which nearly all English Catholic versions are still based, owed its existence to the religious controversies of the sixteenth century. Many Protestant versions of the Scriptures had been issued and were used largely by the Reformers for polemical purposes. The rendering of some of the texts showed evident signs of controversial bias, and it became of the first importance for the English Catholics of the day to be furnished with a translation of their own, on the accuracy of which they could depend and to which they could appeal in the course of argument. The work of preparing such a version was undertaken by the members of the English College at Douai, in Flanders, founded by William Allen (afterwards cardinal) in 1568. The chief share of the translating was borne by Dr. Gregory Martin, formerly of St. John's College, Oxford. His text was revised by Thomas Worthington, Richard Bristowe, John Reynolds, and Allen himself—all of them Oxford men. A series of notes was added, designed to answer the theological arguments of the Reformers; these were prepared by Allen, assisted by Bristowe and Worthington.

The object of the work was, of course, not limited to controversial purposes; in the case of the New Testament, especially, it was meant for pious use among Catholics. The fact, however, that the primary end was controversial explains the course adopted by the translators. In the first place they translated directly, not from the original Hebrew or Greek, but from the Latin Vulgate of St. Jerome. This had been declared authoritative for Catholics by the Council of Trent; but it was also commonly admitted that the text was purer than in any manuscripts at that time extant in the original languages. Then, also, in the translation, many technical words were retained bodily, such as *pasch, parasceve, azymes*, etc. In some instances, also, where it was found difficult or impossible to find a suitable English equivalent for a Latin word, the latter was retained in an anglicized form. Thus in Phil., ii, 8, we get "He *exinanited* himself", and in Heb., ix, 28, "Christ was offered once to *exhaust* the sins of many". It was considered that an ordinary reader, finding the word unintelligible, would pause and inquire its meaning, and that this was preferable to satisfying him with an inadequate rendering. In other cases latinisms seem to have crept in unawares, as in Luke, x, 1, "Our Lord *designed* also other seventy-two"; or in Phil., ii, 10, "In the name of Jesus, every knee bow of the *celestials, terrestrials* and *infernals*". The proper names are usually (though not always) taken from the Vulgate; but the word *Dominus* is rendered throughout *Our* Lord. The general result was a version in cumbersome English, so full of latinisms as to be in places hardly readable, but withal scholarly and accurate.

In the year 1578, owing to political troubles, the college was temporarily transferred from Douai (which was then in the dominions of the King of Spain) to Reims, and during its sojourn there, in 1582, the New Testament was published, and became consequently known as the "Rheims Testament". It contained no episcopal imprimatur, but a recommendation was appended signed by four divines of the University of Reims. The Old Testament was delayed by want of means, until the whole Bible was eventually published in two quarto volumes, in 1609 and 1610, by which time the college had returned to Douai, and the recommendation was signed by three doctors of that university. Thus the New Testament appeared nearly thirty years before the Anglican "Authorized Version", and although not officially mentioned as one of the versions to be consulted, it is now commonly recognized to have had a large influence on the King James Version (see Preface to R. V., i, 2; also, Carleton, "Rheims and the English Bible"). The Reims Testament was reprinted twice at Antwerp—in 1600 and 1621—and a fourth edition was issued at Rouen in 1633. Then it was allowed to rest for over a century, before a fifth edition appeared, with some slight changes, dated 1728, but without any place of publication stated. It is believed to have been printed in London and was edited by Dr. Challoner (afterwards bishop), and Father Blyth, a Carmelite. The Douay Bible was never after this printed abroad. A sixth edition of the Reims Testament was printed at Liverpool in 1788, and a seventh dated Dublin, 1803, which was the last Catholic edition. Several Protestant editions have appeared, the best known being a curious work by Rev. William Fulke, first published in 1589, with the Reims text and that of the Bishops' Bible in parallel columns. A Protestant edition of the Reims Testament was also brought out by Leavitt of New York, in 1834.

Although the Bibles in use at the present day by the Catholics of England and Ireland are popularly styled the Douay Version, they are most improperly so called; they are founded, with more or less alteration, on a series of revisions undertaken by Bishop Challoner in 1749–52. His object was to meet the practical want felt by the Catholics of his day of a Bible moderate in size and price, in readable English, and with notes more suitable to the time. He brought out three editions of the New Testament, in 1749, 1750, and 1752 respectively, and one of the Old Testament in 1750. The changes introduced by him were so considerable that, according to Cardinal Newman, they "almost amounted to a new translation". So also, Cardinal Wiseman wrote, "To call it any longer the Douay or Rheimish Version is an abuse of terms. It has been altered and modified until scarcely any verse remains as it was originally published." In nearly every case Challoner's changes took the form of approximating to the Authorized Version, though his three editions of the New Testament differ from one another in numerous passages. The best known

Catholic Bible published in England in modern times is perhaps Haydock's, which was first issued at Manchester in fortnightly parts in 1811–12. The Irish editions are mostly known by the names of the bishops who gave the imprimatur: as Dr. Carpenter's New Testament (1783); Dr. Troy's Bible (1791); Dr. Murray's (1825); and Dr. Denvir's (1836)—the last two of which have often been reprinted, and circulate largely at the present day in England as well as in Ireland. Of late years the issue of the sixpenny New Testament by Burns and Oates of London has by its large circulation made the text adopted therein—Challoner's of 1749—the standard one, especially as the same is adopted in Dr. Murray's and Dr. Denvir's Bibles. In America an independent revision of the Douay Version by Archbishop Kenrick (1849–59) is much used.

COTTON, *Rheims and Douay* (Oxford, 1855), an exhaustive analysis of all the editions issued; WISEMAN, *Essays* (1853); NEWMAN, *Tracts Theol. and Eccles.* (1859); WESTCOTT, *Hist of the Eng. Bible* (1868); CARLETON, *Rheims and the Eng. Bible* (Oxford, 1902); WARD, *St. Luke* (1897), introduct.; *English Hexapla* (London); MILLIGAN in HASTINGS, *Dict. of the Bible*, IV, 858.

BERNARD WARD.

Doubt (Lat. *dubium*, Gr. ἀπορία, Fr. *doute*, Ger. *Zweifel*), a state in which the mind is suspended between two contradictory propositions and unable to assent to either of them. Any number of alternative propositions on the same subject may be in doubt at the same time; but, strictly speaking, the doubt is attached separately to each one, as between the proposition and its contradictory, i. e. each proposition may or may not be true. Doubt is opposed to *certitude*, or the adhesion of the mind to a proposition without misgiving as to its truth; and again to *opinion*, or a mental adhesion to a proposition together with such a misgiving. Doubt is either *positive* or *negative*. In the former case, the evidence for and against is so equally balanced as to render decision impossible; in the latter, the doubt arises from the absence of sufficient evidence on either side. It is thus possible that a doubt may be positive on the one side and negative on the other (positivo-negative or negativo-positive), i. e. in cases where evidence on one side only is attainable and does not, of itself, amount to absolute demonstration, as, for instance, in circumstantial evidence. Again, doubt may be either *theoretical* or *practical*. The former is concerned with abstract truth and error; the latter with questions of duty, or of the licitness of actions, or of mere expediency. A further distinction is made between doubt concerning the existence of a particular fact (*dubium facti*) and doubt in regard to a precept of law (*dubium juris*). *Prudent* doubts are distinguished from *imprudent*, according to the reasonableness or unreasonableness of the considerations on which the doubt is based. It should be observed that doubt is a purely subjective condition; i. e. it belongs only to the mind which has to judge of facts, and has no application to the facts themselves. A proposition or theory which is commonly called doubtful is, therefore, one as to which sufficient evidence to determine assent is not forthcoming; in itself it must be either true or false. Theories which have at one time been regarded as doubtful for want of sufficient evidence, frequently become certainly true or false by reason of the discovery of fresh evidence.

As certitude may be produced either by reason (which deals with evidence) or by faith (which rests on authority), it follows that theoretical doubt may be in like manner concerned with the subject-matter of either reason or faith, that is to say, with philosophy or with religion. Practical doubt is concerned with conduct; and since conduct must be guided by principles afforded by reason or by faith, or by both conjointly, doubt concerning it regards the application of principles already accepted under one or other of the foregoing heads. The resolution of doubt of this kind is the province of moral theology, in regard to questions of right and wrong; and in regard to those of mere practical expediency, recourse must be had to the scientific or other principles which properly belong to the subject-matter of the doubt. Thus, for example, doubt as to the actual occurrence of an historical event can only be resolved by consideration of the evidence; doubt as to the doctrine of the sacraments, by ascertaining what is of faith on the subject; doubt as to the morality of a commercial transaction, by the application of the authoritative decisions of moral theology; while the question of the wisdom or the reverse of the transaction in regard to profit and loss must be determined by commercial knowledge and experience. The legitimacy, or the reverse, of doubt in regard to matters of fact is made evident by the forms of logic (induction and deduction), which, whatever may be the extent of their function as a means of acquiring knowledge, are indispensably necessary as a test of the correctness of conclusions or hypotheses already formed.

DOUBT IN PHILOSOPHY.—The validity of human perception and reasoning in general as guides to objective truth has been frequently called in question. The doubt thus raised has been sometimes of the character called *methodic*, fictitious, or provisional, and sometimes *real*, or sceptical, as embodying the conclusion that objective truth cannot be known. Doubt of the former kind is the necessary preliminary to all inquiry, and in this sense philosophy is said by Aristotle (Metaph., III, i) to be "the art of doubting well". Sir W. Hamilton points out (Lect. on Metaphysics, v) that doubt, as a preliminary to philosophical inquiry, is the only means by which the necessary removal of prejudice may be effected; as the Baconian method insisted on the primary necessity of putting aside the "idols", or prejudices, by which men's minds are naturally influenced. Thus the Scholastic proof of a proposition or thesis begins by the statement of "doubts", or contrary arguments; after which the evidence for the thesis is given, and finally the doubts are resolved. This, it need hardly be said, is the method pursued in the "Summa" of Saint Thomas Aquinas and still in use in the formal disputations of theological students. An instance of this kind of doubt is the *Sic et Non* (Yes and No) of Abelard, which consists of a long series of propositions on theological, Scriptural, and philosophical subjects, with a counter-proposition attached to each. The solution of the doubts in the sense of the orthodox thesis, which was clearly intended to follow, was never written; or if so, has not been preserved. (See Victor Cousin's "Fragments Philosophiques".) The philosophical system of Descartes begins with a universal methodic doubt; the famous *cogito, ergo sum*, on which the whole system is based, is the solution of the philosopher's fundamental doubt of his own existence. This solution had been anticipated by St. Augustine, who took the subjective certainty of one's own existence as the ground of all certainty [e. g. "Tu, qui vis te nosse, scis esse te? Scio. Unde scis? Nescio. Cogitare te scis? Scio." (Sol., II, i); "Utrum aëris sit vis vivendi, an ignis, dubitaverunt homines; vivere se tamen et meminisse et intelligere et velle et cogitare et scire et judicare quis dubitet? Quandoquidem etiam si dubitet vivit; si dubitat, dubitare se intelligit" etc. (De Trin., X, xiv)]. In general it may be said that doubt, either expressed or implied, is involved in all intellectual research.

Among the systems in which doubt as to the trustworthiness of human faculties is not merely provisionally assumed, but is genuine and final, those which find in a supernatural revelation the guide to truth which natural reason fails to provide must be distinguished from those which hold doubt to be the final conclusion of all inquiry into truth. The former de-

preciate reason in the interests of faith; the latter take reason as the only possible guide, but find no ground for confidence in it. To the former class belongs Nicholas of Cusa (1440), who was the author of two sceptical treatises on human knowledge; certainty is to be found, according to his view, only through the mystical knowledge of God. The scepticism of Montaigne made a reservation (whether sincerely or not is uncertain) in favour of revealed truth; and the same principle was advocated by Charron, Sanchez, and Le Vayer. Hume, in his sceptical essays on miracles and immortality, also attributed a final authority to revelation; but with obvious insincerity. The sceptical views of Hobbes, combined with his peculiar theory of government, made all conviction, including that of religious truth, dependent on the civil authority. Glanvill's "The Vanity of Dogmatizing", or "Scepsis Scientifica", grounded a serious defence of revealed religion on the uncertainty of natural knowledge. Balfour's "Defence of Philosophic Doubt", based on the indemonstrability of ultimate truths, is an attempt in the same direction. (See FIDEISM.)

In the second class are to be reckoned the various systems of genuine scepticism. This appeared in Greek philosophy at a very early date. Heraclitus held the senses to be untrustworthy (*κακοὶ μάρτυρες*) and misleading, though he also conceived a supersensuous knowledge of the universal reason, immanent in the cosmos, to be attainable. Zeno of Elea defended the doctrine of the unity and permanence of being by propounding a series of "hypotheses", each of which resulted in a contradiction, and by means of them sought to demonstrate the unreality of the manifold and changing. The subjective principle of the Sophists (Protagoras, Gorgias, and others of less note) that "man is the measure of all things" implies doubt, or scepticism, as to all objective reality. Knowledge is resolved by Protagoras into mere variable opinion; and Gorgias asserts that nothing really exists, that if anything existed, it could not be known, and that if such knowledge were possible it would be incommunicable. The Pyrrhonists, or Sceptics, held everything in doubt, even the fact of doubting. The Middle Academics, whose chief representatives were Arcesilaus and Carneades, while doubting all knowledge, held, nevertheless, that probability could be recognized in varying degrees. The "Encyclopedia" of Diderot and d'Alembert comments on the odd self-contradiction of Montaigne, who claimed a higher degree of probability for the Pyrrhonist than for the Academic opinion. Sextus Empiricus advanced the theory, often since maintained, that the syllogism is really a *petitio principii*, and that demonstration is therefore impossible. Bayle, in his celebrated "Dictionary", subjected the philosophy of his time to severe destructive criticism, but was confessedly unable to supply its deficiencies. Hume's position was purely negative; for him, neither the existence of the external world nor that of the mind by which it is known was capable of demonstration; and the conclusion of Kant's "Critique of Pure Reason", that the "thing in itself" (*Ding an sich*) is unknowable though certainly existing, is evidently sceptical (though the author himself rejected the title), since it embodies a purely negative doubt as to the nature of "transcendent" reality. Kant's argument for the existence of God, as rationally indemonstrable, but postulated by the practical reason, necessarily results in a very limited conception of the Divine nature. Lamennais made general consent, or the common sense of mankind, the only ground of certitude; the individual reason he held to be incapable of attaining it. "Nothing is so evident to us to-day that we can be sure we shall not find it either doubtful or erroneous to-morrow" (Essai sur l'indifférence, II, xiii).

It may be observed that theories which deny the validity of simple experience as a guide to truth are really instances of doubt, because, though they assert dogmatically the inadequacy of widely accepted evidence, they are nevertheless in that state of suspense by which doubt is properly characterized in regard to the reality commonly held to be made known by experience. Thus the mental attitude which received from Professor Huxley the name of Agnosticism is a strictly doubtful one towards all that lies beyond sense-experience. The doubt is purely negative in this view; whatever is not cognizable by the aid of the senses is held to be unknowable; God may exist, or He may not, but we can neither affirm His existence nor deny it. Again, the system or method known as Pragmatism regards all reality as doubtful; truth is the correspondence of ideas with one another, and cannot be regarded as anything final, but must perpetually change with the progress of human thought; knowledge must be taken at its "face value" from moment to moment, as a practical guide to well-being, and must not be regarded as having any necessary correspondence with definite and permanent reality.

DOUBT IN REGARD TO RELIGION has at different times assumed a variety of forms. It is perhaps uncertain how far the ancient mythologies received or even demanded exact belief; it is at any rate certain that they were, as a rule, not considered worthy of serious attention by the philosophers of any school. The atheism which formed part of the charge on which Socrates was condemned was an offence against the State rather than against religion in itself (see Lecky, Hist. of European Morals, ii). The faith demanded by the Christian Revelation stands on a different footing from the belief claimed by any other religion. Since it rests on Divine authority, it implies an obligation to believe on the part of all to whom it is proposed; and faith being an act of the will as well as of the intellect, its refusal involves not merely intellectual error, but also some degree of moral perversity. It follows that doubt in regard to the Christian religion is equivalent to its total rejection, the ground of its acceptance being necessarily in every case the authority on which it is proposed, and not, as with philosophical or scientific doctrines, its intrinsic demonstrability in detail. Thus, whereas a philosophical or scientific opinion may be held provisionally and subject to an unresolved doubt, no such position can be held towards the doctrines of Christianity; their authority must be either accepted or rejected. The unconditional, interior assent which the Church demands to the Divine authority of revelation is incompatible with any doubt as to its validity. Gregory XVI, by the Brief "Dum acerbissimas", 26 Sept., 1835, condemned the teaching of Hermes that all theological inquiry should be based on positive doubt (Denzinger, 10th ed., no. 1619); and the Vatican Council declared (Sess. II, ch. xxxi): "revelata vera esse credimus, non propter intrinsecam rerum veritatem naturali rationis lumine perspectam, sed propter auctoritatem ipsius Dei revelantis, qui nec falli nec fallere potest", i. e. we believe the things that are revealed to be true, not because of an intrinsic truth which reason perceives, but because of the authority of God Who is the Author of Revelation, and Who can neither deceive nor be deceived.

Heresies have, however, generally had the character rather of dogmatic assertion than of mere doubt, though they arose from a more or less prevalent state of doubt as to doctrines imperfectly understood or not yet authoritatively defined. The devotion to classical studies which followed upon the fall of Constantinople in 1453 and the dispersion of its literary treasures gave rise to the humanism, or literary revival, of the Renaissance, and in many cases resulted in a sceptical attitude towards religion. This scepticism, however, was by no means universal among the Humanists, and was due rather to lack of interest in theological, as compared with literary and philosophical, study, than to any reasoned criticism of religious doctrine. (See

Pastor, "History of the Popes", chapters on the Renaissance.) It helped to prepare the way, however, for the Reformation, which, beginning with a revolt against ecclesiastical authority, called all the doctrines of Christianity in question, rejecting those which failed to gain the approval of the different leaders of the movement. Thus among Protestants in general there is great variety of opinion on religious doctrines, those which are firmly held by some being considered doubtful by others, and by others again, rejected as false. Anglicanism, especially, leaves open many of the tenets which the Catholic Church holds as of faith, and thus endeavours to comprehend within its boundaries persons who differ widely from one another on important subjects. The Catholic Church, on the other hand, pronounces authoritatively as to the truth or falsehood of opinions, by means of general councils, professions of faith, infallible decisions of the supreme pontiff, and the ordinary teaching of her pastors. As St. Avitus, in the sixth century, declared, "it is the law of the councils that if any doubt have arisen in matters which regard the state of the Church, we are to have recourse to the chief priest of the Roman Church" (Ep. xxxvi in P. L., LIX, 253). Doubt as to the Faith is thus impossible in the Catholic Church without infringing the principle of authority on which the Church itself depends. The field, however, which is open to a variety of opinions on questions not directly involving the essential doctrines of the Faith is still a very wide one; and though its extent may be further limited by future dogmatic decisions, it is probable on the other hand that it will be increased in the future, as in the past, by the emergence of doubtful questions as to the exact bearing of dogmatic truth upon fresh discoveries or theories of all kinds.

It will be evident from what has been said that doubt cannot coexist either with faith or knowledge in regard to any given subject; faith and doubt are mutually exclusive, and knowledge which is limited by a doubt, becomes, in regard to the subject or part of a subject to which the doubt applies, no longer knowledge but opinion. A moral certainty—that is, one which is founded on the normal course of human action—does not strictly exclude doubt, but, as excluding *prudent* doubt, must be considered a sufficient practical guide (cf. Butler, "Analogy of Religion", introduction, and pt. II, ch. vi). Thus doubt is sometimes said to imply belief; though such belief or practical certainty cannot properly be held to rise above the most probable kind of opinion. The rhetorical conception of the faith that "lives in honest doubt" (Tennyson, In Memoriam) must be taken to signify that truthful and serious habit of mind which refuses to submit to deception on motives furnished by intellectual sloth or the desire of worldly advantage. Catholic philosophy is entirely opposed both to the Pyrrhonist doubt of external reality and to that form of Idealism which is closely connected with the Kantian method on its sceptical side, and which seeks to reduce all dogma to the mere expression of subjective religious conceptions, relegating the objective facts with which dogma is concerned to the domain of symbol and parable. In the view of the Scholastic system, human experience is a true perception of external reality through the senses and the intellect; phenomena being the object both of the senses, which they directly affect, and, after a different manner, of the intellect, which apprehends through sensible impressions the true nature and principles of the reality which causes those impressions. The facts of revelation to which the Church bears witness are in this sense real and objective, and may neither be explained away nor set aside by any system of historical or scientific criticism. Such is the purport of the Encyclical "Pascendi Dominici gregis" (1907), which both controverts and condemns the attempt to evacuate dogma of its true significance made by the method of religious speculation known as Modernism.

PRACTICAL DOUBT, or doubt as to the lawfulness of an action is, according to the teaching of moral theology, incompatible with right action; since to act with a doubtful conscience is obviously to act in disregard of the moral law. To act with a doubtful conscience is, therefore, sinful; and the doubt must be removed before any action can be justified. It frequently happens, however, that the solution of a practical doubt is not attainable, while some decision is necessary. In such cases the conscience may obtain a "reflexive" certainty by adopting an approved opinion as to the lawfulness of the action contemplated, apart from the intrinsic merits of the question. The question has been much discussed among different schools of theologians whether the opinion so followed must be of greatly preponderating authority in favour of liberty in order to justify an action the lawfulness of which appears intrinsically doubtful, whether it must be merely more probable than the contrary one, or equally probable, or merely probable in itself, even though less so than its contrary. (See MORAL THEOLOGY; PROBABILISM.) The last, however, is the theory now generally accepted for all practical purposes; and the principle that *lex dubia non obligat*—i. e. that a law which is doubtful in its application to the case in hand does not bind—is universally admitted. It must be observed, however, that where the question is one not merely of positive law but of securing a certain practical result, only the "safer" course may be followed. No opinion, however probable, is allowed to take precedence of the most certain means of securing such ends; e. g. in providing for the validity of the sacraments, in discharging obligations of justice, or in avoiding injury to others. Thus doubtful baptisms and ordinations must be repeated conditionally. (See AGNOSTICISM; CERTITUDE; EPISTEMOLOGY; FAITH; HERESY; INFALLIBILITY; SCEPTICISM.)

For doubt in ancient philosophy see ZELLER, *Phil. der Griechen* (Tübingen, 1855–62); IDEM, *Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics*, tr. REICHEL (London, 1868); UEBERWEG, *History of Philosophy*, tr. MORRIS (New York, 1872). For doubt in Scholastic philosophy and moral theology: REINSTADLER, *Elementa Philosophiæ Scholasticæ* (Freiburg, 1904); LEHMKUHL, *Theol. Mor.* (Freiburg, 1903). General: NICHOLAS OF CUSA, *De Doctâ Ignorantiâ* and *De Conjecturis* in *Opera* (Basle, 1565; Ger. tr., Freiburg, 1871); BACON, *Novum Organum;* HOBBES, *Leviathan;* HUME, *Human Understanding* and *Essays;* MONTAIGNE, *Essais* (Paris, 1580; tr. London, 1603 and 1906); DESCARTES, *Principia Phil.* (Amsterdam, 1644); MALEBRANCHE, *Recherches de la vérité* (Paris, 1837); PASCAL, *Pensées;* BAYLE, *Dict. Hist. et Crit.* (Rotterdam, 1697; tr. London, 1738); KANT, *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* and *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft* (tr. London, 1844–8); GLANVILL, *Scepsis Scientifica* (London, 1665); LAMENNAIS, *Essai sur l'indifférence en matière de Religion* (Paris, 1827); VICTOR COUSIN, *Fragments Philosophiques* (Brussels, 1840); HAMILTON, *Lectures on Metaphysics* (Edinburgh, 1871), v; NEWMAN, *Grammar of Assent* (London, 1870); BALFOUR, *Defence of Philosophic Doubt* (London, 1879); HUXLEY, *Lectures and Essays* (1902); STEPHEN, *An Agnostic's Apology*, etc. (1904); JAMES, *Pragmatism* (1907); SCHILLER, *Humanism* (1903); IDEM, *Studies in Humanism* (1907); DEWEY, *Studies in Logical Theory* (1904); DIDEROT AND D'ALEMBERT, *Encyclopédie* (1755), s. v. *Doute;* BLUNT (Anglican), *Dict. of Theol.*, s. v. *Doubt;* KRUG, *Encyclopädisch-philosophisches Lexikon* (Leipzig, 1834), s. v. *Zweifel.*

A. B. SHARPE.

Douglas, GAVIN, Scottish prelate and poet, b. about 1474; d. 1522; he was the third son of Archibald, Fifth Earl of Angus, known as "Bell-the-Cat". Educated for the Church at the universities of St. Andrews and Paris, he held for some years a benefice in East Lothian, and during this period composed most of the poetical works which have made his name famous. In 1501 he became provost of the collegiate church of St. Giles, Edinburgh, and subsequently, through the influence of Queen Margaret, who had married his nephew, the young Earl of Angus, he obtained the abbacy of Arbroath and later the Bishopric of Dunkeld. The queen's efforts to have him promoted to the primacy were unsuccessful; and when the popular indignation at her marriage with

Angus resulted in her being deprived of the regency, Douglas was brought to trial by the new regent, the Duke of Albany, for intriguing with the queen to obtain ecclesiastical promotion without the consent of Parliament. He was imprisoned for a year in Edinburgh Castle, and after his release continued for a time in the administration of his diocese. When, however, Margaret separated from her husband and sided with Albany against the Douglasses, Gavin was deprived of his see. He fled to England in 1521 and was kindly received by Henry VIII, but he died of plague in the following year. He was buried in the Savoy Church in London.

It was unfortunate for Douglas's future reputation that his high birth and family connexions plunged him into the political turmoil of his time, and thus prematurely closed his career as a poet and scholar of the first order. His participation in the internal divisions by which Scotland was torn during most of his life ended, as far as he was concerned, in failure, exile, and death; and it is as a literary genius, rather than a churchman or a statesman, that he lives in Scottish history. It was during his quiet life as a country parson that he wrote the gorgeous allegory called the "Palice of Honour", whose wealth of illustration and poetical embellishments at once won renown for its author; and a little later he produced the translation of Virgil's "Æneid", which gives him his chief claim to literary immortality. The translation is a rather free adaptation of the Roman poet, written in the "Scottis" language then current, while to each book is prefixed an original prologue in verse. It was printed (for the third time) by the Bannatyne Club in 1839. Douglas wrote two other poems, "King Hart" and "Conscience", and translated also Ovid's "De Remedio Amoris". His complete works were first collected and published in Edinburgh (ed. Small), in 1874.

MYLNE, *Vitæ Episc. Dunkeld.* (Edinburgh, 1831); THOMSON AND ANNANDALE, *Hist. of the Scottish People*, I, 541–555; II, 46, 47; CHAMBERS, *Imperial Biography*, s. v. *Douglas;* LESLEY, *Hist. of Scotland*, 1436–1561 (ed. BANNATYNE), 116, 117 sqq.; LINDSAY OF PITSCOTTIE, *Chronicles of Scotland* (1814), II.

D. O. HUNTER-BLAIR.

Doukhobors. See RUSSIA.

Doutreleau, STEPHEN, missionary, b. in France, 11 Oct., 1693; date of death uncertain. He became a Jesuit novice at the age of twenty-two and migrated to Louisiana, U. S. A., with the Ursuline nuns in 1727. Soon after his arrival he was sent to the Illinois mission, for in 1728 he seems to have been at Post Vincennes, "the fort on the Wabash", which was established about that time. On 1 January, 1730, he set out for New Orleans on business connected with the mission. The Natchez Indians, only a few weeks before, had massacred all the inhabitants of the little French village of Natchez, and the Yazoos, a neighbouring Indian tribe, had followed their example. Two Jesuit missionaries perished in these uprisings. Ignorant of the state of the country and accompanied by four or five French *voyageurs*, Father Doutreleau landed at the mouth of the Yazoo River to offer up the Holy Sacrifice. The Indians attacked the little party killing one of the Frenchmen and wounding the missionary in the arm. Doutreleau escaped to his canoe with two of his companions and began their flight down the Mississippi. After many dangers they reached the French camp at Tonica Bay, where they were received with great kindness; their wounds were dressed and after a night's rest they proceeded unmolested to New Orleans. A journey of four hundred leagues through a hostile country had been accomplished. Shortly after, Father Doutreleau became chaplain of the French troops in Louisiana, and in this capacity accompanied them on one expedition. At his own request he was sent back to the Illinois Indians, but how long he remained is uncertain. He was at one time chaplain of the hospital at New Orleans. In 1747 he returned to France after labouring as a missionary in the Mississippi Valley for twenty years.

CHARLEVOIX, tr. SHEA, *History of New France* (New York, 1866–72), VI, 86, 88, 89; MARTIN in CARAYON, *Doc. Inédits.*, XIV, 23, 121, 128; KIP, *Early Jesuit Missions in N. Amer.* (New York, 1846), 289–292. GAYARRÉ, *Histoire de la Louisiane* (New Orleans, 1847), I, 247, 254; SHEA, *Catholic Missions among the Indian Tribes of the U. S.* (New York, 1855), 428, 430, 431; WINSOR, *Narrative and Critical History of America* (Boston, 1887), V, 45; THWAITES, ed. *Jesuit Relations* (Cleveland, 1901), LXXI, 169; LXVII, 342; LXIII; DUMONT, *Mémoires de la Louisiane*, II, 160–163; FRENCH, *Hist. Coll. of Louisiana.*

EDWARD P. SPILLANE.

Dove (Lat. *columba*).—In Christian antiquity the dove appears as a symbol and as a Eucharistic vessel. As a Christian symbol it is of very frequent occurrence in ancient ecclesiastical art. (1) As a symbol of the Holy Spirit it appears especially in representations of the baptism of Our Lord (Matt., iii, 16) and of Pentecost. St. Gregory the Great (590–604) is generally shown with a dove on his shoulder, symbolizing inspiration or rather Divine guidance. A dove of gold was hung up in the baptistery at Reims after the baptism of Clovis; in general the symbol occurs frequently in connexion with early representations of baptism. In ancient times a dove-like vessel was frequently suspended over the baptismal font and in that case was sometimes used to contain the holy oils (Aringhi, Roma Subterr., II, 326). (2) As a symbol of martyrdom it indicated the action of the Holy Spirit in bestowal of the fortitude necessary for the endurance of suffering. (3) As a symbol of the Church, the agent through which the Holy Spirit works on earth. When two doves appear the symbolism may represent, according to Macarius (Hagioglypta, 222), the Church of the circumcision and that of the Gentiles.

Clay Lamp from Cologne Showing Dove and Olive Branch

On a sarcophagus or on other funeral monuments the dove signifies (a) the peace of the departed soul, especially if, as is often the case in ancient examples, it bears an olive branch in its beak; (b) the hope of the Resurrection. In each case the symbolism is derived from the story of Noe and the Flood. Such is the meaning of the dove (*columbula, palumba sine felle*) in numerous epitaphs of the Roman catacombs. Occasionally funeral lamps were made in the shape of a dove. Two doves on a funeral monument sometimes signify the conjugal love and affection of the parties buried there. The dove in flight is the symbol of the Ascension of Christ or of the entry into glory of the martyrs and saints (cf. Ps. cxxiii, 7: "Our soul is escaped as a bird from the snare of the hunters, the snare is broken and we are delivered." In like manner the caged dove signifies the human soul yet imprisoned in the flesh and held captive during the period of mortal life. In general, the dove as a Christian emblem signifies the Holy Spirit either personally or in His works. It signifies also the Christian soul, not the human soul as such, but as indwelt by the Holy Spirit; especially, therefore, as freed from the toils of the flesh and entered into rest and glory.

AS A EUCHARISTIC VESSEL.—The reservation of the

Holy Eucharist for the use of the sick was, certainly since early medieval times, effected in many parts of Europe by means of a vessel in the form of a dove, suspended by chains to the baldachino and thus hung above the altar. Mention may be made here of the (two) doves occasionally represented in the Roman catacombs as drinking from a Eucharistic chalice (Schnyder, "Die Darstellungen des eucharist. Kelches auf altchr. Grabinschriften", in "Stromation Archæologicon", Rome, 1900, 97–118). The idea of the Eucharistic vessel was probably taken from the dove-like receptacle used at an early period in the baptisteries and often suspended above the fonts. These vessels were usually made of gold or silver. This was no doubt always the case if the vessel was designed to be the immediate holder of the Blessed Sacrament, since the principle that no base material ought to be used for this purpose is early and general. But when, as seems generally to have been the case in later times, the dove was only the outer vessel enshrining the pyx which itself contained the Blessed Sacrament, it came about that any material might be used which was itself suitable and dignified. Mabillon (Iter Ital., 217) tells us that he saw one at the monastery of Bobbio made of gilded leather, and one is shown to this day in the church of San Nazario at Milan which is enamelled on the outside and silver gilt within. The exact time at which such vessels first came into use is disputed, but it was certainly at some early date. Tertullian (C. Valentinian. cap. iii) speaks of the Church as *columbæ domus*, the house of the dove, and his words are sometimes quoted as exhibiting the use of such vessels in the third century. The reference, however, is clearly to the Holy Spirit. In the life of St. Basil, attributed to St. Amphilochius, is perhaps the earliest clear mention of the Eucharistic dove. "Cum panem divisisset in tres partes . . tertiam, positam super columbam auream, desuper sacrum altare suspendit" (When he had divided the bread into three pieces . . the third part placed in a golden dove, he suspended etc., Vita Bas., P. G., XXXIX). St. Chrysostom's expression concerning the Holy Eucharist, *convestitum Spiritu Sancto*, clothed with the Holy Spirit (Hom. xiii, ad pop. Antioch.), is generally taken to allude to this practice of reserving the Holy Eucharist in a dove, the emblem of the Holy Spirit. The same idea is expressed by Sedulius (Epist. xii) in the verses, "Sanctusque columbæ Spiritus in specie Christum vestivit honore"—"And the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove has robed Christ in honour".

The general, and certainly the earliest custom, both East and West, was to suspend the dove from the ciborium or baldachino. At a later period in some parts of the West, especially in Rome, a custom grew up of placing a tower of precious material upon the altar, and enclosing the dove with the Blessed Sacrament within this tower. Thus, in the "Liber Pontificalis" which contains ample records of the principal gifts made to the great basilicas in the fourth and succeeding centuries, we never find that the dove was presented without the tower as its complement. Thus in the life of Pope Hilary it is said that he presented to the baptistery at the Lateran *turrem argenteam . . . et columbam auream.* In the life of St. Sylvester (ibid.) Constantine is said to have given to the Vatican Basilica *pateram . . . cum turre et columba.* Innocent I (ibid.) gave to another church *turrem argenteam cum columba.*

Armellini, *Lezioni di Archeologia Cristiana* (Rome, 1898); Martigny, *Dict. des antiq. chrét.* (Paris, 1889); Tyrwhitt and Venables in *Dict. of Christ. Antiq.*, s. v.; Kaufmann, *Manuale di archeologia cristiana* (Rome, 1908), 280 and passim.

Arthur S. Barnes.

Dowdall, George, Archbishop of Armagh, b. at Drogheda, County Louth, Ireland, in 1487; d. at London, 15 August, 1558. He entered the Order of Crutched Friars, and was the last prior of their monastery at Ardee. On the suppression of the monastery by Henry VIII, in 1539, he received a pension of £20 a year. After the death of Primate Cromer, four years later, he was appointed to the See of Armagh by the king, but his appointment was not recognized by the pope. Dowdall acknowledged Henry VIII as supreme head of the Church on earth, and denounced the real primate, Robert Wauchope, to the Government. Though a schismatic, he nevertheless vigorously opposed the introduction of Protestantism into Ireland in the following reign and became the leader of the Catholic party. His opposition proving fruitless, he withdrew from public life in disgust and shortly afterwards retired to the Continent. On the death of Primate Wauchope, Dowdall, having renounced the schism, was appointed in 1553 by the pope to the very see of which he had been the schismatical archbishop. Ruling during nearly all the reign of Queen Mary, he exerted himself to repair the ravages to religion wrought in the preceding reigns. He held an important synod in Drogheda in 1554 in which decrees were passed against priests who had presumed to marry.

Stuart, ed. Coleman, *History of Armagh*, 142 sqq.; Ware, ed. Harris, *Bishops*, I, 91; *Cal. Doc. Ireland 1509–73*, 115; *Consistorial Archives*, Codex C; Brady, *Episcopal Succession*, s. v. *Ireland*, 217.

Ambrose Coleman.

Dowdall, James, martyr, date of birth unknown; executed for his faith at Exeter, England, 20 September, 1600. He was a merchant of Drogheda, Ireland, though several authorities, including Challoner, describe him as a native of Wexford. Further confusion is added by reason of the fact that another contemporary, James Dowdall, died a confessor. According to Rothe, however, the martyr belonged to Drogheda, and traded with England and the Continent. In the summer of 1598, when returning from France, his ship was driven by stress of weather onto the coast of Devonshire, and he was arrested by William Bourchier, Earl of Bath, who had him under examination. Dowdall publicly avowed that he rejected the queen's supremacy, and only recognized that of the Roman pontiff. The earl forwarded the examination to Sir Robert Cecil, and had Dowdall committed to Exeter jail. Whilst in prison he was tortured and put to the rack, but continued unchanged in his fidelity to the ancient faith. On 18 June, 1599, the Earl of Bath wrote to Sir Robert Cecil for instructions in regard to James Dowdall, who had been detained in prison almost a year. Accordingly he was tried at the Exeter assizes, and was ordered to be hanged, drawn, and quartered. His name is included in the Apostolic Process of the Irish Martyrs whose cause is at present (1908) before the Congregation of Sacred Rites.

Rothe, *Analecta* (Cologne, 1617–1619), Cardinal Moran ed. (Dublin, 1884); Bruodin, *Propugnaculum Cath. Veritatis* (Prague, 1669); Murphy, *Our Martyrs* (Dublin, 1896); *Calendar of the MSS. of the Marquis of Salisbury* (London, 1902).

W. H. Grattan-Flood.

Dower (Lat. *doarium;* Fr. *douaire*), a provision for support during life accorded by law to a wife surviving her husband. Being for the widow and being accorded by law, dower differs essentially from a conventional marriage portion such as the *dos* of the old Roman law, the French *dot*, or the English dowry. Dower is thought to have been suggested by the marriage gift which Tacitus found to be usual among the Germans. This gift he terms *dos*, but contrasts it with the *dos* of the Roman law, which was a gift on the part of the wife to the husband, while in Germany the gift was made by the husband to the wife (Larousse, Grand dictionnaire universel, Paris, 1870, s. v. Douaire). There was indeed in the Roman law what was termed *donatio propter nuptias*, a gift from the family of the husband, but this was only re-

quired if the *dos* were brought on the part of the wife. So too in the special instance of a widow (herself poor and undotated) of a husband rich at the time of his death, an ordinance of the Christian Emperor Justinian secured her the right to a part of her husband's property, of which no disposition of his could deprive her.

But the general establishment of the principle of dower in the customary law of Western Europe, according to Maine (Ancient Law, 3rd Amer. ed., New York, 1887, 218), is to be traced to the influence of the Church, and to be included perhaps among its most arduous triumphs. Dower is an outcome of the ecclesiastical practice of exacting from the husband at marriage a promise to endow his wife, a promise retained in form even now in the marriage ritual of the Established Church in England. (See Blackstone, "Commentaries on the Laws of England", II, 134, note p.) In an ordinance of King Philip Augustus of France (1214), and in the almost contemporaneous Magna Charta (1215), dower is referred to. But it seems to have already become customary law in Normandy, Sicily, and Naples, as well as in England. The object of both ordinance and charter was to regulate the amount of the dower where this was not the subject of voluntary arrangement, dower by English law consisting of a wife's life estate in one-third of the lands of the husband "of which any issue which she might have had might by possibility have been heir" (Blackstone, op. cit., 131).

During the pre-Reformation period, a man who became a monk and made his religious profession in England was deemed civilly dead, "dead in law" (Blackstone, op. cit., Bk. II, 121); consequently his heirs inherited his land forthwith as though he had died a natural, instead of a legal, death. Assignment of dower in his land would nevertheless be postponed until the natural death of such a religious. For only by his wife's consent could a married man be legally professed in religion. And she was not allowed by her consent to exchange her husband for dower. After the Reformation and the enactment of the English statute of 11 and 12 William III, prohibiting "papists" from inheriting or purchasing lands, a Roman Catholic widow was not held to be debarred of dower, for dower accruing by operation of law was deemed to be not within the prohibitions of the statute. By a curious disability of old English law a Jewess born in England would be debarred of dower in land which her husband, he having been an Englishman of the same faith and becoming converted after marriage, should purchase, if she herself remained unconverted.

There is judicial authority of the year 1310 for the proposition that dower was favoured by law (Year Books of Edward II, London, 1905, Vol. III, 189), and at a less remote period it was said to be with life and liberty one of three things which "the law favoreth". But an English statute of the year 1833 has impaired the inviolability of dower by empowering husbands to cut off by deed or will their wives from dower. It was the law of dower unimpaired by statute, which according to the American commentator, Chancellor Kent, has been "with some modifications everywhere adopted as part of the municipal jurisprudence of the United States" (Commentaries on American Law, IV, 36). But while the marriage portion, *dot*, is, yet dower is not, known to the law of Louisiana, and it has now been expressly abolished in some other States and in some territories. The instances of legislative modifications are numerous and important.

Of dower (*douaire*) as it existed in the old French law no trace is to be found in the existing law of France. But brought to Canada from the mother country in pre-Revolutionary times, customary dower accruing by operation of law is yet recognized in the law of the former French Province of Quebec. The civil death which by English law seems to have applied to men only, might be by the French law incurred by women taking perpetual religious vows. A widow, therefore, thus entering into religion, would lose her dower, although in some regions she was allowed to retain a moderate income. (See Larousse, op. cit.) And now by the law of Quebec a widow joining certain religious orders of the province is deemed civilly dead and undoubtedly would suffer loss of dower.

MAINE, *Lectures on the Early History of Institutions* (6th ed., London, 1893), 319, 336, 337; MACKELDEY, *Handbook of the Roman Law*, tr. DROPSIE (Philadelphia, 1883), §§ 572, 679; GLASSON in *La Grande Encycl.*, s. v. *Douaire;* STEPHEN, *New Commentaries on the Laws of England* (14th ed., London, 1903), 153, 155, 157, 159; HOWARD, *Several special cases on the laws against the further growth of 'Popery' in Ireland (some cases on the English statute, etc.)* (Dublin, 1775), 303; PARK, *A Treatise on the Law of Dower* (Philadelphia, 1836), 249; CRABBE, *Law of Real Property* (Philadelphia, 1846), II, 85; SCRIBNER, *A Treatise on the Law of Dower* (2nd ed., Philadelphia, 1883), 14–58; BEAUCHAMP, *The Civil Code of the Province of Quebec* (Montreal, 1905), §§ 1431, 1434, 1462, note to § 34.

CHARLES W. SLOANE.

Dower, RELIGIOUS (Lat. *dos religiosa*).—Because of its analogy with the dower that a woman brings to her husband when she marries, the name "religious dower" has been given to the sum of money or the property that a religious woman, or nun (*religiosa*), brings, for her maintenance, into the convent where she desires to make her profession. It is not a question here of the more or less generous donations made by the young woman or her family either to the convent or to some of the good works that it carries on, nor of the amount paid in for the support of the postulant or novice until the time of her profession, but of a sum (usually a fixed one) set apart for the support of a religious who, by her profession, has become a member of the community.

The custom of religious dower was not in vogue in the ancient Church. Introduced occasionally for nuns under solemn vows (the only vows that existed in ancient times), it became gradually the rule in all communities, particularly in congregations under simple vows, these being now the most numerous. According to common ecclesiastical law, every convent had formerly to be provided, at the time of its foundation, with the resources necessary for the maintenance of a fixed number of nuns, not less than twelve. These were received gratuitously and without dower and, although in no wise prohibited from presenting the monastery with a portion of their property, were supported out of the revenue assigned to the monastery for this purpose. That is why the Council of Trent (Sess. XXV, c. iii, De regul.) established in this regard the following rule: "Let only such a number [of religious] be determined, and henceforth maintained, as can be fittingly supported, either by the proper revenue [of each house] or by the customary alms" [in the case of mendicant orders]. The determination of this number belongs to the bishop, who, if there be occasion, will act together with the regular superior (Gregory XIII, Constitution, Deo sacris, 15 Dec., 1572). The Council of Trent does not speak of religious dower. However, from the end of the sixteenth century the prescription relative to the fixed number of religious had fallen into desuetude, and the dower came into use; and this for two reasons. The first was the acceptance of "supernumerary" religious, that is of a larger number than the resources of the convent warranted; hence it was but just that the amount required for their maintenance should be demanded of them. The second reason lay in the decrease of the resources of the ancient convents and in the absence of property for the many new houses founded towards the end of the sixteenth century. An evidence of the simultaneous existence of these two causes is found in the general decree of the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, 6

Sept., 1604 (in Bizzarri, Collectanea, 269), ordaining that the supernumerary religious should deposit a dower equal to twice that of the others and amounting to at least 400 *écus* (about $400). This was the minimum, and each house was to set its own figure, to be regulated according to circumstances. Though deposited at the time of receiving the habit, the convent did not acquire possession of the dower until the ceremony of profession, and if the novice left before being professed, it was restored to her (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. XXV, cap. xvi). Dispensation from solemn vows was, it may almost be said, unknown, and the obligatory restitution of dower had not been provided for in the case of a religious leaving her community; it was the result of equity rather than of law. But since the decree "Perpensis" of 3 May, 1902, which requires of all religious under solemn vows a probationary period of three years under simple vows, this restitution has become a rule. Article X says: "The dower established for each monastery should be deposited before the profession of simple vows"; and Article XII continues: "If a sister who has professed simple vows retires from the monastery, either after being dispensed from her vows by the Holy See or after sentence of dismissal (before the solemn vows), the capital of her dower is to be restored to her, but not the interest."

Such is also the general rule for congregations under simple vows. Stipulations concerning the dower are very clearly set forth in the "Normæ", rules in use by the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars for the approbation of religious under simple vows, published 28 June, 1901, ch. vii, articles 91–94. Each congregation of nuns should settle in its statutes the dower, equal in all cases, for the choir religious; it should even establish a lesser dower (but the same for each one) to be deposited by the lay, or assistant, sisters. The superior cannot receive a religious without a dower or with an insufficient dower, except by permission of the bishop, if the congregation be diocesan, or by that of the Congregation of Religious, if the institute be approved by Rome. The required dower must be duly pledged to the congregation prior to the taking of the habit and must be deposited shortly before the profession. Thus deposited, such a dower cannot be alienated, that is, it cannot be used by the congregation in whatever way it may deem fit, as, for instance, to meet building expenses or discharge debts, but must be prudently and advantageously invested. Even though the funds be administered by the mother-house or the provincial, the income from each dower must be given to the house where the religious resides who brought in that dower. Although no longer the property of the nun, the dower becomes entirely the property of the institute only at the death of the subject, for whom, until then, it must remain set apart, so that, should a religious withdraw from a community either on the expiration of her temporary vows, or after a dispensation, or finally on account of dismissal, the capital of her dower must be restored to her.

FERRARIS, *Prompta Bibliotheca*, s. v. *Moniales*, art. 11; BATTANDIER, *Guide canonique pour les constitutions des sœurs à vœux simples* (Paris, 1905), nos. 135–140; BASTIEN, *Directoire canonique à l'usage des congrégations à vœux simples* (Maredsous, 1904), nos. 109–114, 198, 214; PRÜMMER, *Manuale juris ecclesiastici* (Freiburg im Br., 1907), II, 43.

A. BOUDINHON.

Dowling, JOSEPH THOMAS. See HAMILTON, DIOCESE OF.

Down and Connor, DIOCESE OF (DUNENSIS ET CONNORENSIS), in Ireland. A line drawn from Whitehouse on Belfast Lough due west to the Clady River, thence by the river itself to Muckamore and Lough Neagh, marks the boundary between the Diocese of Down and the Diocese of Connor. North of this line to the [illegible] and the Bann, including the greater part of the County Antrim and a small portion of Derry, is the Diocese of Connor. South of the line, the remainder of Antrim, except the parish of Aghalee, belonging to Dromore, belongs to the Diocese of Down, as also the whole of the County Down, except the baronies of Iveagh and part of Kinelearty. The extent of the united dioceses is 597,450 Irish acres (about 576 sq. miles).

Each diocese was a collection of ancient sees. Within the limits of Down, and founded in St. Patrick's time, there were: Raholp, founded by St. Tassach, Gortgrib by Vinoch, Bright by Loarn, Mahee Island by St. Mochay, Maghera by St. Donard. There were also: Moville, founded by St. Finnian, and Bangor by St. Comgall, the latter an abbey, but often ruled in aftertimes by a bishop. St. Fergus is named as first Bishop of Down. In ancient times the place was called Dun Celtair, Celtair being one of the Red Branch knights. Afterwards it was called Dun-da-Leth-Glaisse, "the fort of the two half-chains". According to tradition two young chiefs had long pined in King Laeghaire's prison. St. Patrick miraculously struck off the chain which bound them, and the prisoners, thus

CHURCH OF COLERAINE, KILLOWEN

released, hastened to their father's residence at Dun Celtair, flinging from them the pieces of the severed chain; hence the new name. A further change occurred after St. Patrick's death. Dying at Saul (493), he was buried at Down, which then contained no church. Subsequently the remains of St. Brigid were brought there from Kildare, as were some relics of St. Columba from Iona. Meanwhile the ancient Dun Celtair had become Downpatrick, a town overshadowing all the neighbouring towns, the capital also of the Diocese of Down, which in process of time absorbed all the surrounding sees.

Like Down, Connor, founded in 480 by St. Macnisse, was a collection of smaller sees. These were Kilroot, Drumtullagh, Culfeightrim, Coleraine, Inispollen, Armoy, and Rashee. The date of the founding of each of these sees is uncertain, as also the dates of their absorption; nor can a regular succession of bishops be discovered. By the twelfth century all the sees had ceased to exist except Connor. Its western boundary then was the Roe; but by the Synod of Rath-Breasail (1118), when the number and limits of the Irish dioceses were fixed, the Bann was made the western boundary of Connor, and Down was joined to it, but only for a brief period. In 1124 St. Malachy became Bishop of Connor, which was separated from Down. The two dioceses were again united in 1134, when Malachy became Archbishop of Armagh; but when he resigned the primacy, in 1137, he became Bishop of Down, again dividing the two sees. This separation was recognized by the Synod of Kells (1152), and continued till 1441, when John Cely, Bishop of Down, was deprived for having violated his vow of chastity. Meanwhile the annals record the death of many distinguished men, bishops and others, connected with

both dioceses. It is further recorded that in 831 Connor was plundered by the Danes, and Down in 942; that in 1177 Downpatrick was captured by John de Courcy, who imprisoned the bishop; that in 1183 de Courcy turned the secular canons out of the cathedral and replaced them by Benedictine monks from Chester; that in 1186 the relics of St. Patrick, St. Brigid, and St. Columba were discovered there and reinterred in the church with great solemnity; that in 1315 a great battle was fought at Connor; and that the whole extent of the two dioceses suffered grievously during the invasion of Edward Bruce.

The primate John Prene resisted the union of Down with Connor in 1441, and it did not finally take effect till 1451. Since that date both dioceses, recognized as one, have remained under the rule of one bishop. During the troubled times of the Reformation and the wars of the O'Neills, the Ulster counties suffered much, though the old Faith was still maintained. But the plantation of Ulster replaced the greater number of the Catholics by English Protestants and Scotch Presbyterians. Later on, in the contests of the seventeenth century, the tide of war frequently rolled over Antrim and Down, with consequent destruction of Catholic property. The penal laws followed; and such was the combined effect of plantation and proscription that in 1670 in the whole of Down and Connor there were but 2500 Catholic families. For nearly sixty years subsequently the diocese was ruled by vicars. When at length the pressure of penal legislation was removed Catholicism revived rapidly. In the period from 1810 to 1840 no less than forty new Catholic churches were built. The progress thus made under Dr. Crolly (1825–1835) and Dr. Denvir (1835–65) was continued under Dr. Dorrian (1865–86) and Dr. MacAlister (1886–95); nor did any of his predecessors show greater energy and zeal than Dr. Henry, whose death occurred with such tragic suddenness early in 1908. During the nineteenth century splendid churches were built at Newtownards, Hollywood, Ballymoney, and Belfast, and on every side visible signs of Catholic progress appeared.

St. Patrick's Church, Downpatrick

This prosperity is largely due to the rapid growth of Belfast. Situated on the shores of Belfast Lough, its site was occupied in the sixteenth century only by a strong castle, then in the hands of the O'Neills of Clannaboy. From them it passed at the close of the century to the British Government, and in 1603 the castle and land adjoining were granted by King James to Sir Arthur Chichester. He laid out and planted a small town, which, in 1613, was made a corporation by royal charter. Its growth was slow, and during the seventeenth century it was entirely overshadowed by the neighbouring town of Carrickfergus. About 1700, Belfast had a population of 2000, and a good deal of trade; in 1757 a population of 8000. Henceforth its rise was rapid and continuous. Its population in 1871 was 174,000; in 1881, 208,122; in 1891, 255,950; in 1901, with an enlarged city area, 348,876. It sends four members to Parliament, and is ruled by a lord mayor, fifteen aldermen, and forty-five councillors. In commerce and shipping, in trade and manufactures, it is the first city in Ireland. Catholicism has more than kept pace with the general advance of the city. In 1708 there were but seven Catholics in Belfast, and not till 1783 was there a Catholic church. Belfast is now the episcopal seat, with ten city parishes, a flourishing diocesan seminary, and many educational and charitable institutions. Among the remarkable men of the diocese the following may be mentioned: St. Macnisse, the patron saint of Connor, and St. Malachy, the patron saint of Down; St. Tassach, who attended St. Patrick in his last illness; St. Comgall, who founded the monastery of Bangor; St. Finnian, founder of Moville; St. Colman Ela, founder of Muckamore in Antrim; St. Mochay, Bishop of Nendrum; St. Donard, Bishop of Maghera; St. Dochona, Bishop of Connor. In the sixteenth century the notorious Miler Magrath was Bishop of Down and Connor; and in the next century the martyred Cornelius O'Devanny, and the fighting bishop, Heber MacMahon, who also met a martyr's fate.—Statistics (1908): Parishes, 60; secular clergy, 167; regular clergy, 21; churches, 114; colleges, 2; monasteries, 5; convents, 16; total Catholic population (1901), 156,693; total population of all creeds, 671,266.

St. Patrick's Cathedral, Belfast (1811)

O'Laverty, *A Historical Account of the Diocese of Down and Connor* (Dublin, 1878–95); Reeves, *Ecclesiastical Antiquities of Down, Connor and Dromore* (Dublin, 1847); Brady, *Episcopal Succession* (Rome, 1876); Lanigan, *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland* (Dublin, 1822); Healy, *Life and Writings of St. Patrick* (Dublin, 1905); Meehan, *Irish Hierarchy* (Dublin, 1872); Benn, *History of Belfast* (London, 1877–80); *Irish Catholic Directories.*

E. A. D'Alton.

Downes (*alias* Bedingfeld, Mountford and Mumford), Thomas, son of Thomas Downes of Bodney in Norfolk, b. in 1617; d. 21 December, 1678. His mother was Mary, daughter of John Bedingfeld of Redlingfield in Suffolk. He was educated at St. Omer, but completed his studies at the English College at Valladolid, and entered the Society of Jesus, 8 January, 1639. From the novitiate he passed to the college of the English Province at Liège, but went for his theology to Pont-à-Mousson and was professed of the four vows 16 January, 1656. In 1671 he was chaplain to the Duke of York, afterwards James II. When the duke as admiral of the fleet put to sea against the Dutch he asked for "Father Mumford" as confessor on board his flagship. During an encounter between the two fleets Father Downes won for himself a great reputation by exposing himself for many hours to a heavy fire while ministering to the wounded and dying. In 1678 he fell a victim to the infamous Oates conspiracy by means of forged letters delivered to him at Windsor but intended to be intercepted, and purporting to have been written by the provincial and Fathers of the Society. He handed the letters to the Duke of York who showed them to the king. The

latter was convinced of the fraud, and testified openly to Father Downes's innocence, but was unable to protect him from the malice of the plotters who succeeded in getting him arrested and sent to the Gatehouse prison where he died.

CARTHEW, *Hundred of Launditch*, Pt. II, 720; FOLEY, *Records of the English Province*, I, 274; V, 251 sq.; VII, 208 and 891; CHALLONER, *Memoirs of Missionary Priests* (1742), II, 405; OLIVER, *Collectanea; Valladolid MS. Diary;* GILLOW *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v. *Montfort.*

J. M. STONE.

Downside Abbey, near Bath, Somersetshire, England, was founded at Douai, Flanders, under the patronage of St. Gregory the Great, in 1605 by the Venerable John Roberts, first prior, and some other English monks who had received the habit and taken vows in the Spanish Benedictine Congregation. In 1611 Dom Philip de Caverel, Abbot of Saint Vaast's at Arras, built a monastery for the community in Douai, and consequently is revered as its founder. For some years the foundation was embroiled in attacks from without, and also in disputes as to a union with other English Benedictines, all of which were settled in 1633 by the Bull "Plantata" of Urban VIII.

CHAPEL OF ST. ISIDORE, DOWNSIDE ABBEY

From the first a school or college for lay pupils, sons of English Catholic gentry, has been an integral part of the institution. This undertaking, conducted on traditional English public school lines, has always absorbed much of the energies of the community, whose other chief external work has consisted in supplying various missions or parishes in England. When Charles II established for his queen a Catholic chapel royal at St. James's palace, the community to serve it was supplied from St. Gregory's at Douai, and certain relics and church-plate then presented are still in existence at Downside. On the outbreak of the French Revolution the school was disbanded and the monks put in prison, where they remained nearly two years. At length in March, 1795, they were allowed to proceed to England where an asylum was supplied by Sir Edward Smythe, fifth Baronet, a former pupil, who lent his Shropshire seat of Acton Burnell to his old masters for use as a monastery and school. In 1814 the establishment was moved to Mount Pleasant, Downside, a small manor-house with sixty-six acres of land, bought for £7000, largely the savings of the economy of the previous nineteen years. In 1823 Dr. Baines, Vicar Apostolic of the Western District, proposed to the community that they should abandon the monastic state and become a kind of diocesan seminary under himself. This extraordinary suggestion being rejected, the bishop applied to the Holy See for the suppression of the monastery on the ground of some alleged flaw in its canonical erection; after much litigation the pope decided in favour of the monks on every point. Since then the establishment has increased steadily in size and importance, new buildings being added in 1823, 1853, and almost continually since 1870. In 1899 Pope Leo XIII raised the priory to abbatial rank, the forty-fifth prior, Dom Edmund Ford, being elected first abbot, on whose resignation in 1906, Dom Cuthbert Butler was chosen to succeed him.

DOWNSIDE ABBEY.
(From the South-east)

Six monks of St. Gregory's have died martyrs for the Catholic Faith and are already pronounced Venerable, viz. Dom George Gervaise, martyred 1608; Dom John Roberts, the first prior, 1610; Dom Maurus Scot, 1612; Dom Ambrose Barlow, 1641; Dom Philip Powell, 1646; and Brother Thomas Pickering, 1679. Besides these the community has given to the Church three archbishops, Dom Bede Polding and Dom Bede Vaughan, the first two archbishops of Sydney, New South Wales; and Dom Bernard Ullathorne, first Bishop of Birmingham and titular Archbishop of Cabasa, well known as an ascetical writer. Also six bishops, Dom Philip Ellis, Dom Laurence York, and Dom Gregory Sharrock, all three successively Vicars Apostolic of the Western District; more recently, Dom Placid Morris, Vicar Apostolic of Mauritius and for many years assistant to Cardinal Wiseman; Dom Joseph Brown, first Bishop of Newport and Menevia; and Dom Henry Davis, Bishop of Maitland, New South Wales. From many other notable names may be mentioned Dom Serenus Cressy, author of the "Church History of Brittany"; Dom John Huddlestone, who was instrumental in saving Charles II after Worcester and reconciled him to the Church on his death-bed; the Abbot Sweeney, the well-known preacher; Dom Jerome Vaughan, founder of the Abbey of Fort Augustus, N. B.; Dom Aidan Gasquet the historian, Abbot President of the English Benedictines and also head of the Pontifical Commission for the revision of the Vulgate. Among the alumni of St. Gregory's School, though not monks in the community, were Bishop Charles Walmesley, who consecrated Dr. Carroll the first Bishop of Baltimore, U. S. A.; John Steevens, editor of Dugdale's "Monasticon"; Henry Carey, author of "God save the King"; Sir John Day, one of the best known English judges; and Bishop Patrick J. Donahue, of Wheeling, U. S. A.

The abbey buildings now consist of a monastery for about fifty monks; school buildings for 1340 boarders; guest-house, the original building bought in 1814; and the abbey church, for exterior view of which see THE

CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA, I, 14. The last-named building consists at present of transepts, choir, and fifteen side chapels only; it is 230 feet long, and 70 feet high internally. Even in its unfinished state it ranks as one of the finest modern Gothic buildings in England, and contains the tomb of the Irish martyr, Venerable Oliver Plunket, Archbishop of Armagh. The community numbers eighty-four choir monks; there are no lay brothers. About half the monks work on the twenty-two missions or parishes in various parts of England which are dependent on the abbey. Besides the school attached to the monastery, Downside has two other schools, at Ealing, London, W, and at Gorey, Co. Wexford, Ireland; a house of studies for its monks at Cambridge University and another for students in London, near the British Museum. The "Downside Review", a periodical now in its twenty-eighth year, devoted chiefly to local, monastic, and liturgical interests, and in which are many articles of value, is published every four months. The "Downside Masses" and "Downside Motets" indicate the abbey's interest in the revival of polyphonic music; a similar interest in Christian art being shown in the "Downside Prints", a series of small devotional pictures reproduced from ancient masters. Attached to the abbey are the titular Abbacies of Glastonbury and St. Alban's, and the cathedral priories of Canterbury, Bath, Coventry, and Norwich. The arms of Downside are: Or a cross moline gules; the abbot's seal bears an effigy of Bl. Richard Whiting, martyr, the last abbot of the neighbouring Abbey of Glastonbury.

WELDON, *Chronological Notes on English Congregation O. S. B.* (privately printed, Worcester, 1881); TAUNTON, *English Black Monks of St. Benedict* (London, 1897), II; BIRT, *Downside* (London, 1902); SNOW, *Necrology of English Benedictines* (London, 1883); *Sketches of Old Downside* (London, 1903); HUDLESTON, *Guide to Downside Abbey Church* (London, 1905); Illustrated articles in *Christian Art*, I, 135; *Architectural Review*, XXIII, 40; *Downside Review*, I—XXVIII, many articles passim.

G. ROGER HUDLESTON.

Doxology.—In general this word means a short verse praising God and beginning, as a rule, with the Greek word Δόξα. The custom of ending a rite or a hymn with such a formula comes from the Synagogue (cf. the Prayer of Manasses: *tibi est gloria in sæcula sæculorum. Amen*). St. Paul uses doxologies constantly (Rom., xi, 36; Gal., i, 5; Eph., iii, 21; etc.). These earliest examples are addressed to God the Father alone, or to Him *through* (διὰ) the Son (Rom., xvi, 27; Jude, 25; I Clem., xli; Mart. Polyc., xx; etc.) and *in* (ἐν) or *with* (σὺν, μετὰ) the Holy Ghost (Mart. Polyc., xiv, xxii, etc.). The form of baptism (Matt., xxviii, 19) had set an example of naming the three Persons in parallel order. Especially in the fourth century, as a protest against Arian subordination (since heretics appealed to these prepositions; cf. St. Basil, "De Spir. Sancto", ii–v), the custom of using the form: "Glory to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost", became universal among Catholics. From this time we must distinguish two doxologies, a greater (*doxologia maior*) and a shorter (*minor*). The greater doxology is the Gloria in Excelsis Deo (q.v.) in the Mass. The shorter form, which is the one generally referred to under the name "doxology", is the Gloria Patri. It is continued by an answer to the effect that this glory shall last for ever. The form, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, is very common in the first centuries (Rom., xvi, 27; Gal., i, 5; I Tim., i, 17; Heb., xiii, 21; I Peter, iv, 11; I Clem., xx, xxxii, xxxviii, xliii, xlv, etc.; Mart. Polyc., xxii, etc.). It is a common Hebraism (Tob., xiii, 23; Ps. lxxxiii, 5; repeatedly in the Apocalypse: i, 6, 18; xiv, 11; xix, 3; etc.) meaning simply "for ever". The simple form, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, is also common (Rom., xi, 36; Doctr. XII Apost., ix, x; in the Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions, *passim*). Parallel formulæ are: εἰς τοὺς μέλλοντας αἰῶνας (Mart. Polyc., xiv); ἀπὸ γενεᾶς εἰς γενεάν (ibid.); etc. This expression was soon enlarged into: "now and ever and in ages of ages" (cf. Heb., xiii, 8; Mart. Polyc., xiv, etc.). In this form it occurs constantly at the end of prayers in the Greek Liturgy of St. James (Brightman, Eastern Liturgies, pp. 31, 32, 33, 34, 41, etc.). and in all the Eastern rites. The Greek form then became: Δόξα πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ καὶ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, καὶ νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν. In this shape it is used in the Eastern Churches at various points of the Liturgy (e. g. in St. Chrysostom's Rite; see Brightman, pp. 354, 364, etc.) and as the last two verses of psalms, though not so invariably as with us. The second part is occasionally slightly modified and other verses are sometimes introduced between the two halves. In the Latin Rite it seems originally to have had exactly the same form as in the East. In 529 the Second Synod of Vasio (Vaison in the province of Avignon) says that the additional words, *Sicut erat in principio*, are used in Rome, the East, and Africa as a protest against Arianism, and orders them to be said likewise in Gaul (can. v.). As far as the East is concerned the synod is mistaken. These words have never been used in any Eastern rite and the Greeks complained of their use in the West [Walafrid Strabo (ninth century), De rebus eccl., xxv]. The explanation that *sicut erat in principio* was meant as a denial of Arianism leads to a question whose answer is less obvious than it seems. To what do the words refer? Everyone now understands *gloria* as the subject of *erat:* "As it [the glory] was in the beginning", etc. It seems, however, that originally they were meant to refer to *Filius*, and that the meaning of the second part, in the West at any rate, was: "As He [the Son] was in the beginning, so is He now and so shall He be for ever." The *in principio*, then, is a clear allusion to the first words of the Fourth Gospel, and so the sentence is obviously directed against Arianism. There are medieval German versions in the form: "Als *er* war im Anfang".

The doxology in the form in which we know it has been used since about the seventh century all over Western Christendom, except in one corner. In the Mozarabic Rite the formula is: "Gloria et honor Patri et Filio et Spiritui sancto in sæcula sæculorum" (so in the Missal of this rite; see P. L., LXXXV, 109, 119, etc.). The Fourth Synod of Toledo in 633 ordered this form (can. xv). A common medieval tradition, founded on a spurious letter of St. Jerome (in the Benedictine edition, Paris, 1706, V, 415) says that Pope Damasus (366-384) introduced the Gloria Patri at the end of psalms. Cassian (died c. 435) speaks of this as a special custom of the Western Church (De instit. cœn., II, viii). The use of the shorter doxology in the Latin Church is this: the two parts are always said or sung as a verse with response. They occur always at the end of psalms (when several psalms are joined together as one, as the sixty-second and sixty-sixth and again the one hundred and forty-eighth, one hundred and forty-ninth and one hundred and fiftieth at Lauds, the Gloria Patri occurs once only at the end of the group; on the other hand each group of sixteen verses of the one hundred and eighteenth psalm in the day Hours has the Gloria) except on occasions of mourning. For this reason (since the shorter doxology, like the greater one, Gloria in Excelsis Deo, is naturally a joyful chant) it is left out on the last three days of Holy Week; in the Office for the Dead its place is taken by the verses: *Requiem æternam*, etc. and *Et lux perpetua*, etc. It also occurs after canticles, except that the Benedicite has its own doxology (*Benedicamus Patrem . . . Benedictus es Domine*, etc.—the only alternative one left in the Roman Rite). In the Mass it occurs after three psalms, the "Judica me" at the beginning, the fragment of the Introit-Psalm, and the "Lavabo" (omitted in Passiontide, except on feasts, and at requiem Masses). The first part only

occurs in the *responsoria* throughout the Office, with a variable answer (the second part of the first verse) instead of "Sicut erat," the whole doxology after the "Deus in adjutorium," and in the *preces* at Prime; and again, this time as one verse, at the end of the *invitatorium* at Matins. At all these places it is left out in the Office for the Dead and at the end of Holy Week. The Gloria Patri is also constantly used in extra-liturgical services, such as the Rosary. It was a common custom in the Middle Ages for preachers to end sermons with it. In some countries, Germany especially, people make the sign of the cross at the first part of the doxology, considering it as chiefly a profession of faith.

ERMELIUS, *Dissertatio historica de veteri christianâ* δοξολογία (1684); SCHMIDT, *De insignibus veteribus christianis formulis* (1696); A SEELEN, *Commentarius ad doxologiæ solemnis Gloria Patri verba: Sicut erat in principio* in his *Miscellanea* (1732); BONA, *Rerum liturgicarum libri duo* (Cologne, 1674), II, 471; THALHOFER, *Handbuch der kath. Liturgik*, I, 490 sq.; IDEM in *Augsburger Pastoralblatt* (1863), 289 sq.; RIETSCHEL, *Lehrbuch der Liturgik*, I, 355 sq.; KRAUS, *Real-Encyk.*, I, 377 sq.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Doyle, JAMES WARREN, Irish bishop; b. near New Ross, County Wexford, Ireland, 1786; d. at Carlow, 1834. He belonged to a family, respectable but poor, and received his early education at Clonleigh, at Rathconrogue, and later at the Augustinian College, New Ross. Shortly after 1800 he joined the Augustinian Order and was sent to Coimbra in Portugal, and there, at the university, first manifested his great intellectual powers. In the university library he read everything, Voltaire and Rousseau among the rest. As a consequence his faith became unsettled; but his vigorous intellect soon asserted itself, and subsequently he became the fearless champion of the Church in which he was born. During the French invasion he did sentry work at Coimbra, and accompanied the English to Lisbon as interpreter, and such was the impression he made at the Portuguese Court that he was offered high employment there. He declined the offer, however, and, returning to Ireland in 1808, was ordained priest the following year. Then for eight years he taught logic at the Augustinian College, New Ross. In 1817 he became professor at Carlow College, and two years later the priests of Kildare and Leighlin placed him *dignissimus* for the vacant see. Their choice was approved at Rome, and thus, in 1819, Doyle became bishop. At that date the effects of the Penal Laws were still visible in the conduct of the Catholics. Even the bishops, as if despairing of equality and satisfied with subjection, often allowed Protestant bigotry to assail with impunity their country and creed. This attitude of timidity and acquiescence was little to Dr. Doyle's taste, and over the signature of "J. K. L." (James, Kildare and Leighlin) he vigorously repelled an attack made on the Catholics by the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin. He also published an extremely able pamphlet on the religious and civil principles of the Irish Catholics; and a series of letters on the state of Ireland, in which the iniquities of the Church Establishment, the exactions of the landlords, the corrupt administration of justice were lashed with an unsparing hand. The clearness of style, the skilful marshalling of facts, the wide range of knowledge astonished all. And not less remarkable was his examination before two Parliamentary committees in London. Seeing his readiness and resource, the Duke of Wellington remarked that Doyle examined the committees rather than was examined by them. He joined the Catholic Association, and when O'Connell was about to contest Clare, Doyle addressed him a public letter hoping "that the God of truth and justice would be with him". After Emancipation these two great men frequently disagreed, but on the tithe question they were in accord, and Doyle's exhortation to the people to hate tithes as much as they loved justice became a battle-cry in the tithe war. Meantime nothing could exceed the bishop's zeal in his diocese. He established confraternities, temperance societies, and parish libraries, built churches and schools, conducted retreats, and ended many abuses which had survived the penal times. He also waged unsparing and incessant war on secret societies. He died young, a martyr to faith and zeal.

FITZPATRICK, *Life and Times of Dr. Doyle* (Dublin, 1890); MACDONAGH, *Bishop Doyle* (London, 1896); O'CONNELL, *Correspondence* (London, 1888); *Letters on the State of Ireland, by J. K. L.* (Dublin, 1825); *Evidence Taken Before the Select Committee of the Houses of Lords and Commons, 1824–5* (London, 1825).

E. A. D'ALTON.

Doyle JOHN, b. in Dublin, Ireland, 1797; d. in London, 2 Jan., 1868; English portrait-painter and caricaturist. This clever artist studied under Gabrielli, and Comerford, the miniature-painter. He came to London in 1821 and started as a portrait-painter, but gave his attention to drawing caricatures in 1827 or 1828, and developed his well-known signature, "H. B.", by means of two sets of initials "J. D." placed one above the other. In 1829 he commenced his famous series of drawings which he continued to produce until 1851, caricaturing in brilliant style all the political movements of the day. His drawings differ completely from the caricatures which preceded them, notably those of Rowlandson and Gillray, inasmuch as they are marked by reticence, courtesy, and a sense of good breeding. They are extraordinarily clever and at times stinging in their bitter epigrammatic quality; but Thackeray under-estimated their power when he spoke of them as "genteel" and said that they would "only produce a smile and never a laugh". There are some six hundred of them in the British Museum, and taken altogether they form a most interesting and graphic representation of the political history of England of the time. Doyle retired from professional work seventeen years before his death. He preserved his incognito to the very last and few people were aware of the fact that the initials on the caricatures formed his signature. He produced several pencil sketches of well-known personages and made use of his studies in this way in his caricatures, but the sketches themselves constitute in several instances the most life-like representations of the persons in question which exist.

EVERITT, *English Caricaturists* (1886); PAGET, *Puzzles* (1874); BINYON, *Drawings in the British Museum* (1900); DOBSON in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; BRYAN, *Dict. of Painters and Engravers*, II, 87.

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Doyle, RICHARD, English artist and caricaturist, b. in London, September, 1824; d. there 11 December, 1883. The second son of John Doyle (q. v.), he inherited much of his father's talent and exceeded the elder Doyle in skill and in power as a draughtsman. From a very early age he amused himself with making drawings. He prepared an account of the Eglinton Tournament when he was but fifteen, and at the age of sixteen commenced his famous journal, now preserved in the British Museum. The journal is a manuscript book containing many small sketches in pen and ink, executed with skill and brilliance, and marked by powers of observation and by a sense of humour hardly equalled and certainly not exceeded in later years. This extraordinary work was reproduced in facsimile in 1885 with an introduction by J. H. Pollen, and is a remarkable proof of Richard Doyle's precocity as an artist. In 1843 he became a contributor to "Punch" and continued on the staff of that paper till 1850. He produced many cartoons, but his name will be especially remembered from the fact that he designed the cover for "Punch" which has continued in use down to the present time. He also wrote for "Punch" a series of articles entitled "Manners and Customes of ye Englyshe". A

very devout Catholic, he resigned his position on the staff of the paper in 1850 in consequence of its hostility to what was termed "papal aggression", and devoted the remainder of his career to preparing drawings for book illustration and to painting in water-colour. His chief series of illustrations were those for "The Newcomes", "The King of the Golden River", "In Fairyland", and "The Foreign Tour of Brown, Jones and Robinson". His water-colour drawings were marked by much poetic feeling, and were executed in harmonious low-toned schemes of colour. His genius has been well described as "kindly, frolicsome, graceful and sportive". He was full of imagination and delighted in romantic fancy, while his caricatures are exquisitely drawn, amusing and graceful, lacking perhaps the strength of his father's works but far exceeding them in charm and in quality of amusement. There are many of his drawings in the British Museum, and some of his sketch-books are in the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge.

The Month (London, March, 1884); EVERITT, *English Caricaturists* (London, 1886); BINYON, *Drawings in the British Museum* (London, 1900); DOBSON, in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Drach, DAVID PAUL, convert from Judaism, b. at Strasburg, 6 March, 1791; d. end of January, 1868, at Rome. Rosenthal's "Convertitenbilder" (III, 48) prefaces the autobiography of Drach with the following words: "The conversion of this learned Jewish proselyte is undoubtedly one of the most important conversions effected by the grace of God during this century in France and became the source of salvation to many of his coreligionists." This conversion, affecting one who enjoyed the highest esteem as an author and a learned rabbi, produced a most profound impression on all active and earnest minds of the rising generation, and incited them to the study of the more serious problems of life. His endeavours to lead his coreligionists to the living fountain of truth, to the acknowledgment of Jesus as the real and true Messias, crystallized in numerous writings and were blessed by God. Herein lies the net result of this scholar's conversion.

Drach received his first instruction at the hands of his father, a renowned Hebraist and Talmudic scholar, whose linguistic talents the son inherited. At the age of twelve Drach entered the first division of the Talmudic school in Edendorf near Strasburg. This course of study, lasting ordinarily for three years, he completed in one year, and entered the second division of the Talmudic school in Bischheim in the following year. He graduated in eighteen months and then matriculated in Westhofen to qualify as a teacher of the Talmud. When only sixteen years of age he accepted the position of instructor at Rappoltsweiler, remaining there three years; afterwards he followed the same profession in Colmar. Here the ambitious youth devoted himself zealously to the study of secular sciences to which he had already seriously applied himself while prosecuting his Talmudic studies. Having obtained the rather unwilling permission of his father, he went to Paris, where he received a call to a prominent position in the Central Jewish Consistory and at the same time fulfilled the duties of tutor in the household of a distinguished Jew. The marked results of his method of teaching induced even Christian families to entrust their children to his care. It was under these circumstances that he received the first impulse towards a change of his religious views which ultimately resulted in his conversion. He writes: "Stirred by the edifying examples of Catholic piety continually set before me to the furtherance of my own salvation, the tendency towards Christianity, born in earlier life, acquired such strength that I resisted no longer." He now applied himself studiously to patristic theology and specialized in the study of the Septuagint with a view towards ascertaining the truth of the unanimous reproach of the Fathers, viz. that the Jews had falsified the Hebrew text. These studies resulted in his unquestioned belief in the Divinity and Messiahship of Jesus Christ. On Maundy Thursday, 1823, he renounced Judaism in the presence of Archbishop Quélen, in Paris, was baptized the following (Holy) Saturday, and on Easter morning received his first Holy Communion and the Sacrament of Confirmation. Two daughters and an infant son were also baptized. His wife, the only member of the family who adhered stanchly to the old faith, abducted the children. They were returned, however, after two years.

After a few years Drach went to Rome, where he was appointed librarian of the Propaganda (1827), which office he held at his death. Among the many converts who trace their conversion to the influence of Drach's example are the Libermann brothers; Franz Maria Paul Libermann was especially indebted to Drach for his sound advice and active assistance in the establishment of the "Congregation of the Immaculate Heart of Mary". Of Drach's numerous writings the following deserves particular mention: "Lettres d'un rabbin converti aux Israélites, ses frères" (Paris, 1825). He also published the "Bible de Vence", with annotations (Paris, 1827–1833) in 27 volumes octavo. He remodelled the Hebrew-Latin Dictionary of Gesenius, and published a Catholic Hebrew-Chaldaic dictionary of the Old Testament (ed. Migne, Paris, 1848). He wrote, moreover, "Du divorce dans la synagogue" (Rome, 1840); "Harmonie entre l'église et la synagogue" (Paris, 1844); and "La Cabale des Hébreux" (Rome, 1864).

PAUL AUGÚSTIN, son of the preceding, b. 12 Aug., 1817; d. 29 Oct., 1895; canon of Notre-Dame and exegete of importance. He studied at the Propaganda College in Rome and was ordained priest there in 1846. We owe to him a large French Bible commentary (La Sainte Bible, Paris, 1869) in which he himself wrote on the Pauline Epistles (1871), the Catholic Epistles (1879), and the Apocalypse (1879).

ROSENTHAL, *Convertitenbilder*, III, 48; GRUBE in *Kirchenlex.*, III, 2011; HURTER, *Nomenclator;* PITRA, *Life of the Ven. Servant of God, Franz Maria Paul Libermann*, Ger. tr. MÜLLER (Stuttgart, 1893).

N. SCHEID.

Drachma (Gr. δραχμή), a Greek silver coin. The Greeks derived the word from δράσσομαι, "to grip", "to take a handful"; cf. δράγμα, *manipulus*, "a handful". Thus the term originally signified a handful of grain (Liddell and Scott; Riehm, "Handwörterbuch"; Smith, "Dict. of Antiq."). But in Vigouroux, "Dict. de la Bible", the term is derived from *darag-mana*, the name of a Persian coin equivalent to the Hebrew דַּרְכְּמוֹן, *dârkemôn*. The Persian word *darag*, Assyrian *darku*, means "degree", "division". Thus the words *darag-mana* and *drachma* would signify a part of a mina. The darag-mana was also called a Daric because it was first struck by the emperor Darius Hystaspis. The drachma contained six oboli. It was the fourth part of a stater, the hundredth part of a mina, and the six-thousandth part of a talent. The precise value of the drachma differed at various times. The two principal standards of currency in the Grecian states were the Attic and the Æginetan. The Attic drachma had the greater circulation after the time of Alexander the Great. Its weight was about 66 grains, its value was a little less than twenty cents (nine pence, three farthings), and its size was about that of a quarter. On the one side it had the head of Minerva, and on the reverse her emblem, the owl, surrounded by a crown of laurels. The Æginetan drachma weighed about 93 grains and was equivalent to one and two-third Attic drachmas. It was current in the Peloponnesus (Corinth excepted, Riehm, "Handwörterb.") and in Macedonia until Alexander the Great. The drachma is mentioned in the Old Testament (II Machabees,

xii, 43), when Judas sends 12,000 drachmas to Jerusalem that sacrifices may be offered for the dead. In the New Testament (Luke, xv, 8, 9), Christ used the word in the parable of the woman that has ten drachmas (D. V. "groats") and loses one.

RIEHM, *Handwörterbuch;* BEURLIER in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v. *Drachme;* BABINGTON in *Dict. Christ. Antiq.*, s. v. *Money;* KENNEDY in HAST., *Dict. of the Bible* s.v. *Money;* WEX, *Métrologie grecque et romaine* (Paris, 1886).

C. VAN DEN BIESEN.

Dracontius, BLOSSIUS ÆMILIUS, a Christian poet of the fifth century. Dracontius belonged to a distinguished family of Carthage and was the pupil of a noted grammarian named Felicianus. He was called *clarissimus* (most illustrious), won the favour of the proconsul Pacideius, and led a prosperous life by means of inherited riches and the income of his law practice until he incurred the ill will of the Vandal king, Gunthamund. The cause of this misfortune seems to have been the expression of sentiments of Romano-Byzantine patriotism; for these utterances Dracontius suffered a long imprisonment. Nothing more is known of his history except that he was still alive when Thrasamund ascended the throne in 496.

His works are the "Romulea", three books on God (De laudibus Dei), and a poem entitled "Satisfactio". The latter two were written in prison; the first-mentioned is a collection of pieces composed at various times and written in the style of rhetorical school-exercises. Thus, one of these poems represents a rich man and a poor man as enemies; as a reward for the exploits of the rich man his statue is erected in the public square and accorded the right of sanctuary. Later, in recompense for additional services, the rich man asks for the head of the poor one, whereupon the latter flees to the statue for safety and a formal process ensues. In another poem Achilles deliberates as to whether or not he shall sell the body of Hector. When Dracontius deals with themes of his own day, as in the eulogy on his former teacher, and the "Epithalamia" for two couples who were friends, his style is occasionally less conventional. The writings forming the "Romulea" contain but little suggestion of a Christian poet; on the other hand, the "Satisfactio" and the "De laudibus Dei" manifest an ardent and sometimes eloquent faith. The "Satisfactio", written about 490, was intended to be instrumental in obtaining the royal pardon; the "De laudibus Dei", produced between 486 and 496, is a recital of God's benefits. The first book of the "De laudibus Dei" has for its main contents a description of the creation; the chief theme of the second is the Incarnation and the Redemption, it also contains vehement attacks on Arianism; the third compares, by appropriate examples, the hope of the Christian who denies himself in order to love God with the cheerless prospect of the pagan who counts on no future reward. This poem, like the others, is full of ideas taken from other sources; the episodes drawn from the Bible, profane history, and mythology are as varied as the textual reminiscences of the Latin poets, both Christian and pagan. However, the excellent pupil of Felicianus was not a thorough master of Latin diction and prosody; his writings give frequent evidence in their form of the surrounding barbarism.

The collection named "Romulea" is incomplete. Probably it should also contain two small poems, one on the months and the other on the origin of the rose; perhaps, further, the "Orestis tragœdia", which is called a tragedy, though in reality it is an epic poem of some thousand verses, wherein the author follows a unique ancient version of the myth; finally, though with less certainty, the "Ægritudo Perdicæ" (Perdica's Malady). The subject of this little poem of 290 hexameters is interesting from the point of view of folk-lore. Perdica, a student of Athens, has neglected the worship of Venus and by way of revenge this goddess inspires him with a guilty love for his mother, Castalia. Perdica falls into a decline and his physicians are unable to understand his ailment, but Hippocrates, who ascertains that Perdica's heart beats more violently when Castalia approaches, recognizes the real nature of the malady. There is no remedy for the trouble and Perdica hangs himself (see Rohde, Der griechisch. Roman, p. 54). The works of Dracontius were not known in their real form until 1791 and 1873. His Christian poems were very popular in the sixth and seventh centuries. They were revised by Eugenius, Bishop of Toledo (d. 657), but these revisions made great changes in the author's statements. What Eugenius failed to understand he altered; moreover, he corrected the doctrine of Dracontius. The latter had said that God deliberately created good and evil at the same time (Satisfactio, 15); Eugenius made him say that God tolerated evil. It was in this recension that both the Christian poems were known until 1791. The larger part of the secular poems of Dracontius were first published in 1873.

VOLLMER in PAULY-WISSOWA, *Realencykl. d. class. Altertumswiss.* (Stuttgart, 1905), s. v. *Dracontius;* first edition of Christian poems in original form, AREVALO ed. (Rome, 1791), reprinted in *P. L.*, LX; first edition of secular poems, ed. von DUHN (Leipzig, 1873), best edition by VOLLMER in *Mon. Germ. Hist.* (Berlin, 1905), except for *Ægritudo Perdicæ*, which is edited by BÄHRENS in *Poetæ latini minores* (Leipzig, 1883), V, 112.

PAUL LEJAY.

Drane, AUGUSTA THEODOSIA, in religion MOTHER FRANCIS RAPHAEL, O.S.D.; b. at Bromley near London, in 1823; d. at Stone, Staffordshire, 29 April, 1894. Her parents were both Protestants, her father being managing partner in an East India mercantile house. Her remarkable natural gifts were developed by wide reading at a very early age. In 1837 she moved with her family to Babbicombe, Devonshire, where she read much of the early literature of the Oxford Movement. Burnet's "History of the Reformation", she declared, was the real cause of her conversion. It was not, however, till 1847 that she grew uneasy as to her religious beliefs, whereupon she consulted Keble and Pusey, but without satisfaction. The influence of Maskell, then Vicar of St. Mary Church, helped her more and she confided to him a scheme called "Ideal of a Religious Order". He told her that such an order existed in the Catholic Church, naming the Third Order of St. Dominic. This made a profound impression on her mind and gradually she was drawn to the Church. She was received at Tiverton, 3 July, 1850, and in 1852 entered the Third Order of St. Dominic at Clifton. On 8 Dec., 1853, she was professed at the new convent of Stone, Staffordshire, and was there employed in teaching and in writing various books, meanwhile making great spiritual progress. In 1860 she was appointed mistress of novices, but in 1863 became mistress of studies instead, thus obtaining more leisure for writing. In 1872 she became prioress under her friend, Mother Imelda Poole, and on the death of the latter in 1881 succeeded her as provincial (25 Nov., 1881), thus taking charge of the whole congregation and the convents of Stoke-on-Trent, Bow, and St. Mary Church. Her character was well summed up by Bishop Ullathorne when he described her as "one of those many-sided characters who can write a book, draw a picture, rule an Order, guide other souls, superintend a building, lay out grounds, or give wise and practical advice with equal facility and success." She continued to grow in remarkable sanctity till her death, which took place a fortnight after she had ceased to be provincial.

Her works include: "The Morality of Tractarianism" (1850), published anonymously; "Catholic Legends and Stories" (1855); "Life of St. Dominic" (1857); "Knights of St. John" (1858); "Three Chancellors, Wykeham, Waynflete and More" (1859); "Historical Tales" (1862); "Tales and Traditions" (1862); "History of England for Family Use" (1864);

"Christian Schools and Scholars" (1867); "Biographical Sketch of Hon. H. Dormer" (1868); "Songs in the Night" (1876); "New Utopia" (1876); "History of St. Catherine of Siena" (1880); "History of St. Dominic" (1891); "The Spirit of the Dominican Order" (1896), and some smaller pieces. She translated the "Inner Life of Père Lacordaire" (1868), edited a "Life of Mother Margaret Mary Hallahan" (1869), "Archbishop Ullathorne's Autobiography" (1891), and "Letters of Archbishop Ullathorne" (1892).

WILBERFORCE, *Memoir of Mother Francis Raphael, O.S.D.* (London, 1895); COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (London, 1891), Supp., Vol. II; *Année dominicaine*, July, 1894.

EDWIN BURTON.

Dreams, INTERPRETATION OF.—There is in sleep something mysterious which seems, from the earliest times, to have impressed man and aroused his curiosity. What philosophy of sleep sprang from the observation of the phenomenon, we do not know; but, like all phenomena the causes of which are not obvious, sleep came, in the course of time, to be considered as an effect of the Divine agency and as something sacred. We should very likely see a vestige of this simple and primitive philosophy in the reverence shown at all times by the Arabs to a man sleeping. But the mystery of sleep is enhanced by the phenomenon of dream which accompanies it. Primitive people, unable to explain the psychology of dreaming or to discover the causes of sleep, observed that, whereas man can, when awake, control his thoughts and fancies, yet he is utterly incapable, when in sleep, either of bringing about such dreams as he might wish, or of directing and ruling those that offer themselves to his faculties; hence they were led to attribute dreams to outside and supernatural agencies. The gods, whose power was believed to manifest itself in natural effects, such as thunderstorms and earthquakes, whose messages were supposed to be written by signs in the heavens, could as well send their communications to men in dreams. Hence the persuasion arose that persons favoured by frequent dreams were sacred and chosen intermediaries between the deity and man. Far from being cast aside by advancing civilization, these ideas developed with it, and were to a certain extent even systematized, as appears in particular from the records of the ancient peoples of the East. These all took it for granted that every dream expressed a Divine message. Most dreams came unsought; but occasionally supernatural communications were solicited by "incubation". The person desirous of obtaining a prophetic dream then betook himself to the temple of the deity from whom he expected instructions, and there slept, after some ritual preparation. Among the shrines known in antiquity for vouchsafing oracles to sleeping worshippers, the temple of Æsculapius at Epidaurus, where dreams were obtained in which remedies were revealed to cure diseases, the cave of Trophonius, the temple of Serapis, and that of Hathor, near the turquoise mines of the Sinai Peninsula, are the best known. As a last means to wrest the dream from a reluctant deity, magic was also resorted to. An interesting example of magical formulæ used for this purpose is contained in a Gnostic papyrus of relatively late date preserved in the Leyden Museum; it is entitled "Agathocles' Recipe for sending a dream", and may be read in Wiedemann's "Religion der alten Ægypter" (p. 144).

The meaning of the Divine message conveyed in dreams was sometimes obvious and unmistakable, as when the facts to be known were plainly revealed either by the deity himself or through the ministry of some messenger. Thus Thothmes IV was instructed by Ra Hormakhu in a dream to dig out of the sand the statue of the Great Sphinx, near the place where he was sleeping. In like manner the early Babylonian king, Gudea, received the command to erect the temple Erinnu to Ninib. Of this description also were the dreams recorded in the annals of King Asshurbanipal. From these documents we learn that Asshur appeared in a dream to Gyges, King of Lydia, and said to him: "Embrace the feet of Asshurbanipal, King of Assyria, and thou shalt conquer thy enemies by his name." Forthwith Gyges dispatched messengers to the Assyrian ruler to narrate this dream and pay him homage, and henceforth succeeded in conquering the Kimmerians. Another passage relates that, in the course of an expedition against Elam, as the Assyrian troops were afraid to cross the Itti River, Ishtar of Arba-ilu appeared to them in their sleep and said: "I go before Asshurbanipal, the king whom my hands have made." Encouraged by this vision, the army crossed the river ("West, As. Inscr.", vol. III; G. Smith, "Hist. of Asshurbanipal"). The Divinely sent dream might also at times foreshow some coming event. Moreover, its meaning was not always clear and might be shrouded in symbols, or, if conveyed through oral communication, wrapped up in figures of speech. In either case, the knowledge of the significance of the dream would depend on the interpretation. And as most dreams portend no clear message, the task of unfolding dream symbols and figures gradually grew into an art, more or less associated with soothsaying. Elaborate rules were laid down and handbooks compiled for the guidance of the priests in explaining the portent of the visions and symbols perceived by the inquirer in his sleep.

Many such manuals have been found in Assyria and Babylonia, the contents of which enable us to understand the principles followed in dream-interpretation. From Dan., ii, 2 sqq., it would seem that the *potherim*, or dream-interpreters, might be called upon even to discharge the perplexing task of recalling dreams forgotten by the dreamer. The instance here recorded cannot, however, be much insisted upon, as the context distinctly intimates that this task, impossible "except to the gods", yet imposed upon the Babylonian diviners by a whim of the king, was beyond their acknowledged attributions. Most of the Egyptian magic books likewise contain incantations either to procure or to explain dreams. These incantations had to be recited according to fixed cantillations, and the soothsayer's art consisted in knowing them thoroughly, copying them faithfully, and applying them properly. Side by side with this religious view of dreams, which regarded them as the expression of the will of the god, there existed the superstitious view, according to which all dreams were considered as omens. Assuming "that things causally connected in thought are causally connected in fact" (Jevons), people blindly believed that their dreams had a bearing on their own fate, and eagerly strove to discover their significance.

Like the Eastern peoples, the Greeks and the Romans attached a religious significance to dreams. Of this belief many traces may be found in classical literature. Homer and Herodotus thought it natural that the gods should send dreams to men, even to deceive them, if needs be, for the accomplishment of their higher ends (Agamemnon's dream). The same indications may be found also in the works of the dramatists (e. g. Clytemnestra's dream in the "Agamemnon" of Æschylus). Plato, whilst regarding it as inconceivable that a god should deceive men, admitted nevertheless that dreams may come from the gods (Tim., cc. xlvi, xlvii). Aristotle was similarly of the opinion that there is a divinatory value in dreams (De Divin. per somn., ii). The teaching of the Stoics was along the same lines. If the gods, they said, love man and are omniscient as well as all-powerful, they certainly may disclose their purposes to man in sleep. Finally, in Greece and Rome, as well as in the East, the popular views of dreams went a great deal farther and developed into superstition. It was in accordance with these views, and to gratify the cravings which they

created, that Daldianus Artemidorus compiled his "Oneirocritica", in which rules were laid down whereby any one could interpret his own dreams.

In the light of the belief and practices of the ancient peoples, we are better able to judge the belief and practices recorded in the Bible. That God may enter into communication with man through dreams is asserted in Num., xii, 6, and still more explicitly in Job, xxxiii, 14 sqq.: "God speaketh once. . . By a dream in a vision by night, when deep sleep falleth upon men, and they are sleeping in their beds: then he openeth the ears of men, and teaching instructeth them in what they are to learn." As a matter of fact, Divine revelation through dreams occurs frequently in the Old and in the New Testament. In most of the cases recorded the dream is expressly said to come from God; of this description are, e. g., the dreams of Abimelech (Gen., xx, 3); of Jacob (Gen., xxviii, 12; xxxi, 10); of Solomon (III K., iii, 5–15); of Nabuchodonosor (Dan., ii, 19); of Daniel (Dan., vii, 1); of Joseph (Matth., i, 20; ii, 13); of St. Paul (Acts, xxiii, 11; xxvii, 23), unless we should interpret these passages as referring to visions granted to the Apostle while awake. God is said to appear Himself only in a few instances, as to Abimelech, to Jacob, to Solomon, and to Daniel, if, as is generally admitted, the "Ancient of days", spoken of in this connexion, should be understood to be God; in other instances He is said to speak through an angel, as in the dreams narrated by St. Matthew and St. Paul. The Bible records other dreams, which, though prophetic, are not distinctly said to come from God (Gen., xxxvii, 6; xl, 5; xli, 1; Judges, vii, 13; II Mach., xv, 11). It appears, however, from the circumstances and from their prophetic import, that their Divine origin cannot be doubted; at least their interpretation is declared (Gen., xl, 8) to "belong to God". Accepting the historical truth of these facts, there is no reason indeed why God should not use dreams as a means of manifesting His will to man. God is omniscient and all-powerful, and He loves man; He may, therefore, in order to disclose his purposes, choose natural as well as supernatural means. Now dreaming, as a natural psycho-physiological phenomenon, has undoubtedly its laws, which, however obscure they may be to man, are established by God, and obey His bidding. But since man may be easily deluded, it is needful that God in using natural causes should supply such evidences as will make His intervention unmistakable. Sometimes these evidences are manifested to the dreamer, at other times to the interpreter, if one be necessary; but they will never fail. The analogy of the foregoing reasons with those brought forward by theologians to prove the possibility of revelation is readily perceived. In fact, there is here more than a mere analogy; for communication by dreams is but one of the many ways God may select to manifest His designs to man; there is between them a relation of species to genus, and one could not deny either without denying the possibility of a supernatural order.

All the dreams actually recorded in Holy Writ came unsought. Some scholars infer from the words of Saul (I K., xxviii, 15): "God is departed from me, and would not hear me, neither by the hand of prophets, nor by dreams", that the practice of deliberately seeking supernatural dreams was not unknown in Israel. The words just quoted, however, do not necessarily imply such a meaning, but may as well be interpreted of unsought prophetic dreams. Still less can it be asserted that the Israelites would seek prophetic dreams by resorting to a well-known sanctuary and sleeping there. The two instances sometimes adduced in this connexion, namely the dream of Jacob at Bethel (Gen., xxviii, 12–19) and that of Solomon at Gabaon (III K., iii, 5–15), do not bear out such an affirmation. In both cases the dream, far from being sought, was unexpected; moreover, with regard to the former, it is evident from the narration that Jacob was quite unaware beforehand of the holiness of the place he slept in. His inference on the next morning as to its sacredness was inspired by the object of the dream, and his conduct in this circumstance seems even to betray some fear of having unknowingly defiled it by sleeping there.

It should not be concluded from the above remarks that there were no errors with regard to dreams and dream-interpretation in the minds of individual Israelites. Like their neighbours, they had a tendency to consider all dreams as omens, and attach importance to their significance. But this tendency was constantly held in check by the more enlightened and more religious part of the nation. Besides the prohibition to "observe dreams", embodied in the Law (Lev., xix, 26; Deut., xviii, 10), the Prophets, from the eighth century B. C. onwards, repeatedly warned the people against giving "heed to their dreams which they dream" (Jer., xxix, 8). "Dreams follow many cares", says Ecclesiastes (v, 2); and Ben Sirach wisely adds that "dreams have deceived many, and they have failed that put their trust in them" (Ecclus., xxxiv, 7). This was, according to II Par., xxxiii, 6, one of the faults which brought about the downfall of Manasses. Above all, the Israelites were warned in every manner against trusting in the pretended dreams of false prophets: "Behold, I am against the prophets that have lying dreams, saith the Lord" (Jer., xxiii, 32; cf. Zach., x, 2; etc.). From these and other indications it appears clear that the religion of Israel was kept pure from superstition connected with dreams. True, a mere glance at the respective dates of the above-quoted passages suggests that the zeal of the prophets was of little avail, at least for certain classes of people. The evil opposed by them continued in vogue down to the Exile, and even after the Restoration; but it is scarcely necessary to remark how unjust it would be to hold the Jewish religion responsible for the abuses of individual persons. Neither did there exist at any time in Israel a class of diviners making it their business to interpret the dreams of their countrymen; there were no *potherim* among the temple-officials, nor later around the synagogues. The very few dream-interpreters spoken of in the Bible, as Joseph and Daniel, were especially commissioned by God in exceptional circumstances. Nor did they resort to natural skill or art; their interpretations were suggested to them by the Divine intellect enlightening their minds; "interpretation belongs to God", as Joseph declared to his fellow-prisoners. Undoubtedly there were among the people some soothsayers ever ready to profit by the curiosity of weaker and credulous minds; but as they possessed no authority and as they were condemned both by God and by the higher religious consciousness of the community, they practised their art in secret.

That certain dreams may be caused by God seemed to be acknowledged without controversy by the early Fathers of the Church and the ecclesiastical writers. This opinion they based mainly on Biblical authority; occasionally they appealed to the authority of classical writers. Agreeably to this doctrine, it was admitted likewise that the interpretation of supernatural dreams belongs to God who sends them, and who must manifest it either to the dreamer or to an authorized interpreter. The divine intervention in man's dreams is an exceptional occurrence; dreaming, on the contrary, is a most common fact. We may inquire, therefore, how the official guardians of the Faith viewed ordinary and natural dreams. In general they repeated to the Christians the prohibitions and warnings of the Old Testament, and denounced in particular the superstitious tendency to consider dreams as omens. It may suffice in this connexion to recall the names of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Gregory of Nyssa, and St. Gregory the Great, whose teaching on the

question at issue is clear and emphatic. A few, however, held opinions somewhat at variance with the traditional view. Among them the most noteworthy is Synesius of Cyrene (about 370–413), who is the author of a very strange treatise on dreams. Starting from the Platonic anthropological trichotomy, and from certain psychological hypotheses of Plato and Plotinus, he attributed to the imagination a manifestly exaggerated rôle. Above all the arts of divination, the lawful use of which he did not seem to doubt, he extolled dreaming as the simplest and surest mode of prophesying. We know that he had accepted the episcopacy only on the condition that he might continue to hold certain favourite philosophic ideas; and it is reasonable to suppose that his theories on dreams were included in the compact.

Medieval theologians added to the reasonings of their predecessors a more careful, and to some extent more scientific, study of the phenomena of sleep; but they found no reason to depart from the moral principles contained in the writings of the Fathers. Suffice it here to quote St. Thomas Aquinas, who summarizes the best teaching of the Schoolmen. To the query: Is divination through dreams unlawful?—he replies: The whole question consists in determining the cause of dreams, and examining whether the same may be the cause of future events, or at least come to the actual knowledge of them. Dreams come sometimes from internal, and sometimes from external, causes. Two kinds of internal causes influence our dreams: one animal, inasmuch as such images remain in a sleeping man's fantasy as were dwelt upon by him while awake; the other found in the body: it is indeed a well-known fact that the actual disposition of the body causes a reaction on the fantasy. Now it is self-evident that neither of these causes has any influence on individual future events. Our dreams may likewise be the effects of a twofold external cause. This is corporeal when exterior agencies, such as the atmospheric conditions or others, act on the imagination of the sleeper. Finally dreams may be caused by spiritual agents, such as God, directly, or indirectly through his angels, and the devil. It is easy to conclude thence what chances there are to know the future from dreams, and when divination will be lawful or unlawful (II–II, Q. 95, a. 6). Modern theologians, whilst profiting by the progress of psychological research, continue to admit the possibility of dreams supernatural in their origin, and consequently the possibility of dream-interpretation depending on supernatural communications. As to ordinary dreams, they readily grant that, because the imaginative faculties of man acquire sometimes a keenness which they do not possess otherwise, it is possible in such cases to conjecture with a certain degree of probability some future events; but in all other cases, by far the most common, it is useless and illogical to attempt any interpretation. As a matter of fact dreams are now—we speak of civilized peoples—seldom heeded; only very ignorant and superstitious persons ponder over the "dictionaries of dreams" and the "keys to the interpretation of dreams" once so much in favour. "As idle as a dream" has become a proverb expressive of the popular mind on the subject, and indicating sufficiently that there is little need nowadays to revive the laws and canons enacted in past ages against divination through dreams.

Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire de la Divination* (Paris, 1879); Lenormant, *La divination et la science des présages chez les Chaldéens* (Paris, 1875); Lehmann, *Aberglaube und Zauberei* (Stuttgart, 1898); Schanz in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Traumdeuterei*; Ladd, *Doctrine of Sacred Scripture* (New York, 1883); Reynolds, *Natural History of Immortality* (1891).

Charles L. Souvay.

Drechsel (also Drexelius or Drexel), Jeremias, ascetic writer, b. at Augsburg, 15 August, 1581; entered the Society of Jesus 27 July, 1598; d. at Munich, 19 April, 1638. He was professor of humanities and rhetoric at Augsburg and Dillingen, and for twenty-three years court preacher to the Elector of Bavaria. His writings enjoyed an immense popularity. Chief among them are his "Considerationes de Æternitate" (Munich, 1620), of which there were nine editions; in addition to these Leyser printed 3200 copies in Latin and 4200 in German. It was also translated into English (Cambridge, 1632; Oxford, 1661; London, 1710 and 1844) and into Polish, French, and Italian. His "Zodiacus Christianus" or "The Twelve Signs of Predestination" (Munich, 1622), is another famous book, but there seems to have been an edition anterior to this; in 1642 eight editions had already been issued and it was translated into several European languages. "The Guardian Angel's Clock" was issued first at Munich, 1622, and went through seven editions in twenty years; it was also translated extensively. "Nicetas seu Triumphata conscientia" (Munich, 1624) was dedicated to the sodalists of a dozen or more cities which he names on the title page; "Trismegistus" was printed in the same year and place; "Heliotropium" or "Conformity of the Human with the Divine Will" came out in 1627; "Death the Messenger of Eternity" also bears the date of 1627. His fancy for odd titles shows itself in other books also. Thus there are the "Gymnasium of Patience"; "Orbis Phaëton, hoc est de universis vitiis Linguæ". The only work he wrote in German was entitled "Tugendtspregel oder Klainodtschatz" (Munich, 1636). He has also a "Certamen Poeticum"; "Rosæ selectissimarum virtutum"; "Rhetorica Cœlestis"; "Gazophylacium Christi". There are in all thirty-four such books. Other works are: "Res bellicæ expeditionis Maximiliani" (1620), and some odes and sermons.

De Backer, *Bibl. de la c. de J.*, 1646–55; Sommervogel, *Bibl. de la c. de J.*, III, 181 sqq.

T. J. Campbell.

Dresden, the capital of the Kingdom of Saxony and the residence of the royal family, is situated on both sides of the Elbe, which is here crossed by five bridges, and is surrounded by pleasing heights. Including the suburbs which now form a part of it, the city contained (1 December, 1905) 516,996 inhabitants, of whom 462,108 were Evangelical Lutherans, 2885 Evangelical Reformed, 44,079 Catholics, 3514 Jews, etc. Dresden is the residence of the vicar Apostolic for Saxony, and is the seat of the Catholic ecclesiastical consistory and of the vicarial court. In 1907 there were in Dresden 24 ecclesiastics, including the vicar Apostolic, who is a titular bishop, 7 rectors, 4 court preachers, and 1 military chaplain. Dresden has 6 Catholic parish churches, of which 2 are only chapels, 1 garrison church, which is also used for Protestant worship, the church attached to St. Joseph's Institute, built in 1746, and 6 chapels. The most important of these edifices is the court church, one of the finest Rococo structures of Germany. It was built by the Italian master-builder, Gaetano Chiaveri, in the years 1739-51, for Frederick Augustus II (1733-63). The church has a finely painted ceiling, a high altar with altar-painting by Raphael Mengs, and valuable silver ornamentation; since 1823 the members of the royal family have been buried in the crypt. Among the other churches should be mentioned the parish church of Dresden-Neustadt, built, 1852-53, in Romanesque style and containing finely painted windows, and the chapel in the royal palace.

The Catholic schools of Dresden consist of a progymnasium with 4 ecclesiastical teachers and about 70 scholars, 1 middle-class school with nearly 300 scholars, and 5 district schools with 3300 pupils. For girls there are also St. Joseph's Institute, founded in 1746 by Maria Josepha, wife of King Augustus III, to give poor Catholic girls food, clothing, and instruction,

and the institution for noble young ladies, founded in 1761 by Freiherr von Burkersroda, in which Catholic young women of noble birth receive a home and an education. As houses of male orders are forbidden throughout Saxony, Dresden has only convents of female congregations; these are: 2 houses of Grey Sisters who have charge of a hospital, St. Joseph's Institute, a home for servants, 2 kitchens for the poor, etc.; 1 convent of the Sisters of St. Charles Borromeo who conduct the Amalia home and a boarding home for working-women. Among the Catholic societies of Dresden should be mentioned: the Catholic Press Association, the Teachers' Association, 2 workingmen's societies, the People's Association (Volksverein) of Catholic Germany, the journeymen's society (Gesellenverein) which carries on a boarding home, the Merchants' Association, 3 associations for youths, 2 societies of St. Charles Borromeo, the Catholic Casino, and 20 religious societies and brotherhoods. The only Catholic daily newspaper for Dresden and Saxony is the "Sächsische Volkszeitung".

Court Church (1751) and Palace (1534), Dresden.

Dresden was originally a village of the Sorbs, who in the sixth century settled on both sides of the Elbe. In the tenth century the territory was conquered by the Germans, and the Diocese of Meissen (see Meissen) was erected in 968 for the conversion of the pagan Sorbs. The first church of Dresden, the church of Our Lady, was built about 1080. Towards the end of the twelfth century the Germans made a settlement, not far from the Sorbs, which is first mentioned in a deed of 1206 and is spoken of as a city as early as 1216. This new settlement, which gradually absorbed the other, received many privileges and rights from Margrave Heinrich the Illustrious (1230-88). The edifices still existing, which were founded in the time of this ruler are: the St. Maternus infirmary, the St. Bartholomäus infirmary, the Franciscan monastery, the church of which forms part of the present Protestant church of St. Sophia, and the church of the Holy Cross, which in 1234 received a piece of the True Cross and consequently became a great resort for pilgrims. After the death of Heinrich, besides the Margrave of Meissen, both the Bishop of Meissen and the monastery of Hersfeld laid claim to Dresden; in 1319 the city finally came into the possession of the margraves. Margrave Wilhelm I made Dresden his place of residence; he enlarged the castle, granted the rights of a city to the old settlement called Alt-Dresden (Old Dresden) on the right bank of the Elbe, and founded there in 1404 a monastery of Hermits of St. Augustine. The intention of this ruler to establish a cathedral chapter in Dresden was not, however, carried out. In 1449 the city was besieged by the Hussites and badly damaged. Among the most remarkable events of the following period was the presence at Dresden of St. John Capistran, who in 1452 preached repentance here with great success.

When the lands of the House of Wettin were divided in 1485 between the two brothers, Albrecht and Ernst, Dresden was included in the possessions of Albrecht, to whose successors it has ever since belonged. Soon after this, in 1491, a great fire laid waste the city, burning to the ground the church of the Holy Cross and 270 houses, but the town recovered quickly. The city developed rapidly under Duke George the Bearded (1500-39), who was a strong opponent of the religious innovations of Luther. Soon after his death, however, his brother Heinrich introduced the Reformation into Dresden (1539). The monasteries of the Franciscans and Augustinians were suppressed; twenty-seven altars of the church of the Holy Cross were destroyed and the paintings were removed; the vessels of gold and silver were taken from the churches by the council, and the holding of Catholic church services was soon after this entirely forbidden.

During the reign of Duke Maurice, who attained the electoral dignity, the two towns were consolidated in 1550; in the time of Maurice and his successors Dresden became one of the most beautiful cities of Germany. After the sufferings of the Thirty Years War Dresden was adorned by its rulers, Johann Georg, Augustus the Strong, and Frederick Augustus II, with fine edifices and numerous treasures of art, so that it competed with Paris in its attractions. The Seven Years War brought intense misery to the city, the population of which fell from 63,000 to the fourth part of

this number. Scarcely had the place recovered when the Napoleonic Wars with their enormous burdens, to which hunger and disease were added, again brought the greatest suffering on the city. After the Wars of Liberation the development of the city steadily progressed until it was interrupted again by the Revolution of 1849 which led to the erection of barricades and to bloody strife. Since then there has been a constant and rapid growth of the city, which rivals the other great centres of the German Empire in elegance and beauty and in the activity of its industries and commerce.

After the introduction of the Reformation into Dresden Catholicism could not exist openly. Catholics were forbidden to settle in it even as late as 1680; the few Catholics who lived there could only hear Mass in the chapel of the imperial embassy. This oppressed condition of the Catholics was not much improved when Augustus the Strong in 1697 became a convert; he gave the chapel of the hunting castle Moritzburg for Catholic worship, and in 1708 the court church of the Holy Trinity was consecrated; but public church services were still forbidden to Catholics. It was not until the Peace of Posen, 11 December, 1806, that the Catholics of Saxony were granted the same freedom of worship as the Lutherans and that the Catholic and Protestant subjects of the king received the same civil and political rights. Since this date the Catholic Church in Dresden has increased, though slowly, as Saxony, notwithstanding the Catholicism of the reigning family, is strongly Protestant and has little toleration for the Church; thus, for example, the founding of monasteries is forbidden by the Constitution of 1831. The losses of the Church in Dresden annually exceed the conversions more than tenfold.

J. E. Richter, *Litteratur der Landes- und Volkskunde des Königreichs Sachsen*, which contains a full bibliography (1889): V Supplements (1892–1905); *Reformationsgesch. der Residenzstadt Dresden* (Meissen, 1827); *Urkundenbuch der Städte Dresden und Pirna* in *Codex diplomaticus Saxoniæ regiæ*, Pt. II, Vol. V (Leipzig, 1875); Dibelius, *Die Einführung der Reformation in Dresden* (Dresden, 1889); O. Richter, *Verfassungs- und Verwaltungsgesch. der Stadt Dresden* (Dresden, 1885–91); Idem, *Atlas zur Gesch. Dresdens* (Dresden, 1898); Idem, *Gesch. der Stadt Dresden* (Dresden, 1900), I; Idem, *Gesch. der Stadt Dresden, 1871–1902* (Dresden, 1903); Gurlitt, *Beschreibende Darstellung der Bau- und Kunstdenkmäler Sachsens* (Dresden, 1900–03), Pts. XXI-XXIII; Idem, *Dresden* (Dresden, 1907); *Handbuch der Wohltätigkeit und Wohlfahrtspflege in Dresden* (Dresden, 1906). Periodicals.—*Mitteilungen des Vereins für Gesch. Dresdens* (Dresden), XX Pts. to 1908; *Dresdener Geschichtsblätter* (Dresden), XVI vols. to 1908; *St. Benno-Kalender* (Dresden), LVII vols. to 1908.

Joseph Lins.

Dreves, Lebrecht Blücher, poet, b. at Hamburg, Germany, 12 September, 1816; d. at Feldkirch, 19 Dec., 1870. The famous Prussian General Blücher was his baptismal sponsor, whence his name. At fifteen he wrote German and Latin poems faultless in rhyme and metre. Four years later he submitted a good-sized volume of poems to the critical judgment of A. von Chamisso and Gustav Schwab, and both expressed favourable opinions. This was followed shortly by another volume entitled "Lyrische Anklänge" (Lyrical Melodies), and although these "melodies" were grafted on the music of his favourites, Chamisso, Uhland, Heine, Rückert, Schwab, and others, they were not devoid of a sweetness all their own. His studies in jurisprudence, prosecuted during the three succeeding years and rewarded by the degree of doctor of laws *summâ cum laude*, failed to extinguish the love of his favourite study of poetry. Another volume, entitled "Vigilien" (Vigils), fulfilled the earlier promises of this child-phenomenon. About this time, however, the seamy side of life presented itself to him, trouble growing apace with financial difficulties in the young lawyer's family. Hitherto, although a strict Protestant, his entire religion had been summed up in the word poetry. Impending poverty destroyed this rather roseate view. His mental and bodily troubles, however, were more or less dissipated by his reception into the Catholic church on Candlemas Day, 1846. A subsequent appointment as notary raised him above immediate want. It was during these darker periods that he was most prolific as an author. In 1843 he had already published anonymously a third volume of poems "Schlichte Lieder" (Unpretentious Songs) embodying his battle-songs, "Lieder eines Hanseaten". Previous to this, when unhampered by the dread of poverty, he had written (1868) the two-act comedy "Der Lebensretter" (The Life-Saver) inscribing it: "A manuscript printed for (improvised) private theatricals".

The change of view involved in his conversion brought him two advantages, a loftier conception of his literary work and an enlarged circle of friends. His "Lieder der Kirche" (Church Hymns) paved his way to becoming a model translator of hymns (2d ed., 1868). He also dedicated his virile pen to the cause of religion in his native town by writing a "History of the Catholic Congregations in Hamburg and Altona". He likewise translated the "Nachtigallenlied" by the Pseudo-Bonaventura and St. Rembert's life of St. Ansgar, Apostle of the North. He undertook the thankless task of editing (1867) the important sources of the history of his native city in the "Annuæ Missionis Hamburgensis 1589–1781". About this time he revised and republished his own poetical works. This work was made easy for him by the advice and aid of the poet von Eichendorff who had become his warm friend. Meantime he had become the father of a happy family, and to secure for his promising son a good education he determined to remove to Feldkirch in the Vorarlberg. To compensate for the loss of his friend von Eichendorff he gained a new one, the poet Father Gall Morel. The most distinguished of his children is his son, Dr. G. Dreves, editor of the "Analecta hymnica medii ævi", a vast collection of medieval hymnology, which has already reached its fiftieth volume.

Rosenthal, *Convertitenbilder* (autobiography), I, 626–636; Kreiten, *Lebrecht Dreves, ein Lebensbild* (Freiburg im Br., 1897); Scheid, *Dichterstimmen der Gegenwart* (1903).

N. Scheid.

Drevet Family, The, were the leading portrait engravers of France for over a hundred years. Their fame began with Pierre, and was sustained by his son, Pierre-Imbert, and by his nephew, Claude. Pierre Drevet, the Elder, b. at Loire in the Lyonnais in 1663; d. in Paris, 1738, was the son of Estienne Drevet, a man of excellent family, and began his studies with Germain Audran at Lyons, continuing them with Gérard Audran in Paris. So rapid was his progress, so quickly did he imbibe and assimilate knowledge, and with such precision and delicacy did he manage the graver, that in 1696 he was made court engraver. In 1707 he was admitted to membership in the Académie des Beaux-Arts, his reception picture being an engraving of Robert de Cotte.

Rigaud's portraits were in high favour at the end of the seventeenth century and Drevet was the first to encounter and surmount the difficulties of translating into black and white the natural appearance of texture and materials which the brilliant oils readily presented. He was an excellent draughtsman, and he treated flesh and fabrics, the flash of jewels and the shimmer of steel, with painter-like realism, surpassing all his predecessors in these effects. With all his elegance of detail he produced an harmonious ensemble, combining artistic feeling with skilful technic. Although his work with the burin was like that of the great Nanteuil, he attained a style of his own. Previous engravers sacrificed much to make the head prominent, but Drevet made everything salient, though never violently so. Always engraving after oil-paintings, Drevet was at times uneven, but this was because the originals were uneven. Orders

THE COURT CHURCH, DRESDEN

poured in upon him faster than he could fill them, and throughout his life he had command of every important work produced in France. His engravings were mainly the portraits of distinguished people. Among his many superb plates a portrait of Colbert (1700) marks the acme of his art; and next in point of excellence come the portraits of Louis XIV and Louis XV, both after Rigaud. Other celebrated works of his are a Crucifixion, after Coypel, and a portrait of Charles II of England. During the last years of his life Drevet worked with his son and they produced plates together.

PIERRE DREVET
Hyacinthe Rigaud

PIERRE-IMBERT DREVET, called the Younger Pierre, was born in Paris, 1697; died there, 1739. His father, the elder Drevet, gave him such assiduous instruction that at the age of thirteen he produced a superb little plate which indicated his future eminence. At first he engraved after Lebrun, but he soon developed a style of his own, spontaneous, sincere, and brilliant. Under his facile, sure, and soft graver every detail was rendered, every shade of colour and every variety of texture. The result was always an harmonious unit. He was his father's constant companion and worked with unwearying patience with him. In 1723 Pierre-Imbert finished his portrait of Bossuet after Rigaud (see CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA, II, s. v. Bossuet), "perhaps the finest of all the engraved portraits of France" (Lippman). In 1724 the portrait of Cardinal Dubois was engraved. Both of these are treated broadly and freely, show magnificent handling of draperies, and possess exquisite finish. The great plate of Adrienne Lecouvreur (1730) and that of Samuel Bernard are by many authorities ranked with the Bossuet. For Bernard's portrait Rigaud himself made the drawing, a most unusual event in eighteenth-century engraving. Besides his masterly portraits, Pierre-Imbert produced many religious and historical plates, chiefly of Coypel. A sunstroke (1726) resulted in intermittent imbecility, and the talented and hardworking master—the last of the pure-line men—had thirteen years of such madness before his death. He kept on engraving, however, until the end. He was a member of the Académie de Peinture and the king assigned him apartments in the Louvre. Among his pupils were François and Jacques Chéreau and Simon Vallée.

The following are among his principal works: "Presentation of the Virgin", after Le Brun; "Presentation in the Temple", after L. Boullongne; portraits of the Archbishop of Cambrai (after Vivien); and René Pucelle, his last work, after Rigaud.

CLAUDE DREVET, a French engraver, b. at Lyons, 1705; d. in Paris, 1782. He was a nephew and pupil of Pierre the Elder and at first followed the traditions of the two Pierres, forming about him a coterie of engravers who endeavoured to keep alive their great traditions. Later he became very hard and precise with the graver, and his work lost all its artistic and painter-like quality, everything being sacrificed for a brilliant technic. Nevertheless, many of his plates possess great charm and delicacy. Claude seemed indifferent to his art and produced but little compared with the other members of the family. When Pierre-Imbert died, his rooms in the Louvre were given to Claude, who proceeded to squander nearly all the money left him by his uncle and his cousin.

He engraved portraits of Henri Oswald, Cardinal d'Auvergne, after Rigaud, and of De Vintimille, Archbishop of Paris, also after Rigaud.

FIRMIN-DIDOT, *Les Drevet* (Paris, 1876); PAWLOWSKY, *Catalogue raisonné;* DILKE, *French Engravers and Draughtsmen of the XVIII Century* (London, 1902); LIPPMAN, *Engraving and Etching* (New York, 1906); PERNETTY, *Les Lyonnais dignes de mémoire*, II, 139.

LEIGH HUNT.

Drexel, FRANCIS ANTHONY, banker, b. at Philadelphia, U. S. A., 20 June, 1824; d. there 15 Feb., 1885. He was the oldest son of Francis Martin Drexel, a Tyrolese by birth, and by profession a portrait-painter and musician, who in 1837 turned his attention to finance, and founded the house of Drexel & Co. in Philadelphia with connexions with the firms of J. S. Morgan & Co. of New York, and Drexel, Harjes & Co. of Paris. Associated with him were his sons Francis Anthony, Anthony Joseph, and Joseph William. Francis Anthony began his financial career at the age of thirteen, and at his father's death in 1863 became the senior member of the firm, and was recognized as one of America's foremost financiers. The house of Drexel & Co. was in the public estimation unalterably associated with the strictest integrity and the most broadminded liberality. At critical periods it came generously to the support of the public credit. Francis A. Drexel's growing fortune did not alienate him from religion or harden his heart against the appeals of charity. He remained to the end poor in spirit, and regarded his vast wealth merely as a Divinely lent instrument for doing good. In his exercises of piety and his copious distribution of charities, he was ably seconded by his second wife, Emma Bouvier Drexel, who died before him. His children by his first wife, who was Hannah J. Langstroth, were Elizabeth, who died 26 September, 1890, and was the wife of Walter George Smith, of Philadelphia, and Katharine, who entered religion and founded the congregation of the Sisters of the Blessed Sacrament for Indians and Coloured People (see CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA, II, p. 599). Another daughter, Louise, wife of Edward Morrell, was the only child of his second marriage. In his will Mr. Drexel followed the Biblical injunction of bequeathing a tithe ($1,500,000) of his great estate to religious and charitable purposes, with the further proviso that in case his daughters should leave no issue, the entire estate should be distributed among the institutions specified in the will. His daughters continued to walk in the footsteps of their father. Among their own benefactions, Mrs. Smith and Mrs. Morrell founded the St. Francis Industrial School at Eddington, Pennsylvania. The Francis A. Drexel Chair of Moral Theology in the Catholic University of America was founded by his daughters in honour of Mr. Drexel.

FRANCIS ANTHONY DREXEL

JAMES F. LOUGHLIN.

Drey, JOHANN SEBASTIAN VON, professor of theology at the University of Tübingen, b. 16 Oct., 1777, at

Killingen, in the parish of Röhlingen, in the then ecclesiastical principality of Ellwangen; d. 19 Feb., 1853. The parish priest of Röhlingen, an ex-Jesuit, noting the boy's talents, instructed him in the elements of Latin, and persuaded his parents to send him, in 1787, in spite of their extreme poverty, to the gymnasium of Ellwangen. There he lived partly on the charity of the townspeople and partly by tutoring, especially in Latin, mathematics, and physics. He studied theology, 1797–1799, at Augsburg; after 1799 he lived in the diocesan seminary at Pfaffenhausen and was ordained in the summer of 1801. During his five years as assistant in his native place, Drey studied the then paramount philosophy of Kant, Fichte, and Schelling, and the philosophical erudition which he acquired in this study appears clearly in his scientific works. His position, from 1806, as professor of philosophy of religion, mathematics, and physics in the Catholic academy of Rottweil, formed a good preparation for his subsequent academical career.

St. Colman's Church, Dromore

When in 1812 King Frederick I of Würtemberg founded the University of Ellwangen as a Catholic national university for his recently acquired Catholic territory, Drey was called to lecture there on dogmatics, history of dogma, apologetics, and introduction to theology. There he published two Latin dissertations: "Observata quædam ad illustrandam Justini M. de regno millenario sententiam" (1814), and "Dissertatio historico-theologica originem et vicissitudinem exomologeseos in ecclesiâ catholicâ ex documentis ecclesiasticis illustrans" (1815), the latter of which was denounced to Rome, but without serious consequences for its author, at least for the time being.

When King William I (1817) incorporated the University of Ellwangen with the old national University of Tübingen as its Catholic faculty of theology, Drey with his colleagues, Gratz and Herbst, joined the staff of the new school and founded (1819), together with them and his new colleague, Hirscher, the "Theologische Quartalschrift" of Tübingen, still flourishing; he took a prominent part in its publication and wrote for it a number of essays and reviews. In the same year he published: "Kurze Einleitung in das Studium der Theologie mit Rücksicht auf den wissenschaftlichen Standpunkt und das katholische System". An effort to make Drey first bishop of the newly founded Diocese of Rottenburg failed, among other reasons because of the distrust with which he was regarded in Rome owing to his above-named work on confession. Somewhat as a recompense the first position at the cathedral was reserved for him, which, however, he never filled. In 1832 appeared his "Neue Untersuchungen über die Konstitutionen und Kanones der Apostel", a work of such thoroughness that only recent investigations, especially those of von Funk, have gone beyond it. After convalescing from a severe illness, he was relieved from his office as teacher of dogmatic theology (1838). Just then his principal work, in three volumes, appeared: "Die Apologetik als wissenschaftliche Nachweisung der Göttlichkeit des Christentums in seiner Erscheinung" (1838–1847). Still comparatively robust, though well advanced in years, Drey was pensioned in 1846, almost against his will; he continued, however, to write for Wetzer and Welte's "Kirchenlexikon" and for the "Theologische Quartalschrift" of Tübingen. With Möhler, Drey was the founder of the so-called Catholic School of Tübingen. Like Möhler, Hefele, and von Funk, he was a truly critical historian. But Drey also gave to the systematic theology of this school its peculiar stamp, equi-distinct from Traditionalism and Rationalism, recognizing on the one hand the objective facts in the history of Revelation and the tradition from generation to generation, maintaining on the other the rights of our natural reason and of philosophical speculation, with all due loyalty to dogma. Kuhn and Schanz faithfully followed in the path marked out by Drey.

Theologische Quartalschrift, XXXV (1853), 340 sqq., LXXX (1898), 18 sq.

Johann Baptist Sägmüller.

Dromore, Diocese of (Dromorensis, and in ancient documents Drumorensis), one of the eight suffragans of Armagh, Ireland. It includes portions of the counties of Down, Armagh, and Antrim, and contains eighteen parishes, of which two, Newry and Clonallon, are mensal parishes. It takes its name from Dromore (*Druim Mor*, great ridge), a small town in the north-west of County Down, sixty-three miles north of Dublin, twenty-five miles east of Armagh, and fourteen miles south-west of Belfast, which is built on the same river, the Lagan. The See of Dromore was founded in the sixth century by St. Colman (called also Mocholmoc), one of the many holy men (more than a hundred) bearing that name in the calendars of Irish saints. From a prophecy said to have been uttered by St. Patrick, sixty years before, Archbishop Healy ("Life and Writings of St. Patrick", p. 494) infers that St. Patrick claimed no immediate spiritual jurisdiction over the territory of Iveagh which forms mainly the Diocese of Dromore, but willed that territory to be reserved for a bishop of the native race of Dal-Araide—namely, St. Colman, who founded his see there about the year 514, some sixty years after St. Patrick founded the See of Armagh. Dromore has had its own independent jurisdiction ever since. The old cathedral of Dromore, which had been taken by the Protestants, was burnt down by the Irish insurgents in 1641, and rebuilt by Bishop Taylor twenty years later; but it has been far surpassed by the Catholic church recently erected. The seat of the cathedral, however, was transferred some two hundred years ago to Newry, the largest town of County Down, and a place of great historical interest, situated at the head of Carlingford Lough. In this town, when the severity of the Penal Laws began to relax, in the latter half of the eighteenth century, the Catholics built in a retired suburb a very plain church which is still in use; but just before Catholic Emancipation an edifice worthy of the name of cathedral was begun in 1825 and completed by Dr. Michael Blake (1833–1860)

The Cathedral, Newry

who had been Vicar-General of Dublin and the restorer of the Irish College at Rome. This cathedral was greatly enlarged and beautified by Bishop Henry O'Neill, who succeeded Bishop McGivern in 1901.

Under Dr. McGivern's predecessor, Dr. John Pius Leahy, O. P. (1860–1890), a Dominican priory was founded on the Armagh side of Newry, and a very handsome church erected. The Poor Clares, who went to Newry from Harold's Cross, Dublin, in 1830, were for many years the only nuns north of the Boyne. The Sisters of Mercy founded a convent at Newry in 1855, and have now flourishing establishments in Lurgan, Rostrevor, and Warrenpoint. There is a large diocesan college at Violet Hill near Newry which is under the patronage of St. Colman. To this patron saint of the diocese and its first bishop, besides the church at Dromore already referred to, are also dedicated the parish churches at Tullylish, Kilvarlin, in the parish of Magheralin, and Barnmeen near Rathfriland in the parish of Drumgath. Few ecclesiastical antiquities have survived the ravages of time, war, and heresy. Abbey Yard in Newry marks the site of the Cistercian abbey founded in the year 1144 by St. Bernard's friend, St. Malachy O'Morgair, and endowed in 1157 by Maurice O'Loughlin, King of All Ireland. It is called in the annals *Monasterium de Viridi Ligno*—a name given to Newry from the yew-tree said to have been planted there by St. Patrick, the Irish name being Niubar (and sometimes Newrkintragh, "the yew at the head of the strand") which is latinized *Ivorium* or *Nevoracum*, but more commonly as above *Viride Lignum*. There are the ruins of an old church half a mile east of Hilltown. In the adjoining parish of Kilbroney (church of St. Bronach, a virgin saint of the district) half a mile north-east of Rostrevor is a graveyard with the venerable ruins of a church, an ancient stone cross, and a little to the west St. Brigid's well. Imbedded in a tree in this graveyard, a very antique bell was found about a hundred years ago and is now carefully preserved.

The first Protestant Bishop of Dromore was John Tod, on whom it was bestowed *in commendam* in 1606, while he was at the same time Bishop of Down and Connor. It was an unfortunate beginning; for the Protestant historian, Sir James Ware, says Tod was degraded for incontinence and poisoned himself in prison in London. Two of his successors distinguished themselves more creditably: Jeremy Taylor, who was bishop of these three dioceses from 1661 to 1667, an eloquent preacher and a writer of genius, and Thomas Percy, Bishop of Dromore from 1782 to 1811, whose "Reliques of Ancient Poetry" had a great and enduring influence on English literature.

There are 18 parishes, 42 churches, and 53 priests, a diocesan seminary and a convent of Dominicans at Newry; also 5 convents of Sisters of Mercy, one of Poor Clares, and a college of the Christian Brothers (Newry). The Catholic population is (1908), 43,014; non-Catholic, 71,187.

O'Hanlon, *Lives of the Irish Saints* (Dublin, s. d.), VI, 224; Ware-Harris, *Antiquities of Ireland* (Dublin, 1739–45); Maziere Brady, *Episcopal Succession in England, Scotland, and Ireland* (Rome, 1876), I, 296; Archdall, *Monasticon Hibernicum*, ed. Moran (Dublin, 1873), I, 285; Healy, *Life and Writings of St. Patrick* (Dublin, 1905), 324, 494; Reeves, *Down, Connor, and Dromore* (Dublin, 1847), 303; O'Laverty, *Bishops of Down and Connor* (Dublin, 1895), 300.

Matthew Russell.

Drostan (Drustan, Dustan, Throstan), Saint, a Scottish abbot who flourished about A. D. 600. All that is known of him is found in the "Breviarium Aberdonense" and in the "Book of Deir", a ninth-century MS. now in the University Library of Cambridge, but these two accounts do not agree in every particular. He appears to have belonged to the royal family of the Scoti, his father's name being Cosgrach. Showing signs of a religious vocation he was entrusted at an early age to the care of St. Columba, who trained him and gave him the monastic habit. He accompanied that saint when he visited Aberdour (Aberdeen) in Buchan. The Pictish ruler of that country gave them the site of Deir, fourteen miles farther inland, where they established a monastery, and when St. Columba returned to Iona he left St. Drostan there as abbot of the new foundation. On the death of the Abbot of Dalquhongale (Holywood) some few years later, St. Drostan was chosen to succeed him. Afterwards, feeling called to a life of greater seclusion, he resigned his abbacy, went farther north, and became a hermit at Glenesk. Here his sanctity attracted the poor and needy, and many miracles are ascribed to him, including the restoration of sight to a priest named Symon. After his death his relics were transferred to Aberdour and honourably preserved there. The "Breviary of Aberdeen" celebrates his feast on 15 December. The monastery of Deir, which had fallen into decay, was rebuilt for Cistercian monks in 1213 and so continued until the Reformation.

Dempster, *Hist. Eccl. Gent. Scot.* (Edinburgh, 1829); *Breviarium Aberdonense* (London, 1854); Innes, *Scotland in the Middle Ages* (Edinburgh, 1860); Forbes, *Kalendar of Scottish Saints* (Edinburgh, 1872); Gammack in *Dict. of Christ. Biog.* (London, 1877).

G. Cyprian Alston.

Droste-Hülshoff, Annette Elisabeth. See Hülshoff.

Droste-Vischering, Clemens August von, Archbishop of Cologne, b. 21 Jan., 1773, at Münster, Germany; d. 19 Oct., 1845, in the same city. Besides attending the University of Münster, he had as private tutor the well-known church historian Theodore Katerkamp (d. 1834). At an early age he was introduced into the circle of learned men that gathered around Baron von Fürstenberg and the pious and refined Princess Amelia von Gallitzin, where he imbibed the thoroughly Catholic principles which characterized him while Archbishop of Cologne. After completing his studies he began, in June, 1796, an extensive educational journey under the direction of Katerkamp, through Germany, Switzerland, and Italy, returning to Münster in Aug., 1797. The following year, on 14 May, he was ordained priest by his brother Caspar Maximilian, then Auxiliary Bishop of Münster. In accordance with the wish of the aged Baron von Fürstenberg, Vicar-General and Administrator of the Diocese of Münster, the cathedral chapter elected Clemens August as his coadjutor on 18 Jan., 1807, and when Fürstenberg resigned six months later, Clemens August became his successor. As administrator he founded in 1808 an independent congregation of Sisters of Mercy, the so-called Klemens-Schwestern, who, though practically confined to the Diocese of Münster, numbered 81 houses and 1126 members in 1904. When in 1813 Münster became part of Napoleon's monarchy, the emperor appointed Baron von Spiegel as Bishop of Münster without the knowledge of the pope, but after Napoleon's fall the pope restored Clemens August to his former office in March, 1815. Under Prussian rule the administrator repeatedly came into conflict with the Government on account of his attitude towards mixed marriages and the supervision of theological studies. When by an agreement between the Holy See and the Prussian Government the dioceses of Prussia were again supplied with bishops, Clemens August, who was not *persona grata* to the Prussian Government, withdrew from public life and devoted himself to works of piety and charity. He remained in seclusion even after being consecrated Auxiliary Bishop of Münster with the titular See of Calama in 1827.

After the death of Baron von Spiegel, the incumbent of the metropolitan See of Cologne, the Prussian Government, to the surprise of Catholics and Protestants alike, desired Clemens August as his successor.

This unexpected move on the part of the Government was intended to conciliate the Catholic nobility of Westphalia and Rhenish Prussia as well as the Catholic clergy and laity, who began to lose confidence in the fairmindedness of the Government and justly protested against the open favouritism shown to Protestants in civil and ecclesiastical affairs. The cathedral chapter of Cologne, which had become accustomed to act as a passive instrument in the hands of the Government, elected Clemens August as Archbishop of Cologne on 1 Dec., 1835. He received the papal confirmation on 1 Feb., 1836, and was solemnly enthroned by his brother, Maximilian, Bishop of Münster, on 29 May. Soon after this he came into conflict with the adherents of Hermes (d. 1831), whose doctrines (see HERMES AND HERMESIANISM) had been condemned by Pope Gregory XVI on 26 Sept., 1835. When many professors at the University of Bonn refused to submit to the papal Bull, Clemens August refused the imprimatur to their theological magazine, forbade the students of theology to attend their lectures, and drew up a list of anti-Hermesian theses to which all candidates for sacerdotal ordination and all pastors who wished to be transferred to new parishes were obliged to swear adherence. The Government was angered because the archbishop had enforced the papal Bull without the royal approbation, but gave him to understand that it would allow him free scope in this affair, provided he would accede to its demands concerning mixed marriages. Before Clemens August became archbishop he was asked by an agent of the Government whether, if he should be set over a diocese, he would keep in force the agreement regarding mixed marriages, which was made "in accordance with the papal Brief of 25 March, 1830", between Archbishop von Spiegel and Minister Bunsen on 19 June, 1834. Clemens August did not then know in what this agreement consisted, and misled by the words "in accordance with the papal Brief", answered in the affirmative. After becoming archbishop he discovered that the agreement in question, far from being in accordance with the papal Brief, was in some essential points in direct opposition to it. The papal Brief forbade Catholic priests to celebrate mixed marriages unless the Catholic training of the children was guaranteed, while in the agreement between von Spiegel and Bunsen no such guarantee was required. Under these circumstances it was the plain duty of the archbishop to be guided by the papal Brief, and all attempts of the Government to the contrary were futile. His conscientious devotion to duty finally caused the Government to have recourse to the most drastic measures.

Advised by Minister Bunsen, Frederick William III ordered the arrest of the archbishop. The order was carried out in all haste and secrecy on the evening of 20 Nov., 1837, and Clemens August was transported as a criminal to the fortress of Minden. If the Government thought it could overawe the Catholics of Prussia by thus trampling under foot the religious liberty of its subjects, it speedily discovered its mistake. The Bishops of Münster and Paderborn, fired by the example of Clemens August, recalled the assent they had formerly given to the agreement; while Martin von Dunin, the Archbishop of Gnesen and Posen, was imprisoned at Kolberg for the same offence that had sent Clemens August to Minden. In an Allocution of 10 Dec., 1837, Pope Gregory XVI praised the course of the Archbishop of Cologne and solemnly protested against the action of the Government. The slanderous "Darlegung", or exposé, in which the Government attempted to defend its course by accusing the archbishop of treason, was refuted by Joseph Görres in his great apologetical work "Athanasius", and a declaration of the true state of affairs was published at Rome by order of the pope. The Government saw its mistake and the archbishop was set free on 22 April, 1839. He was permitted to retain the title of Archbishop of Cologne, but, in order to uphold the authority of the State in the public eye, was prevailed upon to select a coadjutor in the person of Johann von Geissel (q. v.), Bishop of Speyer, who henceforth directed the affairs of the archdiocese. The slanderous accusations of the above-mentioned "Darlegung" were publicly retracted by Frederick William IV, who had meanwhile succeeded to the throne. In 1844 the archbishop went to Rome, where he was most kindly received by the pope and the Curia. The cardinalate, which was offered him by the pope, he refused with thanks and returned to Münster in October. Clemens August is the author of a few ascetical and ecclesiastico-political works. The most important is an exposition of the rights of Church and State entitled "Ueber den Frieden unter der Kirche und den Staaten", published at Münster in 1843.

BRÜCK, *Geschichte der kath. Kirche in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert* (Münster, 1903), II, 298 sqq.; KAPPEN, *Clemens August, Erzbischof von Köln* (Münster, 1897); MUTH in *Deutschlands Episcopat in Lebensbildern* (Würzburg, 1875), III, no. 5.

MICHAEL OTT.

Druidism.—The etymology of this word from the Greek δρῦς, "oak", has been a favourite one since the time of Pliny the Elder; according to this the druids would be the priests of the god or gods identified with the oak. It is true that the oak plays an important part as the sacred tree in the ancient cult of the Aryans of Europe, and this etymology is helped out by the Welsh word for druid, viz. *derwydd*. But there is a difficulty in equating the synonymous Irish *draoi* and Welsh *derwydd*. Probably the best-substantiated derivation of the word is from the root *vid*, "to know", and the intensive prefix *dru*. According to this etymology, the druids would be the "very wise and learned ones". But this, like the others, is merely a conjecture, and it has been surmised that the word as well as the institution was not of Celtic origin. Although the druids are mentioned with more or less fullness of account by a score of ancient writers, the information to be derived from their statements is very meagre, and very little of it is at first hand. Even Cæsar, who probably came more in contact with the druids than any other writer, does not seem to speak of the druids of his time in particular, but of the druids in general. With the ancient writers the word *druid* had two meanings: in the stricter sense it meant the teachers of moral philosophy and science; in the wider sense it included the priests, diviners, judges, teachers, physicians, astronomers, and philosophers of Gaul. They formed a class apart and kept the people, who were far inferior to them in culture, in subjection. They were regarded as the most just of men, and disputes both public and private were referred to them for settlement. Thus their influence was much more a social than a religious one, in spite of the common opinion that they were exclusively a priestly class or Gaulish clergy. They enjoyed certain privileges, such as exemption from military service and the payment of taxes; and the ancient authors are unanimous in speaking of the great honours which were shown them.

Above all, the druids were the educators of the nobility. Their instruction was very varied and extensive. It consisted of a large number of verses learned by heart, and we are told that sometimes twenty years were required to complete their course of study. They held that their learning should not be consigned to writing. They must have had a considerable oral literature of sacred songs, formulæ of prayers, rules of divination and magic, but of all this lore not a verse has come down to us, either in their own language or in the form of translation, nor is there even a legend that we can call with certitude druidic. Pomponius

Mela is the first author who says that their instruction was secret and carried on in caves and forests. It is commonly believed that the druids were the stubborn champions of Gaulish liberty and that they took a direct part in the government of the nation, but this is an hypothesis which, however probable, is not supported, for the early period at least, by any text or by the statement of any ancient author. "The principal point of their doctrine", says Cæsar, "is that the soul does not die and that after death it passes from one body into another." But, as is well known, the belief in the immortality of the soul was not peculiar to the teachings of the philosophers of Gaul. Just what was the nature of that second life in which they believed is not quite clear. Some of the Greek authors, struck by the analogy of this doctrine with that of Pythagoras, believed that the druids had borrowed it from the Greek philosopher or from one of his disciples. The practice of human sacrifice, which has often been imputed to the druids, is now known to have been a survival of a pre-druidic custom, although some members of the druidic corporation not only took part in, but presided at, these ceremonies. Nor has it been proved that the druids had gods of their own or had introduced any new divinity or rites into Gaul, with the exception perhaps of the *Dispater*, who, according to Cæsar, was regarded by the druids as the head of the nation, and who may have owned his origin to their belief. The druids, in addition to teaching, which was their most important occupation, seem to have been content to preside over the traditional religious ceremonies and to have acted as intermediaries between the gods, such as they found them, and men. It is certain that they had a philosophy, but it is very unlikely that their doctrines had penetrated into the great mass of the population.

DRUID STONE, CARROWMORE, SLIGO, IRELAND

Although the only positive information we possess on the druids is to the effect that their institution existed in Gaul and Britain between the years 53 B.C. and A.D. 77, there is evidence to show that it must have existed from a much earlier time and lasted longer than the limits fixed by these dates. It seems reasonable to suppose that the influence of the druids was already at its decline when Cæsar made his campaigns in Gaul, and that to them was due the civilization of Gaul in the fifth and fourth centuries B. C. We may affirm that references to the druids and signs of the existence of their institution, in the germ at least, are found which would date them as early as the third century B. C. With the Roman conquest of Gaul the druids lost all their jurisdiction, druidism suffered a great decay, and there is no reason to believe that it survived long after A. D. 77, the date of the last mention of the druids as still in existence. The opening of the schools of Marseilles, Bordeaux, and Lyons put an end to their usefulness as teachers of moral philosophy; and if some of them remained scattered here and there in Gaul, most of them were obliged to emigrate to Britain. The Emperors Tiberius and Claudius abolished certain practices in the cult of the druids, their organization, and their assemblies, but their disappearance was gradual and due as much to the romanization of the land as to any political measure or act of violence or persecution on the part of Rome. Yet there can be no doubt that Rome feared the druids as teachers of the Gallo-Roman youth and judges of trials. In Gaul in the third century of the Christian Era there is mention of women who predicted the future and were known as druidesses, but they were merely sorcerers, and we are not to conclude from the name they bore that druidism was still in existence at that late date. According to Cæsar, it was a tradition in Gaul in his time that the druids were of British ori-

STONEHENGE, SALISBURY PLAIN, WILTSHIRE, ENGLAND

gin and that it was to Great Britain that they went to make a thorough study of their doctrine, but the authors of antiquity throw very little light on the institution and practices of druidism in the island of Britain.

Our information concerning the druids of Ireland is drawn from what the Christian hagiographers have written of them and what can be gathered from the casual references to them in the epic literature of Ireland. We have only fragmentary notices of the matter of their teachings, but it is clear that there were the most striking resemblances between the druids of Ireland and those of Gaul. In both lands they appear as magicians, diviners, physicians, and teachers, and not as the representatives of a certain religion. In the saga tales of Ireland they are most often found in the service of kings, who employed them as advisers because of their power in magic. In the exercise of this they made use of wands of yew, upon which they wrote in a secret character called ogham. This was called their "keys of wisdom". In Ireland, as in Gaul, they enjoyed a high reputation for learning, and some Irish druids held a rank even higher than that of the king. But they were not exempt from military service nor do they seem to have formed a corporation as in Gaul. In the earliest Christian literature of Ireland the druids are represented as the bitterest opponents of Christianity, but even the Christians of the time seem to have believed in their supernatural power of prophecy and magic. The principal thesis in M. Alexandre Bertrand's book on the religion of the Gauls is that druidism was not an isolated institution in antiquity, without analogy, but that its parallel is to be looked for in the lamaseries which still survive in Tatary and Tibet. He maintains that great druidic communities flourished in Gaul, Britain, and Ireland many centuries before the Christian Era, and that these were the models and beginnings of the abbeys of the Western monks. In this way he would explain the literary and scientific superiority of the monasteries of Ireland and Wales in the early Middle Ages. However ingenious and attractive this hypothesis may be, it is not supported by any historical documents, and many negative arguments might be brought to bear against it.

RHYS, *Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as illustrated by Celtic Heathendom* in *Hibbert Lectures* (London, 1886); ANWYL, *Celtic Religion in Pre-Christian Times* (London, 1906); BERTRAND, *La Religion des Gaulois* (Paris, 1897); D'ARBOIS DE JUBAINVILLE, *Cours de Littérature celtique* (Paris, 1883), I, 83–240; DOTTIN, *La Religion des Celtes* (Paris, 1904).

JOSEPH DUNN.

Druillettes (or DREUILLETS), GABRIEL, missionary, b. in France, 29 September, 1610; d. at Quebec, 8 April, 1681. Druillettes entered the Society of Jesus at Toulouse, 28 July, 1629, and went to Canada in 1643. After studying the Algonquin tongue, he accompanied the Indians on their winter hunting expeditions, sharing in all their privations. Parkman calls attention to the extraordinary piety of those Montagnais, who were mostly Christians, as well as to the great sufferings undergone by the missionary. On the same day that Jogues was sent to the Mohawks, 26 August, 1646, Druillettes was given a mission among the Abnaki, on the Kennebec. He ascended the Chaudière, reached what is now Moosehead Lake by portage, and then entered the Kennebec. Continuing down the river he arrived at the English post of Coussinoc, now Augusta, where he met the agent, John Winslow, who became his life-long friend. From Coussinoc he journeyed on until he reached the sea and then travelled along the coast as far as the Penobscot, where he was welcomed by the Capuchins who had established a mission there. Druillettes was the first white man to make this remarkable journey from the St. Lawrence. Retracing his steps, he established a mission on the Kennebec about a league above Coussinoc. Subsequently it grew into the famous Norridgewock, where Father Rasle was slain. He returned to Quebec in June, but the Capuchins considered that the entire district of Maine was under their jurisdiction, the Jesuits resolved to abandon the mission. In 1648, however, both the Capuchins and Abnaki asked Druillettes to return. But he did not resume his work until 1650, and when he left Quebec the second time it was as envoy of the Government to negotiate a treaty at Boston with the Puritans of New England for commercial purposes, as well as for mutual protection against the Iroquois. He was received with great kindness by the principal men in the English colonies, notably by the famous missionary John Eliot, and by Major-General Gibbons, who kept him at his house. Druillettes speaks in the highest terms of Endicott. Shea is of the opinion that Father Druillettes said Mass privately in Boston, in December, 1650. He returned to the Kennebec in January, and in the following June was again sent as French commissioner to attend a meeting of the representatives of the English colonists at New Haven, September, 1651. Failing to induce the deputies to make a treaty, he resumed his labours among the Abnaki, returning finally to Quebec in March, 1652.

After this date he laboured among the Montagnais Indians, and at Sillery and Three Rivers. In 1658 he embarked with Father Garreau on an Indian flotilla to go to the Ottawas near Lake Superior; but the party was attacked near Montreal, Garreau was slain, and the expedition seems to have been abandoned. Druillettes and Father Dablon then attempted to reach the North Sea. In 1660 they paddled up the Saguenay, reached Lake St. John and continued their course up a tributary, which they called the River of the Blessed Sacrament, finally coming to Nekouba, which was twenty-nine days from Tadousac. As the Indians refused to go any farther north and the country offered no prospect of a mission the travellers returned to Quebec. In 1670 he was at Sault Sainte Marie and was one of those who participated with Allouez and Marquette in the famous "taking possession" of the country by Saint-Lusson in May, 1671. He laboured chiefly among the Mississauga, besides attending to other dependent missions towards Green Bay. Druillettes was regarded as a man of great sanctity, and miracles are attributed to him. He was remarkable for his knowledge of the Indian languages, and Marquette, before going West, was sent to study Algonquin under his direction at Three Rivers. His work among the Indians extended over a period of thirty-eight years. There is a great diversity in the spelling of his name; Charlevoix writes it Dreuillets. He is also called Droullettes and even Brouillettes.

THWAITES, *Jesuit Relations* (Cleveland, 1901), passim; SHEA, *Catholic Church in Colonial Days* (New York, 1886); CHARLEVOIX, *Histoire de la Nouvelle-France* (New York, 1868), II, III, tr.; ROCHEMONTEIX, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle-France* (Paris, 1896), II; PARKMAN, *The Jesuits in North America* (Boston, 1901).

T. J. CAMPBELL.

Drumgoole, JOHN C., priest and philanthropist, b. at Granard, Co. Longford, Ireland, 15 August, 1816; d. in New York, 28 March, 1888. He emigrated to New York in 1824, and to support his widowed mother worked as a shoemaker. His piety and zeal attracted the notice of the pastor of St. Mary's church who made him the sexton of that parish in 1844. He had always cherished an aspiration to study for the priesthood, and to provide the means for this and to maintain his mother he conducted a small book-store. In 1863 he left St. Mary's to carry out his intention of entering the seminary; after making preliminary studies at St. Francis Xavier's and St. John's Colleges, he was admitted as an ecclesiastical student at the seminary of Our Lady of Angels, Suspension Bridge, New York, in 1865. He was ordained priest there 24 May, 1869, and assigned as an assistant at St. Mary's, where he had formerly been sexton.

From here he was appointed to take charge of a lodging-house for boys which the St. Vincent de Paul Society had opened some time previously. The caring for homeless and destitute children appealed to him specially, and he volunteered to take up the direction of this work which had languished until then. Under his sympathetic and prudent management success was at once assured. He started St. Joseph's Union for the support of the institution and soon extended its membership all over the world. The first location of the lodging-house became inadequate to the needs and he purchased land at Great Jones Street and Lafayette Place and built an imposing structure which was opened as the Mission of the Immaculate Virgin in December, 1881. In the following year a farm was bought on Staten Island, and Mount Loretto, the country-place of the Mission, where trade schools and other buildings were built, their care being given to a community of Franciscan Sisters. These buildings cost more than a million dollars and were large enough to care for 2000 destitute children annually; at his death, which occurred after a very short illness, Father Drumgoole left them entirely free of debt. He accomplished all this without any great personal talents apart from a simplicity and earnestness of charity that won him friends everywhere. He had singular success in managing boys, and, like his great prototype, Don Bosco, he believed and said that it was all due to his rule: "in looking after the interests of the child it is necessary to cultivate the heart."

JOHN C. DRUMGOOLE

The Charities Review (New York, Sept., 1898); *The Freeman's Journal, The Catholic Review* (New York), contemporary files.

MALLICK J. FITZPATRICK.

Drury, ROBERT, VENERABLE, Martyr (1567–1607), was born of a good Buckinghamshire family and was received into the English College at Reims, 1 April, 1588. On 17 September, 1590, he was sent to the new College at Valladolid; here he finished his studies, was ordained priest and returned to England in 1593. He laboured chiefly in London, where his learning and virtue made him much respected among his brethren. He was one of the appellants against the archpriest Blackwell, and his name is affixed to the appeal of 17 November, 1600, dated from the prison at Wisbech. An invitation from the Government to these priests to acknowledge their allegiance and duty to the queen (dated 5 November, 1602) led to the famous loyal address of 31 January, 1603, drawn up by Dr. William Bishop, and signed by thirteen of the leading priests, including the two martyrs, Drury and Cadwallador. In this address they acknowledged the queen as their lawful sovereign, repudiated the claim of the pope to release them from their duty of allegiance to her, and expressed their abhorrence of the forcible attempts already made to restore the Catholic religion and their determination to reveal any further conspiracies against the Government which should come to their knowledge. In return they ingenuously pleaded that as they were ready to render to Cæsar the things that were Cæsar's, so they might be permitted to yield to the successor of Peter that obedience which Peter himself might have claimed under the commission of Christ, and so to distinguish between their several duties and obligations as to be ready on the one hand "to spend their blood in defence of her Majesty", but on the other "rather to lose their lives than infringe the lawful authority of Christ's Catholic Church". This bold repudiation of the pope's deposing power was condemned by the theological faculty of Louvain; but it is noteworthy that its author was selected by the pope himself as the very man in whose person he would revive the episcopal authority in England; Dr. William Bishop being nominated Bishop of Chalcedon and first vicar Apostolic in that country in 1623.

The results of the address were disappointing; Elizabeth died within three months of its signature, and James I soon proved that he would not be satisfied with any purely civil allegiance. He thirsted for spiritual authority, and, with the assistance of an apostate Jesuit, a new oath of allegiance was drawn up, which in its subtlety was designed to trouble the conscience of Catholics and divide them on the lawfulness of taking it. It was imposed 5 July, 1606, and about this time Drury was arrested. He was condemned for his priesthood, but was offered his life if he would take the new oath. A letter from Father Persons, S.J., against its lawfulness was found on him. The oath declared that the "damnable doctrine" of the deposing power was "impious and heretical", and it was condemned by Pope Paul V, 22 September, 1606, "as containing many things contrary to the Faith and Salvation". This brief, however, was suppressed by the archpriest, and Drury probably did not know of it. But he felt that his conscience would not permit him to take the oath, and he died a martyr at Tyburn, 26 February, 1606–7. A curious contemporary account of his martyrdom, entitled "A true Report of the Arraignment . . . of a Popish Priest named Robert Drewrie" (London, 1607), which has been reprinted in the "Harleian Miscellany", calls him a Benedictine, and says he wore his monastic habit at the execution. But this "habit" as described proves to be the cassock and cap worn by the secular clergy. The writer adds, "There were certain papers shown at Tyburn which had been found about him, of a very dangerous and traitorous nature, and among them also was his Benedictine faculty under seal, expressing what power and authority he had from the pope to make men, women, and children here of his order; what indulgence and pardons he could grant them", etc. He may have been a *confrater* or oblate of the order.

Harleian Miscellany (London, 1607), III; CHALLONER, *Memoirs of Missionary Priests* (1742), II, 16; *Douay Diaries*, p. 218, sqq.; CAMM, *A Benedictine Martyr in England* (London, 1897); TIERNEY-DODD, *Church History*, III, IV; MORRIS, *Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers*, III.

BEDE CAMM.

Drusilla, daughter of Herod Agrippa I, was six years of age at the time of her father's death at Cæsarea, A. D. 44. She had already been betrothed to Epiphanes, the son of Antiochus, King of Commagene. Herod had stipulated that Epiphanes should embrace the Jewish religion. The prince finally refused to abide by his promise to do so, and the brother of Drusilla, Herod Agrippa II, gave her in marriage to Azizus, King of Emesa, who, in order to obtain her hand, consented to be circumcised. It was shortly after this marriage, it would appear, that Felix, the Roman procurator of Judea, met the beautiful young queen. This meeting very likely took place at the court of Herod Agrippa II, for we can gather from Josephus that Berenice, the elder sister, whose jealousy the Jewish historian mentions as an explanation of Drusilla's conduct, lived with her brother at this time. Felix was struck by the great beauty of Drusilla, and determined to make her his wife. In order to per-

suade a Jewess, who had shown attachment to her religion, to be divorced from her husband and marry a pagan, the unscrupulous governor had recourse to the arts of a Jewish magician from Cyprus whose name, according to some MSS. of Josephus, was Atomos, according to others, Simon. The ill-advised Drusilla was persuaded to accede to the solicitations of Felix. She was about twenty-two years of age when she appeared at the side of the latter, during St. Paul's captivity at Cæsarea (Acts, xxiv, 24–25). Like her husband, she must have listened with terror as the Apostle "treated of justice, and chastity and of the judgment to come". It is said that during the reign of Titus a son of Felix and Drusilla perished together with his wife in the eruption of Vesuvius. But there is no information about the life of Drusilla herself after the scene described in Acts.

JOSEPHUS, *Antiq. Jud.* in *Fl. Josephi Opera*, ed. NIESE (Berlin, 1887–1895), XIX, ix, 1–2; vii, 1–2; SCHÜRER, *Gesch. des jüdischen Volkes* (Leipzig, 1901), I, 555, 557, 564, 573, 577; BEURLIER in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v. *Drusille*.

W. S. REILLY.

Drusipara, a titular see in Thracia Prima. Nothing is known of the ancient history of this town, which, according to Ptolemy, III, 11, 7, and Itiner. Anton., was situated on the route from Adrianople to Byzantium. Under Maximian, St. Alexander suffered martyrdom there (Acta Sanct., May, III, 15). In the time of Emperor Mauritius the city was captured by the Khakan of the Avars, who burned the church and destroyed the relics of the martyr (Theophyl. Simocatta, VII, 14, 15). Drusipara was at first an episcopal see, suffragan of Heraclia (Lequien, Or. Christ., I, 1131, etc.); in the eighth and ninth centuries it became an independent archbishopric, which must have been suppressed during the Bulgarian invasions. In two "Notitiæ Episcopatuum" Mesene appears as a later name for Drusipara; at Mesene in 1453 died the wife of the famous Grand Duke Notaras (Ducas, Hist. Byz., 42). Mesene is to-day a little village, with 500 inhabitants, east of Karishtiran in the vilayet of Adrianople.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Druys (Lat. DRUSIUS), JEAN, thirtieth Abbot of Parc near Louvain, Belgium, b. at Cumptich, near Tirlemont; d. 25 March, 1635. He studied successively at St-Trond, Liège, Namur, and Louvain, and entered the Norbertine Abbey of Parc in 1587. Ordained priest, he was sent to the Norbertine College at Louvain and obtained his licentiate in 1595. Recalled to the abbey, he was made sub-prior and professor of theology to the young religious at the abbey, chaplain to Abbot Ambrose Loots at the Refuge, which the abbey possessed at Brussels during the troublous times at the end of the sixteenth century, and at the death of Abbot Loots his successor. Four years later he was appointed vicar-general to the Abbot-General of Prémontré, and was later named by Archduke Albert a member of the States of Brabant and of his private council. The University of Louvain having suffered much from the religious and political disturbances of the time, Druys was appointed, with a layman, visitor to the university, with full power to reform abuses, a task which was not completed until 1617. He was also made visitor to the University of Douai (1616) and to the Celestine monastery at Héverlé. In addition he restored and enlarged his own abbey, which had suffered much from the vandalism of the soldiers, and provided better educational advantages for his religious. At the general chapter held at Prémontré in 1628, Abbot Druys was commissioned to revise the statutes of the order and conform them to the prescriptions of the Council of Trent, a revision which was approved at the general chapter of 1630. Druys prefixed a preface, "Præfatio ad omnes candidissimi et canonici ordinis religiosos", which Foppens characterizes as *longam, piam, eruditam*. He had a tree of the saints of the order made by the skilful engraver, C. Mallery. He also published a small work entitled "Exhortatio ad candidi ordinis religiosos". Abbot Druys was deputed by the general chapter of 1630 to bring back several abbeys of Spain into union and observance, but was unsuccessful. While on this mission he conferred with Phillip IV on the sad state of affairs in Brabant. A ring presented to him by this monarch is preserved at Parc, as is also a letter from Henrietta Maria, Queen of England.

Annales Præmont. Parcum., II, 486; *Bibl. Norbert.*, 3, 4, 5 (1904); GOOVAERTS, *Dict. bio-bibl. de l'ordre Prémont.* (Brussels), I, 206.

MARTIN GEUDENS.

Druzbicki, GASPAR, ascetic writer, b. at Sierady in Poland, 1589; entered the Society of Jesus, 20 August, 1609; d. at Posen, 2 April, 1662. After some years of teaching he became master of novices, and subsequently rector of the colleges of Kalisz, Ostrog, and Posen. He was twice provincial and was in the seventh and tenth general congregations of the order. Almost all his works are posthumous and have been drawn from his "Opera Ascetica". It has been found impossible to arrange them in chronological order. Among them are a brief defence of the Society against a writer in the Cracow Academy (1632); books of meditations on the Life and Passion of Christ, some in Polish, some in Latin; "The Tribunal of Conscience", translated into English for the "Quarterly Series", edited by the English Jesuits (London, 1885); and "Provisiones Senectutis" (Ingolstadt, 1732). There are also "Considerations for Every Sunday and Feast of the Year" (Kalisz, 1679); "The Sacred Heart, the Goal of Hearts" (Angers, 1885), translated for the English "Messenger", probably by Father Dignam (1890); "Exercises for Novices" (Prague, 1890); "The Religious Vows" (Posen, 1690), translated into Spanish and found in the Library of Guadalajara, Mexico; "Solid Jesuit Virtue" (Prague, 1696); "Lapis Lydius" (Mainz, 1875), translated into French by the Redemptorist Father Ratti (Paris, 1886) and into German by the Benedictine Gütrabher (Salzburg, 1740). A complete list of Druzbicki's works occupies twelve columns in Sommervogel.

DE BACKER, *Bibl. de la c. de J.*, I, 1659–64, III, 2149; SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la c. de J.*, III, 212.

T. J. CAMPBELL.

Druzes, a small Mohammedan sect in Syria, notorious for their opposition to the Maronites, a Catholic people dwelling on the slopes of the Lebanon. Their name is derived as a plural from Dorazy, the proper name of a Persian at the court of El Hakim in Egypt (about A.D. 1015). They subsequently repudiated all connexion with this Mohammed Ibn Ismail el-Dorazy, and styled themselves Unitarians or *Muwahhedin*, on account of the emphasis they lay on the unity of God. Their history begins with the arrival of Dorazy in the Wady el-Teim after his flight from Egpyt. This Persian had had the audacity to read to a large multitude gathered in a mosque a book tending to prove that El Hakim, the mad Fatimite caliph, was an incarnation of God. Escaping from the crowd, who were enraged at this blasphemy, he fled to the valley between Hermon and the Southern Lebanon, and with the support of his master preached his doctrine to these mountaineers, already given to Batenite doctrines and therefore predisposed to accept a further incarnation of the Deity. He was soon superseded by another Persian, Hamzeh Ibn Ahmed El Hady, who became the real founder of the sect and the author of its sacred books. After the assassination of El Hakim, Hamzeh wrote a treatise to prove that El Hakim had not really died but only disappeared to test the faith of his followers. This disappearance and ulti-

DRYBURGH ABBEY

mate return of El Hakim are cardinal points of the Druze faith to-day. The sacred books of the Druzes, successfully hidden from the world for eight centuries, have since the middle of the last century found their way into European libraries. They are written in Arabic and affect the style of the Koran. They consist of six volumes containing 111 treatises of a controversial character or explanatory epistles to individual persons. Each book takes its name from its first treatise. Their speculations strongly reflect their Persian origin.

The Druze doctrine concerning God is characterized by its abstraction from all Divine attributes; these, it declares, would imply limitation in the Supreme Being. God, however, manifested Himself first in the Universal Mind, then in the Universal Soul, and again in the Word. These three form the first great manifestation. The second great manifestation began with the residence of the Universal Mind in Adam for a thousand years; after which Enoch took his place, and in turn was followed by the Seven Ministers, Noe, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Mohammed, Ibn Ismail; the seventh is unknown. God appeared ten times in human form, for the last time in El Hakim. The Druzes teach a distinction between Jesus, the son of Joseph, and the Christ. Christ instructed Jesus, but finally Jesus disobeyed Christ and was crucified in consequence. Christ, who was concealed under the form of one of the Disciples of Jesus, stole the body of Jesus from the grave and gave out the report that Christ had risen, in order that the true Druzes might be concealed for awhile in the religion of Jesus. The Druzes are firm believers in the transmigration of souls, and this transmigration will never end; after the Judgment Day death it will continue, but will be painless for the saved, who will live to the age of 120 years, and whose souls will forthwith be reborn and re-enter a life of peace and pleasure. The Druzes are unshakably convinced that the whole of China is peopled with adherents of their religion. The Judgment Day, or rather the golden age for the Druzes, will be at hand when the Christians wax greater than the Mohammedans, some nine hundred years after the disappearance of El Hakim. Then the Christians, aided by the King of Abyssinia, a sort of Antichrist called "The Antagonist", will march against the Caaba in Mecca. The hosts of Christ and Mohammed will meet, but only to be both overcome by 2,500,000 Chinese Druzes. Moslems and Christians will both be reduced to everlasting slavery, and the Unitarians will reign forever. The Druze religion contains seven moral precepts: veracity, love of the brethren, forsaking of idolatry, repudiation of devils, acknowledgment of God's unity at all times, secrecy in religion, and resignation to the will of God.

DRUZE WOMAN
(In Bridal Dress)

The Druzes are divided into two main classes: the Ukkal, or initiated, and the Juhhal, or uninitiated; amongst the former, the Iwayid profess the strictest Druze principles. They meet on Thursday evenings for worship, which consists almost exclusively in reading their sacred books. They often comply with the outward observances of Islam and even make pretence of being Mohammedans, but they are officially designated as unbelievers. They live mostly in the Lebanon, but are also found in the Hauran and in the districts near Damascus; their total number is estimated at 100,000 or a few thousand more. Encouraged by Turkish authorities, the Druzes in 1860 attacked the Catholic Maronites, and are said to have massacred some ten thousand of them. The massacres were stayed mainly through English and French intervention.

WORTABET, *Researches into the Religions of Syria* (London, 1860); CHURCHILL, *The Druzes and Maronites* (London, 1862); SOCIN in *Realencyk. für prot. Theol.* (Leipzig, 1898), s. v. *Drusen*; NEUMANN, *Das Volk der Drusen* (Vienna, 1878).

J. P. ARENDZEN.

Dryburgh Abbey, a monastery belonging to the canons of the Premonstratensian Order (Norbertine or White Canons), situated four miles south-east of Melrose, Scotland. It was founded about 1150 by Hugo de Morville, Constable of Scotland, who brought a community from Alnwick in Northumberland. The situation is beautiful, a wooded promontory, around three sides of which sweeps the River Tweed. The church was dedicated to the Blessed Virgin. The monastery was burnt to the ground by Edward II, who encamped in the grounds when retreating from Scotland in 1322; but it was restored under Robert I, who himself contributed largely. At the Dissolution it was created a temporal lordship, and conferred by James VI on the Earl of Mar, who made it over to his third son, ancestor of the Earl of Buchan. It has again come into the hands of the last-named family in recent times by purchase.

The general style of the existing remains of Dryburgh is Early English, with some older (Norman) work. Of the church only the western gable, the ends of the transept, and part of the choir remain; but considerable portions of the conventual buildings have been preserved, including the refectory, with a beautiful rose window. James Stuart, of the Darnley family, is buried under the high altar; and various members of the Buchan family lie in one of the chapels. The principal object of interest to visitors is the tomb of Sir Walter Scott, in St. Mary's Aisle (part of the north transept). Sir Walter's maternal ancestors, the Haliburtons, at one time owned Dryburgh. His wife and eldest son are also interred here.

DUGDALE, *Monast. Anglic.*, VII, 1152; *Chartulary of Dryburgh Abbey* in Advocates' Library, Edinburgh; *Harl. MSS.* 4623, II, fol. 85, and 4613. *Liber S. Mariæ de Dryburgh*, ed. BANNATYNE CLUB (Edinburgh, 1847); *Dryburgh Abbey, Its Monks and Its Lords* (London, 1859).

D. O. HUNTER-BLAIR.

Dryden, JOHN, poet, dramatist, critic, and translator; b. 9 August, 1631, at Oldwinkle All Saints, Northamptonshire, England; d. at London, 30 April, 1700. He was the son of Erasmus Dryden (or Driden) and Mary Pickering, daughter of the Rev. Henry Pickering. Erasmus Dryden was the son of Sir Erasmus Dryden, and was a justice of the peace under Cromwell. On both sides Dryden's family were of the Parliamentary party. He received his early education as a king's scholar at Westminster and while there his first published work appeared. This was an elegy contributed in 1649 to the "Lachrymæ Musarum", a collection of tributes in memory of Henry, Lord Hastings. He entered Trinity College, Cambridge, 18 May, 1650, being elected to a scholarship on 2 October. He graduated as Bachelor of Arts, January, 1653–4, and after inheriting from his father a small estate worth £60 annually, he returned to Cambridge, living there until 1655. The "Heroic Stanzas" on the death of Oliver Cromwell, his first important work (1658), are smooth and vigorous, and while laudatory,

are not meanly so. There is no attack on royalty and no mention of Cromwell's religion. Dryden always was in favour of authority and of peace from civil strife, and consequently when disorders broke out upon Cromwell's death, he, with the rest of the nation, welcomed the return of Charles II. He celebrated the king's return with his poem of "Astræa Redux" (1660), in which he already showed his mastery of the rhymed couplet. Then followed his poems on the "Coronation" (1661); "To Lord Clarendon" (1662); "To Dr. Charleton" (1663); "To the Duchess of York" (1665); and "Annus Mirabilis" (1667). His great prose "Essay on Dramatick Poesie" appeared in 1668. Meantime, in 1662, Dryden had been elected to the Royal Society, and on 1 December, 1663, he was married to Lady Elizabeth Howard, eldest daughter of the Earl of Berkshire.

In 1662 he began his dramatic career with "The Wild Gallant", a comedy of humours, influenced by Spanish sources. In 1663 appeared "The Rival Ladies", a tragi-comedy, also from a Spanish model. To this Dryden prefixed the first of the famous prefaces in which he laid down his principles of dramatic criticism. "The Indian Emperor", a heroic play, his first original drama, appeared in 1665. In 1667 he produced "The Maiden Queen", a comedy in which some blank verse is seen alongside of the rhymed couplet and prose; "Sir Martin Mar-all", a prose comedy based on "L'Étourdi" of Molière; and an adaptation of "The Tempest" with Davenant. "The Mock Astrologer" (1668) was an imitation of "Le feint astrologue" of Thomas Corneille, influenced by Molière's "Dépit amoureux". About this time Dryden entered into an agreement with the King's Theatre Company. According to this he was to produce three plays a year, for which he was to receive one and one-quarter shares out of a total of twelve and three-quarters. In the winter of 1668–9, "Tyrannic Love, or the Royal Martyr", a rhymed heroic tragedy, was played, and in 1670 his greatest heroic tragedy, the first and second parts of "Almanzor and Almahide, or the Conquest of Granada".

Dryden was given the degree of M. A. by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1668; in 1670 he was made poet laureate and royal historiographer, which brought him an annual income of £200. In 1671 he was satirized in "The Rehearsal", a play written by Buckingham, Butler, and others. "Marriage à la Mode", a comedy in prose and rhyme, was played in 1672, as well as "The Assignation, or Love in a Nunnery", a prose comedy, interspersed with a little blank verse. "Amboyna" (1673) was a prose tragedy on the subject of the Dutch outrages, and "The State of Innocence" (1674) was an unsuccessful attempt to treat the theme of Paradise Lost. "Aurengzebe" (1676) is a rhymed tragedy in which the run-on lines show a tendency toward blank verse, which becomes triumphant in the next play, "All for Love" (1678). This is Dryden's masterpiece, a play based on the story of Anthony and Cleopatra which he wrote to satisfy his own standards. It is a play worthy of comparison with Shakespeare's "Anthony and Cleopatra", surpassing it in unity of time and motive, and in the part of Ventidius adding one of the great characters of the English drama. "Limberham" (1678), a prose comedy, was unsuccessful and was withdrawn after three nights. After the production of "Œdipus", a tragedy in blank verse written in collaboration with Lee in 1679, Dryden seems to have quarrelled with the King's Company, and his next play, "Troilus and Cressida", (1679), an adaptation in blank verse and prose of Shakespeare's play, was produced by the Duke's Company. With the "Spanish Friar" (1681) he closed for a time his dramatic career. He had in the meantime suffered as well as profited by his fame. The Earl of Rochester, suspecting that Dryden had aided Lord Mulgrave in his attack on Rochester in the "Essay on Satire", caused Dryden to be beaten by hired ruffians as he passed through Rose Street, Covent Garden, while returning from Will's coffee house to his own house in Gerrard Street. It is characteristic of the unfair attitude taken by Dryden's enemies that this cowardly assault was held by them to reflect upon his character.

In November, 1681, Dryden began, in the first part of "Absalom and Achitophel", the series of satires in the rhymed couplet which placed him at the head of English satirical poets. "Absalom and Achitophel" was the most important literary expression of the party which prevented the exclusion of the Duke of York from the succession to the throne. It is also one of the greatest of English satires, especially in its portraiture of the characters of the Duke of Monmouth and the Earl of Shaftesbury, both of whom the author has represented allegorically in the title of the poem. Then followed, in March, 1682, "The Medal", an assault upon Shaftesbury. These poems occasioned many attacks on Dryden, and to one of them, the "Medal of John Bayes" by Thomas Shadwell, Dryden replied, in October, 1682, by "Mac Flecknoe", a vigorous satire which dismissed Shadwell as the "last great prophet of tautology". In November, 1682, appeared the second part of "Absalom and Achitophel", in which Nahum Tate collaborated. In "Religio Laici" (1682) Dryden presented an argument for the faith of the Church of England, and in 1685, on the death of Charles II, he wrote an ode called "Threnodia Augustalis". In 1684 at Charles' request he had also translated "The History of The League" from the French of Maimbourg. Dryden's position at the death of Charles was not an enviable one. His income from play-writing had ceased, his pensions were not regularly paid, though they were continued by James II, and in answer to his appeal for some of the arrears, which amounted to £1000 in 1683, he had received £75 and an appointment as collector of customs of the port of London, the emoluments of which office are not known. He was converted to Catholicism in 1686. This step was the natural outcome of his investigation into theology,

the first result of which had been "Religio Laici". This poem, while a defence of the Church of England, showed a desire for an infallible guide in religious matters and indicates the direction in which Dryden's thoughts were turning. The accession of James gave him the additional incentive of belonging to the king's religion, a powerful motive in Dryden's case, for he was a devoted adherent to authority in Church and State. Dryden was accused of time-serving by his enemies, but this charge is easily disproved by his perseverance in his conversion during the next reign, when he refused even to dedicate his translation of Virgil to William III, lest he should be suspected of denying his religious or political principles.

Dryden published in April, 1687, "The Hind and the Panther", in some ways his most important work. It is divided into three parts; the first describes the different sects in England under the allegorical figures of beasts; the second deals with a controversy between the Hind (the Catholic Church) and the Panther (the Church of England); the third continues this dialogue and develops personal and doctrinal satire. In this poem Dryden succeeded in the difficult task of rendering argument in verse interesting. Especially noteworthy are lines 499–555 (second part), in which he describes the foundation and the authority of the Church, and lines 235–50 (third part), in which he defends his own course of action. In 1688 Dryden translated the "Life of St. Francis Zavier" from the French (1682) of Père Dominique Bouhours, S. J., and when an heir to the throne was born he celebrated the event in his poem of "Britannia Rediviva". The Revolution of 1688 deprived him of his laureateship, and other lucrative posts, on account of his refusal to take the oaths of allegiance to the new government, and left him practically dependent upon his own literary exertions. He turned once more to the stage and produced in 1690 "Don Sebastian", a tragi-comedy in blank verse and prose which rivals "All for Love" for the supreme place among his plays, and in the same year "Amphitryon", a comedy, based on Molière, though with several original situations. In 1691 followed "King Arthur", an opera-masque; in 1692 "Cleomenes", in which Dryden in the course of the blank verse relapses into rhyme; in 1694 "Love Triumphant", a tragi-comedy in blank verse and prose, the last of his plays. In 1693 he published another of his great critical essays, "A Discourse concerning the Original and Progress of Satire", and in 1695 "A Parallel of Poetry and Painting", prefixed to his translation of Du Fresnoy's "Art of Painting".

With his remarkable power of adaptation Dryden now gave his attention to another literary form, that of translation. He had before this, in 1680, made some translations of Ovid; and in the "Miscellanies" of 1684 and 1685, and of 1693 and 1694 there are specimens of Ovid, Horace, Homer, Theocritus and Lucretius, which, together with his more complete translations of Virgil and Juvenal, make a total of about 30,000 lines. In July, 1697, the "Pastorals", the "Georgics", and the "Æneid" of Virgil were published, and the edition was sold off in about six months. Meanwhile, in 1692, Dryden had composed an elegy on Eleonora, Countess of Abingdon, for which he received 500 guineas. About this time, also, he wrote his famous address to Congreve on the failure of the "Double Dealer". In 1699, at the close of his life, he published his "Fables". This volume contained five paraphrases of Chaucer, three of Boccaccio, besides the first book of the "Iliad", and "Alexander's Feast", perhaps his greatest lyrical poem, written in 1697 for a musical society in London which celebrated St. Cecilia's day. Dryden had also written the ode for the celebration in 1687 by the same society. Dryden did not long survive the publication of his last book. He died of inflammation caused by gout, and was buried in Westminster Abbey.

Dryden's position in the history of English literature is one of supreme importance. He brought the rhymed couplet as a means of satire to a brilliancy and a point never surpassed before or since his time; as a close and logical reasoner in verse he has never been equalled. As a dramatist he did much good work and in some cases, as in "All for Love" or "Don Sebastian", he achieved supreme distinction as a lyrist. He has left many exquisite songs and at least two of the finest odes in the language. As a translator and adaptor he ranks high, while as a prose writer he not only produced a body of criticism which established him as one of the greatest of English critics, but he also clarified English prose and marked the way for future development. As a man, he shared the faults of his time, but the scandals heaped upon him by his enemies have fallen away under critical examination, and the impression remains of a brave, honest Englishman, earnest in every cause he championed, who loved to praise those who befriended him, and who could suffer reverses in silence and dignity. The standard edition of Dryden's works is that edited by Walter Scott in 18 volumes in 1808 and re-edited by George Saintsbury (Edinburgh, 1882–93).

For lives of Dryden, see SAINTSBURY, *Dryden* in *English Men of Letters Series* (1881); CHRISTIE, *Memoir* in Globe Edition of *Dryden's Poems* (London, 1870); IDEM in *Dryden's Satires* (Oxford, 1871, 5th ed., 1893); COLLINS, *Memoir* in *The Satires of Dryden* (London, 1893). See also KER in *Introduction* to *The Essays of John Dryden* (Oxford, 1900), II; ROOT, *Dryden's Conversion to the Roman Catholic Faith* in *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* (June, 1907), new series, XV, Pt. II; BELJAME, *Le public et les hommes de lettres en Angleterre au dix-huitième siècle* (Paris, 1883).

CHARLES DRYDEN, eldest son of John Dryden the poet, b. at Charlton, in Wiltshire, England, in 1665 or 1666; d. in 1704. He was educated at Westminster, and elected to Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1683, but could not enter, being a Catholic. He contributed to the second volume of his father's "Miscellany" of 1685, and turned into English the seventh satire for the translation of Juvenal in 1692. He then went to Italy and became chamberlain to Pope Innocent XII, coming back to England in 1697 or 1698. He was drowned in the Thames and was buried at Windsor, 20 August, 1704.

GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.; *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.

ARTHUR H. QUINN.

Dry Mass. See MASS.

Dualism (from Lat. *duo*, two), like most other philosophical terms, has been employed in different meanings by different schools.—*First*, the name has been used to denote the religious or theological system which would explain the universe as the outcome of two eternally opposed and coexisting principles, conceived as good and evil, light and darkness, or some other form of conflicting powers. We find this theory widely prevalent in the East, and especially in Persia, for several centuries before the Christian Era. The Zend-Avesta, ascribed to Zoroaster, who probably lived in the sixth century B. C. and is supposed to be the founder or reformer of the Medo-Persian religion, explains the world as the outcome of the struggle between Ormuzd and Ahriman. Ormuzd is infinite light, supreme wisdom, and the author of all good; Ahriman is the principle of darkness and of all evil. In the third century after Christ, Manes, for a time a convert to Christianity, developed a form of Gnosticism, subsequently styled Manichæism, in which he sought to fuse some of the elements of the Christian religion with the dualistic creed of Zoroastrianism (see MANICHÆISM and ZOROASTER). Christian philosophy, expounded with minor differences by theologians and philosophers from St. Augustine downwards, holds generally that physical evil is the result of the necessary limitations of finite created beings, and that moral evil, which alone is evil in the true sense, is a consequence of the creation of beings possessed of

free wills, and is tolerated by God. Both physical and moral evil are to be conceived as some form of privation or defect of being, not as a positive entity. Their existence is thus not irreconcilable with the doctrine of theistic monism.—*Second*, the term dualism is employed in opposition to monism, to signify the ordinary view that the existing universe contains two radically distinct kinds of being or substance—matter and spirit, body and mind. This is the most frequent use of the name in modern philosophy, where it is commonly contrasted with monism. But it should not be forgotten that dualism in this sense is quite reconcilable with a monistic origin of all things. The theistic doctrine of creation gives a monistic account of the universe in this sense. Dualism is thus opposed to both materialism and idealism. Idealism, however, of the Berkeleyan type, which maintains the existence of a multitude of distinct substantial minds, may, along with dualism, be described as pluralism.

Historically, in Greek philosophy as early as 500 B. C. we find the Eleatic School with Parmenides as their chief, teaching a universal unity of being, thus exhibiting a certain affinity with modern German monism. Being alone exists. It is absolutely one, eternal, and unchangeable. There is no real becoming or beginning of being. Seeming changes and plurality of beings are mere appearances. To this unity of being Plato opposed an original duality—God and unproduced matter, existing side by side from all eternity. This matter, however, was conceived as indeterminate, chaotic, fluctuating, and governed by a blind necessity, in contrast with mind which acts according to plan. The order and arrangement are due to God. Evil and disorder in the world have their source in the resistance of matter which God has not altogether vanquished. Here we seem to have a trace of the Oriental speculation. Again there is another dualism in man. The rational soul is a spiritual substance distinct from the body within which it dwells, somewhat as the charioteer in the chariot. Aristotle is dualistic on sundry important topics. The contrast between the fundamental conceptions of matter and form—of a potential and an actualizing principle—runs through all branches of his system. Necessarily coeternal with God, Who is pure actuality, there has existed the passive principle of matter, which in this sense, however, is mere potentiality. But further, along with God Who is the Prime Mover, there must also have existed from all eternity the World moved by God. In his treatment of cognition Aristotle adopts the ordinary common-sense view of the existence of individual objects distinct from our perceptions and ideas of them. Man is an individual substantial being resulting from the coalescence of the two principles—form (the soul) and matter.

Christianity rejected all forms of a dual origin of the world which erected matter, or evil, or any other principle into a second eternal being coexistent with God; and it taught the monistic origin of the universe from one, infinite, self-existing spiritual Being who freely created all things. The unfamiliar conception of free creation, however, met with considerable opposition in the schools of philosophy and was abandoned by several of the earlier heresies. The neo-Platonists sought to lessen the difficulty by emanastic forms of pantheism, and also by inserting intermediate beings between God and the world. But the former method implied a materialistic conception of God, while the latter only postponed the difficulty. From the thirteenth century, through the influence of Albertus Magnus and still more of St. Thomas Aquinas, the philosophy of Aristotle, though subjected to some important modifications, became the accredited philosophy of the Church. The dualistic hypothesis of an eternal world existing side by side with God was of course rejected. But the conception of spiritual being as opposed to matter received fuller definition and development. The distinction between the human soul and the body which it animates was made clearer and their separability emphasized; but the ultra-dualism of Plato was avoided by insisting on the intimate union of soul and body to constitute one substantial being under the conception of form and matter.

The problem of dualism, however, was lifted into quite a new position in modern philosophy by Descartes (q. v.). Indeed, since his time it has been a topic of central interest in philosophical speculation. His handling of two distinct questions, the one epistemological, the other metaphysical, brought this about. The mind stands in a cognitional relation to the external world, and in a causal relation to the changes within the body. What is the precise nature of each of these relations? According to Descartes the soul is *res cogitans*. Its essence is thought. It is simple and unextended. It has nothing in common with the body, but is connected with it in a single point, the pineal gland in the centre of the brain. In contrast with this, the essence of matter lies in extension. So the two forms of being are utterly disparate. Consequently the union between them is of an accidental or extrinsic character. Descartes thus approximates to the Platonic conception of charioteer and chariot. Soul and body are really two merely allied beings. How then do they interact? Real reciprocal influence or causal interaction seems impossible between such disparate things. Geulincx and other disciples of Descartes were driven to invent the hypothesis of occasionalism and Divine assistance, according to which it is God Himself who effects the appropriate change in either body or mind on the occasion of the corresponding change in the other. For this system of miraculous interferences Leibniz substituted the theory of pre-established harmony according to which God has coupled pairs of bodies and souls which are destined to run in parallel series of changes like two clocks started together. The same insoluble difficulty of psycho-physical parallelism remains on the hands of those psychologists and philosophers at the present day who reject the doctrine of the soul as a real being capable of acting on the body which it informs. The ultra-dualism of Descartes was immediately followed on the Continent by the pantheistic monism of Spinoza, which identified mind and matter in one infinite substance of which they are merely "modes".

The cognitional question Descartes solves by a theory of knowledge according to which the mind immediately perceives only its own ideas or modifications. The belief in an external world corresponding to these ideas is of the nature of an inference, and the guaranteeing of this inference or the construction of a reliable bridge from the subjective world of thought to the objective world of material being, was thenceforth the main problem of modern philosophy. Locke similarly taught that the mind immediately apprehends only its own ideas, but he assumed a real external world which corresponds to these ideas, at least as regards the primary qualities of matter. Berkeley, accepting Locke's assumption that the mind immediately cognizes only its own ideas, raised the question: What grounds have we for believing in the existence of a material world corresponding to those ideas? He concludes there are none. The external cause of these ideas is God Who awakens them in our minds by regular laws. The dualistic opposition between mind and matter is thus got rid of by denying an independent material world. But Berkeley still postulates a multitude of real substantial minds distinct from each other and apparently from God. We have thus idealistic pluralism. Hume carried Berkeley's scepticism a step farther and denied the existence of permanent spiritual substances, or minds, for grounds similar to those on which Berkeley rejected material substances. All we know to exist are ideas of greater or

GLENDALOUGH, COUNTY WICKLOW, IRELAND

less vividness. Kant repudiates this more extreme scepticism and adopts, at least in the second edition of his chief work, a form of dualism based on the distinction of phenomena and noumena. The mind immediately perceives only its own representations. These are modified by innate mental forms. They present to us only phenomena. But the noumena, the things-in-themselves, the external causes of these phenomenal representations, are beyond our power of cognition. Fichte rejected things-in-themselves outside the mind, and reduced the Kantian dualism to idealistic monism. The strongest and most consistent defenders of dualism in modern philosophy have been the Scotch School, including Reid, Stuart, and Hamilton. Among English writers in more recent times Martineau, McCosh, Mivart, and Case have carried on the same tradition on similar lines.

The problem of dualism, as its history suggests, involves two main questions: (1) Does there exist a material world outside of our minds and independent of our thought? (2) Supposing such a world to exist, how does the mind attain to the cognition of it?—The former question belongs to epistemology, material logic, or general philosophy; the latter to psychology. It is true that dualism is ultimately rejected by the materialist who reduces conscious states to functions or "aspects" of the brain; but objections from this standpoint will be more suitably dealt with under materialism and monism. The idealist theory since Berkeley, in all its forms, maintains that the mind can only know its own states or representations, and that what we suppose to be an independent material world is, in the last analysis, only a series of ideas and sensations plus belief in the possibility of other sensations. Our conviction of the objective reality of a vivid consistent dream is analogous to our conviction of the validity of our waking experience. Dualism affirms, in opposition to all forms of idealism, the independent extramental reality of the material world. Among its chief arguments are the following: (1) Our belief in the existence of other minds is an inference from their bodies. Consequently the denial of an external material world involves the rejection of all evidence for the existence of other minds, and lands the idealist in the position of "Solipsism". (2) Physical science assumes the existence of a material world, existing when unperceived, possessing various properties, and exerting various powers according to definite constant laws. Thus astronomy describes the movements of heavenly bodies moving in space of three dimensions, attracting each other with forces inversely proportioned to the square of the distance. It postulates the movement and action of such bodies when they are invisible as well as when they are visible through long periods of time and over vast areas of space. From these assumptions it deduces future positions and foretells eclipses and transits many years ahead. Observations carried out by subsequent generations verify the predictions. Were there not an extramental world whose parts exist and act in a space and time truly mirrored by our cognitions and ideas, such a result would be impossible. The branches of science dealing with sound, light, heat, and electricity are equally irreconcilable with idealism. (3) The teachings of physiology and psycho-physics become peculiarly absurd in the idealist theory. What, for instance, is meant by saying that memory is dependent on modifications in the nervous substance of the brain, if all the material world, including the brain, is but a collection of mental states? (4) Psychology similarly assumes the extramental reality of the human body in its account of the growth of the senses and the development of perception. Were the idealist hypothesis true its language would be meaningless. All branches of science thus presuppose and confirm the dualistic view of common sense.

Granted, then, the truth of dualism, the psychological question emerges: How does the mind come to know the material world?—Broadly speaking there are two answers. According to one the mind immediately perceives only its own representations or ideas and from these it infers external material objects as the cause of these ideas. According to the other, in some of its acts it immediately perceives extended objects or part of the material world. As Hamilton says: "What we directly apprehend is the Non-ego, not some modification of the Ego". The theory which maintains an immediate perception of the non-ego he calls natural dualism or natural realism. The other, which holds a mediate cognition of the non-ego, as the inferred cause of a representation immediately apprehended, he terms hypothetical dualism or hypothetical realism. The doctrine of immediate or presentative perception is that adopted by the great body of the Scholastic philosophers and is embodied in the dictum that the idea, concept, or mental act of apprehension is *non id quod percipitur sed medium quo res percipitur*—not that which is perceived but the medium by which the object itself is perceived. This seems to be the only account of the nature of knowledge that does not lead logically to idealism; and the history of the subject confirms this view. But affirmation of the mind's capacity for immediate perception of the non-ego and insistence on the distinction between *id quod* and *id quo percipitur*, do not dispose of the whole difficulty. Modern psychology has become genetic. Its interest centres in tracing the growth and development of cognition from the simplest and most elementary sensations of infancy. Analysis of the perceptive processes of a later age, e. g. apprehension of size, shape, solidity, distance, and other qualities of remote objects, proves that operations seemingly instantaneous and immediate may involve the activity of memory, imagination, judgment, reasoning, and sub-conscious contributions from the past experience of other senses. There is thus much that is indirect and inferential in nearly all the percipient acts of mature life. This should be frankly admitted by the defender of natural dualism, and the chief psychological problem for him at the present day is to sift and discriminate what is immediate and direct from what is mediate or representative in the admittedly complex cognitional operations of normal adult life.

In Favour of Natural Dualism:—Rickaby, *First Principles of Knowledge* (New York and London, 1901); Case, *Physical Realism* (New York and London, 1881); Ueberweg, *Logic*, tr. (London, 1871); Hamilton, *Metaphysics* (Edinburgh and London, 1877); McCosh, *Exam. of Mill* (New York, 1875); Martineau, *A Study of Religion* (Oxford, 1888); Mivart, *Nature and Thought* (London, 1882); Maher, *Psychology* (New York and London, 1908); Farges, *L'Objectivité de la Perception* (Paris, 1891).

Against Natural Dualism:—Berkeley, *Principles of Human Knowledge*, ed. Fraser (Oxford, 1871); ed. Krauth (Philadelphia, 1874); Mill, *An Exam. of Sir W. Hamilton* (London, 1865); Bradley, *Appearance and Reality* (New York and London, 1899).

Michael Maher.

Dublin (Dublinum), Archdiocese of (Dublinensis), occupies about sixty miles of the middle eastern coast of Ireland, and penetrates inland about forty-six miles, including all the County of Dublin, nearly all of Wicklow, and parts of Kildare and Wexford, with three suffragans: Kildare and Leighlin, Ferns, and Ossory. It covers an area of 698,277 statute acres.

Ptolemy, who flourished in the first half of the second century, on his famous map places *Eblana civitas* under the same parallel of latitude as the present city of Dublin. The first mention of *Duibhlinn* in any extant Irish chronicles is found in the "Annals of the Four Masters", under date of 291, where the name, which in English signifies a black pool, is quoted as that of a river on the bank of which a battle was fought by the King of Ireland against the Leinstermen. A river still empties into the Liffey at Dublin, now known as the Poddle River, but formerly designated the Pool

or Pole, clearly a survival of the earlier Black-Pool. The natives distinguished the locality as *Ath-Cliath*, i. e. "The Ford of Hurdles", from the wicker bridge or ford by which the great road from Tara was conducted across the Liffey into Cualann (South County Dublin and Wicklow).

In 852, when Aulaf (Olaf) the Dane invaded Ireland and subjected all the contending tribes of Danes, he erected a fortress on the triangle of elevated land formed by the confluence of the Duibhlinn with the Liffey, a site now occupied by Dublin Castle. This fortress, taking its name from the river over which it stood, was called in Scandinavian *Dyflin*. In Anglo-Norman charters of the time of Henry II it became *Duvelina;* the legal scribes of King John brought it nearer to the name Dublin, which it has ever since retained. The fortress once established, there is no difficulty in imagining a town or city growing up and clustering around it, which after some time was furnished with a defensive wall, some remnants of which are yet visible.

Early Christian History.—The Christian Faith was preached in this territory, first by Palladius and then by St. Patrick. The stay of Palladius in Ireland was very short, scarcely a year, yet during that brief space he established three Christian communities, *Teach-Renan* (Tigroney), and Donard in County Wicklow, with *Ceill-Finne* in County Kildare. When the death of Palladius was known at Rome in 431, Patrick was immediately selected and consecrated bishop for this Irish mission. To him, therefore, thenceforth regarded as the Apostle of Ireland, the See of Dublin looks as to its founder. His first visit after brief landings at Wicklow, Malahide, and Holmpatrick, was to his old slave-master in the northern parts of the country. But so soon as he was able to gain the sanction of Leoghaire, King of Ireland, to preach the Gospel throughout the land, he visited every part of the island and made innumerable converts. At Kilcullen, in the Dublin Diocese, he established a bishop, and another at Lusk; while there are few parishes in the diocese that do not lay claim to a visit from him. Soon after his death in 492, the monastic system, which Patrick had himself partly initiated, became the settled form of ecclesiastical organization in Ireland. The number of tribes into which the country was divided, and the fierce inter-tribal jealousy that prevailed at all times, rendered this system the more desirable. Each tribe had its own monastic establishment with a portion of the tribe lands set apart for its endowment, and in most of these centres a bishop was to be found, frequently (but not necessarily) the ruler of the community. It was in such establishments that the ecclesiastical jurisdiction was centred. In this way we meet mention from time to time of bishops at Kilcullen, Lusk, Swords, Finglas, Glendalough, Taney, Clondalkin, Castledermot, and Bray. We have no existing records and but scant traditions of any monastic establishment known as *Duibhlinn;* but a tribe did lie scattered along the valley of the Coombe, which may have taken its name, as did the Danish fortress later on, from the *Duibhlinn* which meandered through its midst. The old church-dedications, which were certainly Celtic, of Patrick, Bridget, Kevin, and MacTaill, in this very neighbourhood, would point to such a conclusion. Such a tribe would undoubtedly have had its monastery with its resident bishop. If this surmise be correct, it would help to explain a list of bishops given in Harris's edition of Ware's "Antiquities of Ireland", and described as Bishops of Dublin; whilst from the invariable practice they all seem to have adopted, of embarking in some foreign missionary enterprise, they can scarcely be regarded as diocesan bishops in the accepted sense of the term, i. e. as prelates wedded to their sees.

The first of these bishops that we meet with is St. Livinus. He travelled into Belgium, where he converted many, and was at length crowned with martyrdom, 12 November, 663, in which month his feast is celebrated. To him succeeded Disibod, who being driven out by violence went to Germany, and after forty years' labour in the neighbourhood of Disibodenberg, named after him, died a very holy death. He flourished about 675. St. Wiro is next. He emulated the example of Livinus and passed over into Gaul. There, at the request of Pepin of Heristal, he established himself about 700 at Roermond in Holland, where a portion of his relics is preserved under the high altar of the cathedral dedicated to him. St. Gualafer is mentioned as bishop in the eighth century, but of him nothing is known except that he baptized and instructed his successor, who figures more conspicuously. St. Rumold was certainly Irish-born, and is reputed to have been some time Bishop of Dublin. He cherished an ardent desire for martyrdom, and setting out for Rome there received the pope's blessing. On his return journey he preached at Mechlin with great zeal and success. Having had occasion to rebuke certain public sinners, he met at their hands the longed-for martyrdom. He is the patron of Mechlin, whose splendid cathedral is dedicated to him, and his relics are preserved there in a sumptuous silver shrine. St. Sedulius, who died in 785, is given by some writers as "Bishop of Dublin", by others as "Abbot of Dublin". In all probability he filled both offices. In or about 890 there is mention of Cormac as bishop. Ware could learn nothing about him. D'Alton says he was bishop when Gregory, King of Scotland, besieged and captured Dublin.

Danish Period.—The year 815 is commonly assigned as the date when Scandinavian invaders began to make permanent settlements in Ireland. Hitherto their repeated visits had been mere piratical expeditions. They landed, plundered, and departed. But that year Turgesius and his followers came to stay. The "Annals of the Four Masters" tell us that in 849 the *Duibhgoill* or "black foreigners" arrived at *Ath Cliath* and made a great slaughter of the *Finngoill* or "white foreigners". In 850 the former gained a still more decisive victory. Finally in 852 Aulaf (Olaf) invaded Ireland, "and all the foreign tribes submitted to him". Thus was founded the Danish city and kingdom of Dublin. Aulaf was succeeded by Ivar in 870, and as the latter was at the same time King of Northumbria, this dual sovereignty of the Danish kings of Dublin was with occasional brief interruptions maintained throughout a period of nearly a century and a half. Paganism was of course the cult of these rude Norsemen. They sedulously practised the worship of Thor and Woden, and thus during a great portion of their prolonged rule in Dublin its Christian history becomes a blank, varied at intervals by doleful recitals of the burning and plundering of celebrated monasteries, such as Glendalough, Lusk, Swords, Clondalkin, etc. The first of the Danish kings to embrace Christianity was Sitric, who was baptized in England, and married King Athelstan's daughter in 925. But he very soon abjured the Faith, abandoned his wife, and died a pagan. His son, however, Aulaf Cuarann, on visiting England, was there converted in 943, and received at baptism by King Edmund. He remained firm in the Faith, and going to Iona on a pilgrimage in 980, died there "after penance and a good life". It was the conversion of this Aulaf and his family, aided by the efforts of Northumbrian monks whom he had brought over with him, that led to the conversion of the Danes of Dublin which chroniclers assign to 948.

The great victory won by King Brian Boru on the plain of Clontarf in 1014 broke for ever the power of the Danes in Ireland, but it did not dispossess them of Dublin. Their kings continued to rule there for a century and a half; nevertheless, the completeness of the victory, together with the civilizing effects of

Christianity, disposed the contending races to more friendly intercourse, and enabled Celt and Dane henceforward to live together in comparative peace. In 1038, little more than twenty years after the battle of Clontarf, we find another King Sitric (II) at Dublin, who, seeing that his subjects had all become Christians, was moved to organize the Church on a proper hierarchical basis. Wherefore in that year he founded and endowed a cathedral dedicated to the Holy Trinity (since Queen Elizabeth's time appropriated to Protestant worship and known as Christ Church). To minister in his cathedral he had a bishop appointed and consecrated; with this first bishop of the Danish Christians in Dublin, the See of Dublin may be said to have been formally founded. Having received their Christianity from Northumbria, the Danes looked to Canterbury for their spiritual government; and had their first bishop, Donatus, consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury. Except in faith and general discipline they were in no way identified with the rest of Christian Ireland.

Donatus died in 1074 and was succeeded by Patrick, who bore commendatory letters to Lanfranc and was consecrated by him in St. Paul's, London. After ruling the diocese for about ten years he perished at sea in 1084. Donat O'Haingly, evidently an Irishman, came next. He was a Benedictine monk in Lanfranc's monastery at Canterbury. By consent of the king and of the clergy of Dublin, he was consecrated by Lanfranc in 1085; he died of the plague in 1095. To him succeeded his nephew Samuel O'Haingly, a Benedictine monk of St. Alban's. He was consecrated at Winchester by Saint Anselm on the Sunday after Easter, 1096, and died in 1121. It was to this prelate that St. Anselm administered the sharp rebuke for having removed the monks from his church, from which we may infer that it was at this period that a chapter of secular canons was established in the cathedral, its clergy having been previously monastic. Gregory was chosen as successor. He is described as a wise man and well skilled in languages. He was consecrated at Lambeth by Ralph, Archbishop of Canterbury.

Pro-Cathedral, Marlborough Street, Dublin

Twelfth-century Reforms.—During Gregory's incumbency great and far-reaching changes were wrought in the ecclesiastical organization of Ireland. Up to this time, except in the Danish towns of Dublin, Waterford, and Limerick, the old system of centring jurisdiction in the monastery of the clan with a bishop resident, almost universally prevailed, but Gillebert (Gilbert), Bishop of Limerick, who had travelled much, and had made the acquaintance of St. Anselm, received a strong letter from the latter exhorting him to do his utmost, in union with the Irish bishops, to reform certain abuses and bring the system of ecclesiastical government more into conformity with the prevailing practice of Christendom. Whereupon Gillebert having received legatine powers from Paschal II convoked a synod which met at Rath-Breassail in 1118. At this synod the number of sees was fixed at twenty-four, Dublin excluded. Glendalough, the church founded by St. Kevin in the sixth century, was definitely erected into a diocese, but the Danish See of Dublin was ignored, or if referred to, it is described as being in the Diocese of Glendalough, for the latter came up to the very walls of Dublin and surrounded them on all sides. St. Malachy, consecrated Bishop of Connor about 1127, followed up the work of Gillebert, and on the occasion of a journey to Rome, besought Innocent II to constitute the Bishops of Armagh and Cashel metropolitans and transmit the pallium to them. Before his request could be fully considered, Malachy on a second journey fell sick on the way, and died at Clairvaux in the arms of St. Bernard (1148). The object of his journey, however, was not lost sight of, and in 1151, Eugene III commissioned Cardinal Paparo to proceed to Ireland and establish there four metropolitans, giving him the palliums with which each was to be invested. The cardinal on his arrival convoked a general synod at Kells in 1152. At this synod Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam, were created archiepiscopal sees, with canonical jurisdiction over their suffragans, and each of the new archbishops received the pallium. In this way Gregory became the first Archbishop of Dublin, and had assigned to him as suffragans the Sees of Kildare, Ossory, Leighlin, Ferns, and Glendalough. In a document drawn up by the then Archbishop of Tuam, in 1214, the cardinal is described as finding on his arrival in Ireland, a bishop dwelling in Dublin, who at the time exercised his episcopal office within the walls. "He found in the same diocese another church in the mountains, which likewise had the name of a city [Glendalough] and had a certain *chorepiscopus*. But he delivered the pallium to Dublin which was the best city and appointed that the diocese [Glendalough] in which both these cities were should be divided, and that one part thereof should fall to the metropolitan." This severed the North County Dublin known as Fingall, from Glendalough Diocese and annexed it to Dublin. Thus was the Church in Ireland reorganized in strict hierarchical form, and all dependence upon Canterbury was brought to an end.

Archbishop Gregory died in 1161 and was buried in the Holy Trinity Cathedral. To him succeeded Lorcan (latinized *Laurentius*) O'Toole, son of Muriartach, Prince of Imaile. His mother was an O'Byrne, so that he was Irish of the Irish. Entrusted at an early age to the care of the Bishop of Glendalough he grew up a pious and exemplary youth and eventually became a monk there. When but twenty-five years old he was elected abbot and a few years later bishop of the see. This choice, however, he successfully withstood. But his resistance did not long avail him. As soon as the See of Dublin was vacated both clergy and people turned their eyes on the Abbot of Glendalough and would not be refused. He was consecrated in Dublin cathedral by Gelasius of Armagh in 1162. His first act was to induce the canons of his chapter to become canons regular according to the rule of the priory of Aroasia. He himself assumed the religious habit with them and scrupulously conformed to the rule. He was indefatigable in his work and boundless

in his charity. In 1167 he attended a great convention held at Athboy at the request of King Roderic O'Conor, and helped there to enact several decrees affecting ecclesiastical discipline. In the following year the ill-starred Dermot MacMurrough set out for England to negotiate the betrayal of his country. In 1169 the first expedition of the Anglo-Normans landed in Ireland, and Wexford and Waterford soon fell before them. They then marched on Dublin, and in this expedition Strongbow was joined by the army of Dermot. Hasculf, the Danish king, made a sturdy defence, but eventually the city was captured and Hasculf and his followers escaped to their ships. In 1171 they returned with a number of Norwegians collected at Orkney and the Isles, and attacked the eastern gate of the city. St. Laurence implored King Roderic to come to their aid; the latter did assemble an army, but their operations were ineffective, and the grip of the Norman fastened on Dublin, never again to be relaxed. King Henry II of England

St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin

landed this same year, and received at Dublin the fealty of most of the native princes. Thenceforward Ireland became an appanage of the English Crown.

Early in the following year a synod was held in Cashel by order of Henry, at which Laurence assisted and where among other disciplinary regulations, the system of tithes was introduced, as is commonly believed. With the aid of Strongbow and other Norman chiefs he was enabled to enlarge and beautify Christ Church, i.e. Holy Trinity Cathedral, and the transepts and one bay of the choir remain to this day evidences of his work. In 1177 Cardinal Vivian arrived in Ireland as papal legate, summoned a meeting of bishops and abbots, and inculcated obedience to the conquerors. In 1179 Archbishop Laurence went to Rome to attend the Third General Council of the Lateran under Alexander III. The pope received him with marked kindness, took his see under his protection, confirmed its possessions, and extended its boundaries on the south as far as Bray. He also appointed him his legate in Ireland. Some time in 1180 the archbishop again crossed to England for the purpose of interviewing King Henry in the interests of his people, but Henry had no wish to see him and fled into Normandy. Laurence, nothing daunted, quickly pursued him, but had scarcely landed on the Norman coast when he fell seriously ill. He asked to be brought to the community of Canons Regular established at Eu, and there died peacefully 14 November, 1180. He was canonized by Honorius III in 1226, and his relics, being transferred, were placed over the high altar in a costly shrine where they are still devoutly venerated. His feast is celebrated in Dublin each recurring 14 November with great pomp and solemnity, and a parish church in that city is specially dedicated to him.

Norman-English Archbishops.—With the passing of St. Laurence, the Irish character of the newly constructed hierarchy, as far as Dublin was concerned, was brought to a premature close. The conquerors brought with them a colony of Bristol men and settled them in Dublin, and also brought all their feudal privileges and customs, prominent among which was the right of the English monarch to nominate to vacant sees within his dominion, this with the concurrence of the Holy See. In the exercise of this prerogative, Henry II named John Comyn, an Englishman, as successor to Laurence O'Toole. Henceforward, for full four centuries, the see was occupied by an unbroken line of twenty-five archbishops, all Englishmen, born, bred, and beneficed in England. Comyn proceeded to Rome where he was first ordained priest, and then consecrated bishop, by Lucius III at Velletri. He did not take up his residence in Dublin until 1184. The king conferred additional lands upon him to be held in barony tenure, by virtue of which he became a Lord of Parliament. In 1185 he received Prince John on his landing in Ireland, and in the same year the Diocese of Glendalough was united to Dublin; this union, however, was not to take effect until after the death of the governing bishop, William Piro. In 1186 he assembled a provincial synod in Christ Church cathedral at which several important canons were enacted. In 1190 he undertook the work of building a new church just outside the city wall. He erected it on the site of an old Celtic church dedicated to St. Patrick, but preserved the original dedication and opened it with great solemnity on Patrick's Day, 1191. In connexion with this church he founded and endowed a collegiate chapter of thirteen canons and erected an episcopal residence close by, which became known as St. Sepulchre's.

Archbishop Comyn died in 1212 and was succeeded by Henry de Loundres, Archdeacon of Stafford. Two years later William Piro, Bishop of Glendalough, died, whereupon the union of the sees promised by King John took place. De Loundres's principal work was the conversion of the collegiate chapter established by his predecessor in connexion with St. Patrick's, into a cathedral chapter, with four dignities and an increased number of prebendaries. This change presented the singular spectacle of a city having two cathedrals, with two chapters, one monastic, the other secular, an arrangement which led to a good deal of friction and gave much trouble to succeeding archbishops. In 1228 de Loundres was succeeded by Archbishop Luke, brought over from London. Flourishing as he did in the period of cathedral building, we need not be surprised to learn that he caught the infection, and practically re-erected St. Patrick's as we have it to-day, and put the nave to Christ Church as we see it in its restored condition. It is scarcely necessary to go through nominatim the series of English bishops who filled the see during the medieval period. Suffice it to mention, that as most of them held some government post, such as lord chancellor, or lord treasurer, in conjunction with the archbishopric, their spiritual influence was thereby rendered obnoxious to the native clans of the O'Byrnes and O'Tooles, when they shook off the English yoke during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The Holy See, not to leave the natives without episcopal care, was compelled to provide a bishop for them, titularly of Glendalough, and the *rubricelle* in the Vatican Library furnish a list of six such bishops who presided over the mountainous region of the diocese well into the reign of Henry VIII.

The Anglican Schism.—This monarch, unhappily as is well known, dislocated everything in Church and State. The foul murder of Archbishop Alan, author of the valuable "Liber Niger" and "Repertorium Viride", by the followers of Silken Thomas in 1534, afforded the king the much desired opportunity of introducing

his religious vagaries into Ireland. He kept the see vacant for nearly a year, and then filled it without any reference to the pope, by the appointment of George Browne. Browne had been provincial of the suppressed Augustinian Hermits in England, and was the bond slave of Henry, ready to do his master's bidding. He was consecrated by Cranmer, 19 March, 1535–6, and took up his residence in Dublin in August, 1536. The antecedents of Browne and the schismatical char-

CONVENT OF THE SISTERS OF LORETTO, DALKEY

acter of his appointment did not recommend him to the Dublin clergy. He complained of their resistance to his injunctions and was compelled to send round his own servants in order to cancel the pope's name in the service-books. A sharp warning from the king stirred him up to more demonstrative action, and forthwith he had all holy relics preserved in Christ Church cathedral, including St. Patrick's crosier known as the "Staff of Jesus", gathered into a heap and burned. He co-operated only too gladly in the suppression of all the religious houses, in changing the prior and convent of Christ Church into a secular dean and chapter, and in the total suppression of St. Patrick's chapter. Under Edward VI he introduced that monarch's new liturgy, as found in his first "Book of Common Prayer", into the cathedral, and finished by taking a wife.

With the accession of Queen Mary all things Catholic were restored, and Browne, being convicted of being a married bishop, was deposed. The queen filled the vacant see by nominating Hugh Curwen, Dean of Hereford, yet another Englishman, and the royal nomination was confirmed at Rome. She also re-established the dean and chapter of St. Patrick's. While the queen survived, unhappily not long, Curwen behaved as a Catholic, but on the accession of Elizabeth, he was ready to worship the rising sun, to accept her royal supremacy and Act of Uniformity, and eventually a transfer to the See of Oxford as its Protestant bishop. This apostasy, coupled with the severe persecution of Catholics which continued through the whole of Elizabeth's reign, left the See of Dublin without a Catholic bishop for full forty years. The compensations were, however, a firm and faithful clergy and people, and a long roll of martyrs and confessors.

ERA OF PERSECUTION.—Some attempt was made by the Holy See to provide a bishop in 1585 by appointing a certain Donald or Donatus, but he did not live to take possession, and not until 1600 was his successor appointed in the person of Matthew d'Oviedo, a Spanish Franciscan. Though he came to Ireland, he dared not set foot in his diocese, but governed it through vicars-general, three of whom successively ended their days in prison. Finally about 1611 d'Oviedo returned to Spain and resigned the see, being succeeded by Dr. Eugene Matthews, transferred from Clogher. Dr. Matthews laboured hard and in most difficult times. In 1615 he called a provincial synod in Kilkenny wherein, amongst other enactments, the parochial system was reorganized and order evolved out of chaos. He narrowly escaped imprisonment more than once, and eventually betook himself to Rome where he died in 1623. Early in 1625 his successor Dr. Thomas Fleming, a Franciscan, was appointed. After the outbreak of 1641 and when the Confederation of Kilkenny was initiated, he was appointed a member of the supreme council and took part in its deliberations. But the arrival and victory of the Cromwellians in Dublin in 1649 closed the gates of his cathedral city against him; he took refuge in Galway and died there in 1651 or 1652. Dr. Edmund O'Reilly, his vicar-general, was proposed as vicar Apostolic, but his imprisonment and subsequent exile rendered this proposal abortive, and in 1656 Dr. James Dempsey, vicar capitular of Leighlin, was appointed to this office. In his first report to the Holy See, after the horrors of war, pestilence, and banishment, he states "that in the diocese of Dublin there were not enough Catholics to form three parishes".

The restoration of Charles II to the throne occurred during Dr. Dempsey's administration and would probably have resulted in some benevolent policy of toleration had not the intrigues of the Franciscan friar, Peter Walsh, brought new troubles upon the suffering members of the Faith. The assembly of clergy held in Dublin in 1666 at the instance of Walsh and outmanœuvred by him, did not bring peace. Dr. Dempsey died in 1667, and the see was again vacant until 1669 when the Holy See appointed Dr. Peter Talbot of the Malahide family. He was consecrated at Ghent, 2 May. In 1670 he held a diocesan synod, and a meeting of bishops was held in Dublin in the same year which furnished the occasion, by a claim for precedence, for the first contention between Armagh and Dublin concerning the primacy. In 1673 he was banished the kingdom; it was not until 1677 when broken in health, that he was allowed to return; he was, however, immediately committed a close prisoner to Dublin Castle where after lingering for two years he died. He was a learned man and a prolific writer. In 1683 Dr. Patrick Russell, a native of the County Dublin, succeeded him. The advent of a Catholic king raised the hopes of the afflicted Catholics of Ireland, and with liberty restored to the Church they took heart to make a strong march forward. A provincial synod was assembled in 1685, another in 1688; in 1686 and 1689 diocesan synods were held. The metropolitan chapter, which had never died, was reorganized and the precedence of its members settled. Many other works were projected by Dr. Russell, but the disastrous defeat at the Boyne, in 1690, and the flight of King James put an end to all hope and reduced the Catholics to a worse condition than ever. Dr. Russell was apprehended and cast into prison, where he died in 1692. King James, still recognized by the Holy See, claimed the exercise of the royal pre-

CHRIST CHURCH, FORMERLY HOLY TRINITY CATHEDRAL, DUBLIN

rogative of nominating to vacant sees; the claim being admitted, he named Peter Creagh, Bishop of Cork, as Archbishop of Dublin. Dr. Creagh was an exile in France, and was obliged to govern through a vicar-general. He went himself as auxiliary to the Bishop of Strasburg where he died in 1705. Of the six archbishops who filled the see in the seventeenth century, two could never set foot in the diocese, two died in exile, and two in prison. When the penal laws commenced their ferocious career (1705) Ireland was reduced to a single bishop, the Bishop of Dromore, and he was confined in Newgate Prison, Dublin. The new hierarchy sprang from his prison cell. Therein was consecrated (1707) Dr. O'Rorke, Bishop of Killala, and once established in the Apostolic office, he imposed hands on the newly chosen Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Edmund Byrne, parish priest of St. Nicholas.

The population and extent of Dublin had been steadily increasing ever since the Restoration, and new quarters had grown up. Dr. Byrne's first care was to erect these into parishes. To him owe their origin St. Mary's, St. Paul's, and St. Andrew's. In 1710 the oath of abjuration, aimed against the Stuarts, but full of other objectionable matter, raised a new storm of persecution, and Dr. Byrne for a time was forced to hide with his relatives in Kildare. With

St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin
Showing banners of Knights of St. Patrick

varying vicissitudes he continued to rule the diocese until his death in January, 1723–4. He was succeeded by Dr. Edward Murphy, transferred from Kildare. This archbishop continued to date his letters, according to the well-known formula of hunted bishops: *e loco refugii nostri*, i. e. from our place of refuge. He died in 1729 and was followed by Dr. Luke Fagan, translated from Meath, who died in 1734, and had for his successor Dr. John Linegar, a native of Dublin, who lived until 1757, when his coadjutor Dr. Richard Lincoln, also a native of the city, succeeded him. In 1763 he died, and was followed by Dr. Patrick Fitzsimon who governed the see until 1770, when Dr. John Carpenter succeeded. With him may be said to commence the modern history of the diocese, for he was the first of the archbishops, since Archbishop Alan's time, who left behind him, carefully compiled, detailed records of the diocese. He died on 29 October, 1786.

Restoration of Catholic Life.—With a rapidity extraordinary for that time, Dr. John Thomas Troy, a Dominican, was transferred 9 December, 1786, from Ossory to the Archbishopric of Dublin. For thirty-seven years he governed the Church of Dublin well and wisely. He witnessed the first assertion of Catholic rights, took part in the foundation of Maynooth College, and laid the foundation stone of the metropolitan church in Marlborough Street, which still does duty as pro-cathedral. Archbishop Troy saw the beginnings of the Christian Brothers and the restoration of the Jesuits, while churches and schools multiplied under his eyes. He died in 1823 and was buried in the vaults of the new metropolitan church not yet quite ready for use.

His coadjutor, Dr. Daniel Murray, a native of Wicklow, succeeded him. Educated in Salamanca, he was an eloquent, cultured, and pious ecclesiastic, described by his panegyrist as "the Francis de Sales of Ireland". To him belong the completion of the pro-cathedral, the founding of the Irish Sisters of Charity, and the communities of Loretto. He witnessed the achievement of Catholic Emancipation in 1829, the wonderful career of the Liberator, Daniel O'Connell, of the great temperance movement under Father Mathew, and the establishment of a system of national (primary) education of which he himself was appointed a commissioner. The awakening of a nation and of a church to a new life and increased responsibilities was accomplished in his time. He died in 1852 regretted by all, and was buried in the Marlborough Street vaults, where in the church above them, a beautiful kneeling statue by Sir Thomas Farrell, adorns the northern transept. Archbishop Murray was followed by Dr. Paul Cullen (q. v.), then Archbishop of Armagh, who in June, 1852, was solemnly enthroned in Dublin. He founded the diocesan seminary and the Mater Misericordiæ Hospital. He inaugurated innumerable new churches, colleges, and schools, and became the recognized champion of Catholic education all the world over. In 1866 he was made cardinal—Ireland's first cardinal. In 1870 he took a distinguished part in the Vatican Council, and in 1875 presided over the National Synod of Maynooth. In 1878 he went to Rome to assist at the conclave which elected Leo XIII, but arrived late, and in October of that year passed to his reward. He is interred in the crypt of the college chapel at Clonliffe; a fine marble statue perpetuates his memory in the pro-cathedral.

In October, 1878, Dr. Edward McCabe, consecrated assistant bishop in 1877, was raised to the archiepiscopal office. His administration was short. In 1882 Pope Leo conferred on him the dignity of cardinal. Never in very robust health, he died in February, 1885. He was interred at Glasnevin where a handsome mausoleum is erected to his memory. In July, 1885, the Most Rev. William J. Walsh was appointed to succeed him.

Statistics.—The status of the diocese (1908) is as follows: archbishop 1: bishop (of Canea) 1; parishes, 74; parish priests, 70; administrators, 4; curates etc., 190; in diocesan seminary, 9; chaplains, 21; secular clergy, 293; regular clergy, 247; public churches, chapels, and oratories, 193; convents, 93. Catholic population (Census of 1901), 407,514; non-Catholic population, 112,498; total, 520,012.

The religious orders are very well represented in Dublin by houses of Augustinians, Capuchins, Carmelites, Dominicans, Franciscans, Holy Ghost Fathers, Jesuits, Lazarists, Marists, Oblates, and Passionists. Dublin is the residence of the Superior General of the Irish Christian Brothers and the seat of their novitiate. Numerous sisterhoods, both within and without the city (Sisters of Charity, Mercy, Loretto, Dominican, Presentation, Carmelite, Holy Faith, Sacred Heart, Poor Clares, Assumption, Bon Secours, Poor Servants, Heart of Mary, etc.) devote themselves to the usual works of education and charity (hospitals, orphanages, asylums for the aged poor, for the blind, and for deaf-mutes of both sexes, industrial schools, homes, refuges, lunatic asylums, etc.).

The Catholic University of Ireland, founded in 1854, consists (since 1882) of the following (6) colleges located for the most part near Dublin: St. Patrick's College, Maynooth; University College, St. Stephen's Green (Jesuits); University College, Blackrock (Holy Ghost Fathers); St. Patrick's College, Carlow; Holy Cross College, Clonliffe; and the School of Medicine, Dublin. Each of these colleges retains its

own independent organization. (For the history of this university see CULLEN; MACHALE; NEWMAN; IRELAND.) Other colleges are conducted by the Jesuits (Belvedere College), the Holy Ghost Fathers (Rathmines), the Carmelites (Terenure), and the Lazarists (Castleknock). The Holy Cross College (Clonliffe) is the diocesan college or seminary for aspirants to the priesthood. For the ecclesiastical seminary of St. Patrick's, Maynooth, see MAYNOOTH COLLEGE.

By the New Universities Act passed in 1908, the official existence of the Catholic University of Ireland was brought to a close. This Act suppressed the Royal University of Ireland, and created two new universities in Ireland, both strictly undenominational. One had its seat in Belfast, and absorbed the Queen's College already existing there; the other had its seat in Dublin, with a new college founded there, and absorbing the Queen's Colleges in Cork and Galway. The new Colleges of Dublin, Cork, and Galway, although undenominational under the Act, principally subserve Catholic interests, Dublin University (Trinity College) being left undisturbed and mostly frequented as well as governed by members of the Protestant Church. The Archbishop of Dublin is nominated, though not ex officio, a member of the Senate of the new university having a seat in Dublin, and also a member of the Statutory Commission charged by the Crown with the duty of revising and approving of the statutes of the several colleges comprised in the university.

CARDINAL DUBOIS

GILBERT, *Crede Mihi* (Dublin, 1897); IDEM, *History of the City of Dublin* (Dublin, 1859); WARE, ed. HARRIS, *Antiquities of Ireland* (Dublin, 1764); D'ALTON, *Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin* (Dublin, 1838); MORAN, *History of the Catholic Archbishops of Dublin* (Dublin, 1864); IDEM, *Spicilegium Ossoriense* (Dublin, 1874); RENEHAN, *Collections on Irish Church History* (Dublin, 1861); SHEARMAN, *Loca Patriciana* (Dublin, 1874); HALLIDAY, *Scandinavian History of Dublin* (Dublin, 1864); Reports 20th, 23rd and 24th, *Public Records in Ireland* (Dublin, 1888, 1891, and 1892; LEWIS, *Topographical Dictionary of Ireland* (2 vols., Dublin, 1839), I, 525-65.

NICHOLAS DONNELLY.

Dubno. See MOSTAR.

Dubois, GUILLAUME, French cardinal and statesman, b. at Brive, in Limousin, 1656; d. at Versailles, 1723. He was the son of an honourable physician and received his first education from the Fathers of the Christian Doctrine in his native place, whence he went in 1672, as beneficiary, to the Collège Saint-Michel in Paris. He had been engaged some nine years in private teaching when he was appointed (1683) sub-preceptor to the Duke of Chartres, nephew of Louis XIV, the full tutorship following four years later. When the Duke of Chartres became Duke of Orléans (1700), Dubois was made his secretary. During the regency of Philippe d'Orléans he rose in rapid succession to the high positions of state councillor (1716), secretary of foreign affairs (1717), Archbishop of Cambrai (1720), cardinal and *surintendant des postes* (1721), member of the *Conseil de régence*, and soon after, *ministre principal* (1722). The French Academy admitted him the same year and the Assembly of the French Clergy elected him president in 1723, the year of his death.

Owing to his humble birth, his stanch opposition to Jansenism, and his bold reversal of the aristocratic regime prevalent under Louis XIV, Dubois was disliked by the noblemen of his day. On the authority of contemporary libels and Saint-Simon's memoirs, historians of France have long repeated against him such charges as corrupting the morals of his pupil, accepting money from England, seeking, though unworthy, ecclesiastical dignities, etc. The publication by Sévelinges of Dubois's memoirs and correspondence together with the careful study of contemporary documents by Seilhac, Wiesener, and Bliard—e. g. the diplomatic papers preserved in the archives of the French, English, and Spanish foreign offices—have thrown a new light on the subject and partly verified the words of Fontenelle at the time of the reception of Cardinal Dubois into the French Academy: "Les siècles suivants en sauront davantage; fiez-vous à eux". Far from catering to his pupil's wantonness, Dubois did what he could to check it, and his *Plan d'éducation pour le duc de Chartres* shows a competent and conscientious tutor. The expediency of his foreign policy, resulting in the Triple Alliance of France, England, and Holland against Spain, like the contrary policy of Cardinal de Bernis, must be largely a matter of opinion. In so far as Dubois was concerned, it was the best way of serving the interests of France and counteracting the intrigues of Alberoni. Stair and Stanhope had a high regard, almost amounting to friendship, for the minister of France, but on both sides the charge that bribery was resorted to is untrue. That Dubois was not set against the natural amity between France and Spain was shown later, when, after Alberoni's fall and the restoration of peace, he successfully negotiated the treaty of 1721 and the marriage of Louis XV with the *Infanta* and that of the Prince of the Asturias with Mlle de Montpensier. Dubois's career as a churchman is not above reproach. While there is no foundation for the oft-repeated assertion of his secret marriage, his gross licentiousness, and notorious impiety even at the hour of his death, still it cannot be denied that he sought and used ecclesiastical dignities principally as props to his political prestige. Tonsured at the age of thirteen he bethought himself of sacred Orders only in his old age, when, the better to secure the long coveted and long denied red hat, he asked for the Archbishopric of Cambrai merely as a stepping stone to the cardinalate.

The "Mémoires du cardinal Dubois" published by P. Lacroix (Paris, 1829) are apocryphal. His genuine writings were edited by Sévelinges: "Mémoires secrets et correspondance inédite du cardinal Dubois" (Paris, 1815).

SAINT-SIMON, *Mémoires*, ed. CHÉRUEL (Paris, 1858), with remarks of CHÉRUEL; *Relations de Saint-Simon et de l'Abbé Dubois* in *Rev. Hist.*, I, 140; SEILHAC, *L'Abbé Dubois, premier ministre de Louis XV* (Paris, 1862); WIESENER, *Le Régent, l'Abbé Dubois et les Anglais* (Paris, 1893); BLIARD, *Dubois, cardinal et premier ministre* (Paris, 1902), reviewed by SHAHAN in *Catholic Univ.*

Bulletin, VIII, 350. See also HARDWICKE, *State Papers* (London, 1778); COXE, *Memoirs of the Life of Walpole* (London, 1798); GRAHAM, *The Stair Annals* (Edinburgh, 1875); HASSALL, *Alberoni and Dubois* in *Periods of European History* (New York, 1903), VI, 25.

J. F. SOLLIER.

Dubois, JEAN-ANTOINE, French missionary in India, b. in 1765 at St. Remèze (Ardèche); d. in Paris, 17 Feb., 1848. The Abbé Dubois was a director of the Seminary of the Foreign Missions, a member of the Royal Societies of Great Britain and Paris, and of the Literary Society of Madras. At the outbreak of the French Revolution he went to India to preach Christianity to the natives, whose favour he soon won by his affability and patience. For their instruction he composed elementary treatises on Christian doctrine which won general commendation. Though he remained thirty-two years in that arduous field, his labours were all fruitless and he returned convinced that the conversion of the Hindus with the deep-rooted prejudices of centuries was impossible under the existing conditions. This opinion which he broached in "Letters on the State of Christianity in India" etc. (London, 1823), was vigorously attacked in England. Two Anglican ministers, James Hough and H. Townley, published, respectively, "A Reply to the Letters of the Abbé Dubois" etc. (London, 1824) and "An Answer to the Abbé Dubois" (London, 1824). "The Friend of India", a journal of Calcutta (1825), contained a refutation of his letters, to which the abbé rejoined in a letter of much gravity and moderation. It found its way into the "Bulletin des Sciences", May, 1825, and the first volume of the "Asiatic Journal" (1841). Besides these letters he wrote: "Description of the Character, Manners and Customs of the People of India, and of their Institutions, religious and civil" (London, 1816). This work was bought by the East India Company for twenty thousand francs and printed at their expense. The author published an enlarged edition in French under the title "Mœurs, institutions, et cérémonies des peuples de l'Inde" (Paris, 1825, 2 vols.), which is considered the best and most complete work on the subject. "Exposé de quelques-uns des principaux articles de la théologie des Brahmes" (Paris, 1825); "Le Pantcha-tantra ou les cinq ruses, fables du Brahme Vichnou-Sarma" (Paris, 1826). Abbé Dubois was one of the collaborators of the "Bulletin Universel des Sciences" of the Baron de Férussac.

Journal Asiatique (1848), I, 466; *Biog. des Contemp.: Journal des Savants* (1826); *Bulletin Universel des Sciences*, VII, Vol. IV, no. 51; Vol. V, no. 258; Vol. VI, no. 92; *Revue Encyclopédique*, XXVII, 211; *Asiatic Journal and Monthly Register* (1818), I, 135–147; (1820), I, 491, II, 170; (1823), II, 366; (1825), I, 764; *Biog. Univ.* (Paris, 1852), VIII, 358.

EDWARD P. SPILLANE.

Dubois, JOHN, third Bishop of New York, educator and missionary, b. in Paris, 24 August, 1764; d. in New York, 20 December, 1842. His early education was received at home until he was prepared to enter the Collège Louis-le-Grand, where he had for fellow-students Robespierre and Desmoulins. Ordained priest at the Oratorian Seminary of St-Magloire, 22 Sept., 1787, by Archbishop de Juigné, of Paris, he was appointed an assistant to the *curé* of St-Sulpice, and chaplain to the Sisters of Charity (Hospice des Petites Maisons). Forced in May, 1791, by the French Revolution to leave France, he escaped in disguise to America, and landed at Norfolk, Virginia, Aug., 1791, bearing commendatory letters from the Marquis de Lafayette to James Monroe, the Randolphs, Lees, Beverlys, and Patrick Henry. He was cordially received, resided for some time in the house of Mr. Monroe, received instruction in English from Patrick Henry, and even celebrated Mass in the State House at Richmond. Bishop Carroll assigned the young priest to missionary work, first at Norfolk, and later at Richmond. In 1794 he became pastor of Frederick where he built the first church and ministered to Western Maryland and Virginia. His career as an educator began in 1808, when, joining the Society of St-Sulpice, he withdrew from the Frederick mission and opened a school on the mountain, at Emmitsburg, as a *petit séminaire*. This he soon discovered impracticable, and, in its place, founded there the present Mt. St. Mary's College. Father Dubois was also of invaluable assistance, material and spiritual, to Mother Seton, foundress of the American Sisters of Charity, when she established (1809) a convent of her community a short distance from the college.

On the death of the Rt. Rev. John Connolly, second Bishop of New York, 6 Feb., 1825, Father Dubois was chosen his successor and consecrated the third Bishop of New York by Archbishop Maréchal in Baltimore, 29 Oct., 1826. Three days later he took possession of his diocese, which covered the whole State of New York, and half the State of New Jersey, with a Catholic population of about 150,000, eighteen priests, and some twelve churches. A visitation of his diocese revealing the pressing need of priests and of a seminary, he went to France and Rome for aid in 1829, and obtained substantial help from the Society for the Propagation of the Faith and the Congregation of Propaganda. He made three unsuccessful attempts to establish a seminary. Fire destroyed one when just completed at Nyack; another projected on a site chosen in Brooklyn was never begun; and a third at Lafargeville, in the northern part of the State, was closed because too remote and inaccessible. Another serious problem confronted the bishop in the lay trustee system controlling the churches. On one occasion, when the trustees of the cathedral threatened to withhold his salary, he made this memorable reply—"I am an old man, and do not need much. I can live in a basement or in a garret. But whether I come up from the basement or down from the garret, I shall still be your Bishop" (see TRUSTEEISM; NEW YORK, ARCHDIOCESE OF). Enfeebled by age and hard work, he asked for a coadjutor, the diocese having grown to include 38 churches, 12 stations, and 40 priests, and the Rev. John Hughes of Philadelphia was appointed titular Bishop of Basilinopolis and coadjutor of New York in 1837. Bishop Dubois's infirmities increasing, Bishop Hughes was made administrator in 1839, and the old bishop passed the last days of a life of apostolic zeal in retirement. His body rests in the crypt of St. Patrick's old Cathedral, New York.

SHEA, *History of Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1890), III; HERBERMANN in *U. S. Cath. Hist. Soc., Historical Records and Studies* (New York, 1900), I, part II; SMITH, *The Catholic Church in New York* (New York, 1905–8), I; FARLEY, *The History of St. Patrick's Cathedral* (New York, 1908; MCCAFFREY, *The Jubilee of Mount St. Mary's* (New York, 1859).

P. J. HAYES.

Dubourg, LOUIS-GUILLAUME-VALENTIN, second Bishop of Louisiana and the Floridas, Bishop of Montauban, Archbishop of Besançon, b. at Cap François, Santo Domingo, 16 February, 1766; d. at Besançon, France, 12 December, 1833. His theological studies were made at Paris, where he was ordained in 1788 and entered the Company of Saint Sulpice. He was superior of the seminary of Issy when the French Revolution broke out, and retired at first to Bordeaux. In 1794 he emigrated to the United States where he was welcomed by Bishop Carroll. He was president of Georgetown College from 1796 to 1799. After an unsuccessful trip to Havana where he attempted to open a school, he returned to Baltimore and became the first superior of Saint Mary's College.

On 18 August, 1812, he was appointed Apostolic Administrator of the Diocese of Louisiana and the Floridas to succeed Bishop Penalver y Cardenas promoted (1801) to the archiepiscopal See of Guatemala. The position was by no means an easy one and Father Dubourg was forced, at the beginning of his administra-

tion to take up his residence outside New Orleans. However, he gradually overcame his opponents. On 23 January, 1815, on the threshold of the New Orleans cathedral, he bestowed on General Jackson the laurels of victory.

After settling in a satisfactory way the affairs of the diocese Father Dubourg proceeded to Rome where he was consecrated Bishop of Louisiana and the Floridas, 24 September, 1815. He returned to America in 1817 and took up his residence in St. Louis where he founded a theological seminary and college at "The Barrens". He also founded the St. Louis Latin Academy which developed into the present well-known St. Louis University. The Religious of the Sacred Heart simultaneously opened their first American convent, St. Charles's Academy (1818), and soon after a second one at Florissant. These institutions gave a great impulse to religion in what was then known as Upper Louisiana. The bishop visited yearly the southern part of his diocese, and when Bishop Rosati was appointed his coadjutor, New Orleans became again his residence. In 1826 Bishop Dubourg went again to Europe. He was a brilliant and learned man, but was reluctant to enforce his authority against the cathedral trustees who continually opposed him; therefore he tendered his resignation of the See of New Orleans (November, 1826), thinking that another incumbent would be more successful.

He was not, however, allowed to live in retirement, but was transferred, 2 October, 1826, to the Diocese of Montauban; then on 15 February, 1833, he was promoted to the archiepiscopal See of Besançon. Archbishop Dubourg was one of the first patrons and beneficiaries of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, but was not, as has been said, its founder. This society was organized at a meeting held at Lyons by the Abbé Inglesi, Bishop Dubourg's vicar-general, but the chief rôle in its creation is due to a pious woman of Lyons, Pauline-Marie Jaricot (q. v.).

SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1890), III, passim; IDEM, *The Hierarchy of the Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1886); GUASCO, *L'Œuvre de la Propagation de la Foi* (Paris); A MEMBER OF THE ORDER OF MERCY, *Essays Educational and Historical* (New York, 1899); MÉRIC, *Vie de M. Emery* (Paris).

CÉLESTIN M. CHAMBON.

Dubric (DYFRIG, DUBRICIUS), SAINT, bishop and confessor, one of the greatest of Welsh saints; d. 612. He is usually represented holding two crosiers, which signify his jurisdiction over the Sees of Caerleon and Llandaff. St. Dubric is first mentioned in a tenth-century MS. of the "Annales Cambriæ", where his death is assigned to the year 612. This date appears also in the earliest life of the saint that has come down to us. It was written about 1133, to record the translation of his relics, and is to be found (in the form of "Lectiones") in the "Liber Landavensis". It may contain some genuine traditions, but as it appeared at least five hundred years after St. Dubric's death, it cannot claim to be historical. According to this account he was the son (by an unnamed father) of Eurddil, a daughter of Pebia Claforwg, prince of the region of Ergyng (Erchenfield in Herefordshire), and was born at Madley on the River Wye. As a child he was noted for his precocious intellect, and by the time he attained manhood was already known as a scholar throughout Britain. He founded a college at Henllan (Hentland in Herefordshire), where he maintained two thousand clerks for seven years. Thence he moved to Mochros (perhaps Moccas), on an island farther up the Wye, where he founded an abbey. Later on he became Bishop of Llandaff, but resigned his see and retired to the Isle of Bardsey, off the coast of Carnarvonshire. Here with his disciples he lived as a hermit for many years, and here he was buried. His body was translated by Urban, Bishop of Llandaff, to a tomb before the Lady-altar in "the old monastery" of the cathedral city, which afterwards became the cathedral church of St. Peter.

A few years after the "Liber Landavensis" was written, there appeared the "Historia Regum Britanniæ" of Geoffrey of Monmouth, and this romantic chronicle is the source of the later and more elaborate legend of St. Dubric, which describes him as "Archbishop of Caerleon" and one of the great figures of King Arthur's court. Benedict of Gloucester and John de Tinmouth (as adapted by Capgrave) developed the fictions of Geoffrey, but their accounts are of no historical value. There is no record of St. Dubric's canonization. The "Liber Landavensis" assigns his death to 14 November, but he was also commemorated on 4 November. The translation of his body, which the same authority assigns to 23 May, is more usually kept on 29 May.

Liber Landavensis, ed. REES (Llandovery, 1840), 75–83, 323–331; GEOFFREY OF MONMOUTH, *Historia Regum Britanniæ* (London, 1844), viii, ix; WHARTON, *Anglia Sacra* (London, 1691), II, 654–661, 667; CAPGRAVE, *Nova Legenda Angliæ* (Oxford, 1907); ALFORD, *Fides Regia Britannica sive Annales Ecclesiæ Britannicæ* (Leyden, 1663), I, 547–548; CHALLONER, *Britannia Sacra* (London, 1745), II, 274–5; *Lives of the Cambro-British Saints*, ed. REES (Llandovery, 1853); REES, *Essay on the Welsh Saints* (London, 1836), 144, 170–2, 176–8; NEDELEC, *Cambria Sacra* (London, 1879), 289–323; HOLE in *Dict. of Christ. Biog.* (London, 1877), s. v. *Dubricius;* TOUT in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (London, 1888), s. v. *Dubricius.*

LESLIE A. ST. L. TOKE.

Dubrovnik. See RAGUSA.

Dubuque, ARCHDIOCESE OF (DUBUQUENSIS), established, 28 July, 1837, created an archbishopric, 1893, comprises that part of Iowa, U. S. A., north of Polk, Jasper, Poweshiek, Iowa, Johnson, Cedar, and Scott, and east of Kossuth, Humboldt, Webster, and Boone Counties; an area of 18,084 sq. miles. The city is picturesquely situated on the Mississippi, at the base of noble bluffs that rise 300 feet above the river; many of these eminences are crowned with Catholic institutions and fine residences. The city is named after Julien Dubuque, a Canadian, who lived there from 1788 to 1811, mining lead and trading with the Indians. His grave was marked by a cross and recently has been adorned with a rugged round tower of native limestone.

The first white men to visit Iowa were the Jesuit Marquette and the Franciscan Hennepin. Later missionaries sent from Quebec laboured among the Indians of Wisconsin and Iowa, and kept alive the Faith among the scattered pioneers. Iowa became United States territory by the Louisiana Purchase, and in 1833, after treaty with the Indians, was opened to settlement. The lead mines at Dubuque attracted many, the fertile prairies many more, and the population increased rapidly. The earliest Catholic settlers were French, German, and Irish, coming directly from their native lands or from the Eastern States; soon the whole State was dotted with thriving villages and prosperous farms. The attitude of non-Catholics has been uniformly friendly; the coming of a priest and the building of a church were generally met with favour and even with generous contributions. At present the Catholic people of the Archdiocese of Dubuque are about equally divided between agricultural and urban pursuits, and hold a prominent position in social, business, and professional life. The principal parishes outside of the city of Dubuque presided over by irremovable rectors are Clinton, Cedar Rapids, Independence, Marshalltown, Waterloo, Dyersville, Mason City, Lansing, Ackley, Cascade, New Vienna, and Waukon.

The Diocese of Dubuque was created in 1837 by division of that of St. Louis, and embraced the area north of Missouri to Canada, and east of the Mississippi to the Missouri. One priest, a zealous Dominican, Samuel Mazzuchelli, ministered to a scattered population of less than 3000; three churches had been built; St. Raphael's at Dubuque, one at Davenport,

and one at Sugar Creek, Lee County. To-day in that same territory the Church numbers nearly 1,000,000 souls with two archbishops, a score of bishops, and thousands of priests and religious workers.

BISHOPS.—(1) PIERRE-JEAN-MATHIAS LORAS, the first bishop, was born at Lyons, France, 30 August, 1792; his father and uncle were guillotined during the Revolution. Mathias, who had as a school-mate the Blessed Curé d'Ars, was ordained priest 12 November, 1815, and for years was superior of the seminary of Largentière. His zeal led him in 1829 to Mobile, Alabama, U. S. A., where he laboured as pastor of Sand Spring Hill until 1837. Consecrated Bishop of Dubuque, at Mobile, 10 December, 1837, by Bishop Portier of Mobile, he familiarized himself by letters with the needs of his diocese, and went to France for priests; he returned 21 April, 1839, with six men of heroic mould, whose names are inseparably linked with the Catholic North-West: Joseph Crétin, who in 1851 was consecrated first Bishop of St. Paul, A. Ravoux, a noted Indian missionary, J. A. M. Pelamourgues, the patriarch-priest of Davenport, L. Galtier, R. Petiot, and J. Causse, pioneer priests of Minnesota. At Dubuque the bishop was received, 19 April, 1839, with great joy by all classes. His administration was marked by piety, zeal, and providential prudence. He multiplied his priests, encouraged immigration from the crowded cities of the East, welcomed the Trappists and various orders of sisters, chose and purchased tracts of land in the wilderness, that are now flourishing parishes. He was constantly engaged in visitations and preaching missions. By personal example and formation of societies, he advanced the cause of temperance. In his work the generosity of the people was supplemented by contributions from France. In a letter of 1839 to the Society for the Propagation of the Faith of Lyons, he acknowledged a gift of $10,500 for his diocese. In 1850 St. Bernard's diocesan seminary was opened, which flourished for five years; among its students was Henry Cosgrove, who became Bishop of Davenport. In 1854 Bishop Loras visited Ireland and France in quest of priests. In 1855 he requested and obtained as coadjutor the Rev. Clement Smyth, superior of the Trappist community at New Melleray. Bishop Loras died at Dubuque, 20 February, 1858. Where he found one priest and a scattered little flock, he left 48 priests with 60 churches and 54,000 Catholics.

(2) CLEMENT SMYTH was b. 24 February, 1810, at Finlea, County Clare, Ireland; educated at Trinity College, Dublin, he entered the Cistercian Order and was ordained, 29 May, 1841. He was sent to the United States and founded New Melleray monastery, twelve miles from Dubuque, on land donated by Bishop Loras. He was consecrated, 3 May, 1857, by Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis. Bishop Smyth was a man whose deep piety and boundless charity won the devotion of priests and people. He held a synod whose canons remained unaltered till 1902. Under him immigration continued, but owing to hard times and the Civil War, not much progress was made in church-building, but the spiritual edifice was strengthened. At his death, 22 September, 1865, there were 90,000 Catholics in Iowa.

(3) Bishop Smyth was succeeded in 1866 by the RT. REV. JOHN HENNESSY, b. 20 August, 1825, in the County Limerick, Ireland. He entered Carondelet seminary near St. Louis, and was ordained in 1850. He became president of the seminary, and in 1858 was sent to Rome as representative of Archbishop Kenrick. From 1860 to 1866 he was pastor of St. Joseph, Missouri. As a priest he manifested extraordinary prudence, learning, and eloquence. He was consecrated by Archbishop Kenrick, at Dubuque, 30 Sept., 1866. Bishop Hennessy received many priests from Germany and Ireland, and in 1873 founded St. Joseph's College and Theological Seminary in Dubuque. Existing parishes were systematically divided, and he directed his energies especially to Christian education. Wherever possible schools were built, and heroic sacrifices were made that every Catholic child should be educated by Catholic teachers. Considerable and continued opposition was offered by some Catholics, not only for economic reasons, but also because they considered the programme an attack on the public schools. The wisdom of the bishop was shown by the prosperous condition of the parochial schools, which at the time of his silver Jubilee showed 12,257 pupils enrolled. Bishop Hennessy assisted at the Vatican Council, and was prominent in the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. In 1893 he was made first Archbishop of Dubuque, with Davenport, Omaha, Wichita, and Sioux Falls as suffragan sees. His death occurred 4 March, 1900.

(4) The MOST REV. JOHN J. KEANE, titular Archbishop of Damascus and formerly Bishop of Richmond, Virginia, and Rector of the Catholic University of America, was named to succeed Archbishop Hennessy, 24 July, 1900. Archbishop Keane was b. 12 Sept., 1839, at Ballyshannon, Co. Donegal, Ireland; ordained 2 July, 1866, at Baltimore; consecrated bishop at Baltimore 25 Aug., 1878. Synods in 1902, 1905, and 1908 applied the Baltimore decrees to local conditions. Conferences of the clergy were held semi-annually in every deanery. Complete annual reports from every parish were made through the chancery. His zeal for total abstinence founded an archdiocesan union, and in the field of education he encouraged postgraduate courses for priests, doubled the faculty and buildings of St. Joseph's College, the preparatory seminary of the archdiocese, which now enrolls 260 classical students, established a missionary band of diocesan priests, welcomed the Sisters of the Good Shepherd and the Sisters of the Order of St. Dominic, and the Brothers of Mary. Thus with indefatigable zeal he continued the work of his predecessors. In 1902 the western portion of the archdiocese was erected into the new Diocese of Sioux City.

Among the early missionaries and priests were Rev. John McMahon, C. P. Fitzmaurice, Daniel Maloney, Maurice Flavin, John Shields, James O'Gorman, who became vicar Apostolic at Omaha, M. Flannery, A. Hattneberger, H. Meis, Charles McGauran, John Brazil, T. M. Lenihan, later Bishop of Cheyenne, C. Johannes, Patrick McCabe, and T. Donahoe. Prominent among Catholic laymen were: Charles Corkery, Postmaster under President Buchanan, Patrick Quigley, Gen. Geo. W. Jones, United States Senator, 1848–1859, and Minister to New Granada, Dennis A. Mahoney, Eugene Shine, Maurice Brown, Thomas Connolly, Cornelius Mullen, Patrick Clark, Gen. John Lawler, of Prairie-du-Chien, who gave many church sites in Iowa, Senas Huegel, Anton Heeb, Gerard Becker, Charles Gregoire, John Mullaney, Wm. Ryan, Wm. Neuman, and David Hennessy.

The Sisters of Charity of the B. V. M. went to Dubuque in 1844 from Philadelphia. The mother-house is now located there and they conduct two academies and eleven schools in various centres, besides having sent communities to four other states. The Sisters of Mercy located in 1868 in Davenport, and now have independent houses at Dubuque, Cedar Rapids, and Independence. The Presentation Nuns arrived from Ireland in 1875, and have 65 members. The Visitation Nuns conduct an academy in Dubuque; they number 31 members. The Sisters of St. Francis came from Westphalia, Germany, and 320 of them are employed in schools throughout Iowa. Other sisterhoods represented in the archdiocese are Third Order of St. Dominic, Franciscan Sisters of Perpetual Adoration, Sisters of St. Francis of Assisi, M. C., School Sisters of St. Francis, Sisters of the Holy Ghost, Sisters of the Holy Humility of Mary, and the School Sisters of Notre Dame.

STATISTICS.—Official reports for 1908 give these figures: 222 diocesan and 9 regular priests; 165 parish churches; 63 mission churches; 50 chapels (in religious institutions); 1 college for men with 380 students; 25 academies for the higher education of young women, attended by 4000; 96 parochial schools, with 25,000 pupils; 1 orphanage with 225 inmates; 7 hospitals each accommodating from 30 to 150 patients; one industrial home with 50 inmates; one home of the Good Shepherd. Catholic population, 111,112 in a total of 693,400. About 650 sisters of religious communities are engaged in teaching, and about 130 are in hospitals and other charitable work.

SHEA, *History of Catholic Church in U. S.* (New York, 1889–1892); DE CAILLY, *Life of Bishop Loras* (New York, 1897); KEMPKER, *History of Catholics in Iowa* (Iowa City, 1887); *Souvenir Volume of Silver Jubilee of Archbishop Hennessy; Souvenir Volume of Installation of Archbishop Keane;* REUSS, *Biographical Cyclopedia of the Catholic Hierarchy of the U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1898).

J. C. STUART.

Duc, FRONTON DU (called in Latin DUCÆUS), a French theologian and Jesuit, b. at Bordeaux in 1558; d. at Paris, 25 September, 1624. At first he taught in various colleges of the Society and wrote for the dramatic representations encouraged by the Jesuits the "Histoire tragique de la pucelle de Domrémy, autrement d'Orléans" (Nancy, 1581), which was acted at Pont-à-Mousson before Charles III, Duke of Lorraine. At a later date he took part in the theological discussions of the age and is the author of "Inventaires des faultes, contradictions, faulses allégations du Sieur du Plessis, remarquées en son livre de la Sainte Eucharistie, par les théologiens de Bordeaux" (Bordeaux, 1599–1601). This is one of the many refutations of the treatise on the Eucharist issued in 1598 by the Huguenot theologian Du Plessis-Mornay. The Protestant publicist made a reply to which Fronton du Duc rejoined in 1602.

At the suggestion of Casaubon, Henry IV contemplated the publication of manuscripts of the royal library. The clergy of France decided to confide the revision of the Greek Fathers to the Jesuits, and Fronton du Duc was chosen by the Society to labour on this project. Accordingly he published the works of St. John Chrysostom (Paris, 1609–24) and a "Bibliotheca veterum Patrum" (Paris, 1624, 2 vols. in folio). The "Bibliotheca" contains a large number of the Greek Fathers with Latin translations (see the list in Sommervogel, III, 245), and serves as a supplement to the great collection of Margarin de la Bigne known as "Sacra Bibliotheca Sanctorum Patrum". After the death of Fronton du Duc there was issued an edition of Nicephorus Callistus (Paris, 1630, 2 vols. in folio) which he had undertaken. This edition follows a Vienna manuscript that had belonged to the library of Matthias Corvinus; its publication had been delayed by a series of curious complications in which the political schemes of Richelieu were involved. Fronton du Duc had also occupied himself with the Greek texts of the Bible and had begun a revision of the text, but this was not completed. Librarian from 1604 of the Collège de Clermont at Paris, he reorganized the library, which had been scattered during the period in which the Jesuits had been obliged to abandon the school. While holding this position he also taught (1618–23) positive theology.

OUDIN, in NICÉRON, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des hommes illustres de la république des lettres* (Paris, 1737), XXXVIII, 103; SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque de la c. de J.* (Paris, 1897), III, 233–49.

PAUL LEJAY.

Du Cange, CHARLES DUFRESNE, historian and philologist, b. at Amiens, France, 18 Dec., 1610; d. at Paris, 1688. His father, who was a magistrate, had him educated by the Jesuits at Amiens, and the young man afterwards studied law at Orléans and was admitted to the Bar before the Parlement of Paris, 11 August, 1631. But the legal professian failing to satisfy him, he returned to Amiens, married there in 1638 and in 1645 purchased the position of Treasurer of France held by his father-in-law. Obliged to leave Amiens in 1668 on account of the plague, he settled in Paris, where he died. Neither his official duties nor his family cares (he was the father of ten children) prevented him from following scholarly pursuits. Conversant with many languages, he was consulted on all sides, and he obtained much information through his correspondence. His unremitting energy was largely expended on the history of France and that of Constantinople. To insure a solid basis for his researches, he began by mastering the languages of the texts and was unceasing in his efforts to increase his knowledge of Byzantine Greek and Low Latin.

Two great and useful works were the outcome of this preparation and even yet suffice to secure the scholarly reputation of their author; they were the "Glossarium ad scriptores mediæ et infimæ latinitatis" (Paris, 3 vols. fol. 1678; new edition with addenda by Dom Carpentier, Paris, 7 vols., 4to, 1840–1850; 10 vols., 1882–1887), and the "Glossarium ad scriptores mediæ et infimæ græcitatis" (Paris, 2 vols. fol., 1688). Chief among his other works are: "Histoire de l'Empire de Constantinople sous les empereurs françois" (Paris, 1657, 1 vol. fol.); "Traité historique du chef de Saint Jean-Baptiste" (Paris, 1666, 4to); "Histoire de Saint Louis" (Paris, 1668, 2 vols. fol.); the "Historia Byzantina" (Paris, 1680, 2 vols. fol.), editions of the Byzantine historians, notably of Zonaras (Paris, 1686, 2 vols. fol.); and the "Chronicon Paschale" (Paris, 1689, fol.). He left many manuscripts which, after being widely scattered, were collected toward the middle of the eighteenth century by his grand-nephew Dufresne d'Aubigny and are now nearly all preserved in the National Library, Paris. From these have been compiled the "Histoire de la Ville d'Amiens (published by Hardouin at Amiens, 1840) and "Les familles d'outre-mer" (published by Rey in the "Documents inédits de l'histoire de France", Paris, 1869).

BALUZE, *Epistola de vitâ et morte C. Du Cange ad Eus. Renaudotum* (Paris, 1688), reprinted as preface to the *Chronicon Paschale;* NICÉRON, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des hommes illustres* (Paris, 1727–1745), VIII; *Notice des ouvrages manuscrits de M. Du Cange* in *Journal des Savants* (October-December, 1749); and DUFRESNE D'AUBIGNY, *Mémoire historique sur les manuscrits de M. Du Cange* (Paris, 1752).

PAUL LEJAY.

Duccio di Buoninsegna, painter, and founder of the Sienese School, b. about 1255 or 1260, place not known; d. 3 August, 1319. About this time Siena was at the zenith of her political power. She had just defeated Florence on the field of Montaperti (4 September, 1260), and an era of marvellous development followed this conquest. Then was begun the huge task of building the cathedral, where, in 1266, was commenced the incomparable pulpit sculptured by Nicholas of Pisa, and it was under these flourishing conditions that Duccio received his artistic education. However, he owed nothing to the Gothic style nor to the naturalistic renaissance of Nicholas of Pisa: he allied himself exclusively with Byzantine tradition. Duccio has been called the "Last of the Greeks", and his genius consisted in giving exquisite expression to the refined sentiment of the masters of Byzantium, discovering its original meaning despite the barbarous, hideous imitations made by a degenerate school.

Duccio is first mentioned in 1278, when he was engaged upon minor work, such as painting the coffers of the archives and the *tablettes* (memorandum-books) of the Biccherna, one of them for the year 1293 now in the Industrial Museum of Berlin. But his great work at this time was the famous "Madonna de' Ruccellai"—one of the most illustrious specimens of Italian painting—preserved at Florence in a side-

chapel of Santa Maria Novella and, on the authority of Vasari, so long considered one of Cimabue's masterpieces. But that the painting was Duccio's is now beyond question, as Milanesi has published the text of a contract drawn up for this picture, 15 April, 1285, between the artist and the rectors of the Confraternity of the Virgin. Although still hieratical and archaic, Duccio's "Madonna", when compared, for instance, with that of Guido of Siena, painted in 1221 and shown to-day in the Palazzo Pubblico of Siena, seems fully to deserve its celebrity.

But it was in 1311 that Duccio achieved his principal work, the glory of which is destined to remain traditional, the great reredos for the high altar of the Siena cathedral. This panel, removed in the fifteenth century, may now be seen in the museum of the Opera del Duomo. The day of its installation was observed as a public feast; shops were closed and bells were rung and the people of the city, carrying lighted candles, solemnly escorted the picture from the artist's residence at the Porta Stalloreggi to the cathedral. This painting was indeed a national masterpiece and in this regard is comparable only to the reredos by Van Eyck in Flemish painting. The two sides represent the two Testaments of the school. The back comprises twenty-six scenes from the life of Jesus between the entry into Jerusalem and the Ascension. The steps, now taken apart, were decorated with twenty other scenes representing Christ's childhood, and His miracles, and the life of the Virgin. In fact, the theme was the same as that treated by Giotto in 1305 in the Arena of Padua. But Duccio consulted Byzantine formularies only, and his compositions resemble the famous miniatures of the "Evangelistarium" of Rossano, or those of the great Benedictine school of Mont' Amiata. However, apart from his perfect taste in colour and in style, Duccio excelled in the essentially Greek elegance of his portrayal of ordinary life. He abounds in genre pictures as pure as some of the selections in the Anthology. The scene of "Peter before the High-Priest", the dialogue of the holy women with the angel at the Sepulchre, and the "Pilgrims of Emmaus" are models of poetic conception expressed in a familiar, true-to-life, lyric fashion. On the front of the great panel is the "Madonna Maestà" (Majesty), which is in reality the "Madonna de' Ruccellai" more amply, richly, and harmoniously developed. Never did Byzantine painting attain greater plasticity of expression. But here the form is animated by a new sentiment, a tenderness that manifests itself in the distich engraved on the step of the Virgin's throne:—

MATER SANCTA DEI, SIS CAUSSA SENIS REQUIEI
SIS DUCCIO VITA, TE QUIA PINXIT ITA.

(Holy Mother of God, give peace unto Siena; obtain for me that, as I have painted Thee so fair, I may live eternally.)

Duccio painted only frame (and panel) pictures and, without doubt, miniatures, and hence the oblivion into which he fell in a country where monumental painting alone is glorified. Nevertheless his is the first of the great names in Italian painting. He preceded Giotto by a score of years and had the honour of founding an original Sienese school at a time when there were as yet no painters in Florence: since, in 1285, it was to him that the Florentines had to have recourse. And the most magnificent work of the Sienese School, the "Maestà" by Simone di Martino, in the Palazzo Pubblico (1315) is but an enlargement of Duccio's. His type of beauty and his poetic ideal were indelibly impressed upon this charming school. Duccio seems to have been gay and light-hearted. In 1313 he was imprisoned for debt and at another time fined for refusing to mount guard. Some of his lesser works are preserved in various collections in the Siena Museum, the National Gallery, London, and at Windsor.

MILANESI, *Documenti per la storia dell' arte senese* (Siena, 1854), I; CROWE AND CAVALCASELLE, *Storia della pittura in Italia* (2nd ed., Florence, 1899), III; LANGTON DOUGLAS, *History of Siena* (London, 1902); VENTURI, *Storia dell' arte Italiana* (Milan, 1907), V; PERATÉ, *Duccio* in *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* (Feb. and Sept., 1893); LISINI, *Notizie di Duccio pittore* (*Bollettino senese di storia patria*, 1898); LANGTON DOUGLAS, *Duccio* in *Monthly Review* (Aug., 1903); RICHTER, *Lectures on the National Gallery* (London, 1898).

LOUIS GILLET.

Duchesne, PHILIPPINE-ROSE, founder in America of the first houses of the Society of the Sacred Heart, b. at Grenoble, France, 29 August, 1769; d. at St. Charles, Missouri, 18 October, 1852. She was the daughter of Pierre-François Duchesne, an eminent lawyer. Her mother was a Périer, ancestor of Casimir Périer, President of France in 1894. She was educated by the Visitation Nuns, entered that order, saw its dispersion during the Reign of Terror, vainly attempted the re-establishment of the convent of Ste-Marie-d'en-Haut, near Grenoble, and finally, in 1804, accepted the offer of Mother Barat to receive her community into the Society of the Sacred Heart. From early childhood the dream of Philippine had been the apostolate of souls: heathen in distant lands, the neglected and poor at home. Nature and grace combined to fit her for this high vocation; education, suffering, above all, the guidance of Mother Barat trained her to become the pioneer of her order in the New World. In 1818 Mother Duchesne set out with four companions for the missions of America. Bishop Dubourg welcomed her to New Orleans, whence she sailed up the Mississippi to St. Louis, finally settling her little colony at St. Charles. "Poverty and Christian heroism are here", she wrote, "and trials are the riches of priests in this land." Cold, hunger, and illness; opposition, ingratitude, and calumny, all that came to try the courage of this missioner, served only to fire her lofty and indomitable spirit with new zeal for the spread of truth. Other foundations followed, at Florissant, Grand Côteau, New Orleans, St. Louis, St. Michael; and the approbation of the society in 1826 by Leo XII recognized the good being done in these parts. She yearned to teach the poor Indians, and old and broken as she was, she went to labour among the Pottowatomies at Sugar Creek, thus realizing the desire of her life. Stirred by the recitals of Father De Smet, S.J., she turned her eyes towards the Rocky Mountain missions; but Providence led her back to St. Charles, where she died. Thirty-four years of mission toil, disappointment, endurance, self-annihilation sufficed, indeed, to prove the worth of this valiant daughter of Mother Barat. She had opened the road, others might walk in it; and the success hidden from her eyes was well seen later by the many who rejoiced in the rapid spread of her order over North and South America. Sincere, intense, generous, austere yet affectionate, endowed with large capacity for suffering and work, Mother Duchesne's was a stern character that needed and took the moulding of Mother Barat. Preliminary steps for her beatification have already been taken.

BAUNARD, *Histoire de la Mère Duchesne* (Paris, 1876), tr. FULLERTON (Roehampton, 1879); WARD, *Life of Venerable Madeleine Sophie Barat* (Roehampton, 1900); CONNELLY, *Rev. Mother Duchesne* in *The Month* (London, 1898), XCI; *Rev. Mother Philippine Duchesne* in *The Messenger* (New York, 1890).

CATHERINE M. LOWTH.

Duckett, JAMES, VENERABLE, Martyr, b. at Gilfortrigs in the parish of Skelsmergh in Westmoreland, England, date uncertain, of an ancient family of that county; d. 9 April, 1601. He was a bookseller and publisher in London. His godfather was the well-known martyr James Leybourne of Skelsmergh. He seems, however, to have been brought up a Protestant, for he was converted while an apprentice in London by reading a Catholic book lent him by a friend. Before he could be received into the Church he was twice imprisoned for not attending the Protestant service,

and was obliged to compound for his apprenticeship and leave his master. He was finally reconciled by a venerable priest named Weekes who was imprisoned in the Gatehouse at Westminster. After two or three years he married a Catholic widow, but out of his twelve years of married life, no less than nine were spent in prison, owing to his zeal in propagating Catholic literature and his wonderful constancy in his new-found faith. His last apprehension was brought about by Peter Bullock, a bookbinder, who betrayed him in order to obtain his own release from prison. His house was searched on 4 March, 1601, Catholic books were found there, and Duckett was at once thrown into Newgate. At his trial, Bullock testified that he had bound various Catholic books for Duckett, which the martyr acknowledged to be true. The jury found him not guilty, but Judge Popham at once stood up and bade them consider well what they did, for Duckett had had bound for him Bristowe's "Motives", a controversial work peculiarly odious to Anglicans on account of its learning and cogency. The jury thereupon reversed their verdict and brought in the prisoner guilty of felony. At the same time three priests, Page, Tichborne, and Watkinson, were condemned to death. Bullock did not save himself by his treachery, for he was conveyed in the same cart with Duckett to Tyburn, where both were executed, 19 April, 1601. There is an account, written by his son, the Prior of the English Carthusians at Nieuport (Flanders), of James Duckett's martyrdom. On the way to Tyburn he was given a cup of wine; he drank and desired his wife to drink to Peter Bullock, and freely to forgive him. At the gallows his last thoughts were for his betrayer. He kissed him and implored him to die in the Catholic Faith.

JOHN DUCKETT, VENERABLE, Martyr, probably a grandson of Venerable James Duckett, b. at Underwinder, in the parish of Sedbergh, Yorkshire, in 1603; d. 7 September, 1644. He was ordained priest in 1639 and afterwards went to Paris where he studied three years in the College of Arras. He had an extraordinary gift of prayer, and while yet a student would spend whole nights in contemplation. On his way to the English mission, he spent two months in spiritual exercises, under the direction of his uncle, the Carthusian prior at Nieuport. He laboured for about a year in Durham, and was taken near Wolsingham on his way to baptize two children, 2 July, 1644. The place which tradition declares to be that of his arrest is now marked by a tall stone cross. Carried to Sunderland, he was examined by a Parliamentary Committee of sequestrators, and placed in irons. He confessed his priesthood and was thereupon sent up to London with Father Ralph Corbie, S. J. (q. v.), who had been arrested about the same time near Newcastle-on-Tyne. They were committed to Newgate, and edified the crowds of Catholics who flocked to see them by their joyousness, their sanctity, and their longing to suffer for Christ. A reprieve for one of them having been obtained, each refused to take it for himself. On his way to execution, Duckett astonished all by his supernatural joy; comforting those who wept for him, he said smiling: "Why weep you for me who am glad at heart of this happy day?" His jailers even were so struck by his gladness that they exclaimed "assuredly this man dies for a good cause". He suffered with Father Corbie, at Tyburn. In a farewell letter to the Bishop of Chalcedon, he wrote on the eve of his martyrdom: "I fear not death, nor I contemn not life. If life were my lot, I would endure it patiently; but if death, I shall receive it joyfully, for that Christ is my life, and death is my gain. Never since my receiving of Holy Orders did I so much fear death as I did life, and now, when it approacheth can I faint?"

POLLEN, *Acts of English Martyrs* (London, 1891); CAMM, *A North Country Martyr, the Venerable John Duckett* (with portrait, London); CHALLONER, *Memoirs* (London, 1741); GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, II.

BEDE CAMM.

Ducoudray, LÉON. See COMMUNE, MARTYRS OF THE PARIS.

Du Coudray, PHILIPPE-CHARLES-JEAN-BAPTISTE-TRONSON, soldier, b. at Reims, France, 8 September, 1738; d. at Philadelphia, U. S. A., 11 September, 1777. He was educated for the army and showed great merit as an engineer. He was adjutant-general of artillery and considered one of the best military experts in France when, in 1776, he volunteered to go to America to assist the colonists in their revolt against England. Silas Deane and Benjamin Franklin, the American agents, promised him a commission as major-general with command of the artillery. This stipulation gave great offence to the officers already attached to the army when he arrived from France, in May, 1777, with twenty-nine other officers and twelve sergeants of artillery. Several of the more prominent threatened to resign. As a compromise he was made inspector-general 11 August, 1777, with the rank of major-general, and assigned to command the works along the Delaware. On 11 Sept., 1777, he was drowned while crossing the Schuylkill River at Philadelphia, the horse on which he was seated becoming frightened and dragging him overboard. Congress gave him an official funeral and attended his requiem Mass, 18 Sept., 1777, in St. Mary's church. This was one of the four occasions on which Congress was officially present at Mass during the Revolution, the others being the requiem on 8 May, 1780, for Don Juan de Miralles, the agent of the Spanish Government, and the Te Deums on 4 July, 1779, and 4 November, 1781, all being celebrated at St. Mary's, Philadelphia. Du Coudray was buried in St. Mary's churchyard, but the grave is now unknown.

GRIFFIN, *Catholics and the American Revolution* (Ridley Park, Pennsylvania, 1907); *Cyclopedia of Am. Biog.*, s. v.; SHEA, *Hist. of Cath. Ch. in U. S.* (New York, 1889–92); HEITMAN, *Historical Register of the Officers of the Continental Army* (Washington, 1893).

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Ducrue, FRANCIS BENNON, missionary in Mexico, b. at Munich, Bavaria, of French parents, 10 June, 1721; d. there 30 March, 1779. He became a member of the Society of Jesus in 1738, and ten years later was sent to California, where he laboured zealously until the expulsion of the order in 1767. When that untoward event took place, Ducrue was the superior of all the California missions. He submitted uncomplainingly to the decree of expulsion and even co-operated with the royal commission in enforcing its provisions. The Jesuits withdrew, taking with them only their clothing and a few books; this was all the wealth they carried away from California after seventy years of work in its missions. Ducrue eventually returned to his native land. He wrote in Latin "A Journey from California through the district of Mexico to Europe in the year 1767", which was translated into German for the "Nachrichten von verschiedenen Ländern des spanischen Amerika" of Christoph von Murr (Halle, 1809, 2d pt., p. 489–530). H. H. Bancroft regards this as "a standard work on the subject so far as California is concerned" (Works, XV, 478). He left also a "Relation of the Expulsion of the Society of Jesus from Mexico and in particular from California in 1767". This document is likewise found in Murr (vol. XII, p. 217–276), and was translated into French and published by Fr. Carayon in his "Documents Inédits" (Paris, 1876). Murr also gives some interesting specimens of the language of California, which were communicated to him by Ducrue.

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la c. de J.*, III, 253, and Supplement; MICHAUD, *Biog. Univ.* (Paris, 1852), XI, 419; CARAYON, *Documents Inédits* (Poitiers, 1876); DE BACKER, *Bibl. des écriv. de la c. de J.*, I, 1677; BANCROFT, *North Mexican States and Texas* (San Francisco, 1884), I, 476, 478; CLINCH, *California and Its Missions* (San Francisco, 1884), I, ch. ix, 178 sqq.

EDWARD P. SPILLANE.

Dudik, BEDA FRANCISCUS, Moravian historian, b. at Kojetein near Kremsier, Moravia, 29 January, 1815; d. as abbot and titular bishop at the monastery of Raigern, 18 January, 1890. After studying at the philosophical school at Brünn he attended the University of Olmütz. In 1836 he entered the Benedictine Order and in 1840 was ordained priest at Raigern. From this latter date until 1854 he taught first the classical languages and then history at the gymnasium of Brünn. In 1855 he became *Privatdozent* for historical research at the University of Vienna; in 1859 he was appointed historiographer of Moravia, and in 1865 was made a member of the Academy of Sciences of Vienna. For purposes of historical research he went in 1851 to Sweden, in 1852 to Rome, in 1870 to France, Belgium, and Holland, in 1874 to Russia, a country which he later repeatedly visited. Between the years 1853 and 1859 he established at Vienna the main historical library of the Teutonic Order. Dudik was a prolific writer and diligent investigator; his works have a lasting value on account of the sources from which he drew. His chief works in chronological order are: "Geschichte des Benediktinerstiftes Raigern" (2 vols., Brünn, 1849; 2nd ed., Vienna, 1868); "Mährens Geschichtsquellen" (Brünn, 1850); "Forschungen in Schweden für Mährens Geschichte" (Brünn, 1852); "Iter Romanum" (2 vols., Vienna, 1855); "Des Herzogtums Troppau ehemalige Stellung zur Markgrafschaft Mähren" (Vienna, 1857); "Waldsteins Korrespondenz" (Vienna, 1865–66); "Waldstein von seiner Enthebung bis zur abermaligen Uebernahme des Armeekommandos" (Vienna, 1858); "Des hohen Deutschen Ritterordens Münzsammlung in Wien" (Vienna, 1858, a special edition with 32 copper plates); "Kleinodien des Deutschen Ritterordens" (Vienna, 1866); "Archive im Königreich Galizien und Lodomerien" (Vienna, 1867); "Erinnerungen aus dem Feldzug in Italien 1866" (Vienna, 1867); "Preussen in Mähren im Jahre 1742" (Vienna, 1869); "Schweden in Böhmen und Mähren 1640–1660" (Vienna, 1879); "Geschichtliche Entwickelung der Buchdruckerkunst in Mähren von 1486 bis 1621" (Brünn, 1879).

Dudik's most important publication is: "Mährens allgemeine Geschichte" (12 vols., Brünn, 1860–89); it treats the history of Moravia up to 1350. Volumes VIII–X, which give an account of Moravia during the period of the Przemyslian dynasty, have been translated into Czech. He also published several papers in the transactions of the Academy of Sciences; in vol. LIV appeared: "Korrespondenz Ferdinands II. mit seinen Beichtvätern Becanus and Lamormain".

Revue bénédictine, VII, 179.

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

Duel (*duellum*, old form of *bellum*).—This word, as used both in the ecclesiastical and civil criminal codes to-day, generally signifies every contest with deadly weapons which takes place by agreement between two persons on account of some private quarrel. Thus a contest with weapons is essential to the conception of a duel. Further, the contest must take place by agreement, and the weapons used must be capable of inflicting deadly wounds. Although generally demanded by custom, similarity of weapons is not essential, neither are witnesses, seconds, etc. Finally, it is essential to a duel that it take place on account of some private matter, such as wounded honour. Consequently the customary duel of to-day differs from those public duels which took place for some public reason by the arrangement of the authorities, as the conflict between David and Goliath. Between contending nations there is no higher court than the appeal to arms; therefore war must decide, and there may be instances in which it is allowable to substitute for a battle between two armies a contest between two persons selected for the purpose.

HISTORY.—Duelling was unknown to the civilized nations of antiquity. The contests of the Roman gladiators were not, like the duels of to-day, a means of self-defence, but bloody spectacles to satisfy the curiosity and cruelty of an effeminate and degenerate people. On the other hand the custom of duelling existed among the Gauls and Germans from the earliest era, as Diodorus Siculus (Biblioth. histor., Lib. V, ch. xxviii), Velleius Paterculus (Histor. rom., II, cxviii), and others relate. The duel is, therefore, undoubtedly of heathen origin, and was so firmly rooted in the customs of the Gauls and Germans that it persisted among them even after their conversion. The oldest known law of Christian times that permitted the judicial duel is that of the Burgundian King Gundobald (d. 516). With few exceptions the judicial duel is mentioned in all old German laws as a legal ordeal. It rested on a twofold conviction. It was believed, first, that God could not allow the innocent to be defeated in a duel; hence it was held that the guilty party would not dare primarily to appeal to the judgment of God in proof of his innocence and then enter upon the fight under the weight of perjury; the fear of Divine wrath would discourage him and make victory impossible.

The Church soon raised her voice against duelling. St. Avitus (d. 518) made an earnest protest against the law of the above-mentioned Gundobald, as is related by Agobard (d. 840), who in a special work on the subject points out the opposition between the law of Gundobald and the clemency of the Gospel; God might very easily permit the defeat of the innocent. The popes also at an early date took a stand against duelling. In a letter to Charles the Bald, Nicolas I (858–67) condemned the duel (*monomachia*) as a tempting of God. In the same century his example was followed by Stephen VI, later by Alexander II and Alexander III, Celestine III, Innocent III and Innocent IV, Julius II, and many others. In addition to the judicial, non-judicial combats also occurred, in which men arbitrarily settled private grudges or sought to revenge themselves. The tournaments, especially, were often used to satisfy revenge; on account of this misuse the Church early issued ordinances against the excesses committed at tournaments, although these were not always obeyed. The more the judicial combat fell into disuse, the more the old instinct of the Germanic and Gallic peoples, by which each man sought to gain his rights with weapon in hand, showed itself in personal contests and at tournaments. From the middle of the fifteenth century duelling over questions of honour increased so greatly, especially in the Romance countries, that the Council of Trent was obliged to enact the severest penalties against it. It decreed that "the detestable custom of duelling which the Devil had originated, in order to bring about at the same time the ruin of the soul and the violent death of the body, shall be entirely uprooted from Christian soil" (Sess. XXIV, De reform., c. xix). It pronounced the severest ecclesiastical penalties against those princes who should permit duelling between Christians in their territories. According to the council those who take part in a duel are *ipso facto* excommunicated, and if they are killed in the duel they are to be deprived of Christian burial. The seconds and all those who advised the duel or were present at it are also excommunicated. These ecclesiastical penalties were at a later date repeatedly renewed and even in parts made more severe. Benedict XIV decreed that duellists should also be denied burial by the Church, even if they did not die on the duelling ground and had received absolution before death. All these penalties are substantially in force to-day. Pius IX in the "Constitutio Apostolicæ Sedis" of 12 October, 1869, decreed the penalty of excommunication against "all who fight duels, or challenge to a duel or accept such challenge; as well as against all who are accessory

to the duel or who in any way abet or encourage the same; and finally against those who are present at a duel as spectators [*de industriâ spectantes*], or those who permit the same, or do not prevent it, whatever their rank, even if they are kings or emperors".

Like the Church, the State also took steps against the evil of duelling. In 1608 an edict against the practice was issued by Henry IV of France. Whoever killed his opponent in a duel was to be punished with death; severe penalties were also enacted against the sending of a challenge and the acceptance of the same. Unfortunately transgressors against this law were generally pardoned. In 1626, during the reign of Henry's successor, Louis XIII, the laws against duelling were made more stringent and were strictly carried out. Notwithstanding these measures the custom of duelling increased alarmingly in France. The great number of French noblemen who fell in duels about the middle of the seventeenth century, is shown by the statement of the contemporary writer Théophile Raynaud that within thirty years more men of rank had been killed in duels than would have been needed to make up an entire army. Olier, the founder of the Congregation of Saint-Sulpice, with the aid of St. Vincent de Paul, formed an association of distinguished noblemen, the members of which signed the following obligation: "The undersigned publicly and solemnly make known by this declaration that they will refuse every form of challenge, will for no cause whatever enter upon a duel, and will in every way be willing to give proof that they detest duelling as contrary to reason, the public good, and the laws of the State, and as incompatible with salvation and the Christian religion, without, however, relinquishing the right to avenge in every legal way any insult offered them as far as position and birth make such action obligatory." Louis XIV aided these efforts at reform by the severe enactment against duelling which he issued early in his reign. For a long time after this duelling was infrequent in France.

In other countries too severe measures were taken against the constantly spreading evil. In 1681 the Emperor Leopold I forbade the fighting of duels under the severest penalties; Maria Theresa ordered not only the challenger and the challenged but also all who had any share in a duel to be beheaded, and in the reign of the Emperor Joseph II duellists received the punishment of murderers. Frederick the Great of Prussia tolerated no duellists in his army. The present penal code of Austria makes imprisonment the punishment of duelling; the penal code of the German Empire commands confinement in a fortress. The penalty is, without doubt, entirely insufficient and constitutes a form of privilege for the person who kills his adversary in a duel. Theoretically these penal laws are also applicable to the respective armies, but unfortunately in the case of officers they are not carried out; indeed, up to the present time, an officer who refuses to fight a duel in Germany and Austria is in danger of being dismissed from the army. In 1896 when, in consequence of the fatal issue of a duel, the Reichstag by a large majority called upon the Government to proceed by all the means in its power against the practice of duelling, as opposed to the criminal code, the emperor issued a cabinet order on 1 January, 1897, which established courts of honour to deal with disputes in the army concerning questions of honour. Unfortunately the decree leaves it open to the court of honour to permit or even to command a duel to take place. Furthermore, on 15 January, 1906, General von Einem, Prussian Minister of War, stated that the principle of the duel was still in force, and Chancellor von Bülow added to this: "....the corps of army officers can tolerate no member in its ranks who is not ready, should necessity arise, to defend his honour by force of arms". In the army, as a result of this principle, a conscientious opponent of duelling is constantly exposed to the danger of being expelled for refusing to fight. In England duelling is almost unknown, and no duel has occurred, it is said, in the British army for the last eighty years. English jurisprudence contains no special ordinances against duelling; the wounding or killing of another in a duel is punishable according to common law. On the Continent also public opinion on the subject of duelling seems to be gradually changing. The demand for the abolition, even in the army, of this abuse is growing louder and louder. Some years ago, at the instance of the Infante Alfonso of Bourbon and Austria-Este, an anti-duelling league was formed in order to carry on systematically the opposition to duelling. A preliminary convention, held at Frankfort-on-the-Main in the spring of 1901, issued an appeal for support in its struggle against this evil. In a few weeks a thousand signatures were received, mostly those of men of influence from the most varied ranks of society. A convention to draw up a constitution met at Cassel 11 January, 1902, and Prince Carl zu Löwenstein was elected president. A committee was also appointed to direct affairs and to conduct the agitation. The league has made most satisfactory progress; in 1908 it established a permanent bureau at Leipzig. Concerning the aims of the league the declaration subscribed by the members states the following: "The undersigned herewith declare their rejection, on principle, of duelling as a custom repugnant to reason, conscience, the demands of civilization, existing laws, and the common good of society and the State."

WRONGFULNESS OF DUELLING.—After what has been said above there can be no doubt that duelling is contrary to the ordinances of the Catholic Church and of most civilized countries. By the wording of its ordinance against duelling, the Council of Trent plainly indicated that duelling was essentially wrong and since then theologians have almost universally characterized it as a sinful and reprehensible course of action. However there were always a few scholars who held the opinion that cases might arise in which the unlawfulness of duelling could not be proved with certainty by mere reason. But this opinion has not been tenable since Pope Benedict XIV in the Bull "Detestabilem" of the year 1752 condemned the following propositions: (1) "A soldier would be blameless and not liable to punishment for sending or accepting a challenge if he would be considered timid and cowardly, worthy of contempt, and unfit for military duty, were he not to send a challenge or accept such, and who would for this reason lose the position which supported him and his family, or who would be obliged to give up forever the hope of befitting and well-earned advancement." (2) "Those persons are excusable who to defend their honour or to escape the contempt of men accept or send a challenge when they know positively that the duel will not take place but will be prevented by others." (3) "A general or officer who accepts a challenge through fear of the loss of his reputation and his position does not come under the ecclesiastical punishment decreed by the Church for duellists." (4) "It is permissible under the natural conditions of man to accept or send a challenge in order to save one's fortune, when the loss of it can not be prevented by any other means." (5) "This permission claimed for natural conditions can also be applied to a badly guided state in which, especially, justice is openly denied by the remissness or malevolence of the authorities." Like his predecessors, Leo XIII in his letter "Pastoralis officii", of 12 September, 1891, to the German and Austro-Hungarian bishops, laid down the following principles: "From two points of view the Divine law forbids a man as a private person to wound or kill another, excepting when he is forced to it by self-defence. Both natural reason and the inspired Holy Scriptures proclaim this Divine law."

The intrinsic reason why duelling is in itself sinful and reprehensible is that it is an arbitrary attack on God's right of ownership as regards human life. Only the owner and master of a thing has the right at pleasure to destroy it or expose it to the danger of destruction. But man is not the owner and master of his life; it belongs, instead, entirely to his Creator. Now man can only call that his property and treat it as such which is intended in the first instance for his benefit, so that he has the right to exclude others from the use of the same. Man, however, is not created primarily for himself but for the glory and service of God. Here below he is to serve his Creator and Lord as long as the Lord wills and thus attain his own salvation. For this end God has given man life, maintains it for him, and has bestowed on him the instinct of self-preservation. But if man is not the master of his life, he has not the right to expose it at pleasure to destruction or even deliberately to seek such danger. In order rightfully to expose the life to danger there must be a justifiable reason, and even then the risking of life is only permissible, not the end to be sought in itself. What is said of one's own life applies also to the life of one's fellow-man. Every man has the right in case of necessity forcibly to defend himself against an unlawful attack on his life, even if it cost the life of the assailant; this is a requirement of public safety; but apart from such defence no man has the right as a private individual to injure the life of his fellow-man or at pleasure to expose his own to similar danger. Hence it is easy to perceive that a duellist unjustifiably exposes both his own life and that of his fellow-man, consequently is guilty of a wrongful assumption of the right of God, the Lord of life and death. To make this clear it is only necessary to examine the pretexts used to palliate duelling, or, what is the same, to look into the aims sought to be attained by this custom. One of the principal reasons given in justification of duelling is the obtaining of satisfaction. A man is insulted or injured in reputation, and in order to obtain satisfaction challenges the defamer. But besides the offence against civil law in seeking to establish one's rights with weapons, thus evading the authority of the State, a duel is totally unsuited to the attainment of satisfaction and in addition is wrongful. Satisfaction consists in the offender withdrawing his insult and treating the offended person with respect and honour. This end cannot, however, be attained by duelling. When the one who has given the provocation accepts the challenge he does not thereby withdraw the insult; he intends, rather, to maintain it by weapons and shows himself, moreover, ready to add other and greater wrongdoing to the first, inasmuch as he may severely wound or even kill the challenger. Moreover, who would allow to the man whom he wishes to compel to make good a wrong the same chance of victory as to himself, i. e. who would give the offender the opportunity to add to the wrong he has already done an even more heinous injury? Yet this is what the challenger does in granting his adversary the same weapons and the same chance for success as he claims for himself.

Another reason offered in justification of duelling is self-defence. The duellist desires to avoid the loss of the respect of his peers and thus to retain his office and his income, or, as is said, to defend his honour and his social position. It is unfortunately only too true that to-day the conscientious opponent of duelling, especially in the army, must often suffer great losses. Nevertheless duelling cannot be justified as self-defence. Honour and the respect of others cannot be preserved by the use of arms, nor in a duel is there any actual vindication of these. The duel implies that the honour of the challenger has already been injured, and consequently that this injury is an accomplished fact; besides, the duel takes place according to agreement, so that it is not a case of self-defence against sudden attack. But the word *self-defence* is used in a broader sense. According to the prejudices existing in certain circles, the person who does not answer an insult by a challenge or who declines a challenge is held to be dishonourable and cowardly; thus it may be that a man's entire social position is at stake. Yet, from its very nature, a duel is an unsuitable and illicit method of preserving or rehabilitating honour. Look at a duel first from the point of view of the person injured. He must, it is said, send a challenge because he has been insulted. Two cases, however, are here possible. Either his moral character and good name have been attacked, or the specific charge of cowardice has been made against him. If the former be the case, the duel is manifestly unsuited to defend the injured man's honour. A duel can never prove that the person attacked is a man of honour, is not a simpleton, has not committed adultery, or the like. A man without character or morals can be just as skilful in handling weapons as his honourable opponent. If the quarrel hinges on the charge of cowardice, a duel is apparently a proper means of disproving the same. But in this instance the challenger directly endangers his life in order to prove that he is no coward. Consequently he cannot say that he only suffers his life to be endangered, he deliberately seeks this danger in order to show his courage. And, according to our former statements, this is to dispose of one's life unlawfully. It cannot be said in reply that the injured person merely intends the rehabilitation of his honour. That is certainly the final aim of the duel, but the first and direct aim is to prove one's courage by fighting the duel. Is it permissible, however, to risk one's own life and that of one's fellow-man merely as a means of proving one's courage? If this be correct, it would be equally allowable to enter a lion's cage, sword in hand, if public opinion demanded such proof of personal bravery. Hence it follows that the duel is not in reality a proper means to demonstrate one's courage, for true courage is a moral virtue which is not blind and foolhardy, but exposes itself to danger only if reason demand it. What has been said of the injured party is applicable also to the party giving the provocation, the one who is challenged. If he has acted unjustly he should as a man of honour offer reparation; that is his duty, and the refusal to perform this duty plainly gives him no right to fight a duel with his opponent. If he is not in the wrong he ought to refuse the challenge. The only ground for which a challenge might be accepted would be fear of the accusation of cowardice; that this reason is, however, not tenable has already been shown. It surely is the basest cowardice to do, through fear of being accused of want of courage, what sober reflection would lead any man of sense to condemn as immoral and wrong.

The conclusion necessarily to be drawn from the above is: whoever is killed in a duel is indirectly guilty of self-murder, because he has for no justifiable reason risked his life, and whoever slays his adversary in a duel is guilty of unjustifiable homicide, because he has taken the risk of causing death without any right to do so; this holds true even though he did not directly intend his opponent's death. The above applies not only to duels undertaken by private individuals of their own free will, but also to duels fought on account of personal grievances by order of State authorities. Those in authority have not the right to dispose at their pleasure of the life of the subject. Should a dispute be laid before them, they should examine the matter judicially and punish the guilty party. If the guilt cannot be proved the accused should be acquitted; in such a case the authorities have no right to command a duel and thus expose the innocent to the same peril as the guilty. This has all the more force, as duels often take place on account of wrongs which are not to-day punished with death by civil law.

Das Duell in seinem Ursprung und Wesen (Paderborn, 1864); *Das Duell als Emancipation der Ehre* (Freiburg im Br., 1846); TONGERONS DE CAMPIGNEULLES, *Histoire des duels anciens et modernes* (Paris, 1835); NAHLOWSKI, *Das Duell* (Leipzig, 1864); OTT, *Geschichte des Zweikampfs aller Völker und Zeiten* (Olmütz, 1855); HÜBSCHNER, *Das Duell* (Elberfeld, 1868); VON BELOW, *Das Duell in Deutschland* (1896); GRIEPENKERL, *Das Duell im Lichte der Ethik*, Seminary memorial publication for bishop's jubilee (Trier, 1906); WIERINGER, *Das Duell von dem Richterstuhl der Religion, der Moral, des Rechts und der Geschichte* (Graz, 1895); LEHMKUHL, *Das Duell im Lichte der Vernunft* in *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, XLVI (1894), 345; MEYER, *Institut. juris naturalis* (Freiburg im. Br., 1900), II, 76, 299; CATHREIN, *Moralphilosophie* (Freiburg im Br., 1904), II; PAULSEN, *System der Ethik* (Berlin, 1900), II, 101 sqq.; LASSON, *System der Rechtsphilosophie* (Berlin, 1882), 548; VON BOGULAWSKI, *Die Antiduellbewegung* (Berlin, 1902); SPOHN, *Die konventionellen Gebräuche beim Zweikampf* (Berlin, 1901).

V. CATHREIN.

Duffy, SIR CHARLES GAVAN, politician and author, b. at Monaghan, Ireland, 12 April, 1816; d. at Nice, France, 9 Feb., 1903. Educated in his native town, he contributed, at an early age, to the "Northern Herald", and in 1836 joined the staff of the Dublin "Morning Register" of which he shortly afterwards became sub-editor. In 1839, being appointed editor of the newly established Ulster Catholic paper, "The Vindicator", he went to Belfast, where he resided till 1842. Going to Dublin in the summer of that year, he met two young barristers, Thomas Davis and John Dillon, and in conjunction with them he founded "The Nation", the first number of which appeared in October. Duffy was editor, Dillon and Davis were among its contributors, and what with the ability of editor and contributors, the freshness and vigour of style, and the manly and militant tone adopted on public questions, the paper soon became a power. Its whole-hearted support of Repeal filled the meetings and the coffers of the Repeal Association, and O'Connell gratefully recognized its assistance. Peel also noted its influence, and when O'Connell was prosecuted in 1844, Duffy was with him in the dock and subsequently his fellow-prisoner in Kilmainham. Later, in the struggles between the Young and the Old Irelanders, Duffy took sides with the former against O'Connell, and was one of those who helped to found the Irish Confederation. He specially resented O'Connell's alliance with the Whigs, as he did the intolerance and presumption of John O'Connell. The failure of the Repeal movement, the horrors of the famine, and the death of O'Connell weakened his faith in constitutional action, and for a time, in 1848, he advocated revolutionary measures. The Government, in consequence, seized his paper and threw Duffy into prison; but, though tried four times in succession, the prosecution failed, owing chiefly to the great ability of his lawyer, Isaac Butt. In the revived "Nation", in 1849, Duffy reverted to constitutional agitation, and with Lucas and others established in 1850 the Tenant League, which at the general election of 1852 returned forty members of parliament pledged to Tenant Right and Independent Opposition, Duffy himself being returned for New Ross, County Wexford. The treachery of the place-hunters, Keogh and Sadlier, soon wrecked the party, and, when Lucas died, Duffy in despair resigned his seat and left for Melbourne, Australia, where he arrived early in 1856. Though determined to avoid politics, he was induced to enter the Victorian Parliament, where his great abilities made him at once a prominent figure. He filled in succession the position of minister of public works and minister of public lands, and for a brief period was prime minister. Ultimately he became speaker, receiving also the honour of knighthood. These honours and dignities he reached without ever denying either his country or faith, or ever failing to defend them when assailed. He consistently championed the labourers and the farmers against the capitalists and the squatters, and when he left Victoria in 1880 the whole colony regarded him as one of the ablest and most useful of her public men. His last years were devoted to writing several valuable historical works: "Young Ireland" (Dublin, 1884); also his "Four Years of Irish History" (London, 1883); "The League of North and South" (London, 1886); and "My Life in Two Hemispheres" (London, 1903).

LUCAS, *Life of Frederick Lucas* (London, 1887); MITCHELL, *The Last Conquest of Ireland (Perhaps)* (New York, 1860); O'CONNELL, *Correspondence* (London, 1888).

E. A. D'ALTON.

Duhamel, JEAN-BAPTISTE, a French scientist, philosopher, and theologian, b. at Vire, Normandy (now in the department of Calvados), 11 June, 1624; d. at Paris, 6 August, 1706. He began his studies at Caen and completed them at Paris. In 1642, being only eighteen years of age, Duhamel published an explanation of the work of Theodosius called "Spherics", to which he added a treatise on trigonometry. The following year he entered the Congregation of the Oratory, which he left ten years later to take charge of the parish of Neuilly-sur-Marne. Resigning this position in 1663, he became chancellor of the church of Bayeux. When Colbert founded the Académie des Sciences (1666), he appointed Duhamel its first secretary. Duhamel held this office until 1697, when he resigned and, upon his own recommendation, was succeeded by Fontenelle. With Colbert's brother, the Marquis de Croissy, he went, in 1668, first to Aix-la-Chapelle for the peace negotiations, and later to England, where he came in touch with the foremost scientists, especially with the physicist Boyle.

Duhamel's works are "Philosophia moralis christiana" (Angers, 1652); "Astronomia physica" (Paris, 1659); "De meteoris et fossilibus" (Paris, 1659); "De consensu veteris et novæ philosophiæ" (Paris, 1663), a treatise on natural philosophy in which the Greek and scholastic theories are compared with those of Descartes; "De corporum affectionibus" (Paris, 1670); "De mente humanâ" (Paris, 1672); "De corpore animato" (Paris, 1673); "Philosophia vetus et nova ad usum scholæ accommodata" (Paris, 1678). This last work, composed by order of Colbert as a textbook for colleges, ran through many editions. He also published: "Theologia speculatrix et practica" (7 vols., Paris, 1690), abridged in five volumes for use as a textbook in seminaries (Paris, 1694); "Regiæ scientiarum Academiæ historia" (Paris, 1698; enlarged edition, 1701); "Institutiones biblicæ" (Paris, 1698), in which are examined the questions of the authority, integrity, and inspiration of the Bible, the value of the Hebrew text and of its translations, the style and method of interpretation, Biblical geography, and chronology; "Biblia sacra Vulgatæ editionis" (Paris, 1705), with introductions, notes, chronological, historical, and geographical tables. In his choice of opinions, Duhamel shows great impartiality and unbiased judgment. His admiration for empirical science does not make him despise the speculations of his predecessors, but he examines and criticizes both sides carefully, tries to reconcile them, and, if this be impossible, gives his own opinion. Brucker, in his history of philosophy, calls him "vir et judicii laude clarissimus et doctrinæ copia celeberrimus". Fontenelle praises his noble character and his disinterestedness; his charity, which "was exercised too frequently not to become known, notwithstanding his care to conceal it"; his humility, which was not only on his lips, but was "a feeling based on science itself".

VIALARD, *J.-B. Duhamel* (Paris, 1884); MORIN-LAVALLÉE, *Bibliographie viroise* (Caen, 1879); FONTENELLE, *Histoire du renouvellement de l'Académie royale des sciences en MDCXCIX, et les Eloges historiques de tous les Académiciens morts depuis ce renouvellement* (Paris, 1706); CHALMERS, *Biographical Dictionary* (London, 1814), XVII, 84; BRUCKER, *Historia critica philosophiæ* (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1767), IV, 760; DUPIN, *Nouvelle bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques* (2nd ed., Paris and Mons, 1703—), XVIII, 297.

C. A. DUBRAY.

Duhig, JAMES. See ROCKHAMPTON.

Duke, EDMUND, Ven. See HILL, RICHARD.

Dukhobortsy. See RUSSIA.

Dulcin (DOLCINO). See APOSTOLICI.

Du Lhut (DULUTH), DANIEL GREYSOLON, SIEUR, b. at Saint-Germain-en-Laye about 1640; d. at Montreal, 26 Feb., 1710. He first served in the French army, becoming a lieutenant in 1657 and a gendarme of the King's Guard in 1664. He also took part in the campaign in Flanders and was present at the battle of Senef in 1674. During that year he went to Canada, whither he had been preceded by several members of his family, amongst them his cousins, the Tontys. At first he settled in Montreal, but in 1678 left for the West accompanied by his brother, La Tourette, and six soldiers. In 1679 he took possession of the Sioux country in the name of the King of France. He also explored Lake Superior and the high inland plateau where the Mississippi, the Red River, and the St. Lawrence rise, erected the fortified post of Kaministiquia (now Fort William) and afterwards built Fort La Tourette on Lake Nepigon. Du Lhut was the first Canadian to explore the West and it was his privilege to save Father Hennepin from captivity when this famous Recollect missionary, having become separated from La Salle's expedition, was wandering about in the wilderness near Saint-Antoine. On account of his intrepidity, Du Lhut had great influence over the savages, who admired and feared him; he kept them loyal to France and obliged them to join the expeditions which La Barré and Denonville organized against the Iroquois in 1684 and 1687. In 1686 he laid the foundation of the post of Detroit and in 1696, having been made captain after twenty years of service, was in command of Fort Frontenac. Here, in 1707, he was succeeded by Tonty, his cousin. He died three years later and was buried in the church of the Recollects at Montreal.

Du Lhut was one of the most dauntless pioneer rangers (*coureurs de bois*) in Canada during the French regime. For thirty years he succeeded in keeping the country to the west of the Great Lakes under French control. Notwithstanding that he had every chance of becoming wealthy, he died poor and Governor Vaudreuil testified to his having been a very upright man. The city of Duluth, Minnesota, takes its name from him. Du Lhut wrote accounts of his journeys (1676–1678), but unfortunately they have been lost; however, we have a plan that he designed for a chain of posts to be erected for the purpose of keeping the lake-route clear of savages and thus facilitating communication between Canada and the western and southern parts of the continent (1683–95). This plan was published by Margry (Découvertes et Etablissements, V, 3–72). In the Library of Congress at Washington may also be found extracts from his account of Detroit.

SULTE in *La Revue Canadienne* (1893), 480–489, 541–550; MCLENNAN in *Harper's Magazine* (September, 1893); *Transactions Royal Soc. Canada* (1903), new series, IX, 39.

J. EDMOND ROY.

Dulia (Gr. δουλεία; Lat. *servitus*), a theological term signifying the honour paid to the saints, while *latria* means worship given to God alone, and *hyperdulia* the veneration offered to the Blessed Virgin Mary. St. Augustine (De Civ. Dei, X, ii, 1) distinguishes two kinds of *servitus:* "one which is due to men . . . which in Greek is called *dulia;* the other, *latria*, which is the service pertaining to the worship of God". St. Thomas (II-II, Q. ciii, a. 3) bases the distinction on the difference between God's supreme dominion and that which one man may exercise over another. Catholic theologians insist that the difference is one of kind and not merely of degree; dulia and latria being as far apart as are the creature and the Creator. Leibniz, though a Protestant, recognizes the "*discrimen infinitum atque immensum* between the honour which is due to God and that which is shown to the saints, the one being called by theologians, after Augustine's example, latria, the other dulia"; and he further declares that this difference should "not only be inculcated in the minds of hearers and learners, but should also be manifested as far as possible by outward signs" (Syst. theol., p. 184). A further distinction is made between dulia in the absolute sense, the honour paid to persons, and dulia in the relative sense, the honour paid to inanimate objects, such as images and relics. With regard to the saints, dulia includes veneration and invocation; the former being the honour paid directly to them, the latter having primarily in view the petitioner's advantage. More detailed explanation of dulia and the reasons for which it is shown to persons or things will be found in the articles IMAGES, RELICS, SAINTS. See also ADORATION and WORSHIP.

E. A. PACE.

Duluth, DIOCESE OF (DULUTHENSIS), established 3 Oct., 1889, suffragan of the Archdiocese of St. Paul, U. S. A., comprises the counties of Aitkin, Becker, Beltrami, Carlton, Cass, Clay, Clearwater, Cook, Crow Wing, Hubbard, Itasca, Kittson, Lake, Marshall, Norman, Pine, Polk, Roseau, Red Lake, Mahnomen, Koochiching, and St. Louis, in the State of Minnesota, an area of 39,439 square miles. The first white men and the first Catholics to visit this region were the French fur-traders who, under Groseilliers, are recorded as having shipped furs from there in 1660. Daniel Greysolon Du Lhut, the French officer, adventurer, and fur-trader after whom the see city is named, was there in 1679. After a varying existence as trading post and frontier settlement, Duluth was incorporated as a town in May, 1857. The first priest in Minnesota was the famous Father Hennepin, who in 1680 was a prisoner among the Sioux. He explored the Mississippi and at St. Paul named the falls in honour of St. Anthony, writing a glowing description of them in 1683. Wandering missionaries made infrequent visits to the Indian tribes and scattered Catholics of the region down to 1839, when the Rev. Joseph Crétin (q. v.), a zealous French priest, began an active and successful missionary career.

The Seventh Provincial Council of Baltimore (1849) recommended to Rome the erection of a new see at St. Paul for the Territory of Minnesota and the appointment of Father Crétin as its first bishop, which plan was carried out. Father Crétin had been in the territory for some time, trying to revive the old Indian missions and evangelize the Canadian *voyageurs* who went there for the fur trade. The numerous Indians roaming in the wilderness had nearly forgotten the doctrines of Christianity preached to their ancestors by the Recollects and Jesuits more than a century before, but they were still anxious to have the "black-robes" come among them once more. In 1875 the Vicariate Apostolic of Northern Minnesota was established, and these two divisions of the whole State continued until 4 May, 1888, when St. Paul was raised to the rank of an archdiocese with the four suffragan sees of Duluth, Winona, Jamestown (now Fargo), and St. Cloud, the last-named being the new title for the Vicariate of Northern Minnesota. Duluth, the see city, was within these old limits of the vicariate. In 1866 the few Catholics there were brought together by a visiting missionary. They numbered only about two dozen families in 1870, and Father John Chebul, an Austrian by birth, attended them as a mission from Superior and built the first frame chapel for their use. Other priests of the formative period were Fathers G. Keller, a German, J. B. M. Génin, a French Oblate, Joseph Buh, Charles Verwyst, Joseph Staub, Christopher Murphy, and G. J. Goebel.

THE REV. JAMES MCGOLRICK, a member of the

council of Bishop Ireland of St. Paul and rector of the church of the Immaculate Conception, Minneapolis, was nominated as the first bishop of the new see and consecrated at St. Paul, 27 Dec., 1889. He was born 1 May, 1841, at Borrisokane, County Tipperary, Ireland, and ordained for the American mission at All Hallows Seminary, near Dublin, 11 June, 1867. Emigrating to the United States, he began his work at St. Paul as an assistant at the cathedral. He was next appointed to establish a parish in the then rising town of Minneapolis and remained there for twenty-two years as pastor of the church of the Immaculate Conception. He found, on taking charge of his new diocese, a Catholic population of about 19,000, of which 3000 were Indians. There were 20 priests, 15 secular and 5 regular; 34 churches, 10 stations, and 8 Chippewa Indian missions attended by Benedictine, Franciscan, and Jesuit missionaries.

The first railroad from Duluth to St. Paul ran only in 1870, and in 1882 the first iron-range road, on which industry the chief reliance for material prosperity rested. The commercial panics of 1872 and 1893 were great blows to this section, but in ten years the priests had increased to 38 and the missions and stations to 74 with 30 Indian missions and stations. The Sisters of St. Benedict had been introduced and were in charge of 9 parish and 2 Indian schools, with 1400 children. They also managed 2 hospitals and a home for the aged. The Catholic population had also increased to 23,000. Since then conditions have bettered, and the statistics of the diocese for 1908 give these figures: priests 65, 44 secular, 21 regular; churches with resident priests 50; missions with churches 36; stations 45; chapels 15; academies for girls 3, with 395 pupils; parish schools 10, with 1586 pupils; Indian industrial schools 2, with 192 pupils; orphan asylum 1; hospitals 6; Catholic population 54,300, White 50,000, Indian 4300. The religious communities represented in the diocese are the Benedictine and the Oblate Fathers, the Christian Brothers, the Benedictine Sisters, and the Sisters of St. Joseph. The Benedictine Fathers have charge of the Indian missions, and the Benedictine Sisters attend to the needs of the schools established for the benefit of the Indian children, their industrial schools on the Red Lake and White Earth reservations being especially successful in spite of scant means and other disadvantages. The constant good done by these institutions, for the girls of the tribes especially, has been manifested by every test applied to their operation. The Christian Brothers have a high school attached to the cathedral in Duluth.

REUSS, *Biog. Cycl. of the Hierarchy of U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1898); *Catholic News* (New York, Dec., 1889), files; *Directory of Cathedral Parish* (Duluth, 1905); *Catholic Directory U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1889–1909); THEBAUD, *Forty Years in the U. S.* (New York, 1904); RAVOUX, *Memoirs* (St. Paul, 1892); Documents in archives of Archdiocese of St. Paul and St. Paul Catholic Historical Society.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Dumas, JEAN-BAPTISTE, distinguished French chemist and senator, b. at Alais, department of Gard, 14 July, 1800; d. at Cannes, 10 April, 1884. Like many other distinguished chemists, Dumas began his career as a pharmacist, and at Geneva, where he went when a very young man, he obtained a position in the Le Royer pharmacy. Here in connexion with Prévost he published a memoir on the physiology of the nervous system which attracted attention and is still well known. This led to an invitation to go to Paris, where he became tutor of Thénard's course of lectures in chemistry at the Ecole Polytechnique and was appointed professor at the Athénée. While engaged in these positions his published researches concerning the vapour density of the elements, those on the formulæ of alcohols and ethers, his memoirs on the law of substitution in organic compounds, and his work on chemical types gave him an illustrious position in chemical investigation. The first researches on the replacing of hydrogen by chlorine in organic bodies is due to him; this was supplemented by researches as to the atomic weight of carbon, his labours doing much to establish the relations of the hydro-carbon compounds in organic chemistry. With Boussingault he studied the composition of water and of the atmosphere. With Stas he investigated the composition of carbon dioxide, and later his memoirs on hydrogen and the amide compounds brought him at once into the first rank among the chemists of the nineteenth century.

In 1829 he founded the Ecole Centrale des Arts et Manufactures with Péclet, Lavallié, and Olivier. Brilliant lecture courses in the Sorbonne won him further renown. He replaced Thénard as professor at the Ecole Polytechnique, was professor at the Sorbonne and dean of the faculty of sciences. Originally a very poor speaker, by practice and study he acquired elocutionary powers that brought him great celebrity. Dumas also became professor at the Ecole de Médecine, a position he resigned in favour of Wurtz, one of his most distinguished pupils. His scholars included such illustrious men as H. Sainte-Claire Deville, Wurtz, Debray, Pasteur, and others. Turning his attention to politics, Dumas was elected a deputy from the department of Nord in 1849; among the proposed laws in which he was interested were various ones treating the recoining of money, stamped paper, forgery of public acts, taxes on salt, sugar, etc. In 1851 he was appointed minister of agriculture and commerce by Louis Napoléon, and after the *coup d'état* was made senator. From 1832 he was a member of the Institute, being elected to the Academy of Sciences, and in 1868 he was made a perpetual secretary; in 1878 he became a member of the French Academy. In 1858–59 he carried on an animated controversy as to the nature of the elements with Despretz; in the course of the discussion Dumas' energetic methods in attacking his opponent's views excited some criticism. His abandonment of chemical research for politics was considered a misfortune by the scientific world, as he ceased his brilliant investigations when in the very prime of his powers.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DUMAS

Dumas was a consistent Catholic, and remained true to his faith all his life. When it was necessary, he never hesitated to defend Christianity against the attacks of materialism. Examples of his views in this regard may be found in his various addresses, as: his address on Bérard; his commemorative address on Faraday, and the speech in which he extended the greetings of the Academy to the historian Taine. The Count d'Haussonville, at the funeral of Dumas, gave eloquent testimony to the latter's religious belief. Dumas was a prolific writer. Among his works may be mentioned: "Traité de chimie appliquée aux arts" (8 vols., 1828–45); "Précis de chimie physiologique et médicale"; "Leçons sur la philosophie chimique" (1837); "Essai de statique chimique des êtres organisés" (1841), the last work written in collaboration with Boussingault. Besides the publications just mentioned there were numerous papers in scientific

journals and in the transactions of the Academy of Sciences. A list of his papers was published in the "Catalogue of Scientific Papers of Royal Society, London".

MAINDRON, *L'Œuvre de Jean-Baptiste Dumas* (1886); *Dictionnaire Larousse*, s. v.

T. O'CONOR SLOANE.

Dumetz, FRANCISCO, date of b. unknown; d. 14 Jan., 1811. He was a native of Mallorca (Majorca), Spain, where he entered the Franciscan Order. In May, 1770, he went to Mexico with forty-eight other Franciscans to join the famous Franciscan missionary college of San Fernando in the City of Mexico. On volunteering for the Indian missions, he was sent to California in October, 1770. Sailing from San Blas, Jalisco, with ten friars in January, 1771, he reached Monterey in May and was assigned to Mission San Diego. In May, 1772, he was transferred to Mission San Carlos, and in May, 1782, was appointed for Mission San Buenaventura, where he continued his unostentatious labours for the Indians until August, 1797, when he was directed to found Mission San Fernando. Father Dumetz remained there from its founding on 8 Sept. to the end of 1805, except during 1803 and 1804 when apparently he resided at San Gabriel. From January, 1806, to the time of his death, Father Dumetz was stationed at San Gabriel. His remains were buried in the mission church on 15 January. Dumetz was the last of the pioneer friars who did so much for California, where he toiled without interruption for forty years.

PALOU, *Noticias* (San Francisco, 1874), I; IDEM, *Vida del Fray Junipero Serra* (Mexico, 1787), *Records of Missions, San Carlos, San Buenaventura, San Fernando, San Gabriel;* ENGELHARDT, *The Franciscans in California* (Harbor Springs, Mich., 1897).

ZEPHYRIN ENGELHARDT.

Dumfries, DIOCESE OF. See GALLOWAY.

Dumont, HUBERT-ANDRÉ, Belgian geologist, b. at Liège, 15 Feb., 1809; d. in the same city, 28 Feb., 1857. When only twenty years old he received the gold medal of the Academy of Brussels for his "Description géologique de la province de Liège". This memoir marked an important advance in stratigraphical geology. In 1835 he won a doctorate in mathematical and physical science and in the same year was appointed professor of geology and mineralogy at the University of Liège. He held this position until his death, serving also for a time as rector of the university. His native city has erected a statue in his honour. Dumont was a devout Catholic, and one of his sons entered the Society of Jesus. His principal achievement was his geological map of Belgium, the preparation of which engaged his attention for a number of years. The first edition was issued in 1849. Later and more complete editions followed, the last being "La carte géologique de la Belgique et des contrées voisines représentant les terrains qui se trouvent en dessous du limon hesbayen et du sable campinien au 800,000e".

Dumont's work, together with that of Gosselet on the palæozoic rocks of Belgium, served as a foundation for a subsequent research in that region. The former in 1848 had divided the Terrain Ardennais into the Devillien, Revinien, and Salmien groups, the Terrain Rhénan into the Gedinnien, Coblentzien, and Ahrien groups, and the Terrain Anthraxifère into the Eifelien, Condrusien, and Houiller groups. This classification, though based on purely local characteristics, was an excellent one both from a lithological and a stratigraphical point of view. He did not, however, deem it necessary to make any extended comparison between the subdivisions which he had distinguished in Belgium and similar groups in other countries. It was his opinion that the same fauna never extended over the whole earth, so that extreme caution was necessary in establishing a parallel between widely separated rocks on the basis of fossils contained in them. Besides the works already mentioned, Dumont was the author of a number of papers characterized by careful observation and great clearness. Among them are: "Notice sur une nouvelle espèce de phosphate ferrique" (Bull. de l'Acad. de Belgique, V); "Observations sur la constitution géologique des terrains tertiaires de l'Angleterre comparés à ceux de la Belgique" (Ibid., XIX); "Mémoire sur les terrains triasique et jurassique de la province de Luxembourg" (Mém. de l'Acad., XV). "Etude sur les terrains ardennais et rhénan de l'Ardenne, du Rhin, du Brabant, et du Condroz" (Ibid., XX–XXII).

FAYNO, *André Dumont, sa vie et ses travaux* (Liège, 1858); D'OMALIUS D'HALLOY, *Notice sur André Dumont* (Brussels, 1858); ZITTEL, *History of Geology and Palæontology* (London, 1901); KNELLER, *Das Christentum u. die Vertreter der neueren Naturwissenschaft* (Freiburg, 1904).

HENRY M. BROCK.

Dumoulin (or DUMOLIN; latinized MOLINÆUS), CHARLES, French jurist, b. at Paris in 1500; d. there 27 December, 1566. He was a descendant of a noble family related to Anne Boleyn, the mother of Elizabeth of England. The life of Dumoulin was full of vicissitudes. After taking the degree of Doctor of Law, he first lectured on that subject at Orléans in 1521, and afterwards became an advocate of the Parlement of Paris (the highest court of France). He soon abandoned this position, devoted himself exclusively to the study of law, and gained a great reputation by his works on jurisprudence. He liked to call himself the jurisconsult of France and Germany. It is related that he said: "Ego qui nemini cedo nec a nemine doceri possum" (I yield to no one nor is anyone able to teach me). His hatred for the papacy led him into apostasy. In 1542 he embraced Calvinism, but soon passed over to Lutheranism. His violent attacks on the papacy compelled him to seek refuge in Germany. In 1553 he lectured on law at Tübingen, and afterwards at Strasburg, Dôle, and Besançon; returning to Paris in 1557, he was soon obliged to quit that city and went successively to Orléans and Lyons. From 1564, he resided again in Paris; on his death-bed he abjured his heresy and was reconciled to the Church. The following are his principal works upon civil law: "Commentarii in consuetudines Parisienses"; "Extricatio labyrinthi dividui et individui"; "Tractatus de eo quod interest". His chief work on canon law is a critical edition of the "Decree of Gratian" with the gloss, accompanied by notes (*postillæ* or *notæ*) hostile to the pope. Amongst his polemical works may be mentioned: "Commentarius ad edictum Henrici II, contra parvas datas et abusus curiæ Romanæ" (1552); "Conseil sur le fait du Concile de Trente, réception ou rejet d'icelui" (1564), which work caused him to be cast into prison; "Consilium super commodis et incommodis novæ sectæ Jesuitarum" (edited 1604). His "Opera omnia" were published in three volumes at Paris, in 1612; the best edition, however, is that of Paris, 1681, in five volumes.

BRODEAU, *Vie de Charles Dumoulin* (Paris, 1654); PRAT, *Maldonat et l'université de Paris au XVIe siècle* (Paris, 1856); AUBÉPIN, *L'influence de Dumoulin sur la législation française* in *Revue critique de législation et de jurisprudence*, IV, 261 sqq., V, 32 sqq., 305 sqq.; DUVIVIER, *Charles Dumoulin et le concile de Trente* in *Belgique Judiciaire*, xxiv, 716 sqq.

A. VAN HOVE.

Dunbar, WILLIAM, Scottish poet, sometimes styled the "Chaucer of Scotland", born c. 1460; died c. 1520(?). He graduated B. A. at St. Andrews University in 1479. Educated for the Church, according to his own statement he became a Franciscan novice, and as such traversed the whole of England, preached in various towns, and crossed over for a time to Picardy in France. About 1490 he returned to Scotland and entered the service of James IV, who employed him on various embassies to Paris and elsewhere, and settled

a small pension on him. He celebrated James's marriage to Margaret of England by his well-known poem "The Thrissil and the Rois" (The Thistle and the Rose, 1503), symbolizing the amity between the two kingdoms. The poet received gifts in money from the king on this and on other occasions, such as the celebration of his first Mass in 1504, but though he often petitioned both the king and queen for a benefice (limiting his wishes, as he said, to a small country kirk covered with heather) he never obtained one, and seems always to have lived in poverty. The best known of his other poems were the "Goldyn Targe", an allegory illustrating the victory of love over reason; a "Dance" (of the seven deadly sins), a work of much gloomy power; and many other pieces, some humorous and disfigured by the coarseness of the time, others of a religious and ascetic type. A few were printed during his lifetime; and in 1834 an admirable edition of his complete works was published, edited by Dr. David Laing. In 1511 Dunbar is mentioned among Queen Margaret's train on one of her journeys; but nothing is heard of him after 1513, the year of the battle of the Flodden. Laing conjectures that he may have fallen at that fight, but other writers suppose him to have survived until about 1520.

LAING, *Works of Dunbar*, with biography and notes (Edinburgh, 1834); supplement (1876).

D. O. HUNTER-BLAIR.

Dunboyne Establishment. See ST. PATRICK'S COLLEGE (Maynooth).

Dunchadh (DUNICHAD, DUNCAD, DONATUS), SAINT, confessor, Abbot of Iona; date of b. unknown, d. in 717. He was the son of Ceannfaeladh and grandson of Maelcobha of the house of Conall Gulban. He is first heard of as Abbot of Killochuir on the coast of S. E. Ulster (perhaps Killough, County Down). There is considerable dispute as to the year in which he became Abbot of Hy (Iona). The "Annals of Ulster" first mention him in that capacity under the year 706 (really 707); but Conamhail was abbot from 704 to 710. It may be that St. Dunchadh was coadjutor to Conamhail (the phrase is *principatum tenuit*). Or perhaps there was some schism in the monastery over the paschal question, for though St. Dunchadh is said to have ruled from 710 till 717, in 713 the death of "St. Dorbaine Foda, Abbot of Ia" is recorded by the "Annals of the Four Masters", and the same authority relates the appointment of "Faelchu, son of Dorbene" to the abbacy in 714. It was this Faelchu who was certainly abbot from 717 to 724. Both of these, however, may have been really coadjutors to St. Dunchadh, or priors, or even bishops, for there were certainly bishops in Iona at that period, and the phrase employed is *cathedram Iæ obtinuit*. However this may be, the paschal controversy was settled at Iona by the adoption of the Roman usage, while St. Dunchadh was abbot. This took place at the instance of St. Egbert, a Northumbrian priest, who had been educated in Ireland. He came to Iona in 716, and was at once successful in persuading the community to abandon the Celtic Easter and tonsure.

Annals of the Four Masters, ed. O'DONOVAN (Dublin, 1856), I, 307–315; BEDE, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. HUSSEY (Oxford, 1846), 124–303; USSHER, *Britannicarum Ecclesiarum Antiquitates* (Dublin, 1639), 702, 1170; *Life of St. Columba . . . by Adamnan*, ed. REEVES (Edinburgh, 1874), clxxii, 335; LANIGAN, *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland* (Dublin, 1829), III, 154–7; GAMMACK in *Dict. Christ. Biog.* (London, 1877), I, 911.

LESLIE A. ST. L. TOKE.

Dundrennan, ABBEY OF, in Kirkcudbrightshire, Scotland, a Cistercian house founded in 1142 by King David I and Fergus Lord of Galloway for monks brought from Rievaulx in Yorkshire. The name (*Dun-nan-droigheann*) means "fort of the thornbushes", and the monastery commands a fine view of the Solway Firth. Queen Mary fled to Dundrennan after the battle of Langside and spent her last night in Scotland there before embarking for England from the neighbouring Port Mary. In 1587 the abbey and lands passed to the Crown, and in 1621 it was annexed to the royal chapel at Stirling. For many years the buildings were used as a quarry for the erection of houses in the vicinity, but in 1842 steps were taken to repair and preserve what was left of them. The cruciform church had a nave of six bays 130 feet long, and choir 45 feet long, 175 feet in all; and there was a central tower 200 feet high. The style is transition between Norman and First Pointed. Among the tombs which remain is that of Alan Lord of Galloway (c. 1250), much mutilated, in the east aisle of the north transept, as well as those of several of the abbots and priors. The finest remains architecturally are those of the chapter-house, with its beautiful cinquefoil arched doorway between two windows, and its roof supported by octagonal columns, of which only fragments are left. Of the domestic buildings of the abbey nothing but a remnant has been preserved. The abbey estate now belongs to the family of Maitland of Dundrennan.

HUTCHINSON, *Memorials of the Abbey of Dundrennan* (Exeter, 1857); MAXWELL, *Dundrennan Abbey and Its History* (Castle Douglas, 1875).

D. O. HUNTER-BLAIR.

Dunedin, DIOCESE OF (DUNEDINENSIS), comprises the provincial district of Otago (including the Otago part, Southland, and Stewart Island, as well as other adjacent islands). The diocese contains the most picturesque lake and fiord scenery in New Zealand. Its area is about 24,000 sq. miles, of which some 4000 sq. miles are gold-fields, and 2340 forest. This part of New Zealand was visited (perhaps discovered) by Captain Cook in 1770. Beyond a few traders, there was, however, no white population in the Otago provincial district till 1840, when some families settled on land at Waikouaiti. In 1848 the district was first colonized systematically and on a considerable scale by the Otago Association, under the auspices of the Free Church of Scotland. It was desired to retain the province as a Free Kirk reserve, and the immigration of Catholics was at first resented. The last barriers of religious exclusiveness were, however, swept away by the rush of population that flowed into the province from all parts of Australasia when, in 1861, rich gold was discovered at Gabriel's Gully and elsewhere. The new conditions thus brought about led to a rapid development of the mineral, pastoral, agricultural, and forest resources of Otago. All New Zealand formed part of the Vicariate Apostolic of Western Oceania, which was erected in 1835. The first vicar, Dr. Pompallier, arrived in the country, with the pioneer (Marist) missionaries, in 1838. All New Zealand remained within his spiritual charge till 1848.

From 1848 till 1869 the territory now comprised in the Diocese of Dunedin was included in the episcopal See of Wellington. In the latter year the Diocese of Dunedin was established. Its first bishop was the Right Rev. Patrick Moran, translated thither from the Cape of Good Hope, 3 December, 1869; d. 22 May, 1895. He was succeeded by the Right Rev. Michael Verdon, consecrated 3 May, 1896. In 1840 Dr. Pompallier, with Fathers Comte and Pezant, visited and instructed the native villagers and a few white Catholic whalers at Otakou and Moeraki. Up to 1859, however, there was no Catholic church or school or resident priest in the whole southern province, and only about ninety scattered Catholics, who were periodically visited, on foot, by the saintly Marist, Father Petitjean. Early in the gold-rush of the sixties, another devoted Marist missionary, Father Moreau, was appointed resident priest in Dunedin, with charge of the whole province. He built, at Dunedin, the first Catholic church and presbytery in that part of New Zealand. Soon after the arrival of Bishop Moran, in 1871, Father Moreau and a few of his fellow-religious

who had been for some time labouring in Otago, were recalled to the Diocese of Wellington.

The Dominican nuns and the secular clergy were introduced by the new bishop in 1871, the Christian Brothers in 1874. The "New Zealand Tablet" was established in 1873, and strenuous work was done in extending the facilities for religion and education, a sum of over £80,000 (about $388,000) having been expended for these causes during the first fifteen years of the episcopate of Bishop Moran. When the secular system of public instruction was established by law in 1876, he became, and remained to the close of his life, an eloquent champion of the rights of the Catholic schools to a share in the moneys devoted by the State to the education of youth. The extension of the external organization of religion has more than kept pace with the increase of Catholic population, and Dunedin is one of the best equipped of the smaller dioceses of Australasia. The first Sisters of Mercy were introduced in 1890, the second and larger division in 1897, the Marist Brothers in 1897, the Sisters of St. Joseph in 1897–8, and the Little Sisters of the Poor in 1904. A provincial ecclesiastical seminary for all New Zealand was opened at Mosgiel (near Dunedin) in 1900, and has been greatly enlarged in later years.

At the beginning of 1908 there were in the diocese 20 parochial districts, 65 churches, 32 secular priests, 8 brothers, 160 nuns, 1 ecclesiastical seminary, 4 boarding schools for girls, 6 superior day schools, 20 primary schools, 1 orphanage, 1 home for aged poor, and at the census of 1906 there were 22,685 Catholics in a total white population of 180,974.

THOMSON, *Story of New Zealand* (London, 1859); MCNAB, *Murihiku and the Southern Islands* (Invercargill, 1907); POMPALLIER, *Early History of the Catholic Church in Oceania* (Auckland, 1888); MORAN, *History of the Catholic Church in Australasia* (Sydney, s. d.); PYKE, *History of the Early Gold Discoveries in Otago* (Dunedin, 1887).

HENRY W. CLEARY.

Dunfermline, ABBEY OF, in the south-west of Fife, Scotland. Founded by King Malcolm Canmore and his queen, Margaret, about 1070, it was richly endowed by him and his sons, and remodelled as a Benedictine abbey by his successor, David I, who brought an abbot and twelve monks from Canterbury. The monastic buildings, which were of such extent and splendour that three sovereigns and their retinues might (says Matthew Paris) have been lodged there together, were burned down by Edward I of England in 1304, but were afterwards restored. The tombs of Malcolm and Margaret are still to be seen within the ruined walls of the Lady chapel, and were repaired and enclosed by order of Queen Victoria. Dunfermline Abbey was one of the richest Scottish houses, owning almost all Western Fife, as well as property in other counties. It possessed, within its own domains, civil and criminal jurisdiction equal to that of the Crown. The church succeeded Iona as the burial-place of kings, and was thus the Westminster Abbey of Scotland. Besides Malcolm and Margaret, David I and Robert Bruce, with his queen and daughter, were interred there. After the Dissolution, the property passed through the hands of the Pitcairn family, Lord Gray, and Seton Earl of Dunfermline, to the Marquises of Tweeddale. The splendid church was destroyed in 1560 by the Reformers, all but the nave, which they refitted for Presbyterian worship. It is a fine example of Anglo-Norman architecture, with a beautiful western doorway. The remains of the church and palace are now Crown property.

INNES, *Regist. de Dunfermelyn* (Bannatyne Club, 1841); CHALMERS, *Historical and Statistical Account of Dunfermline* (Edinburgh, 1844); HENDERSON, *Royal Tombs at Dunfermline* (Dunfermline, 1856), and *Annals of Dunfermline* (Glasgow, 1879); MERCER, *History of Dunfermline* (Dunfermline, 1858); DUGDALE, *Monast. Anglic.*, VII, 1152–1154.

D. O. HUNTER-BLAIR.

Dungal, Irish monk, teacher, astronomer, and poet who flourished about 820. He is mentioned in 811 as an Irish priest and scholar at the monastery of St-Denis near Paris. In that year he wrote a letter to Charlemagne explaining the eclipse of the sun which was supposed to have taken place in 810. In one of Alcuin's letters (M. G., Epp., IV, 437) he is alluded to as a bishop. In 823 he is mentioned in a "capitulary" of Lothair, and in 825 in an imperial decree by which he was appointed "master" of the school at Pavia. This is the last mention of Dungal in the public records of the empire. In 827 or 828 he appeared against Claudius, Bishop of Turin, in a work defending the veneration of images. From the fact that he bequeathed his books to the library of St. Columbanus at Bobbio it is inferred that he spent his last days in the Irish monastery on the Trebbia. The date of his death is unknown. His books, many of them at least, were transferred by Cardinal Federigo Borromeo to the Ambrosian Library in Milan, where they now are.

Some historians doubt whether the Dungal of St-Denis and the adversary of Claudius are one person. The prevalent opinion, however, is that they are one and the same. In his letter to Charlemagne Dungal brings to bear on the question of eclipses a knowledge of astronomy far beyond the current ideas of the time. His "Reply" to Claudius is enriched with many citations from the Greek and Latin Fathers and from the liturgical hymns of the Church. The poems ascribed in most manuscripts to Exul Hibernicus are believed by Dümmler, editor of the "Poetæ Ævi Carolini", to have been written by Dungal, who like many of his fellow-exiles from Ireland styles himself *peregrinus, exul, pauper et peregrinus.* Only three of them bear the name Dungal. They are interesting from many points of view, especially from that of the historian who searches the records of Charlemagne's reign for the all too scanty references to the personal feelings and the attitude of mind of the Irish scholars who flocked to the Continent of Europe in the ninth century. Yet they do not enable us to determine when and where Dungal was born, though from the fact that among the books which he presented to the Library of Bobbio is the "Antiphonary of Bangor", it is inferred that he spent the years of his student life in Ireland at the famous Bangor school. Mabillon published a ninth-century poem from which it appears that Dungal enjoyed among his contemporaries a reputation for more than ordinary learning.

Neues Archiv der Gesellsch. f. deutsche Geschichtskunde, IV, 254; *Poetæ ævi Carolini* (Berlin, 1881), I, 393; MURATORI, *Antiq. Ital.*, III, dis. xliii; TIRABOSCHI, *Storia della letter. italiana*, III, 163; *Catholic University Bulletin* (Washington, 1907), XIII, 11 sqq.

WILLIAM TURNER.

Dunin, MARTIN VON, Archbishop of Gnesen and Posen, b. 11 Nov., 1774, in the village of Wat near the city of Rawa, Poland; d. 26 Dec., 1842, in the city of Posen. He studied theology in the Collegium Germanicum at Rome (1793–97), and was ordained priest in Sept., 1797. After some service in the Diocese of Cracow, he was made a canon of Wloclawek by the Bishop of Cujavia, in 1808 canon of Gnesen, in 1815 chancellor of its cathedral chapter, in 1824 canon of Posen and counsellor to the Government in matters of education. On the death of Archbishop Theophilus von Wolicki (1829) Von Dunin became administrator of the Archdiocese of Gnesen and Posen, was appointed archbishop in 1831, and consecrated 10 July of the same year. He endeavoured at once to reorganize his vast diocese, a work rendered necessary by the vicissitudes of Poland in the eighteenth century, the consequent reunion of the Dioceses of Gnesen and Posen, and the secularization or suppression of the monasteries. He reconstructed on a new plan the ecclesiastical seminaries of Gnesen and Posen, travelled throughout the two dioceses administering the Sacrament of Confirmation and dedicating new

churches, and discharged faithfully the other duties of his pastoral ministry. In the exercise of these duties he came into conflict with the Prussian Government on the question of mixed marriages. The conditions laid down by Benedict XIV (1740–58) in the Constitution "Magnæ nobis" (29 June, 1748), by which marriages between Catholics and members of other Christian denominations became lawful, had been well observed in Catholic Poland. But in a treaty concluded in 1768 with various European powers the Prussian Government undertook to enforce another order of things. Mixed marriages were no longer forbidden; male children born of such marriages were to be brought up in the religion of their father, the female offspring in that of the mother. The marriage was to be blessed by the ecclesiastical minister, under whose jurisdiction the bride was; if a Catholic priest should refuse to solemnize the marriage, the minister of the other party was to officiate. Similar provisions were contained in the code of Prussian law extended to Prussian Poland in 1797. By a royal decree of King Frederick William III (1797–1840), 21 Nov., 1803, they were further modified in an anti-Catholic sense: all the children of mixed marriages were to be raised in the religion of the father.

Such legislation was unquestionably hostile to Catholic interests. It often happened, therefore, that Catholic priests blessed mixed marriages without first requiring the usual promise concerning the free exercise of religion for the Catholic party and the education of all offspring in the Catholic Faith. The bishops were silent; both priests and bishops seemed to believe that they must endure what they could not prevent. Penalties were inflicted by the Government on all priests who refused to bless mixed marriages contracted without any of the above conditions. The Catholic conscience was finally aroused by the Brief "Litteris altero abhinc" of Pius VIII (1829–30), 25 March, 1830, forbidding priests to bless a mixed marriage if no promise were given relating to the education of the children in the Catholic Faith. In case of such refusal Pius VIII agreed to tolerate a passive assistance (*assistentia passiva*) on the part of the priest. Realizing the harm done to the Catholic religion by the lax practice observed so far, Archbishop Von Dunin resolved to break with it. In January, 1837, he requested from the Ministry of Ecclesiastical Affairs in Berlin permission to publish the Brief of Pius VIII, or at least to direct his clergy to obey its provisions. His request was refused. A petition sent directly to Frederick William III, 26 Oct., 1837, was similarly treated. Determined not to betray his high office he sent an instruction to his priests, 30 Jan., 1838, in which he inculcated the principles of the Church relating to mixed marriages; soon after (27 Feb.) he suspended *ipso facto* any priest of his diocese who should henceforth bless a mixed marriage without previous assurance as to the Catholic education of the offspring. The king was notified of these acts, 10 March, 1838. While the instructions of the archbishop were well received throughout his diocese, the Government was highly indignant and sought by all means to render them ineffectual. They were declared null and void; the archbishop was asked to recall them, and finally (in July, 1838) a regular trial was commenced against him in the Court of Posen, to which, however, he always objected as conducted by a non-competent authority. In the midst of this struggle he received much consolation from the unanimous support of his clergy, and from an Allocution in his favour by Gregory XVI, 13 Sept., 1838. At the conclusion of his trial in 1839 he was summoned to Berlin, where he arrived 5 April. A last ineffectual attempt was made to have him recant; finally the sentence of the court proclaiming his deposition from office, inability ever to hold one, and a confinement of six months in a fortress, was read to him. He appealed directly to the king for clemency, but nothing was changed except that he was detained in Berlin instead of being sent to a fortress.

Meanwhile the archbishop began to think of the needs of his diocese, and being unable to obtain permission to return, he departed secretly from Berlin and arrived in Posen, 4 October. In less than two days, during the night of 5–6 Oct., he was arrested and taken to the fortress of Colberg, where he remained until the death of Frederick William III (7 June, 1840). After his departure the diocese put on public mourning; the bells and the organs remained silent during the celebration of the Holy Mysteries; on all Sundays and feast days public prayers were said for the speedy return of the archbishop; and both the clergy and the nobility of Posen made several fruitless attempts to obtain his release. With the accession of the peaceful king, Frederick William IV (1840–61), matters changed. On 3 Aug., 1840, Von Dunin was set free, and on the 5th of the same month he arrived in Posen amid the rejoicing of his faithful flock. According to an agreement reached with the Government he issued a pastoral letter, 25 Aug., in which his previous instructions were somewhat modified, without detriment, however, to Catholic principle. He recommended his clergy not to insist absolutely on the fulfilment of the usual conditions required for mixed marriages, but at the same time to abstain from all active participation in such marriages, if the usual promises were not given. No mention was made of any punishment in the case of contravention. Later on (21 Feb., and 26 Sept., 1842) he issued new instructions relating to the manner of dealing in confession with the husband or wife of a mixed marriage. The priests were directed to be indulgent towards those who tried their best to influence their children in favour of the Catholic Faith, and to distinguish them from those who were altogether careless in the discharge of this sacred duty. With this the whole controversy ceased. Archbishop Von Dunin did not long survive these conflicts. His memory is held in respect for his unswerving loyalty to Catholic principles, and for his courage, frankness, and prudent moderation displayed in their defence.

Pohl, *Martin Von Dunin, Erzbischof von Gnesen und Posen* (Marienburg, 1843); Brück, *Gesch. der kath. Kirche in Deutschl. im neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (Münster, 1903), II; Pohl in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; Mirbt in *Realencyklopädie*, s. v.

Francis J. Schaefer.

Dunkeld, Diocese of (Dunkeldensis), in Scotland, constituted, as far back as the middle of the ninth century, the primatial see of the Columban Church by King Kenneth Mac Alpine, who rebuilt there the church and monastery founded by King Constantine (afterwards destroyed by the Danes), and translated thither St. Columba's relics. The first occupant of the see is styled in the Annals of Ulster (A. D. 865) Bishop of Fortrenn, the name by which the kingdom of the Southern Picts was then known. He was also Abbot of Dunkeld, with jurisdiction, formerly enjoyed by Iona, over the other Columban monasteries in Scotland. The seat of the primacy was, however, subsequently transferred to Abernethy, and then to St. Andrews, and Dunkeld became subject to lay abbots, from one of whom, Crinan, sprang Malcolm III and his successors on the throne of Scotland. In 1127 King Alexander, who had already founded the Diocese of Moray farther north, erected Dunkeld into a cathedral church and replaced the Columban monks by a chapter of secular canons. The new bishopric included a great part of what afterwards became the Dioceses of Argyll and Dunblane, and retained its jurisdiction over various churches representing old Columban foundations. The Abbots of Iona remained, as heretofore, subject to the ancient prima-

tial See of Dunkeld, until Iona became the seat of the Bishop of the Isles at the end of the fifteenth century. About the same time Dunkeld (together with Dunblane, Galloway, and Argyll) became a suffragan of the newly-constituted Archbishopric of Glasgow; but during the primacy of Archbishop Foreman of St. Andrews (1513–1522) it was restored to the metropolitan province. Thirty-five bishops occupied the See of Dunkeld from its foundation in 1107 until the extinction of the ancient hierarchy in the sixteenth century. Of this line of prelates the most distinguished were James Kennedy (1438–1440), illustrious for his birth, learning, and piety, who was translated, after two years at Dunkeld, to the Bishopric of St. Andrews; the famous poet-prelate Gavin Douglas (1516–1521), who died in exile in England; and John Hamilton (1545–1547), who succeeded the murdered Cardinal Beaton at St. Andrews, and closed his troubled career on the scaffold at Stirling in 1571. The last pre-Reformation Bishop of Dunkeld was Robert Crichton (nephew of a former occupant of the see), who survived until 1586.

For close on three centuries, the Diocese of Dunkeld, like the other Scottish bishoprics, remained vacant, until, on 4 March, 1878, it was restored by Leo XIII by his Bull, "Ex supremo apostolatus apice". The diocese, as then re-constituted, is one of the suffragan sees of the archiepiscopal province of St. Andrews, and includes the counties of Perth, Forfar, Clackmannan, Kinross, and the northern part of Fife. Since the revival of the see, it has been held by three bishops: George Rigg (d. 1887); James G. Smith (transferred to St. Andrews in 1900); and the Right Rev. Angus Macfarlane, consecrated 1901. The bishop's pro-cathedral is in Dundee, the residence of the great majority of the Catholics of the diocese, and the cathedral chapter, erected in 1895, consists of a provost and eight canons. The total number of secular priests in the diocese (1908) is 35; regulars (Redemptorists), 12. The missions and chaplaincies number 17, the churches, chapels, and stations 31, and the parochial schools 15. There are two monasteries of men (Redemptorists and Marists), four convents of women (Sisters of Mercy, Little Sisters of the Poor, Ursulines, and Sisters of Charity), and the Catholic institutions comprise a home for aged poor, a house of mercy for servants, and a working girls' home. The Catholic population of the diocese is estimated to be rather more than 30,000. The old cathedral of Dunkeld, beautifully situated on the Tay amid wooded hills, was erected between 1220 and 1500. The building was much damaged in the reign of Robert II, and suffered later at the hands of the Earl of Buchan, styled the "Wolf of Badenoch". It fell partly into ruins in the sixteenth century, since when the choir has been used for Presbyterian worship. The Dukes of Atholl, long the owners of the building, have spent a good deal on its preservation and repair, and an extensive restoration of the choir was carried out in 1908, chiefly at the cost of Sir Donald Currie. There is now no Catholic church or resident priest in the village of Dunkeld.

SKENE, *Celtic Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1876–80), II, 370; MYLN, *Vitæ Episc. Dunkeld.* (Edinburgh, 1831); FORDUN, *Scotichronicon*, ed. GOODALL (Edinburgh, 1759), XVI, xxvii; THEINER, *Vet. Mon. Hibern. atque Scot.* (Rome, 1864), 506; *Dunkeld: Historical and Descriptive* (Dunkeld, 1879); WALCOTT, *The Ancient Church of Scotland* (London, 1874), 208–217; *Catholic Directory for Scotland* (1908).

D. O. HUNTER-BLAIR.

Dunne, EDWARD J. See DALLAS, DIOCESE OF.

Dunne, JOHN. See BATHURST, DIOCESE OF.

Dunne, JOHN. See WILCANNIA, DIOCESE OF.

Dunne, ROBERT. See BRISBANE, DIOCESE OF.

Duns Scotus, JOHN, surnamed DOCTOR SUBTILIS, d. 8 Nov., 1308; he was the founder and leader of the famous Scotist School, which had its chief representatives among the Franciscans. Of his antecedents and life very little is definitely known, as the contemporary sources are silent about him. It is certain that he died rather young, according to earlier traditions at the age of thirty-four years (cf. Wadding, Vita Scoti, in vol. I of his works); but it would seem that he was somewhat older than this and that he was born in 1270. The birth-place of Scotus has been the subject of much discussion, and so far no conclusive argument in favour of any locality has been advanced. The surname Scotus by no means decides the question, for it was given to Scotchmen, Irishmen, and even to natives of northern England. The other name, Duns, to which the Irish attach so much importance, settles nothing; there was a Duns also in Scotland (Berwick). Moreover, it is impossible to determine whether Duns was a family name or the name of a place. Appeal to supposedly ancient local traditions in behalf of Ireland's claim is of no avail, since we cannot ascertain just how old they are; and their age is the pivotal point.

This discussion has been strongly tinged with national sentiment, especially since the beginning of the sixteenth century after prominent Irish Franciscans like Mauritius de Portu (O'Fihely), Hugh MacCaghwell, and Luke Wadding rendered great service by editing Scotus's works. On the other hand, the English have some right to claim Scotus; as a professor for several years at Oxford, he belonged at any rate to the English province; and neither during his lifetime nor for some time after his death was any other view as to his nationality proposed. It should not, however, be forgotten that in those days the Franciscan cloisters in Scotland were affiliated to the English province, i. e. to the *custodia* of Newcastle. It would not therefore be amiss to regard Scotus as a native of Scotland or as a member of a Scottish cloister. In any case it is high time to eliminate from this discussion the famous entry in the Merton College MS. (no. 39) which would make it appear that Scotus was a member of that college and therefore a native of Northern England. The statutes of the college excluded monks; and as Scotus became a Franciscan when he was quite young, he could not have belonged to the college previous to joining the order. Besides, the entry in the college register is under the date of 1455, and consequently too late to serve as an argument.

The case is somewhat better with the entry in the catalogue of the library of St. Francis at Assisi, under date of 1381, which designates Duns Scotus's commentary on the "Sentences" of Peter Lombard as "magistri fratris Johannis Scoti de Ordine Minorum, qui et Doctor Subtilis nuncupatur, de provincia Hiberniæ" (the work of master John Scotus of the Franciscan Order, known as the subtle doctor, from the province of Ireland). This, though it furnishes the strongest evidence in Ireland's favour, cannot be regarded as decisive. Since Scotus laboured during several years in England, he cannot, simply on the strength of this evidence, be assigned to the Irish province. The library entry, moreover, cannot possibly be accepted as contemporary with Scotus. Add to this the geographical distance and it becomes plain that the discussion cannot be settled by an entry made in far-off Italy seventy-three years after Scotus's death, at a time too when geographical knowledge was by no means perfect. Finally, no decisive evidence is offered by the epitaphs of Scotus; they are too late and too poetical. The question, then, of Scotus's native land must still be considered an open one. When he took the habit of St. Francis is unknown; probably about 1290. It is a fact that he lived and taught at Oxford; for on 26 July, 1300, the provincial of the English province of Franciscans asked the Bishop of Lincoln to confer upon twenty-two of his subjects jurisdiction to hear confessions. The bishop gave the

permission only to eight; among those who were refused was "Ioannes Douns". It is quite certain, too, that he went to Paris about 1304 and that there he was at first merely a Bachelor of Arts, for the general of the Franciscans, Gonsalvus de Vallebona, wrote (18 Nov., 1304) to the guardian of the college of the Franciscans at Paris to present John Scotus at the university for the doctor's degree. The general's letter mentions that John Scotus had distinguished himself for some time past by his learning *ingenioque subtilissimo*. He did not teach very long in Paris; in 1307 or 1308 he was sent to Cologne, probably as a professor at the university. There he died, and was buried in the monastery of the Minorites. At the present time (1908) the process of his beatification is being agitated in Rome on the ground of a *cultus immemorabilis*.

DUNS SCOTUS—JODOCUS OF GHENT (?)
Barberini Palace, Rome (Ideal).

Duns Scotus's writings are very numerous and they have often been printed; some, in fact, at a very early date. But a complete edition, in 12 folio volumes, was published only in 1639 by Wadding at Lyons; this, however, included the commentaries of the Scotists, Lychetus, Poncius, Cavellus, and Hiquæus. A reprint of Wadding's edition, with the treatise "De perfectione statuum" added to it, appeared 1891–95 at Paris (Vives) in 26 vols. 4to. Whether all the writings contained in these editions are by Duns Scotus himself is doubtful; it is certain, however, that many changes and additions were made by later Scotists. A critical edition is still wanting. Besides these printed works, some others are attributed to Scotus, especially commentaries on several books of Scripture. The printed writings deal with grammatical and scientific, but chiefly with philosophical and theological, subjects. Of a purely philosophical nature are his commentaries and *quæstiones* on various works of Aristotle. These, with some other treatises, are contained in the first seven volumes of the Paris edition. The principal work of Scotus, however, is the so-called "Opus Oxoniense", i. e. the great commentary on the "Sentences" of Peter Lombard, written in Oxford (vols. VIII–XXI). It is primarily a theological work, but it contains many treatises, or at least digressions, on logical, metaphysical, grammatical, and scientific topics, so that nearly his whole system of philosophy can be derived from this work. Volumes XXII–XXIV contain the "Reportata Parisiensia", i. e. a smaller commentary, for the most part theological, on the "Sentences". The "Quæstiones Quodlibetales", chiefly on theological subjects, one of his most important works, and the above-mentioned essay, "De perfectione statuum", fill the last two volumes. As to the time when these works were composed, we know nothing for certain. The commentaries on Aristotle were probably his first work, then followed the "Opus Oxoniense" and some minor essays, last the "Quæstiones Quodlibetales", his dissertation for the doctor's degree. The "Reportata" may be notes written out after his lectures, but this is merely a surmise.

Scotus seems to have changed his doctrine in the course of time, or at least not to have been uniformly precise in expressing his thought; now he follows rather the *sententia communis* as in the "Quæstiones Quodlibetales"; then again he goes his own way. Many of his essays are unfinished. He did not write a *summa philosophica* or *theologica*, as did Alexander of Hales and St. Thomas Aquinas, or even a compendium of his doctrine. He wrote only commentaries or treatises on disputed questions; but even these commentaries are not continuous explanations of Aristotle or Peter Lombard. Usually he cites first the text or presupposes it as already known, then he takes up various points which in that day were live issues and discusses them from all sides, at the same time presenting the opinions of others. He is sharp in his criticism, and with relentless logic he refutes the opinions, or at least the arguments, of his opponents. In his fervour he sometimes forgets to set down his own view, or he simply states the reasons for various tenable opinions, and puts them forward as more or less probable; this he does especially in the "Collationes". Hence it is said that he is no systematizer, that he is better at tearing down than at building up. It is true that none of his writings plainly reveals a system; while several of them, owing no doubt to his early death, betray lack of finish. His real teaching is not always fully stated where one would naturally look for it; often enough one finds instead the discussion of some special point, or a long excursus in which the author follows his critical bent. His own opinion is to be sought elsewhere, in various incidental remarks, or in the presuppositions which serve as a basis for his treatment of other problems; and it can be discovered only after a lengthy search. Besides, in the heat of controversy he often uses expressions which seem to go to extremes and even to contain heresy. His language is frequently obscure; a maze of terms, definitions, distinctions, and objections through which it is by no means easy to thread one's way. For these reasons the study of Scotus's works was difficult; when undertaken at all, it was not carried on with the requisite thoroughness. It was hard to find a unified system in them. Not a few unsatisfactory, one-sided, or even wrong opinions about him were circulated and passed on unchallenged from mouth to mouth and from book to book, growing more erroneous as they went. Nevertheless, there is in Scotus's teaching a rounded-out system, to be found especially in his principal work, a system worked out in minutest details. For the present purpose, only his leading ideas and his departures from St. Thomas and the *sententia communis* need be indicated.

SYSTEM OF PHILOSOPHY.—The fundamental principles of his philosophical and theological teaching are his *distinctio formalis*, and his idea of being. The *dis*

tinctio formalis is intermediate between the *distinctio rationis tantum*, or the distinction made by the intellect alone, and the *distinctio realis*, or that which exists in reality. The former occurs, e. g., between the definition and the thing defined, the latter, within the realm of created reality, between things that can exist separately or at least can be made to exist separately by Divine omnipotence, as, e. g., between the different parts of a body or between substance and accident. A thing is "formally distinct" when it is such in essence and in concept that it can be thought of by itself, when it is not another thing, though with that other it may be so closely united that not even omnipotence can separate it, e. g. the soul and its faculties and these faculties among themselves. The soul forms with its faculties only one thing (*res*), but conceptually it is not identical with the intellect or the will, nor are intellect and will the same. Thus we have various realities, entities, or formalities of one and the same thing. So far as the thing itself exists, these entities have their own being; for each entity has its own being or its own existence. But existence is not identical with subsistence. The accident, e. g., has its own being, its own existence, which is different from the existence of the substance in which it inheres, just because the accident is not identical with the substance. But it has no subsistence of its own, since it is not a thing existing by itself, but inheres in the substance as its subject and support; it is not an independent being. Moreover, only actually existing things have real being: in other words, being is identical with existence. In the state of mere ideality or possibility, before their realization, things have an essence, an ideal conceivable being, but not an actual one; else they could not be created or annihilated, since they would have had an existence before their creation. And since being is *eo ipso* also true and good, only those things are really good and true which actually exist. If God, therefore, by an act of His free will gives existence to the essences, He makes them by this very act also true and good. In this sense, it is quite correct to say that according to Scotus things are true and good because God so wills. By this assertion, however, he does not deny that things are good and true in themselves. They have an objective being, and thence also objective truth and goodness, because they are in the likeness of God, Whose being, goodness, and truth they imitate. At the same time, in their ideal being they are necessary; the ideas of them are not produced by the Divine free will, but by the Divine intellect, which, without the co-operation of God's will, recognizes His own infinite essence as imitable by finite things, and thus of necessity conceives the ideas. In this ideal state God necessarily wills the things, since they cannot but be pleasing to Him as images of His own essence. But from this it does not follow that He must will them with an effective will, i. e. that He must realize them. God is entirely free in determining what things shall come into existence.

God alone is absolutely immaterial, since He alone is absolute and perfect actuality, without any potentiality for becoming other than what He is. All creatures, angels and human souls included, are material, because they are changeable and may become the subject of accidents. But from this it does not follow that souls and angels are corporeal; on the contrary, they are spiritual, physically simple, though material in the sense just explained. Since all created things, corporeal and spiritual, are composed of potentiality and actuality, the same *materia prima* is the foundation of all, and therefore all things have a common substratum, a common material basis. This *materia*, in itself quite indeterminate, may be determined to any sort of thing by a form—a spiritual form determines it to a spirit, a corporeal form to a material body. Scotus, however, does not teach an extreme Realism; he does not attribute to the universals or abstract essences, e. g. genus and species, an existence of their own, independent of the individual beings in which they are realized. It is true, he holds that *materia prima*, as the indeterminate principle, can be separated from the *forma*, or the determining principle, at least by Divine omnipotence, and that it can then exist by itself. Conceptually, the *materia* is altogether different from the *forma;* moreover, the same *materia* can be determined by entirely different forms, and the same form can be united with different *materiæ*, as is evident from the processes of generation and corruption. For this reason God at least can separate the one from the other, just as in the Holy Eucharist He keeps the accidents of bread and wine in existence, without a substance in which they inhere. It is no less certain that Scotus teaches a plurality of forms in the same thing. The human body, e. g., taken by itself, without the soul, has its own form, the *forma corporeitatis*. It is transmitted to the child by its parents and is different from the rational soul, which is infused by God himself. The *forma corporeitatis* gives the body a sort of human form, though quite imperfect, and remains after the rational soul has departed from the body in death until decomposition takes place. Nevertheless, it is the rational soul which is the essential form of the body or of man; this constitutes with the body one being, one substance, one person, one man. With all its faculties, vegetative, sensitive, and intellectual, it is the immediate work of God, Who infuses it into the child. There is only one soul in man, but we can distinguish in it several forms; for conceptually the intellectual is not the same as the sensitive, nor is this identical with the vegetative, nor the vegetative with that which gives the body, as such, its form; yet all these belong formally, by their concept and essence, to the one indivisible soul. Scotus also maintains a formal distinction between the universal nature of each thing and its individuality, e. g. in Plato between his human nature and that which makes him just Plato—his Platoneity. For the one is not the other; the individuality is added to the human nature and with it constitutes the human individual. In this sense the property or difference, or the *hœcceitas*, is the *principium individuationis*. Hence it is clear that there are many points of resemblance between matter and form on the one hand and universal natures and their individualization on the other. But Scotus is far from teaching extreme Realism. According to his view, matter can exist without form, but not the universal essence without individuation; nor can the different forms of the same thing exist by themselves. He does not maintain that the uniform matter underlying all created things is the absolute being which exists by itself, independent of the individuals, and is then determined by added forms, first to genera, then to species, and lastly to individuals. On the contrary, *materia prima*, which according to him can exist without a form, is already something individual and numerically determined. In reality there is no *materia* without form, and vice versa. The *materia* which God created had already a certain form, the imperfect form of chaos. God could create matter by itself and form by itself, but both would then be something individual, numerically, though not specifically, different from other matter and other forms of the same kind. This matter, numerically different from other matter, could then be united with a form, also numerically different from other forms of the same kind; and the result would be a compound individual, numerically different from other individuals of the same kind. From such individualized matter, form, and compound we get by abstraction the idea of a universal matter, a universal form, a universal compound, e. g. of a universal man. But by themselves universal matter and universal form cannot exist. The universal as such is

a mere conception of the mind; it cannot exist by itself, it receives its existence in and with the individual; in and with the individual it is multiplied, in and with the individual it loses again its existence. Even God cannot separate in man the universal nature from the individuality, or in the human soul the intellectual from the sensitive part, without destroying the whole. In reality there are only individuals, in which, however, we can by abstraction formally separate both the abstract human nature from the individuality and the several faculties from one another. But the separation and distinction and formation of genera and species are mere processes of thought, the work of the contemplating mind.

The psychology of Scotus is in its essentials the same as that of St. Thomas. The starting-point of all knowledge is the sensory or outer experience, to which must be added the inner experience, which he designates as the ultimate criterion of certitude. He lays stress on induction as the basis of all natural sciences. He denies that sense-perception, and a fortiori intellectual knowledge, is merely a passive process; moreover, he asserts that not only the universal but also the individual is perceived directly. The adequate object of intellectual knowledge is not the spiritual in the material, but being in its universality. In the whole realm of the soul the will has the primacy since it can determine itself, while it controls more or less completely the other faculties. The freedom of the will, taken as freedom of choice, is emphasized and vigorously defended. In presence of any good, even in the contemplation of God, the will is not necessitated, but determines itself freely. This doctrine does not imply that the will can decide what is true and what is false, what is right and what is wrong, nor that its choice is blind and arbitrary. Objects, motives, habits, passions, etc. exert a great influence upon the will, and incline it to choose one thing rather than another. Yet the final decision remains with the will, and in so far the will is the one complete cause of its act, else it would not be free. With regard to memory, sensation, and association we find in Scotus many modern views.

System of Theology.—It has been asserted that according to Scotus the essence of God consists in His will; but the assertion is unfounded. God, he holds, is the *ens infinitum*. It is true that according to him God's love for Himself and the spiration of the Holy Ghost by Father and Son are not based upon a natural instinct, so to say, but upon God's own free choice. Every will is free, and therefore God's will also. But His will is so perfect and His essence so infinitely good, that His free will cannot but love it. This love, therefore, is at once free and necessary. Also with regard to created things Scotus emphasizes the freedom of God, without, however, falling into the error of merely arbitrary, unmotived indeterminism. It has been asserted, too, that according to Scotus, being can be attributed univocally to God and creatures; but this again is false. Scotus maintains that God is the *ens per essentiam*, creatures are *entia per participationem*—they have being only in an analogical sense. But from the being of God and the being of creatures, a universal idea of being can be abstracted and predicated univocally of both the finite and the infinite; otherwise we could not infer from the existence of finite things the existence of God, we should have no proof of God's existence, as every syllogism would contain a *quaternio terminorum*. Between God's essence and His attributes, between the attributes themselves, and then between God's essence and the Divine Persons, there is a formal distinction along with real identity. For conceptually Divinity is not the same as wisdom, intellect not the same as will; Divinity is not identical with paternity, since Divinity neither begets, as does the Father, nor is begotten, as is the Son. But all these realities are formally in God and their distinction is not annulled by His infinity; on the other hand it remains true that God is only one *res*. The process constituting the Blessed Trinity takes place without regard to the external world. Only after its completion the three Divine Persons, as one principle, produce by their act of cognition the ideas of things. But quite apart from this process, God is independent of the world in His knowledge and volition, for the obvious reason that dependence of any sort would imply imperfection.

The cognition, volition, and activity of the angels is more akin to ours. The angels can of themselves know things; they do not need an infused species, though in fact they receive such from God. The devil is not necessarily compelled, as a result of his sin, always to will what is evil; with his splendid natural endowments he can do what in itself is good; he can even love God above all things, though in fact he does not do so. Sin is only in so far an infinite offence of God as it leads away from Him; in itself its malice is no greater than is the goodness of the opposite virtue.

In his Christology, Scotus insists strongly on the reality of Christ's Humanity. Though it has no personality and no subsistence of its own, it has its own existence. The *unio hypostatica* and the *communicatio idiomatum* are explained in accordance with the doctrine of the Church, with no leaning to either Nestorianism or Adoptionism. It is true that Scotus explains the influence of the hypostatic union upon the human nature of Christ and upon His work differently from St. Thomas. Since this union in no way changes the human nature of Christ, it does not of itself impart to the Humanity the beatific vision or impeccability. These prerogatives were given to Christ with the fullness of grace which He received in consequence of that union. God would have become man even if Adam had not sinned, since He willed that in Christ humanity and the world should be united with Himself by the closest possible bond. Scotus also defends energetically the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin. All objections founded on original sin and the universal need of redemption are solved. The merits of Christ are infinite only in a broader sense, but of themselves they are entirely sufficient to give adequate satisfaction to the Divine justice; there is no deficiency to be supplied by God's mercy. But there is needed a merciful acceptation of the work of Christ, since in the sight of God there is no real merit in the strictest sense of the word.

Grace is something entirely supernatural and can be given only by God, and, what is more, only by a creative act; hence the sacraments are not, properly speaking, the physical or instrumental cause of grace, because God alone can create. Sanctifying grace is identical with the infused virtue of charity, and has its seat in the will; it is therefore conceived rather from the ethical standpoint. The sacraments give grace of themselves, or *ex opere operato*, if man places no obstacle in the way. The real essence of the Sacrament of Penance consists in the absolution; but this is of no avail unless the sinner repent with a sorrow that springs from love of God; his doctrine of attrition is by no means lax. As to his eschatology it must suffice to state that he makes the essence of beatitude consist in activity, i. e. in the love of God, not in the Beatific Vision; this latter is only the necessary condition.

In ethics Scotus declares emphatically that the morality of an act requires an object which is good in its nature, its end, and its circumstances, and according to the dictate of right reason. It is not true that he makes God's free will decide arbitrarily what is good and what is bad; he only asserts that the Commandments of the second table of the Decalogue are not in such strict sense laws of nature as are those of the first table; because God cannot grant a dispensation from the laws of the first, whereas He can dispense from those of the second, as in fact He did when He com-

manded Abraham to sacrifice his son. But the precepts of the second table also are far more binding than the other positive laws of God. In the present order of things God cannot permit manslaughter universally, taking the property of others, and the like. There are also indifferent actions *in individuo*. Absolutely speaking, man should direct all his actions towards God; but God does not require this, because He does not wish to burden man with so heavy a yoke. He obliges man only to observe the Decalogue; the rest is free. Social and legal questions are not treated by Scotus *ex professo;* his works, however, contain sound observations on these subjects.

Relation between Philosophy and Theology. —Scotus does not, as is often asserted, maintain that science and faith can contradict each other, or that a proposition may be true in philosophy and false in theology and vice versa. Incorrect, also, is the statement that he attaches little importance to showing the harmony between scientific knowledge and faith and that he has no regard for speculative theology. Quite the contrary, he proves the dogmas of faith not only from authority but, as far as possible, from reason also. Theology presupposes philosophy as its basis. Facts which have God for their author and yet can be known by our natural powers, especially miracles and prophecies, are criteria of the truth of Revelation, religion, and the Church. Scotus strives to gain as thorough an insight as possible into the truths of faith, to disclose them to the human mind, to establish truth upon truth, and from dogma to prove or to reject many a philosophical proposition. There is just as little warrant for the statement that his chief concern is humble subjection to the authority of God and of the Church, or that his tendency a priori is to depreciate scientific knowledge and to resolve speculative theology into doubts. Scotus simply believes that many philosophical and theological proofs of other scholars are not conclusive; in their stead he adduces other arguments. He also thinks that many philosophical and theological propositions can be proved which other Scholastics consider incapable of demonstration. He indeed lays great stress on the authority of Scripture, the Fathers, and the Church; but he also attaches much importance to natural knowledge and the intellectual capacity of the mind of angels and of men, both in this world and in the other. He is inclined to widen rather than narrow the range of attainable knowledge. He sets great value upon mathematics and the natural sciences and especially upon metaphysics. He rejects every unnecessary recourse to Divine or angelic intervention or to miracles, and demands that the supernatural and miraculous be limited as far as possible even in matters of faith. Dogmas he holds are to be explained in a somewhat softened and more easily intelligible sense, so far as this may be done without diminution of their substantial meaning, dignity, and depth. In Scripture the literal sense is to be taken, and freedom of opinion is to be granted so far as it is not opposed to Christian Faith or the authority of the Church. Scotus was much given to the study of mathematics, and for this reason he insists on demonstrative proofs in philosophy and theology; but he is no real sceptic. He grants that our senses, our internal and external experience, and authority together with reason, can furnish us with absolute certainty and evidence. The difficulty which many truths present lies not so much in ourselves as in the objects. In itself everything knowable is the object of our knowledge. Reason can of its own powers recognize the existence of God and many of His attributes, the creation of the world out of nothing, the conservation of the world by God, the spirituality, individuality, substantiality, and unity of the soul, as well as its free will. In many of his writings he asserts that mere reason can come to know the immortality and the creation of the soul; in others he asserts the direct opposite; but he never denies the so-called moral evidence for these truths.

Theology with him is not a scientific study in the strictest sense of the word, as are mathematics and metaphysics, because it is not based upon the evidence of its objects, but upon revelation and authority. It is a practical science because it pursues a practical end: the possession of God. But it gives the mind perfect certainty and unchangeable truths; it does not consist in mere practical, moral, and religious activity. Thus Scotus is removed from Kant and the modern *Gefühlstheologen*, not by a single line of thought but by the whole range of his philosophical speculation. Scotus is no precursor of Luther; he emphasizes ecclesiastical tradition and authority, the freedom of the will, the power of our reason, and the co-operation with grace. Nor is he a precursor of Kant. The doctrine regarding primacy of the will and the practical character of theology has quite a different meaning in his mind from what it has in Kant's. He values metaphysics highly and calls it the queen of sciences. Only as a very subtle critic may he be called the Kant of the thirteenth century. Nor is he a precursor of the Modernists. His writings indeed contain many entirely modern ideas, e. g. the stress he lays on freedom in scientific and also in religious matters, upon the separateness of the objective world and of thought, the self-activity of the thinking subject, the dignity and value of personality; yet in all this he remains within proper limits, and in opposition to the Modernists he asserts very forcibly the necessity of an absolute authority in the Church, the necessity of faith, the freedom of the will; and he rejects absolutely any and every monistic identification of the world and God. That he has so often been misunderstood is due simply to the fact that his teaching has been viewed from the standpoint of modern thought.

Scotus is a genuine Scholastic philosopher who works out ideas taken from Aristotle, St. Augustine, and the preceding Scholastics. He is universally recognized as a deep thinker, an original mind, and a sharp critic; a thoroughly scientific man, who without personal bias proceeds objectively, stating his own doctrines with modesty and with a certain reserve. It has been asserted that he did more harm than good to the Church, and that by his destructive criticism, his subtleties, and his barbarous terminology he prepared the ruin of Scholasticism, indeed that its downfall begins with him. These accusations originated to a great extent in the insufficient understanding or the false interpretation of his doctrines. No doubt his diction lacks elegance; it is often obscure and unintelligible; but the same must be said of many earlier Scholastics. Then too, subtle discussions and distinctions which to this age are meaningless, abound in his works; yet his researches were occasioned for the most part, by the remarks of other Scholastic philosophers, especially by Henry of Ghent, whom he attacks perhaps even more than he does St. Thomas. But the real spirit of scholasticism is perhaps in no other Scholastic so pronounced as in Scotus. In depth of thought, which after all is the important thing, Scotus is not surpassed by any of his contemporaries. He was a child of his time; a thorough Aristotelean, even more so than St. Thomas; but he criticizes sharply even the Stagirite and his commentators. He tries always to explain them favourably, but does not hesitate to differ from them. Duns Scotus's teaching is orthodox. Catholics and Protestants have charged him with sundry errors and heresies, but the Church has not condemned a single proposition of his; on the contrary, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception which he so strongly advocated, has been declared a dogma.

Müller, *Biographisches über D. Scotus* (Cologne, 1881), Programm; Little, *The Grey Friars in Oxford* (Oxford, 1892), 219 sqq.; Renan, *Hist. litt. de la France* (1869), XXV, 404-

467; PLUZANSKI, *Essai sur la philosophie de D. Scot.* (Paris, 1888); WERNER, *Joh. Duns Scotus* (Vienna, 1881); IDEM, *Die Psychologie und Erkenntnisslehre des Joh. Duns Scotus* (Vienna, 1877); SEEBERG, *Die Theologie des Duns Scotus* (Leipzig, 1900); MINGES, *Ist Duns Scotus Indeterminist?* (Münster, 1905); IDEM, *Der Gottesbegriff des Duns Scotus auf seinen angeblich excessiven Indeterminismus geprüft* (Vienna, 1907); IDEM, *Die Gnadenlehre des Duns Scotus auf ihren angeblichen Pelagianismus und Semipelagianismus geprüft* (Münster, 1906); IDEM, *Verhältniss zwischen Glauben und Wissen, Theologie und Philosophie, nach Duns Scotus* (Paderborn, 1908); IDEM, *Der angeblich excessive Realismus des Duns Scotus* (Münster, 1908); IDEM, *Joannis Duns Scoti doctrina philosophica et theologica quoad res præcipuas proposita, exposita et considerata* (Quaracchi, 1908), I, II; cf. also the following periodical articles by the same author: *Die angeblich laxe Reuelehre des Duns Scotus* in *Zeitschr. f. kath. Theol.* (Innsbruck, 1901), 231–251; *Der Wert der guten Werke nach Duns Scotus* in *Theol. Quartalschr.* (Tübingen, 1907), 76–93; *Beitrag zur Lehre des Duns Scotus über die Person Jesu Christi* (Tübingen), 384–424; *Bedeutung von Objekt, Umständen und Zweck für die Sittlichkeit eines Aktes nach Duns Scotus* in *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* (Fulda, 1906), 338–347; *Beitrag zur Lehre des Duns Scotus über die Univocation des Seinsbegriffes* (Fulda), 306–323.

LEXICOGRAPHIC AIDS:—DE VARESIO, *Promptuarium Scoticum* (Venice, 1690), I, II; GARCIA, *Lexicon Scholasticon (Scoticum)*, (Quaracchi, 1906–1908), *distributio*, 1–4.

PARTHENIUS MINGES.

Dunstan, SAINT, archbishop and confessor, one of the greatest saints of the Anglo-Saxon Church; b. near Glastonbury on the estate of his father, Heorstan, a West Saxon noble. His mother, Cynethryth, a woman of saintly life, was miraculously forewarned of the sanctity of the child within her. She was in the church of St. Mary on Candlemas Day, when all the lights were suddenly extinguished. Then the candle held by Cynethryth was as suddenly relighted, and all present lit their candles at this miraculous flame, thus foreshadowing that the boy "would be the minister of eternal light" to the Church of England. In what year St. Dunstan was born has been much disputed. Osbern, a writer of the late eleventh century, fixes it at "the first year of the reign of King Aethelstan", i. e. 924–5. This date, however, cannot be reconciled with other known dates of St. Dunstan's life and involves many obvious absurdities. It was rejected, therefore, by Mabillon and Lingard; but on the strength of "two manuscripts of the Chronicle" and "an entry in an ancient Anglo-Saxon paschal table", Dr. Stubbs argued in its favour, and his conclusions have been very generally accepted. Careful examination, however, of this new evidence reveals all three passages as interpolations of about the period when Osbern was writing, and there seem to be very good reasons for accepting the opinion of Mabillon that the saint was born long before 925. Probably his birth dates from about the earliest years of the tenth century.

DUNSTAN AT THE FEET OF CHRIST
Fol. 1 recto, MS. Auct., F. IV. 32, Bodleian Library, Oxford, 956

In early youth Dunstan was brought by his father and committed to the care of the Irish scholars, who then frequented the desolate sanctuary of Glastonbury. We are told of his childish fervour, of his vision of the great abbey restored to splendour, of his nearly fatal illness and miraculous recovery, of the enthusiasm with which he absorbed every kind of human knowledge, and of his manual skill. Indeed, throughout his life he was noted for his devotion to learning and for his mastery of many kinds of artistic craftsmanship. With his parents' consent he was tonsured, received minor orders, and served in the ancient church of St. Mary. So well known did he become for devotion and learning that he is said to have been summoned by his uncle Athelm, Archbishop of Canterbury, to enter his service. By one of St. Dunstan's earliest biographers we are informed that the young scholar was introduced by his uncle to King Aethelstan, but there must be some mistake here, for Athelm probably died about 923, and Aethelstan did not come to the throne till the following year. Perhaps there is confusion between Athelm and his successor Wulfhelm. At any rate the young man soon became so great a favourite with the king as to excite the envy of his kinsfolk at court. They accused him of studying heathen literature and magic, and so wrought on the king that St. Dunstan was ordered to leave the court. As he quitted the palace his enemies attacked him, beat him severely, bound him, and threw him into a filthy pit (probably a cesspool), treading him down in the mire. He managed to crawl out and make his way to the house of a friend, whence he journeyed to Winchester and entered the service of Bishop Aelfheah the Bald, who was his relative. The bishop endeavoured to persuade him to become a monk, but St. Dunstan was at first doubtful whether he had a vocation to a celibate life. But an attack of swelling tumours all over his body, so severe that he thought it was leprosy, which was perhaps some form of blood-poisoning caused by the treatment to which he had been subjected, changed his mind. He made his profession at the hands of St. Aelfheah, and returned to live the life of a hermit at Glastonbury. Against the old church of St. Mary he built a little cell only five feet long and two and a half feet deep, where he studied and worked at his handicrafts and played on his harp. Here the devil is said (in a late eleventh-century legend) to have tempted him and to have been seized by the face with the saint's tongs.

While Dunstan was living thus at Glastonbury he became the trusted adviser of the Lady Aethelflaed, King Aethelstan's niece, and at her death found himself in control of all her great wealth, which he used in

later life to foster and encourage the monastic revival. About the same time his father Heorstan died, and St. Dunstan inherited his possessions also. He was now become a person of much influence, and on the death of King Aethelstan in 940, the new king, Eadmund, summoned him to his court at Cheddar and numbered him among his councillors. Again the royal favour roused against him the jealousy of the courtiers, and they contrived so to enrage the king against him that he bade him depart from the court. There were then at Cheddar certain envoys from the "Eastern Kingdom", by which term may be meant either East Anglia or, as some have argued, the Kingdom of Saxony. To these St. Dunstan applied, imploring them to take him with them when they returned. They agreed to do so, but in the event their assistance was not needed. For, a few days later, the king rode out to hunt the stag in Mendip Forest. He became separated from his attendants and followed a stag at great speed in the direction of the Cheddar cliffs. The stag rushed blindly over the precipice and was followed by the hounds. Eadmund endeavoured vainly to stop his horse; then, seeing death to be imminent, he remembered his harsh treatment of St. Dunstan and promised to make amends if his life was spared. At that moment his horse was stopped on the very edge of the cliff. Giving thanks to God, he returned forthwith to his palace, called for St. Dunstan and bade him follow, then rode straight to Glastonbury. Entering the church, the king first knelt in prayer before the altar, then, taking St. Dunstan by the hand, he gave him the kiss of peace, led him to the abbot's throne and, seating him thereon, promised him all assistance in restoring Divine worship and regular observance.

St. Dunstan at once set vigorously to work at these tasks. He had to re-create monastic life and to rebuild the abbey. That it was Benedictine monasticism which he established at Glastonbury seems certain. It is true that he had not yet had personal experience of the stricter Benedictinism which had been revived on the Continent at great centres like Cluny and Fleury. Probably, also, much of the Benedictine tradition introduced by St. Augustine had been lost in the pagan devastations of the ninth century. But that the Rule of St. Benedict was the basis of his restoration is not only definitely stated by his first biographer, who knew the saint well, but is also in accordance with the nature of his first measures as abbot, with the significance of his first buildings, and with the Benedictine prepossessions and enthusiasm of his most prominent disciples. And the presence of secular clerks as well as of monks at Glastonbury seems to be no solid argument against the monastic character of the revival. St. Dunstan's first care was to re-erect the church of St. Peter, rebuild the cloister, and re-establish the monastic enclosure. The secular affairs of the house were committed to his brother Wulfric, "so that neither himself nor any of the professed monks might break enclosure". A school for the local youth was founded and soon became the most famous of its time in England. But St. Dunstan was not long left in peace. Within two years after the appointment King Eadmund was assassinated (946). His successor, Eadred, appointed the Abbot of Glastonbury guardian of the royal treasure and records, and entrusted much of the government of the realm to his hands. The policy of Dunstan was supported by the queen-mother, Eadgifu, by the primate, Oda, and by the East Anglian party, at whose head was the great ealdorman, Aethelstan, the "Half-king". It was a policy of unification, of conciliation of the Danish half of the nation, of firm establishment of the royal authority. In ecclesiastical matters it favoured the spread of regular observance, the rebuilding of churches, the moral reform of the secular clergy and laity, the extirpation of heathendom. Against all this ardour of reform was the West-Saxon party, which included most of the saint's own relations and the Saxon nobles, and which was not entirely disinterested in its preference for established customs. For nine years St. Dunstan's influence was dominant, during which period he twice refused a bishopric (that of Winchester in 951 and Crediton in 953), affirming that he would not leave the king's side so long as he lived and needed him.

In 955 Eadred died, and the situation was at once changed. Eadwig, the elder son of Eadmund, who then came to the throne, was a dissolute and headstrong youth, wholly devoted to the reactionary party and entirely under the influence of two unprincipled women. These were Aethelgifu, a lady of high rank, who was perhaps the king's foster-mother, and her daughter Aelfgifu, whom she desired to marry to Eadwig. On the day of his coronation, in 956, the king abruptly quitted the royal feast, in order to enjoy the company of these two women. The indignation of the assembled notables was voiced by Archbishop Oda, who suggested that he should be brought back. None, however, were found bold enough to make the attempt save St. Dunstan and his kinsman Cynesige, Bishop of Lichfield. Entering the royal chamber they found Eadwig with the two harlots, the royal crown thrown carelessly on the ground. They delivered their message, and as the king took no notice, St. Dunstan compelled him to rise and replace his crown on his head; then, sharply rebuking the two women, he led him back to the banquet-hall. Aethelgifu determined to be revenged, and left no stone unturned to procure the overthrow of St. Dunstan. Conspiring with the leaders of the West-Saxon party she was soon able to turn even his own scholars against the abbot, and before long induced Eadwig to confiscate all Dunstan's property in her favour. At first Dunstan took refuge with his friends, but they too felt the weight of the king's anger. Then, seeing his life was threatened, he fled the realm and crossed over to Flanders, where he found himself ignorant alike of the language and of the customs of the inhabitants. But the ruler of Flanders, Count Arnulf I, received him with honour, and lodged him in the Abbey of Mont Blandin, near Ghent. This was one of the centres of the Benedictine revival in that country, and St. Dunstan was able for the first time to observe the strict observance that had had its renascence at Cluny at the beginning of the century. But his exile was not of long duration. Before the end of 957 the Mercians and Northumbrians, unable longer to endure the excesses of Eadwig, revolted and drove him out, choosing his brother Eadgar as king of all the country north of the Thames. The south remained faithful to Eadwig. At once Eadgar's advisers recalled St. Dunstan, caused Archbishop Oda to consecrate him a bishop, and on the death of Cynewold of Worcester at the end of 957 appointed the saint to that see. In the following year the See of London also became vacant and was conferred on St. Dunstan, who held it in conjunction with Worcester. In October, 959, Eadwig died, and his brother was readily accepted as ruler of the West-Saxon Kingdom. One of the last acts of Eadwig had been to appoint a successor to Archbishop Oda, who died on 2 June, 958. First he appointed Aelfsige of Winchester, but he perished of cold in the Alps as he journeyed to Rome for the pallium. In his place Eadwig nominated Brithelm, Bishop of Wells. As soon as Eadgar became king he reversed this act on the ground that Brithelm had not been able to govern even his former diocese properly. The archbishopric was conferred on St. Dunstan, who went to Rome in 960 and received the pallium from Pope John XII. We are told that, on his journey thither, the saint's charities were so lavish as to leave nothing for himself and his attendants. The steward remonstrated, but St. Dunstan merely suggested trust in Jesus Christ.

That same evening he was offered the hospitality of a neighbouring abbot.

On his return from Rome Dunstan at once regained his position as virtual ruler of the kingdom. By his advice Aelfstan was appointed to the Bishopric of London, and St. Oswald to that of Worcester. In 963 St. Aethelwold, the Abbot of Abingdon, was appointed to the See of Winchester. With their aid and with the ready support of King Eadgar, St. Dunstan pushed forward his reforms in Church and State. Throughout the realm there was good order maintained and respect for law. Trained bands policed the north, a navy guarded the shores from Danish pirates. There was peace in the kingdom such as had not been known within memory of living man. Monasteries were built; in some of the great cathedrals monks took the place of the secular canons; in the rest the canons were obliged to live according to rule. The parish priests were compelled to live chastely and to fit themselves for their office; they were urged to teach their parishioners not only the truths of the Catholic Faith, but also such handicrafts as would improve their position. So for sixteen years the land prospered. In 973 the seal was put on St. Dunstan's statesmanship by the solemn coronation of King Eadgar at Bath by the two Archbishops of Canterbury and York. It is said that for seven years the king had been forbidden to wear his crown, in penance for violating a virgin living in the care of the nunnery of Wilton. That some severe penance had been laid on him for this act by St. Dunstan is undoubted, but it took place in 961 and Eadgar wore no crown till the great day at Bath in 973. Two years after his crowning Eadgar died, and was succeeded by his eldest son Eadward. His accession was disputed by his stepmother, Aelfthryth, who wished her own son Aethelred to reign. But, by the influence of St. Dunstan, Eadward was chosen and crowned at Winchester. But the death of Eadgar had given courage to the reactionary party. At once there arose a determined attack upon the monks, the protagonists of reform. Throughout Mercia they were persecuted and deprived of their possessions by Aelfhere, the ealdorman. Their cause, however, was supported by Aethelwine, the ealdorman of East Anglia, and the realm was in serious danger of civil war. Three meetings of the Witan were held to settle these disputes, at Kyrtlington, at Calne, and at Amesbury. At the second place the floor of the hall (*solarium*) where the Witan was sitting gave way, and all except St. Dunstan, who clung to a beam, fell into the room below, not a few being killed. In March, 978, King Eadward was assassinated at Corfe Castle, possibly at the instigation of his step-mother, and Aethelred the Redeless became king. His coronation on Low Sunday, 978, was the last action of state in which St. Dunstan took part. When the young king took the usual oath to govern well, the primate addressed him in solemn warning, rebuking the bloody act whereby he became king and prophesying the misfortunes that were shortly to fall on the realm. But Dunstan's influence at court was ended. He retired to Canterbury, where he spent the remainder of his life. Thrice only did he emerge from this retreat: once in 980 when he joined Aelfhere of Mercia in the solemn translation of the relics of King Eadward from their mean grave at Wareham to a splendid tomb at Shaftesbury Abbey; again in 984 when, in obedience to a vision of St. Andrew, he persuaded Aethelred to appoint St. Aelfheah to Winchester in succession to St. Aethelwold; once more in 986, when he induced the king, by a donation of 100 pounds of silver, to desist from his persecution of the See of Rochester.

St. Dunstan's life at Canterbury is characteristic; long hours, both day and night, were spent in private prayer, besides his regular attendance at Mass and the Office. Often he would visit the shrines of St. Augustine and St. Ethelbert, and we are told of a vision of angels who sang to him heavenly canticles. He worked ever for the spiritual and temporal improvement of his people, building and restoring churches, establishing schools, judging suits, defending the widow and the orphan, promoting peace, enforcing respect for purity. He practised, also, his handicrafts, making bells and organs and correcting the books in the cathedral library. He encouraged and protected scholars of all lands who came to England, and was unwearied as a teacher of the boys in the cathedral school. There is a sentence in the earliest biography, written by his friend, that shows us the old man sitting among the lads, whom he treated so gently, and telling them stories of his early days and of his forebears. And long after his death we are told of children who prayed to him for protection against harsher teachers, and whose prayers were answered. On the vigil of Ascension Day, 988, he was warned by a vision of angels that he had but three days to live. On the feast itself he pontificated at Mass and preached three times to the people: once at the Gospel, a second time at the benediction (then given after the Pater Noster), and a third time after the Agnus Dei. In this last address he announced his impending death and bade them farewell. That afternoon he chose the spot for his tomb, then took to his bed. His strength failed rapidly, and on Saturday morning (19 May), after the hymn at Matins, he caused the clergy to assemble. Mass was celebrated in his presence, then he received Extreme Unction and the Holy Viaticum, and expired as he uttered the words of thanksgiving: "He hath made a remembrance of his wonderful works, being a merciful and gracious Lord: He hath given food to them that fear Him." They buried him in his cathedral; and when that was burnt down in 1074, his relics were translated with great honour by Lanfranc to a tomb on the south side of the high altar in the new church. The monks of Glastonbury used to claim that during the sack of Canterbury by the Danes in 1012, the saint's body had been carried for safety to their abbey; but this claim was disproved by Archbishop Warham, by whom the tomb at Canterbury was opened in 1508 and the holy relics found. At the Synod of Winchester in 1029, St. Dunstan's feast was ordered to be kept solemnly throughout England on 19 May. Until his fame was overshadowed by that of St. Thomas the Martyr, he was the favourite saint of the English people. His shrine was destroyed at the Reformation. Throughout the Middle Ages he was the patron of the goldsmiths' guild. He is most often represented holding a pair of smith's tongs; sometimes, in reference to his visions, he is shown with a dove hovering near him, or with a troop of angels before him.

Acta SS., 19 May, IV, 344–84; WHARTON, *Anglia Sacra* (London, 1691), II, 88–121, 148, 211–233; D'ACHÉRY AND MABILLON, *Acta SS. O.S.B.* (Venice, 1733–40), V, 639–97; *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. STUBBS in *R. S.* (London, 1874); *Icelandic Sagas . . . Relating to . . . the British Isles*, ed. VIGFUSSON AND DASENT in *R. S.* (London, 1887–94), II, xxiii–xxv, 385–408; IV, 397–420; *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, ed. THORPE in *R. S.* (London, 1861); WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY, *De antiquitate Glastoniensis Ecclesiæ* in GALE, *Scriptores* (Oxford, 1691), XV; IDEM, *Gesta Pontificum*, ed. HAMILTON in *R. S.* (London, 1870); IDEM, *Gesta Regum*, ed. STUBBS in *R. S.* (London, 1887–9); *Chron. Monast. de Abingdon*, ed. STEVENSON in *R. S.* (London, 1858); *Chron. Abbatiæ Rameseiensis*, ed. MACRAY in *R. S.* (London, 1886); REYNER, *Apostolatus Benedict. in Anglia* (Douai, 1626), III, 77–94; YPES, *Chronica gen. de la orden de San Benito* (Valladolid, 1615), V, 106 a–112 b; ALFORD, *Ann. Eccl. Anglicanæ* (Leyden, 1663), III, ad ann. 925–1021; MABILLON, *Annales O. S. B.* (Lucca, 1739), III, 393, 420, 449, 480, 491, 498, 508, 517, 543, 545, 563, 593, 615; IV, 42, 46, 176, 221, 232; WRIGHT, *Biog. Brit. Lit.* (London, 1842), I, 443–462; ROBINSON, *Hist. of Glastonbury Abbey, Somersetshire, and Life of St. Dunstan* (London, 1844); LINGARD, *Hist. and Antiq. of the Anglo-Saxon Ch.* (London, 1845), II, 267–311, 445–450; HOOK, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury* (London, 1868); FREEMAN, *Hist. of the Norman Conquest* (Oxford, 1870), I, 63–5, 263–6; GREEN, *The Conquest of England* (London, 1883); ID., *Dunstan at Glastonbury* in *Proc. Somersetshire Archæol. Soc.*, XI, ii, 122–142; JONES, *Muniments of the town of Axbridge* in

Proc. Som. Archæol. Soc., XV, ii, 22–26; HUNT in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; HUNT, *The English Ch. . . . to the Norman Conquest* (London, 1899), 331–366; GASQUET AND BISHOP, *The Bosworth Psalter* (London, 1908); TOKE, *Notes on the Accepted Date of St. Dunstan's Birth* in appendix to GASQUET AND BISHOP'S *The Bosworth Psalter;* WILKINS, *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ* (London, 1737); KEMBLE, *Codex diplomaticus ævi Saxonici* (London, 1839–40); LIEBERMANN, *Ungedruckte anglo-normännische Geschichtsquellen* (Strassburg, 1879), 3.

LESLIE A. ST. L. TOKE.

Dupanloup, FÉLIX-ANTOINE-PHILIBERT, Bishop of Orléans, France, b. at Saint-Félix, Savoie, 2 June, 1802; d. at Lacombe, Isère, 11 October, 1878. His mother, Anne Dechosal, to whom he ever remained tenderly devoted, gave him his early education. The better to screen his future from the disgrace of his illegitimate birth, she took him when only seven years old to Paris where, by dint of work and privations, she succeeded in keeping him for some time at the Collège Sainte-Barbe. After various attempts in other directions, Félix chose the ecclesiastical career, studying grammar at the *Petite Communauté*, humanities at the preparatory seminary of Saint-Nicolas du Chardonnet, philosophy at Issy, and theology at Saint-Sulpice. Ordained priest 18 Dec., 1825, he went as curate to the Madeleine where he founded the famous Catéchismes de l'Assomption and the Académie de St-Hyacinthe, being entrusted meanwhile with the religious education of the Duc de Bordeaux and of the Princes d'Orléans. The novelty and success of his catechizing methods drew upon him the ill will of his pastor. Transferred to Saint-Roch (1834), he soon won a reputation as pulpit orator and director. As superior of the preparatory seminary of Saint-Nicolas (1837–45), he so completely transformed the institution that admission into it was eagerly sought by members of the best families of France. "During those few years", says Renan, himself a pupil of Saint-Nicolas (Souvenirs d'enfance et de jeunesse), "the old house of the rue St-Victor became the school in France which sheltered the greatest number of historical or well-known names." At Saint-Nicolas Dupanloup was truly the ideal educator later described in his famous book: "La haute éducation intellectuelle". Absorbed as he was in his professional work, he did not completely give up the direction of souls. Through one of his penitents, Pauline de Périgord, he brought about the conversion of Talleyrand (1838). A course in sacred eloquence which he had brilliantly inaugurated at the Sorbonne was discontinued after the eleventh lecture, owing to the excitement occasioned by the lecturer's severe criticism of Voltaire and Villemain's unwillingness to enforce order. In 1844, in connexion with the Villemain educational bill, which was scarcely more satisfactory to the Catholics than its numerous predecessors, Dupanloup inaugurated with Montalembert and Ravignan that long struggle for liberty of education which resulted in the *loi Falloux*. It was at his suggestion that Ravignan wrote "De l'existence et de l'institut des Jésuites", in order to put down the still active bugbear of the *hommes noirs* called up by Bérenger. He also actively supported Montalembert in the formation of the Committee for the Defence of Religious Liberty, and when later Thiers spoke in favour of another unacceptable educational bill, Dupanloup wrote in reply "Des associations religieuses", a pamphlet which became later the book "De la pacification religieuse". A difference of views with Archbishop Affre, in connexion with the above-mentioned polemics and the direction of Saint-Nicolas, ended in Dupanloup's transfer from the seminary to a canonicate at Notre-Dame, 1845.

The four years of his canonicate were by no means years of leisure. In spite of his increasing activity in confessional and pulpit, he found time for public interests. The elections of 1846 sent to the French Parliament some 150 deputies friendly to liberty of education, and for these Dupanloup wrote "L'état de la question", a moderate but clear assertion of Catholic claims. As the Salvandy project of 1847 fell short of these claims, he again published a series of pamphlets, "Du nouveau projet de loi", "Des petits-séminaires", among others; and the better to control public opinion, he undertook the work of a Catholic daily paper, finally purchasing "L' ami de la religion". In 1848 when Falloux, yielding to Dupanloup's persuasion, accepted a portfolio under President Louis Napoleon, he appointed a commission to draft an educational bill, and made Dupanloup a member. Dupanloup's courtesy and undeniable competence won over to the Catholic view such men as Thiers and Cousin, thus insuring the enactment of 1850. "He made me minister against my will", said Falloux speaking of Dupanloup; "I have made him bishop against his will." Appointed to the See of Orléans, he took possession of it 11 Dec., 1849, and during the twenty-eight years of his episcopate showed incredible activity. His administration, minutely described by Cochard, touched on every vital interest of the diocese: the holding of synods, parish visitations, organization of *catéchismes* and *petits-séminaires* along the lines adopted in Paris, development of charitable works, encouragement of ecclesiastical studies among priests, completion of the cathedral of Ste-Croix, introduction of the Roman Liturgy, etc. Still his energy was not exhausted. Wherever the interests of religion were at stake, he gave them vigorous support. In the question of the classics he stood for the broader view and entered upon a lively discussion with Louis Veuillot. Profiting by his membership in the French Academy, to which he had been elected 8 May, 1854, Dupanloup prevented the award of the *prix Bodin* to Taine's "History of English Literature" and opposed the admission of Littré into that body. The reorganization of "Le Correspondant", with Falloux, Foisset, Cochin, and de Broglie at its head, was also largely his work. The *Pucelle d'Orléans* (Jeanne d'Arc) found in him an ardent champion; twice he pronounced her panegyric at Orléans, and it was he who introduced in Rome the cause of her beatification and raised the first funds towards a new monument in her honour.

DUPANLOUP

Dupanloup was always held in high esteem by the Irish people. In 1862, on the occasion of one of the periodical Irish famines, he preached a charity sermon in the Church of St-Roch at Paris, which netted the sum of thirty thousand francs. The grateful Irish returned this with interest during the Franco-Prussian war when they remitted to the eloquent Bishop of Orléans the sum of two hundred thousand francs in response to his appeal for the needs of France. On the occasion of the centenary (1875) of Daniel O'Connell, whom he had always admired and often praised publicly, Dupanloup was formally invited by the centenary authorities to take part in the celebration. Though too ill at the time to accept the honourable invitation, he wrote in reply two letters, memorable for their eloquence, to the Lord-Mayor of Dublin and to Cardinal McCabe, and which were printed in "Le Monde", 9 and 10 Aug., 1875 (Lagrange, Vie de Du-

panloup, Paris, 1894, II, 347–48; III, 317). His "Letter on Slavery", written on the occasion of the Civil War in the United States, is another evidence of Dupanloup's broad sympathy, and helps to account for his popularity in English-speaking countries.

Dupanloup's main efforts, however, were directed towards the defence of the Holy See, menaced in its independence by the ambition of the House of Savoy and the ill-disguised connivance of Napoleon III. Salomon says (Mgr Dupanloup, p. 58): "For eight years, he did not lay down his arms. From Villafranca to Mentana, he never took off his breast-plate." During this phase of his life, besides endeavouring to enlist pontifical zouaves and to increase the Peter's-pence, he wrote the "Protestation" against the impending spoliation of the pope; the "Lettre à un catholique sur la brochure 'Le pape et le congrès'"; "La souveraineté pontificale", in which he cited a declaration made by Cousin in favour of the temporal power of the pope; two other pamphlets, one against the Convention of 15 Sept., 1864, and the other in defence of the Encyclical of 8 Dec. and of the Syllabus; several letters to Ratazzi, Minghetti, etc. The Vatican Council and the Franco-Prussian War exhibit Dupanloup in two very different lights. At the council he was the leader of that minority which for political reasons stood, if not against the papal infallibility itself, at least against the opportuneness of its definition. The papal Bull of indiction, in which no mention was made of infallibility, he welcomed with joy and transmitted to his flock in a dignified pastoral letter; but when the Catholic sentiment, voiced by such organs as the "Civiltà Cattolica" and the "Univers", began to petition for the definition, he appended to his pastoral letter certain *observations* which, by making known in advance the position he intended to take, involved him in a petty controversy with Louis Veuillot. Once in Rome he never swerved from his position but used all the resources of his fiery nature to win others over to his views. It was he who, on the eve of the final vote, advised the minority to vote neither *placet* nor *non-placet*, but to abstain and withdraw. That he appealed to the secular arm and threatened the council with diplomatic intervention has been both asserted and denied. This much is vouched for by Ollivier, then minister of Napoleon III: "No bishop of the minority, Dupanloup or other, ever demanded the evacuation of the pontifical territory" (Le Correspondant, 10 Dec., 1892). In justice to him it should be added that, once the dogma was defined, he was neither slow to acquiesce in what he called "the victory of truth and of God" nor half-hearted in declaring his adherence. During the Franco-Prussian War Dupanloup showed himself a worthy successor of Saint-Aignan and like him won the title of *defensor civitatis*. His prestige enabled him to have the severe conditions imposed by the victors on the city of Orléans either withdrawn or mitigated. In gratitude his people sent him to the National Assembly. As a member he took an effective part in securing the passage of the law which restored the military chaplains (1874) and of that which authorized the Catholic institutes (1875). He was made Senator in 1875, and one of his last public acts was to deter the French Government from officially taking notice of the centenary of Voltaire (1878). A malady which had long undermined his health resulted in his death while at the château de Lacombe. His remains were laid to rest in the cathedral of Orléans and his heart conveyed to Saint-Félix, his native place. As a clause of his last will forbade any funeral oration, Bishop Bougaud pronounced only a few words of eulogy, the oration being delivered in 1888 by Bishop Besson at the unveiling of Dupanloup's monument.

Dupanloup was without question one of the ablest French bishops of his day. He repeatedly refused higher positions. In many things a conservative and even a legitimist, he was one of the first who thought of appealing, in behalf of the Catholic cause, to common law and public liberties before a generation no longer able or willing to recognize the Divine right of the Church. The criticisms passed on him by Catholics of a different school were more than offset by numerous papal Briefs of encouragement and episcopal letters of approval from all parts of the world. A man of action, he was also a prolific writer. A complete list of his writings is given by Lagrange, his biographer. Some of his polemical pamphlets have already been noticed. In his educational writings Dupanloup enunciates some of the most important principles which are now generally accepted. Among these are his conception of education as a process of developing mental activity instead of injecting knowledge into the mind, and his insistence on the duty of the teacher to respect the freedom of the pupils and to cultivate in them a spirit of honour. He advocates physical education by means of games, and warns against the danger of forcing precocious children. Education, he holds, is intellectual, moral, religious, and physical; but it is essentially one, and to neglect any of its purposes would be fatal.

His more important works are:—catechetical: "L'œuvre par excellence" (1869); educational: "L'éducation en général", "La haute éducation intellectuelle" (1850), "La femme studieuse" (1869), and "Lettres sur l'éducation des filles" (1878); historical: "Vie de Mgr Borderies" (Paris, 1904); oratorical: panegyrics of Jeanne d'Arc (1855 and 1869), St. Martin (1862), and St. Vincent de Paul (1863); funeral orations of Père de Ravignan (1858), the volunteers (1860), Mgr Menjaud (1861), and Lamoricière (1865); pastoral: "Lettres pastorales et mandements" (in the archives of the episcopal palace of Orléans).

DUPANLOUP, *Journal intime*, ed. in part, BRANCHEREAU (Paris, 1902); LAGRANGE, *Vie de Mgr Dupanloup* (Paris, 1883; 7th ed., 1894); SALOMON, *Mgr. Dupanloup* in *Les Grands Hommes de l'Église au XIX^e siècle* (Paris, 1907), VI; COCHARD, *Dupanloup* in *L'épiscopat français* (1802–1905) (Paris, 1907), s.v. *Orléans;* THUREAU-DANGIN, *Hist. de la monarchie de Juillet* (Paris, 1892), V; LECANUET, *L'Eglise de France sous la troisième république* (Paris, 1907); GRIMAUD, *Liberté d'enseignement en France* (Paris, 1907); OLLIVIER, *l'Eglise et l'Etat au Concile du Vatican* (Paris, 1879). See also E. VEUILLOT, *Louis Veuillot* (Paris, 1901); LECANUET, *Vie de Montalembert* (Paris, 1895–1901); PONTLEVOY, *Vie du R. P. Xavier de Ravignan* (Paris, 1860); LEDOS, *Vie du R. P. Lacordaire* (Paris, 1902).

J. F. SOLLIER.

Duperron, JACQUES-DAVY, theologian and diplomat, b. 25 Nov., 1556, at St-Lô (Normandy), France; d. 5 Sept., 1618, at Batignolles, a suburb of Paris. His parents were Calvinists and on account of persecution sought refuge in Switzerland soon after his birth. Having received a thorough literary, scientific, and philosophical education, he applied himself to the study of the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers, especially St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas, and in 1577 or 1578 was converted to the Catholic Faith. He enjoyed the favour and confidence of King Henry III, to whom he had been presented in 1576, and later that of Henry IV. The latter's conversion was to a great extent due to Duperron's instructions and influence, and his absolution from heresy was obtained from the pope by Duperron and Cardinal d'Ossat (1595). While in Rome for that purpose, Duperron was consecrated Bishop of Evreux, a see to which King Henry IV had already appointed him in 1591, though he was not yet in Holy orders. Immediately after his conversion Duperron began to work with untiring zeal for the conversion of Protestants. By his science, eloquence, and power of argument he won many victories in controversies and conferences with ministers of the reformed sects. In 1600 the famous Fontainebleau conference took place with the leader of French Calvinism, Duplessis-Mornay, who had been accused by Duperron of mutilating, falsifying, and misinterpreting texts from the Fathers in his work on the Eucharist. Of the judges three were Catholics, and three Calvin-

lsts. On 4 May nine passages were examined concerning which the commission decided against Duplessis. The latter's real or feigned sickness and his departure prevented further meetings.

Duperron was created a cardinal in 1604. The same year he went to Rome, and was invited to assist at the meetings of the Congregatio de Auxiliis which Clement VIII had summoned to end the discussions on grace and freedom. Meanwhile he took an important part in the election of Leo XI and Paul V. The decision of Paul V not to condemn the Molinistic system was due largely to Duperron's advice. Duperron became Archbishop of Sens in 1606. In 1611 he stopped the decision of the Parliament condemning one of Bellarmine's works, and defended the latter's thesis of the pope's infallibility and superiority over councils. At a synod held at Paris (1612) he condemned the work "De ecclesiasticâ et politicâ potestate" by Edmond Richer, syndic of the Sorbonne. In 1614–15, at the meeting of the States General at Paris, he urged, against the Third Estate, the acceptance of the decrees of the Council of Trent on discipline and reform. Duperron's knowledge and eloquence were so great that Pope Paul V said of him: "Let us pray that God may inspire Duperron, for he will persuade us of whatever he pleases."

His works were collected in three volumes (Paris, 1620 and 1622). The first volume contains his "Traité du sacrement de l'Eucharistie" written against Duplessis-Mornay. Its three books deal with (1) a comparison of the Eucharist and the other sacraments of the New Law with those of the Old Law; (2) the tradition of the Fathers, to which is added a special study of St. Augustine's doctrine; (3) the practice of the Church concerning the adoration of the Eucharist. The second volume is the "Réplique à la Réponse du Roy de la Grande-Bretagne". James I of England claimed that he belonged to the Catholic Church, as he believed all truths considered necessary by the first Christians. In his answer Duperron treats of the characteristics of the Catholic Church, of some articles which the king did not look upon as essential, the preservation and integrity of the doctrine and discipline of the Church, the Eucharist as a sacrament and a sacrifice, the invocation of the Saints, the use of Latin, translation of Holy Scripture, etc. The third volume contains various works among which are a treatise on vocation, the Acts of the Fontainebleau conference, a refutation of the work of Tilenus on Apostolic traditions, some moral and spiritual treatises, and poems both Christian and profane. Duperron's secretary, César de Ligny, wrote "Ambassades et négociations du cardinal Duperron" (Paris, 1618). Under the title of "Perroniana", remarks on theological, political, and literary subjects were published by Christophe du Puy from the notes of his brother, who had been with Duperron for a long time.

FÉRET, *Le cardinal Duperron* (Paris, 1877); DE BURIGNY, *Vie du cardinal Duperron* (Paris, 1768); DUPIN, *Nouvelle bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques* (Paris, 1710), XVII, 25; RÄSS, *Die Convertiten seit der Reformation* (Freiburg, 1866), II, 226, 441, III, 384; *Gallia christiana* (2d ed., Paris, 1870), XI, 612, XII, 96; SEIDL in *Kirchenlexicon*, IV, 26.

C. A. DUBRAY.

Dupin (also DU PIN), LOUIS-ELLIES, theologian, b. 17 June, 1657, of a noble family in Normandy; d. 6 June, 1719. His mother, a Vitart, was the niece of Marie des Moulins, grandmother of the poet Jean Racine. At the age of twenty Dupin accompanied Racine who made a visit to Nicole for the purpose of becoming reconciled to the gentlemen of Port Royal. But, while not hostile to the Jansenists, Dupin's intellectual attraction was in another direction; he was the disciple of Launoy, a learned critic and a Gallican. Dupin took his theological course at the Sorbonne, and received there the degree of bachelor in 1680, and of doctor in 1684.

From the beginning of his studies he had accumulated notes on the works and teachings of the Fathers. In 1686 there appeared the first volume of the "Nouvelle bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques", covering the first three centuries. In it Dupin had treated simultaneously biography, literary criticism, and the history of dogma; in this he was a pioneer leaving far behind him all previous efforts, Catholic or Protestant, which were still under the influence of the Scholastic method. He was also the first to publish such a collection in a modern language. Unfortunately he was young and worked rapidly. In this way errors crept into his writings and his productions were violently attacked. Mathieu Petit-Didier, a Benedictine, published an anonymous volume of "Remarques sur la bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques de M. Du Pin" (Paris, 1691), and this was followed by two other volumes to which the author's name was appended (Paris, 1692 and 1696). Dupin answered him in his fifth volume and Petit-Didier replied in the fore part of his second volume of "Remarques". Petit-Didier's observations were often inspired by contemporaneous prejudice. Thus Dupin had placed in the fourth century, to which indeed he rightly belongs, St. Macarius the Egyptian. Petit-Didier discovered Semipelagianism in this author's works, in reality ideas professed by many before St. Augustine, but from which the adversary of Dupin concluded that Macarius should come after Pelagius and St. Augustine (II, 198).

A more formidable enemy appeared in Bossuet, who, during a public thesis at the College of Navarre in 1692, condemned the audacity of the critic. Dupin answered him and Bossuet appealed to the civil authority, denouncing Dupin to Chancellor Boucherat and to Archbishop de Harlay. Bossuet simply enumerated the points that he disapproved in the "Bibliothèque" concerning original sin, purgatory, the canonicity of the Sacred Scriptures, the eternity of hell's torments, the veneration of saints and of their relics, the adoration of the Cross, grace, the pope and the bishops, Lent, divorce, the celibacy of the clergy, tradition, the Eucharist, the theology of the Trinity, and the Council of Nicæa. He demanded a censure and a retractation.

Like Petit-Didier Bossuet would not admit that any of the Greek or Latin Fathers differed from St. Augustine on the subject of grace, nor that this matter could be called subtle, delicate, and abstract. Between Dupin and Bossuet there was a still wider difference. "The liberty M. Dupin takes of so harshly condemning the greatest men of the Church should, in general, not be tolerated" (Bossuet, Œuvres, XXX, 513). On the other hand Bossuet strongly contended that heretics could not be too severely dealt with: "It is dangerous to call attention to passages that manifest the firmness of these people without also indicating wherein this firmness has been overrated: otherwise they are credited with a moral steadfastness which elicits sympathy and leads to their being excused" (op. cit., XXX, 633).

Dupin submitted but was nevertheless condemned by the Archbishop of Paris (14 April, 1696). He continued his "Bibliothèque", which was put on the Index long after his death (10 May, 1757), though other works of his were condemned at an earlier date. He had also to suffer the criticism of Richard Simon (Paris, 1730, 4 vols.). Simon and Dupin had similar views and methods so that when Bossuet was writing the "Défense de la Tradition et des Saints Pères" (which did not appear, however, until 1743), he included both in his invectives against the "haughty critics" who inclined to rabbinism and the errors of Socinus. Although Dupin spoke favourably of Arnauld and signed the "Cas de conscience", he was not a Jansenist. On these matters he rather shared the opinion of Launoy who "had found a way to be at once both demi-Pelagian and Jansenist" (Bossuet, Œuvres, XXX, 509). Dupin was pre-eminently a Gallican. It was probably on this account that Louis XIV had him

exiled to Châtellerault, on the occasion of the "Cas de conscience". Dupin retracted and returned, but his chair in the College of France was irretrievably lost. Later Dubois, who aspired to the cardinalate and sought therefore the favour of Rome, made similar accusations against Dupin. Dupin was on friendly terms with Wake, the Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury, who hoped for a union of the two Churches. The correspondence was looked on with suspicion, and in 1718 the regent had Dupin's papers seized. This act led to calumnies against the writer, who really had had no other aim than the reconciliation of the separated Anglicans. A similar purpose animated the "mémoires" he presented to Peter the Great during the latter's residence in France. Dupin died shortly after.

Besides the "Nouvelle bibliothèque ecclésiastique" (58 vols. 8vo with tables), the "Remarques" by Petit-Didier, and the "Critique" by R. Simon reprinted in Holland (19 vols. 4to), Dupin edited the works of Gerson (Paris, 1703), Optatus of Mileve (Paris, 1700), the Psalms with annotations (1691), and published "Notes sur le Pentateuque" (1701), an abridgment of "L'histoire de l'Eglise" (1712), "L'histoire profane" (1714–1716), "L'histoire d'Apollonius de Tyane" (1705, under the name of M. de Clairac), a "Traité de la puissance ecclésiastique et temporelle", a commentary on the Four Articles of the clergy of France(1707), the "Bibliothèque universelle des historiens" (1716), numerous works and articles on theology, reprints of former works, etc. Dupin was no pedant. Etienne Jordan, a contemporary who saw him, said: "In the morning he would grow pale over books and in the afternoon over cards in the pleasant company of ladies. His library and adjoining apartment were marvellously well kept."

NICÉRON, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des hommes illustres* (Paris, 1727–1745), II, 31; BOSSUET, *Œuvres* (Versailles, 1817), XXX, 475; REUSCH, *Der Index der verbotenen Bücher* (Bonn, 1885), II, 586; MARGIVAL, *R. Simon* in *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses* (Paris, 1899), IV, 435; SAINTE-BEUVE, *Port-Royal*, VI, 129, 174, 365; MOSHEIM AND MACLAINE, *Histoire ecclésiastique ancienne et moderne* (1776), VI, 135; also ET. JORDAN, *Recueil de littérature, de philosophie et d'histoire* (Amsterdam, 1730), 66.

PAUL LEJAY.

Dupin, PIERRE-CHARLES-FRANÇOIS, known as BARON CHARLES DUPIN, a French mathematician and economist, b. at Varzy, Nièvre, 6 October, 1784; d. at Paris, 18 January, 1873. At the age of twenty-three he entered the Ecole polytechnique, and after three years of successful studies under the famous Monge, he received the degree of naval engineer. He then served in that capacity in the navy and showed so much ability that he was later appointed inspector-general of the navy. In 1813 he published a pamphlet, "Développement de géométrie pour faire suite à la géométrie pratique de Monge" (Paris, 1813), containing many new and brilliant theories, the most important of which were one relating to the indicatrix of curved surfaces and another on orthogonal surfaces. He was elected to the Academy of Sciences in 1818. The next year Dupin received a professorship at the Conservatoire des arts et métiers; during this period he wrote various pamphlets on scientific topics, such as: "Applications de géométrie et de mécanique à la marine" (Paris, 1822); "Diverses leçons sur l'industrie, le commerce, la marine" (Paris, 1825), and also numerous memoirs for the Academy of Sciences, which were highly spoken of. Notwithstanding his brilliant prospects as a mathematician, he soon preferred to devote himself to political economy. His "Voyages en Grande Bretagne de 1816 à 1819" (6 vols., Paris, 1820–1824), which were the result of a personal inquiry into the commerce and industry of England, placed him in the foremost rank of statisticians. In his "Carte de la France éclairée" (Paris, 1824), he was the first to use different colours to show the development of education in various parts of France. Charles X gave him the title of baron in 1824. Dupin gradually turned to politics and for forty years was a member of legislative assemblies. Under the Restoration, in spite of the honour bestowed upon him by the Bourbons, he sided with the Liberals and took his seat at the Left of the Chamber; under the Monarchy of July, he sat with the Centre, and finally with the Right, under the Republic of 1848. He rallied to the Second Empire and was appointed senator by Napoleon III. In his political career he showed himself a man of ability, of great industry and activity, and never failed to assert his Catholic convictions. Although a less brilliant man than his brother the Elder Dupin, he may have a more lasting reputation on account of his discoveries in geometry.

ANONYMOUS, *Notice historique sur le baron Charles Dupin* (Paris, 1857); *Les Mondes* (Paris, 1873), XXX, 135; *Revue des questions historiques* (1881), IX, 517–590.

LOUIS N. DELAMARRE.

Du Plessis d'Argentré. See ARGENTRÉ.

Duplex (DOUBLE). See CALENDAR.

Duplication of Mass. See BINATION.

Duponceau, PETER STEPHEN, jurist and linguist, b. at St-Martin de Ré, France, 3 June, 1760; d. at Philadelphia, U. S. A., 1 April, 1844. Educated in a Benedictine college, he exhibited a marked taste for languages, and in 1777 accompanied Baron Steuben to America, serving as his secretary in the Revolutionary army, with rank of captain, until compelled by ill-health to resign in 1781. He settled in Philadelphia, studied law, and was admitted to the Bar. Throughout a long life he was identified with public affairs and was also author or translator of a number of legal or historical treatises, but his fame rests chiefly upon his studies of the native American languages at a period when ethnology was as yet hardly recognized as a science. Most of his linguistic papers appeared in volumes of the American Philosophical Society (Philadelphia), of which he was a member from 1791 and president from 1827 until his death. His memoir on the grammatical system of the Indian languages (Mémoire sur le systême grammatical des langues de quelques nations Indiennes de l'Amérique du Nord) won the Volney prize of the French Institute in 1835.

DUNGLISON, *Public Discourse in Commemoration of Peter S. Duponceau* (Philadelphia, 1844); PILLING, *Bibliography of Algonquian Languages* (Washington, 1891).

JAMES MOONEY.

Duprat, ANTOINE, Chancellor of France and Cardinal, b. at Issoire in Auvergne, 17 January, 1463; d. at the Château de Nantouillet near Meaux, 9 July, 1535. Educated for the law he won a high position in his profession and in 1507 became first president of the Parliament of Paris (the highest court of France). In 1515 Francis I made him chancellor and prime minister. In 1517, after his wife's death, he took Sacred orders and gradually rose in the hierarchy: first as bishop of several dioceses held by him in plurality; then as Archbishop of Sens, 1525; cardinal, 1527, and legate *a latere*, 1530. Duprat's influence extended much beyond the departments of justice and finance placed under his direct control. Hanotaux, in the introduction to his "Recueil des instructions", calls Duprat "one of the most notable men of ancient France, second only to Richelieu in the decisive influence he exercised on the destinies of his country". This influence was constantly exerted to strengthen royal absolutism; it was felt in the stern measures he took against the *grands Seigneurs*, and in his elaborate fiscal system. Duprat's influence was also manifested, together with his perfect orthodoxy, in those measures which affected the relations of France with the Church, namely, the signing of the Concordat of 1516, and the checking of nascent Prot-

estantism. The Concordat, which Duprat himself negotiated with Leo X at Bologna, did away with the schismatical principles of the "Pragmatic Sanction"; on the other hand, by causing the appointment of the French hierarchy to rest on royal nomination instead of the old canonical elections, it vested in the civil power an easily abused authority over Church affairs. Duprat's uncompromising attitude towards Protestantism was dictated both by his political sense and his orthodoxy. The wiles of Luther, Melanchthon, and Calvin did not deceive him; even so the well-known Protestant sympathies of Marguerite d'Angoulême, the Duchesse d'Etampes, and the Minister du Bellay failed to move him. The Sorbonne and the Parliament were instructed to exclude the writings of the innovators; in 1534 the posting of subversive pamphlets at the door of the royal apartments cost the perpetrators their lives. Duprat left no writings, but took a leading part in the compilation of the "Coutumes d'Auvergne"; he also did much to encourage the renaissance of letters.

(2) GUILLAUME, son of the foregoing, b. at Issoire, 1507; d. at Beauregard, 1560. Appointed Bishop of Clermont in 1529, he led a zealous and saintly life and is favourably known by the leading part he took in the last sessions of the Council of Trent as well as by his patronage of the Jesuits. Not only did he receive them in his diocese, where they were put in charge of the colleges of Billom and Mauriac, but, in face of much opposition, he helped them financially and in other ways to found in Paris the Collège de Clermont, so called after Duprat's episcopal city.

DUPRAT, *Vie d'Antoine Duprat* (Paris, 1857); HANOTAUX, *Etudes historiques sur les XVI^e et XVII^e siècles* (Paris, 1886); IDEM, *Recueil des instructions données aux ambassadeurs* (Paris, 1888), I; BAUDRILLART, *Quatre cents ans de concordat* (Paris, 1905); FOURNIER, *Guillaume Duprat* in *Etudes religieuses*, 1904.

J. F. SOLLIER.

Dupuytren, GUILLAUME, BARON, French anatomist and surgeon, b. 6 October, 1777, at Pierre-Buffière, a small town in the Limousin, France; d. in Paris, 8 February, 1835. His parents were so poor that he received his education at the Collège de la Marche through charity. By competitive examination he gained the position of prosector in anatomy at the newly established Ecole de Médecine, Paris, when he was but eighteen. In 1803 he was appointed assistant surgeon to the Hôtel-Dieu. In 1811 he became professor of operative surgery, and in 1815 professor of clinical surgery at the Ecole de Médecine and head surgeon to the Hôtel-Dieu. He was indefatigable in his devotion to his profession and had one of the largest surgical practices of all time. He amassed a fortune estimated at $1,500,000. He succeeded in accomplishing all this in spite of a consumptive tendency against which he had to battle all his life and which finally carried him off. In his will he endowed the chair of anatomy at the Ecole de Médecine and established a home for physicians in distress. A curious contraction of the fascia of the palm of the hand, which cripples the fingers, is called after him, and the anatomical museum of the Ecole de Médecine bears his name. The most important of his writings is his treatise on artificial anus. He published also a treatise on gunshot wounds and clinical lectures on surgery. Dupuytren was not an original investigator in surgical subjects, but he was an excellent observer and a great worker, who knew how to adopt and adapt others' ideas very practically.

VIDAL DUPUYTREN, *Essai Hist.* (Paris, 1835); LARRY, *Discours à l'inauguration de la Statue de G Dupuytren* (Paris, 1869).

JAMES J. WALSH.

Duquesnoy, FRANÇOIS (called also FRANÇOIS FLAMAND, and in Italy IL FLAMINGO), b. at Brussels, Belgium, 1594; d. at Leghorn, Italy, 12 July, 1646. Duquesnoy was the son of an excellent Dutch sculptor from whom he received his first lessons. At an early age he carved the figure of justice on the portal of the *chancellerie* at Brussels, and two angels for the entrance of the Jesuit church of that city. In 1619, at the age of twenty-five, he was sent by the Archduke Albert to study in Rome, and there he resided many years, executing various works of importance. To him we owe the handsome baldachinum over the high altar in St. Peter's, the colossal statue of St. Andrew with his cross, also in St. Peter's, and the Santa Susanna in the church of S. Maria di Loreto. In the cathedral of Ghent is his rococo tomb for Bishop Triest, a good work in its own style. Duquesnoy was a contemporary of Bernini and a friend of Le Poussain, who recommended him to Cardinal Richelieu. The sculptor was about to start for Paris when death overtook him at Leghorn. It is reported that he was poisoned by his own brother, Jérôme, who was also a clever sculptor (b. 1612; burned for unnatural crime, 24 Oct., 1654). François is famous for his beautiful sporting children in marble and bronze, his ivory carvings for drinking-cups, etc. The figure known to the populace of Brussels as the "Mannecken" is commonly attributed to him.

LÜBKE, *History of Sculpture* (tr. London, 1872); CLEMENT, *Sculpture* (New York, 1885).

M. L. HANDLEY.

Duran, NARCISCO, b. 16 Dec., 1776, at Castellon de Ampurias, Catalonia, Spain; d. 1 June, 1846. He entered the Franciscan Order at Gerona, 3 May, 1792, volunteered for the Indian Missions, was incorporated into the Franciscan Missionary College of San Fernando in the City of Mexico, and in 1806 came to California. He was assigned to Mission San José and toiled there among the Indians until April, 1833, when he retired to Mission Santa Barbara. As early as 1817 Father Sarriá, the *comisario prefecto*, recommended Duran for higher offices. Father Payeras, the *comisario prefecto* in 1820, likewise held him worthy and capable of any office. Towards the end of 1824 the College of San Fernando elected him *presidente* of the missions, which post he held with the exception of one term (1828–1831) until 1838. From 1844 till his death in 1846 he again held this office, and from 1837 to 1843 he was also *comisario prefecto* of the Fernandinos, i. e. Franciscans subject to the college in Mexico, who were in charge of the missions in Southern California. During the troublous times of the secularization and sale of the missions it was Father Duran who fought the pillagers step by step, though in vain, and fearlessly unmasked the real aims of the despoilers. His numerous letters to the Government on the subject are masterpieces of close reasoning, pungent sarcasm, and unanswerable argument. Governor Figueroa recommended the exile of Father Duran, but the Mexican Government allowed him to remain unmolested at Mission Santa Barbara until his death. Six weeks previous to this the dying Bishop of California had appointed Father Duran vicar-general, and for a month he held the office of administrator of the diocese. His body was placed in the vault beneath the sanctuary of the mission church. He was almost the last survivor of the Fernandinos, and for virtue, learning, and missionary zeal ranks with the most brilliant of his predecessors.

Records of Mission San José; Archives of the Archbishop of San Francisco; Archives of Mission Santa Barbara; BANCROFT, *History of California* (San Francisco, 1886), III–V; ENGELHARDT, *The Franciscans in California* (Harbor Springs, 1897); CLINCH, *California and its Missions* (San Francisco, 1904).

ZEPHYRIN ENGELHARDT.

Durand de Maillane, PIERRE TOUSSAINT. See GALLICANISM.

Durand Ursin, a Benedictine of the Maurist Congregation, b. 20 May, 1682, at Tours; d. 31 Aug., 1771, at Paris. He took vows in the monastery of

Marmoutier at the age of nineteen and devoted himself especially to the study of diplomatics. In April, 1709, he joined his confrère Edmond Martène, who was making a literary tour through France with the purpose of collecting material for a new edition of "Gallia Christiana" (q. v.). After searching the archives of more than eight hundred abbeys and one hundred cathedral churches, they returned in 1713 to the monastery of St-Germain-des-Prés, laden with all kinds of valuable historical documents, many of which were included in "Gallia Christiana", while the others were published in a separate work, entitled "Thesaurus novus Anecdotorum" (5 vols. folio, Paris, 1717). In 1718 the two Maurists started on a new literary tour through Germany and the Netherlands to collect material for Bouquet's "Rerum Gallicarum et Francicarum Scriptores". Besides collecting valuable material for Bouquet's work they gathered an immense mass of other historical documents which they published in a large work entitled "Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum historicorum, dogmaticorum et moralium amplissima collectio" (9 vols. fol., Paris, 1724–33). They also jointly published in French a learned account of their journeys: "Voyage littéraire de deux Religieux Bénédictins de la Congrégation de St. Maur" (2 vols., Paris, 1717 and 1724). In addition to the works which Durand published jointly with Martène, he also collaborated with Dantine and Clémencet in a French work on diplomatics, entitled "L'Art de vérifier les dates", continued Coustant's "Collection of Papal Letters", assisted Sabatier with the edition of the "Itala", and contributed to many other Maurist publications. In 1734 he was banished from the monastery of St-Germain-des-Prés as a Jansenist "Appellant", at the instance of Cardinal de Bissy. He was sent to the monastery of St-Eloi in Noyon. After two years he was permitted to repair to the monastery of Blancs-manteaux in Paris; where he spent the remainder of his life in literary pursuits.

Tassin, *Histoire littéraire de la congrégation de St-Maur* (Brussels, 1770), 550–567; Berlière, *Nouveau supplement à l'histoire littéraire de la cong. de St-Maur* (Paris, 1908), I, 196–7; Ger. tr. (Frankfort, 1774), II, 263 sqq.; Herbst in *Theol. Quartalschr.* (Tübingen, 1833), 239 sqq.; de Lama, *Bibl. des écriv. de la cong. de St-Maur* (Munich and Paris, 1882), 147 and 161.

Michael Ott.

Durandus (Duranti, Durantis), William, canonist and one of the most important medieval liturgical writers; b. about 1237 at Puimisson in the Diocese of Béziers, Provence, d. at Rome, 1 Nov., 1296. He was called "Speculator" from the title of one of his works, "Speculum Judiciale". He studied law at Bologna under Bernard of Parma and then taught it at Modena. Clement IV (Guy Foulques, 1265–1268, also a Provençal) summoned Durandus to Rome, ordained him subdeacon, and gave him titular canonries at Beauvais and Chartres. He was then attached to the papal curia as *Auditor generalis causarum sacri palatii*. He accompanied Gregory X (1271–1276) to the Second Council of Lyons (1274) and, as the pope's secretary, drew up its decrees. In 1279 he was made dean of Chartres, but did not reside there. At about the same time he went to Romagna as papal governor and succeeded in subduing a rebellion under Guy of Montefeltro. He destroyed Guy's fortress della Ripa and founded in its place the town of Urbania. In 1286 he was elected bishop by the chapter of Mende (Mimatum) in the province of Narbonne, but did not go into residence till 1291. Meanwhile his diocese was administered by his nephew, William Durandus the younger. In 1295 he was again in Italy (under Boniface VIII, 1294–1303) as governor of Romagna and Ancona, where the Ghibellines were again in rebellion. He refused the pope's offer to make him Archbishop of Ravenna, came to Rome, and died there. There is no reason to suppose that Durandus belonged to any religious order, though he has been claimed by both the Dominicans and the Austin Canons. He is buried at Rome in Santa Maria Sopra Minerva, where a long epitaph tells the story of his life and gives a list of his works.

Of these works the most famous is the "Rationale divinorum officiorum" (first ed. by Fust and Schoeffer at Mainz, 1459, and reprinted frequently, at Ulm by John Zainer, 1473; latest ed. at Naples, 1839). It was written in 1286. Its eight books contain a detailed account of the laws, ceremonies, customs, and mystical interpretation of the Roman Rite. Book I treats of the church, altar, pictures, bells, churchyard, etc.; II of the ministers; III of vestments; IV of the Mass; V of the canonical hours; VI of the *Proprium Temporis;* VII of the *Proprium Sanctorum;* and VIII of the astronomical calendar, manner of finding Easter, Epacts, etc. Durandus's "Rationale" is the most complete medieval treatise of its kind; it is still the standard authority for the ritual of the thirteenth century and for the symbolism of rites and vestments. The allegorical explanation of vestments, for instance, as signifying virtues or the garments worn by Christ in His Passion, is taken from its third book. Other works are "Speculum Legatorum", afterwards enlarged into "Speculum Judiciale" (four books), a treatise on the canonical rights of legates and the forms of canonical processes (first ed. at Strasburg in 1473; Frankfort, 1668); "Breviarium, sive Repertorium juris canonici" (Rome, 1474), "Breviarium glossarum et textuum juris canonici" (Paris, 1519), both commentaries on the decretals, arranged in the same order; and "Commentarius in canones Concilii Lugdunensis II" (Fano, 1569, with a life of the author by Simon Majolus), a semi-official exposition of the canons of the Second Council of Lyons. Durandus's epitaph also mentions a "Pontificale", which is now lost. For works wrongly attributed to him see Schulte (op. cit. infra.), II, 155–156.

Sarti, *De claris archigymnasii Bononiensis professoribus a sæc. XI. usq. sæc. XIV.* (Bologna, 1769), 386, §99; Hurter, *Nomenclator* (Innsbruck, 1899), IV, 352–356; Schulte, *Gesch. der Quel. u. Lit. des can. Rechtes* (Stuttgart, 1875), II, §35, pp. 144–156; *Rationel, ou Manuel des divins offices, de Guillaume Durand*, tr. by Barthélemy (with an historical notice of the author), 5 volumes (Paris, 1854); Neale and Webb, *The Symbolism of Churches and Church Ornaments*, a tr. by Green of the first book of the *Rationale divinorum officiorum* (Leeds, 1843).

Adrian Fortescue.

Durandus, William, the Younger, d. 1328, canonist, nephew of the famous ritualist and canonist of the same name (with whom he is often confounded). He was at first archdeacon of Mende, Languedoc, under his uncle and was appointed bishop of that see by Boniface VIII, in 1296, after the uncle's death. He was present at the Council of Vienne in 1311–1312. The pope (John XXII, 1316–1334) and the King of France (Charles IV, 1316–1328) sent him on an embassy to the Sultan Orkhan (1326–1360) at Brusa, to obtain more favourable conditions for the Latins in Syria. He died on the way back, in Cyprus (1328). He wrote, by command of Clement V (1305–1314), a work: "Tractatus de modo concilii generalis celebrandi et de corruptelis in ecclesiâ reformandis", in three books. It is a treatise on the canonical process of summoning and holding general councils, gathered from approved sources with many quotations and illustrations from the Fathers and from church history, together with attacks on various abuses and corruptions that were common in the fourteenth century among ecclesiastical persons. The first edition was printed at Lyons in 1531, then again at Paris by Philip Probus, a canonist of Bourges, in 1545, and dedicated to Pope Paul III (1534–1549) as a help towards the Council of Trent. Other editions, Paris, 1671, etc.

Sarti, *De claris archigymnasii Bononiensis professoribus a sæc. XI. usq. sæc. XIV.* (Bologna, 1769), 395 seq.; Hurter, *Nomenclator* (Innsbruck, 1899), IV, 432, note; Schulte, *Gesch. der Quellen und Litt. des can. Rechtes* (Stuttgart, 1875), II, §51, 195–196.

Adrian Fortescue.

Durandus of Saint-Pourçain, philosopher and theologian, b. at Saint-Pourçain, Auvergne, France; d. 13 September, 1332, at Meaux. He entered the Dominican Order at Clermont and obtained the doctor's degree at Paris in 1313. John XXII called him to Avignon as Master of the Sacred Palace, where he expounded the Scriptures. In 1318 he was consecrated Bishop of Le Puy-en-Velay and was transferred to Meaux in 1326. He is known as *Doctor Resolutissimus* owing to his strenuous advocacy of certain opinions novel to the Schoolmen of his day. His writings include commentaries on the "Sentences" (Paris, 1508); "De origine jurisdictionum" (Paris, 1506); and a treatise on the condition of holy souls after their separation from the body. His nominalism was so much opposed to the contemporary philosophic realism that the third period of Scholasticism is made to begin with him. He rejects both the sensible and the intelligible species, introduced, he says, to explain sense-perception, as also the active intellect. He denies the principle of individuation as distinct from the specific nature of the individual. In theology he argues for a separation of natural knowledge from that obtained through faith and revelation. Certain dogmas, as that of the Trinity, cannot be shown not to contain impossibilities; but to believe them, withal, increases the merit of faith. Because the miracles of Christ do not prove His Divinity, His acceptance by the faithful enhances the merit of believing. After all, he says, theology is not strictly a science, since it rests on faith, not on the first principles of knowledge. In theology it is sufficient to know the idea of him who, being inspired, cannot err. He teaches, besides, that all actions proceed from God Who gives the power to act, but this is no immediate influx of the Creator upon the actions of the creature. The sacraments are only causes without which grace is not conferred. Marriage is not strictly a sacrament. He also insinuates that Christ could be present in the Eucharist with the substances of bread and wine remaining. Throughout, Durandus shows admirable submission to the corrective prerogative of the Church, the exercise of which was not unnecessary. By order of John XXII, the treatise "De statu animarum" was examined and was found to contain eleven errors.

QUÉTIF AND ECHARD, *Script. O. P.*, I, 586; STÖCKL, *Geschichte der Philosophie im M. A.*, II, 976; HAURÉAU, *De la philosophie scolastique*, Pt. II (Paris, 1880), II, 346; MORTIER, *Histoire des maîtres généraux de l'Ordre des Frères Prêcheurs* (Paris, 1907), III, 68–86; FÉRET, *La faculté de théologie de Paris et ses docteurs les plus célèbres*, III, 401–408.

THOS. M. SCHWERTNER.

Durandus of Troarn, French Benedictine and ecclesiastical writer, b. about 1012, at Le Neubourg near Evreux; d. 1089, at Troarn near Caen. Affiliated from early childhood to the Benedictine community of Mont-Sainte-Cathérine and of Saint-Vandrille, he was made abbot of the newly founded Saint-Martin of Troarn by William, Duke of Normandy, in whose esteem he stood on a par with Lanfranc, Anselm, and Gerbert. Ordericus Vitalis calls him *ecclesiastici cantus et dogmatis doctor peritissimus.* Of his achievements in sacred music we know nothing beyond that mention, but we have his "Liber de Corpore et Sanguine Domini" (P. L., CXLIX, 1375) against Berengarius. The ninth and last part of it contains precious historical information about the heresiarch. In Durandus's mind Berengarius is a figurist pure and simple, after the manner of Scotus Eriugena, whose now lost book he is said to have possessed and used. In the rest of his book Durandus follows Paschasius, whom he somewhat emphatically styles *Divini sacramenti scrutator diligentissimus discussorque catholicus*, and from whom he borrows both his patristic apparatus and his theological views. Turmel, however, notes that Durandus quotes new texts of Bede, Amalarius, Fulbert de Chartres, and St. John Chrysostom. His presentation of the Eucharistic dogma is frankly Ambrosian, i. e. he maintains with Paschasius and Gerbert the conversion of the bread and wine into the identical body and blood of Christ, thus excluding the Augustinian theory of the *Præsentia spiritalis* still held by some of his contemporaries and contributing to prepare the definition of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215). Durandus explains with skill the Augustinian texts, chiefly in the "De doctrinâ christianâ" and the "Letter to Boniface", misused by Berengarius; but in the last analysis he appeals to the argument of authority already used by Guitmond (P. L., CXLIX, 1415): "The saintly Doctor of Hippo, wearied by the labours of composition, fails at times to clearly bring out his thought. Hence he may appear obscure to the unlearned and even become a source of error. If perchance he should have erred in so great a mystery, we should then bethink ourselves of the Apostolic saying: 'But though an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you besides that which you have received, let him be anathema'" (loc. cit., 1415). Durandus wrote also against Berengarius a poem of 900 verses, of which twenty-five preface the above treatise and thirteen are quoted in Mabillon's "Annales" (LXIV, 119), the rest being unpublished. Migne (loc. cit.) appends to the "Liber" two epitaphs composed by Durandus, one for Abbot Ainard and the other for the Countess Mabile. (See BERENGARIUS OF TOURS.)

CEILLIER, *Hist. des auteurs sacrés* (Paris, 1863), XIII, 459; TURMEL, *Hist. de la théol. positive* (Paris, 1904), I, index; BATIFFOL, *L'Eucharistie* in *Etudes de théol. positive* (Paris, 1905), II, 379; CHEVALIER, *Bio-Bibl.*, s. v.; ORDERICUS VITALIS, *Historia eccl.* in P. L. CLXXXVIII, 548, 577.

J. F. SOLLIER.

Durango (DURANGUM), ARCHDIOCESE OF, located in north-western Mexico. The see was created 28 Sept., 1620, seventy-two years after the Friars Diego de la Cadena and Gerónimo de Mendoza had established the San Juan Bautista de Analco mission in the valley of the Sierra Madre. The city of Durango was founded in 1554 by the Spanish captain Ibarra, and served at once as a centre for numerous missionaries, whose efforts to convert the natives were so successful that under Philip III the Diocese of Guadalajara was divided by Paul V, and Durango was raised to episcopal rank. The first bishop, Gonzalo Hernandez y Hermosillo, devoted much time to the evangelization and spiritual welfare of the Indians. In the beginning the Diocese of Durango included New Mexico (Santa Fé), Chihuahua, and Sonora; eventually these were made independent sees. Durango was made an archdiocese by Leo XIII (23 June, 1891), and now includes all the State of Durango and part of Zacatecas, with Sonora, Chihuahua, and Sinaloa for suffragans. The first archbishop was Vicente Salinas. Among the remarkable bishops of the see were the scholarly Gorospe, to whom the city owes its canal; the famous writer Legaspi, who began the cathedral that was finished and consecrated by Antonio Zubiría y Escalante, and lately decorated anew by Archbishop Santiago Zubiría y Manzanera. The Catholic press is represented by "El Domingo", and the "Boletin Eclesiastico". Besides the Escuelas Guadalupanas there are two colleges, the Colegio Guadalupano and a College of the Brothers of Mary. The territory of the diocese is quite mountainous and is watered only by a few streams, but is well adapted for grazing. There are many rich mines of gold, silver, and iron. In 1900 the population of the State of Durango was 307,274, that of the city 31,092. The latter, known also as Guadiana and Ciudad de Victoria, stands picturesquely at 6700 feet above sea-level, and has several important industries and a large trade in cattle and leather.

Gerarchia Cattolica (Rome, 1908); BATTANDIER, *Ann. Pont. Cath.* (Paris, 1908); HEILPRIN, *Lippincott's Gazetteer* (Philadelphia, 1906).

REGINALDO GÜERECA.

Durazzo, ARCHDIOCESE OF (DYRRACHIENSIS), in Albania, situated on the Adriatic, has a good port, and is the chief town of a sandjak in the vilayet of Scutari; the population is about 9000. According to Appian it was founded by a barbarian king, Epidamnus, after whom it was called Epidamnum; it then took the name of Dyrrachium, from Dyrrachus, nephew of a daughter of Epidamnus, to whom was due its port. According to Thucydides and Strabo it was more probably a colony of Corcyra. It was one of the causes of the Peloponnesian War. Conquered by the kings of Illyria, when attacked by the Romans, it surrendered to the latter and received from Rome many privileges. Its port was important for communication with Greece. Cicero and Pompey in their disgrace took refuge at Dyrrachium. When towards the end of the fourth century the empire was divided into two parts, the city fell to the Eastern Empire. The Byzantine emperors made it a strong fortress, and Anastasius I was born there. After the seventh century it was the centre of a theme; in 1011 its governors received the title of dukes. Under Michael the Paphlagonian (1034–1041) it was occupied by the Bulgarians; in 1042 it was retaken by the Greeks. In 1082 it was captured by Robert Guiscard, who defeated Alexius Comnenus under its walls; at the death of Robert it fell again into the power of the Greeks, who held it till the capture of Constantinople by the Latins (1204). From 1206 to 1294 it belonged to the despots of Epirus. It was then conquered by the Angevin kings of Naples, who gave it as a fief to princes of their family; the descendants of these rulers kept the title of "Duras" even when they no longer held the city. The effective lordship passed to the Thopias about the middle of the fourteenth century. In 1373 the city was occupied by the Balsas of the Zetta, in 1386 by the Venetians, and finally, in 1501, by the Turks.

The church of Durazzo is the most ancient in Albania. According to local tradition the first bishop of the country was St. Cæsarius, one of the Seventy Disciples. St. Astius, his successor, is said to have suffered martyrdom under Trajan about A. D. 100. A list of the Greek bishops is in Lequien (Oriens Christianus, II, 240–247), but it is very incomplete. Durazzo is even yet a metropolis for the Greeks. Under Eucharius, who attended the Council of Ephesus, 431, it was the metropolis of Epirus Nova or Illyria Græca. The see, long disputed between the Greeks, the Bulgarians, and Serbs, remained finally in the hands of the first named. Its bishops, who as early as 519 had sided with Acacius, Patriarch of Constantinople, against Pope Hormisdas, followed the schism of Michael Cærularius in the eleventh century. At the beginning of the thirteenth century, after the Latin conquest of Constantinople, a Latin see was established there (1209). The Latin succession was often interrupted, on account of political changes; the actual (1908) archbishop is the fifty-second of the list (Lequien, III, 950–954; Gams, I, 407; II, 87; Eubel, I, 241; II, 164). The episcopal residence was likewise subject to several removals; after the Turkish conquest the archbishops transferred it to Corbina (1509), then to Canovia; to-day they reside at Delbenisti. Durazzo had originally but one suffragan, Cernicum or Tzernicum, site unknown. Later it had Prisca, Croia, Alessio, and Canovia. To-day Alessio only is subject to the Archbishop of Durazzo, but his power over it has been so limited by Propaganda that he may be considered an archbishop without a suffragan.

There are in the archdiocese about 250,000 inhabitants, of whom about 140,000 are Mussulmans (Turks and chiefly Albanese), 95,000 Greeks or Græcized Albanese, 14,000 Catholics (Albanese, except a few Italians and Austrians). There are also at Elbassan about 150 recently converted Greeks. The diocese has no seminary, but some students are sent to the seminary of Scutari. It has 20 priests, of whom 13 are secular priests, 22 parishes, 46 churches or chapels, 39 stations, 5 schools for boys and 1 for girls (the latter conducted by Sisters of Charity of Agram). Franciscan friars have charge of several parishes.

FARLATI, *Illyricum sacrum*, VII, 335–384; DEGRAND, *Souvenirs de la Haute Albanie* (Paris, 1901), 179–183; *Missiones Catholicæ* (Rome, 1907), 132.

L. PETIT.

Durbin, ELISHA JOHN, the "patriarch-priest of Kentucky", b. 1 Feb., 1800, in Madison Co., in that State, of John D. Durbin, son of Christopher Durbin, pioneer, and Patience Logsdon; d. in 1887 at Shelbyville, Kentucky. In 1816 he was sent to the preparatory seminary of St. Thomas, in Nelson Co., where he spent about four years of manual labour and study under such distinguished missionaries as David Flaget, Felix de Andreis, and Joseph Rosati; thence he went to the near-by Seminary of St. Joseph, at Bardstown, where, in 1821–1822, he had as instructor Francis Patrick Kenrick, later Bishop of Philadelphia and Archbishop of Baltimore. He was ordained priest in Bardstown, by Bishop David, 21 Sept., 1822. Early in 1824 Bishop Flaget entrusted to him the pastoral care of western and south-western Kentucky, about thirty counties, with an area of over 11,000 square miles, nearly one-third of the State. Then began a missionary career of over sixty years hardly paralleled in the United States, and that subsequently won for him the names of "Apostle of Western Kentucky" and "Patriarch-Priest of Kentucky". Union County was the centre of his mission. From it he journeyed on horseback over his vast territory, erected churches, established stations, formed congregations, and visited isolated families. In the beginning duty called him beyond his mission proper into Indiana, and once a year to Nashville, Tennessee. He traversed his extensive and sparsely settled mission incessantly for over sixty years, his churches, stations, and the rude homes of his poor flock his only abiding places. Occasionally a communication from him would appear in the press, and then only in defence of truth or outraged justice. When he did write, he wrote cogently and elegantly. Enfeebled by age, his sturdy constitution gave way in 1884, when his bishop, yielding to his entreaties, assigned him the small mission at Princeton, Kentucky. After a stroke of paralysis he was given, in 1885, the chaplaincy of an academy, at Shelbyville, Ky., where he died.

The Catholic Advocate (Louisville, 1836–1887); *The Record* (Louisville, 1879–1887); WEBB, *Centenary of Catholicity in Kentucky* (Louisville, 1884); HOWLETT, *Historical Tribute to St. Thomas' Seminary* (St. Louis, 1906); MAES, *Life of Rev. Charles Nerinckx* (Cincinnati, 1880).

LOUIS G. DEPPEN.

Dürer, ALBRECHT, celebrated painter and engraver, b. at Nuremberg, Germany, 21 May, 1471; d. there, 6 April, 1528. Dürer left his native city, then famous for its commerce, learning, and art, but three times in his life. His first journey was undertaken after he had completed his apprenticeships both to his father, a goldsmith, and to the painter and engraver Wohlgemut; on this occasion he travelled through Germany and visited at Colmar and Basle the family of the recently deceased Schongauer; in 1505–07 he spent some time in Venice; in 1520–1521 he went to the Netherlands, visiting especially Antwerp.

FIRST PERIOD: TO 1505.—After the earliest works of his youth (portraits, Madonnas, coats-of-arms, landscape-sketches) he set up in 1494 a studio of his own. In the same year he married Agnes Frey but they had no children. Among his Nuremberg friends the learned humanist Willibald Pirkheimer held the first place. Besides great advancement in learning, Dürer owed to Pirkheimer the happiness of a lifelong friendship

and the acquaintance with classical antiquity which he occasionally drew upon in his work. Dürer's art, however, with its sources in the German Middle Ages, remained essentially German; the influence of the art of Italy and the Netherlands was merely supplementary. In his own country there were few chances for mural paintings; but the demand for altar-pieces and portraits was all the greater. His woodcuts were eagerly sought after by the general public, his engravings on copper by connoisseurs. Among his fine compositions are: the Baumgärtner altar-painting, the central panel of which represents the Adoration of the Christ Child, the wings, the donors as Sts. George and Eustachius; the "Lamentation of Christ", in which the pathos is noteworthy; and the remarkable picture of himself (1500). These are preserved in the Old Pinakothek in Munich. The portrait of himself just mentioned is greatly idealized as is also that of a lady of the Fürleger family. On the other hand, in the portraits of his father and mother realism predominates. But here, as in the "Prodigal Son" and in his drawings, Dürer seeks to elevate his naturalism by former by his directions to the wood-engravers who carried out his designs.

Second Period: 1505 to 1520.—In the "Festival of the Rosary", painted in Venice for German merchants residing there, he competes, not unsuccessfully, with the Italian colourists, though it may be said that colour was not his strong point. The painting (Abbey of Strahow, Prague) is damaged, but a good copy is preserved in the Imperial Museum at Vienna. An oil-painting of the same period, "Christ on the Cross", and other works that followed, e. g. "Adam and Eve" (Madrid and Florence), show that Dürer's trip to Italy and the acquaintance made there with Giovanni Bellini were not without profit to his art; but Dürer's nationality and the independence of his genius are always evident. Another work much admired was the so-called Heller altar-piece, destroyed at Munich in 1674 by fire. Valuable studies for this picture and an indistinct copy are still extant. One of the finest examples of German art is the "Adoration of the Trinity" or "All Saints" (1511). Placed beside the "Disputa" of Raphael or the Sistine paintings of Michelangelo pro-

Madonna and Child (1512)
Imperial Museum, Vienna

Portrait of Himself (1500)
Old Pinakothek, Munich

Hieronymus Holzschuher (1526)
Royal Museum, Berlin

Albrecht Dürer

sweet simplicity, depth of feeling, and grandeur of conception. The "Adoration of the Magi" in the Uffizi at Florence will bear comparison, at least for German taste, with the masterpieces of Italy and the Netherlands. Dürer's woodcuts have a quality entirely their own; though without colouring, they yet produced the effect of colour. The "Apocalypse" (15 cuts) is distinguished by its daring fancy and grandeur of conception. The most striking of the series are: the "Four Riders", the "Angels of the Euphrates", the "Battle of the Angels with the Dragon". To the same period belong, for the most part, the powerful "Larger Passion" (7, later 12, cuts) as well as the beautiful "Life of the Virgin" (16, later 20, cuts), in which the scenes from the life of the Holy Family in Egypt have all the sweetness of a charming idyll. Mention should be made of the so-called "Green Passion" in the Albertina Museum at Vienna, a series of twelve drawings with the pen on green paper, also of the "Smaller Passion" of a later date in 37 woodcuts, and of the 17 copperplate engravings on the same subject. For the fifth time the artist came back to the Passion of Christ eight years before his death; a few sketches are to be found in the Uffizi at Florence and in the Albertina at Vienna. Wood and copperplate engraving were brought to great perfection by Dürer; the latter, and etching as well, by his own work; the duced in the same year, it would not suffer from the comparison. God the Father sits upon a throne and holds forth the Cross with the Crucified; above both of them, in the form of a dove, the Holy Ghost hovers. About them the saints of heaven in two companies with the Mother of God and John the Baptist at their head kneel in adoration. In the upper part of the picture, above the blessed hosts, choirs of angels surround the Holy Trinity; in the lower part, the Church Militant, led by the powerful figures of a pope and an emperor, takes part in the adoration. As an idealization of the world this multitude stands above the clouds. At the very bottom and to one side, as though left behind, is seen the humble figure of the painter. This work deserves no less praise for its perfection of finish than for its sublimity of conception. The frame, carved in renaissance style from drawings by Dürer, is still preserved at Nuremberg. In the same year, 1511, Dürer produced the "Virgin with the Pear", one of the finest of his Madonnas. In the years 1513–14 he executed three great copperplate engravings; these may, perhaps, be looked upon as ideal representations of a fearless knight, an unsatisfied searcher for knowledge, and a saint happy in God and are called: "The Knight with Death and the Devil"; "Melancholia"; "St. Jerome in his Study". To these must be added various paintings, e.g. of Charle-

magne, Sigismund, and Albrecht of Brandenburg; further, the marginal drawings, displaying great fancy and humour, made for Maximilian's "Prayer Book", and the "Triumphal Arch of Maximilian" belong to the same time. Later, Dürer worked also on the "Triumph of Maximilian", and produced (1522) the large "Triumphal Car", for the emperor.

THIRD PERIOD: 1520 TO 1528.—Admirable sketches for "St. Jerome with the Skull", lately discovered by Anton Weber in Lisbon, give ample proof of the artist's diligence during his stay in the Netherlands. The striking head of the saint is very like the "Head of an Old Man" in the Albertina. After his return to Nuremberg, Dürer painted a noteworthy "Head of Christ" and portraits of Pirkheimer, Erasmus, and Holzschuher. His last work of importance (1526) was the "Four Apostles", Peter with John, and Paul with Mark; these paintings, which are now in Munich, are much admired for the individuality of character expressed by the figures and the fine treatment of the drapery. From the inscription under these pictures, despite the fact that Peter is represented as holding the keys of heaven, and from other circumstances that prove little, some have wished to infer that towards the end of his life Dürer became attached to the doctrines of Luther. But even the Protestants van Eye, A. W. Becker, C. Kinkel, and others, do not share in this opinion, and M. Thausing, the great Dürer scholar, has now rejected it. No doubt many well-disposed persons of the time saw the necessity for ecclesiastical reform and hoped that it would be hastened by Luther's stand. But they were deceived and acknowledged it, as Pirkheimer did for himself and his friend: "I confess that in the beginning I believed in Luther, like our Albert of blessed memory . . . but as anyone can see, the situation has become worse."

In the years 1525–27, Dürer wrote three books: on geometry, the proportions of the human figure, and the art of fortification.

SINGER, *Versuch einer Dürer Bibliographie* in *Studien zur deutschen Kunstgeschichte* (1905); CONWAY, *Literary Remains of Albrecht Dürer* (Cambridge, 1889); CUST, *Albrecht Dürer, a Study of his Life and Works* (London, 1897); KNACKFUSS, *A. Dürer* (6th ed., 1899), tr. DODGESON (London, 1900); WEBER, *A. Dürer* (3rd ed., Ratisbon, 1903); Collection of drawings by LIPPMANN (4 vols.); of woodcuts, LÜTZOW; of copperplates and etchings, LÜTZOW AND SOLDAU; of letters and diaries, THAUSING.

G. GIETMANN.

Durham (DUNELMUM), ANCIENT CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF (DUNELMENSIS).—This diocese holds a unique position among English bishoprics. Owing to its geographical position on the Scottish border, the successive bishops were led to assume constitutional and political functions in addition to their spiritual office. Consequently their rights and privileges were peculiar and extensive; and even to this day the Anglican Bishop of Durham has precedence over all other English prelates except those of Canterbury, York, and London. The diocese is the lineal continuation of the Anglo-Saxon See of Lindisfarne, founded by St. Aidan in 635, when he came from the monastery of Iona at the request of St. Oswald, King of Northumbria, to evangelize that newly-conquered heathen kingdom. He built his monastery on the Island of Lindisfarne, now Holy Island, off Northumbria. Thus Northumbrian Christianity was of Celtic origin and followed the Celtic use as to the observance of Easter and other matters. But in the south the Roman use prevailed and conflict became inevitable. The controversy arose in the time of St. Colman, the third bishop, and was settled in 664 at the Synod of Whitby when the Roman use was adopted. Shortly after, St. Colman resigned the episcopate and the see was transferred to York, with St. Wilfrid as bishop.

In 678, St. Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, cut off from it two new sees, one for the Lindiswaras of Lincolnshire and the other for Bernicia. In 680 the Bernician see was subdivided into the Dioceses of Lindisfarne and Hexham, while finally a separate bishopric was created for the Southern Picts. So that when St. Cuthbert (q. v.) became Bishop of Lindisfarne the diocese was only a fragment of what it had been under St. Aidan. In the ninth century, when the Danes repeatedly harassed Northumbria, the Diocese of Hexham ceased to have a separate existence, and about 820 was merged in that of York. In 875, Eardulf, Bishop of Lindisfarne, was driven from his see, and taking the body of St. Cuthbert, he with his monks fled from the Danes. After wandering seven years they found a resting place at Chester-le-Street (882); and from here Eardulf and his eight immediate successors ruled the see. In 995 Bishop Aldhun again found himself defenceless before the Danes and fled with St. Cuthbert's body to Ripon. When peace was restored, he was returning to Chester-le-Street when miraculous signs were given that the body of the saint was to remain at Dunholm, the place where the city of Durham now stands. A stone chapel was built to receive St. Cuthbert's body and Aldhun began a great church where the cathedral now is, which was finished and consecrated in 999. In this way Aldhun became the first Bishop of Durham.

The following is the list of bishops with the dates of their accession. Those marked thus (†) held the office of Lord Chancellor:—

BISHOPS OF LINDISFARNE

St. Aidan, 635
St. Finan, 652
St. Colman, 661
Tuda, 664
St. Eata, 678
St. Cuthbert, 685
St. Eadbert, 688
Eadfrid, 698
St. Ethelwold, 724
Cynewulf, 740
Higbald, 780
Egbert, 803
Heathured (otherwise Egfrid), 821
Ecgred, 830
Eanbert, 845
Eardulf, 854

CHESTER-LE-STREET

Cutheard, 900
Tilred, 915
Wilgred, 928
Uchtred, 944
Sexhelm, 947
Aldred, 947
Elfsig, 968
Aldhun or Aldwin, 990

BISHOPS OF DURHAM

Aldhun came to Durham, 995
Vacancy, 1018
Eadmund, 1021
Eadred, 1041
Egelric, 1042
Egelwin, 1056
Walcher, 1071
William de S. Carilef, 1080
Vacancy, 1096
Rannulf Flambard, 1099
Vacancy, 1129
Galfrid Rufus†, 1133
Vacancy and usurpation of Cumin, 1140
William de S. Barbara, 1143
Hugh de Pudsey, 1153
Vacancy, 1194
Philip de Pictavia (el. 1195, cons. 1197)
Vacancy, 1208
Richard de Marisco†, 1217
Vacancy, 1226
Richard Poor, 1228
Vacancy, 1237
Nicholas de Farnham, 1241
Walter de Kirkham, 1249
Robert de Stitchill, 1260
Robert de Insula, 1274
Antony Beck, 1283
Richard de Kellaw, 1311
Lewis de Beaumont, 1318
Richard de Bury†, 1333
Thomas de Hatfield, 1345
John Fordham, 1382
Walter Skirlaw, 1388
Thomas Langley† (afterwards Cardinal), 1406
Robert Neville, 1438
Laurence Booth†, 1457
William Dudley, 1476
Vacancy, 1483
John Sherwood, 1485
Richard Fox, 1494
William Sever, 1502
Vacancy, 1505
Christopher Bainbridge (afterwards Cardinal), 1507
Vacancy, 1508
Thomas Ruthall, 1509
Thomas Wolsey (already Cardinal and Abp. of York), 1523
Cuthbert Tunstall, 1530

THE CATHEDRAL.—The first Norman bishop, Walcher, was murdered by the people in 1080, and

succeeded by William de S. Carilef, who began the present cathedral, the foundation being laid 29 July, 1093. He also replaced the secular cathedral clergy by Benedictine monks from Jarrow and Wearmouth. The situation of the cathedral is very remarkable, as it stands high on the cliff overhanging the river, and the building itself is most imposing, with its noble proportions, and what Dr. Johnson called its appearance of "rocky solidity and of indeterminate duration". Bishop Carilef died shortly after beginning it; but the building was carried on with energy by the next bishop, the infamous Rannulf Flambard. He built the nave and aisles and the lower part of the west front, and in 1104 the shrine of St. Cuthbert was transferred to the new cathedral. In 1143 the see was usurped by William Cumin, chancellor of the King of Scotland,

West Towers and Cloister Court, Durham Cathedral

who for sixteen months violently kept the rightful bishop out of possession. This interfered with the building, but the next bishop, Hugh de Pudsey, was a great builder, and among his additions is the "Galilee Chapel", a unique specimen of transitional work. Another special feature of Durham cathedral is the eastern transept, known as the "Chapel of the Nine Altars", built by Bishop Poor about 1230. The central tower (214 feet) was rebuilt towards the end of the fifteenth century. The bishops also built their own half-regal residence, Durham Castle, and the extensive buildings of the monastery, portions of which still remain. The relations between the bishops and the monks were frequently very strained, especially in the time of the warrior-prelate, Antony Beck, though bishops like Richard Poor, Richard de Kellaw, or the scholar, Richard de Bury, lived in harmony with them.

Civil Jurisdiction of the Bishopric of Durham.—The twofold jurisdiction of the bishops of Durham was clearly recognized by law from early times. In the reign of Edward I the Rolls of Parliament state: "Episcopus Dunelmensis duos habet status, videlicet, statum episcopi quoad spiritualia et statum comitis palacii quoad tenementa sua temporalia." But the origin of this civil jurisdiction has never been ascertained. According to one theory it represents a local survival of the old Northumbrian Kingdom. According to another view it was conferred by grant of some king, Alfred or, more plausibly, William the Conqueror. There is, however, no historical trace of any such grant, and recent research makes it more probable that it is a development of immunities granted to the Bishopric of Durham. Even before the Conquest the bishops held large endowments of land known as the patrimony of St. Cuthbert, *Terra* or *patrimonium Sancti Cuthberti*. Therefore the diocese possessed large franchise or immunity both as against the sovereign power of the King of England and the local rights of the Earl of Northumberland. Thus the bishopric was not included in Domesday Book, and even at the time of the Conquest the county of Durham was governed by the bishop with almost complete local independence. These extensive rights were strengthened by the fact that the bishops frequently had to repel Scottish invasions, by their own forces and at their own expense, which fostered both the military and financial independence of the palatinate. The strong local feeling of Northumbrian independence also prevented the formation of any firm ties with the English sovereigns, until the masterful policy of Henry II brought Durham into subordination to the central government. But this subordination was exceedingly limited even then, and the bishopric escaped the deprivation of its privileges which befell many other franchises at that time. This was due to Bishop Hugh de Pudsey, who was the king's cousin and personal friend, and who took care as time went on to obtain the charters necessary to safeguard the liberties of his see.

These were most considerable. First, the bishop had within the bishopric every right that the king had in the country: *Quicquid rex habet extra episcopus habet intra*. He was therefore the head of the civil government, with appointment of all civil officers. The bishop's writ, not the king's, ran within the bishopric, and the "Bishop's peace" was regarded as different from the "King's peace" until the time of Henry VIII. Offenders and law-breakers were tried in the bishop's court and if necessary punished by his officials. Forfeitures for treason and forfeitures of war were both his right, and he could create corporations, and erect fairs and markets. He did not, however, have the right of making treaties with foreign powers, though instances of attempted secret treaties with Scotland are not wanting. The bishops had their own mint, and their coinage bears their initials on the reverse of each coin. From the feudal point of view the bishop was very strong, as he was the universal landlord, and all land was held mediately or immediately of him and not of the king. From this followed his rights of wardship, rights to all mines and to treasure-trove, as well as his extensive forest rights. At law he could stay procedure against offenders, grant pardons and even suspend the application of a statute. He had courts of common law, equity, and admiralty, besides his spiritual courts; and he regulated the relations between the latter and the temporal courts.

Thus, in theory, the bishop was as a king in his bishopric, but in practice his power was limited by the sovereign. In some instances the king actually infringed upon his rights, and in other cases there was conflict of jurisdiction. Up to the end of the thirteenth century the episcopal power developed in every way, then followed a period during which the kings somewhat unwillingly tolerated the position, for the sake of the convenience of having what amounted to a buffer state between England and Scotland, and also because it was difficult to solve a problem so beset with complications both ecclesiastical and feudal. Although it is sometimes stated that the bishops had a council in the nature of a parliament, it is becoming increasingly clear that we have

DURHAM CATHEDRAL

here a confused tradition of two separate bodies—the assembly and the council. The assembly (*communitas*) was practically the same gathering as the shire-moot in other counties. It raised money by taxation at the request both of the king and of the bishop, and sometimes for its own purposes. But it was not a legislative assembly, since all general legislation applied to the palatinate, although Durham was not represented in Parliament till the time of the Stuarts. When Acts were not intended to apply to Durham express exemption was stated. The council was in origin a feudal body, chosen from the bishop's immediate followers and officials, the functions entrusted to it being the general administration of the palatinate, financial affairs, and the duty of advising the bishop. The judicial courts of the palatinate arose out of this body. Much of the civil and judicial independence of the palatinate was destroyed by the Act of Resumption passed in 1536, at the will of Henry VIII. By this act the bishop's semi-regal power was abolished.

GALILEE CHAPEL, DURHAM CATHEDRAL

The see at this time was held by Cuthbert Tunstall, the venerable prelate who was the last Catholic bishop and who lived to witness the suppression of monasteries, the Pilgrimage of Grace (1536), and finally the surrender of Durham Abbey (1540), which involved the spoliation of St. Cuthbert's shrine. During the reign of Edward VI he was imprisoned and an Act of Parliament was passed dissolving the bishopric and forming it into a county palatine. After the brief respite of Mary's reign, Bishop Tunstall was deprived of his see by Elizabeth, July, 1559. With his death in confinement, on 18 Nov., the line of Catholic bishops ended. Ten years later during the "Rising of the North" the Catholics seized Durham cathedral, restored the altar, and publicly celebrated Mass, thus making it the last of the old English cathedrals in which Mass has been said.

In the bishopric there were six collegiate churches, Auckland, Darlington, Chester-le-Street, Lanchester, Norton, and Staindrop. The Benedictines held Durham Abbey, with the dependent houses of Jarrow, Wearmouth, and Finchale. There were Augustinians at Hexham and Brinkburn; Cistercians at Newminster; and Premonstratensians at Blanchland. Durham College (now Trinity), at Oxford, was greatly protected and helped by various bishops and priors of Durham, and possibly was originally a Durham foundation. The arms of the see are: azure, a cross between four lions rampant, or. The mitre over the arms is encircled by a ducal coronet.

The Historical Works of Symeon of Durham in *R. S.* (1882–1885), the chief authority for the history of the see down to 1153. Subsequent events are recorded by GEOFFREY OF COLDINGHAM, *Liber de Statu Ecclesiæ Dunhelmensis* (1152–1214); ROBERT DE GRAYSTANES, *Historia de Statu Ecc. Dunhelm.* (1214–1336); WILLIAM DE CHAMBRE, *Continuatio Historiæ Dunhelmensis*—all three ed. by RAINE and pub. by SURTEES SOCIETY in *Historiæ Dunelmensis Scriptores Tres* (London, 1839), IX. Many other volumes of the SURTEES SOCIETY throw light on the history of the see. HUTCHINSON, *History of the County of Durham* (Newcastle, 1785–1794); SURTEES, *History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham* (London, 1816–1840); RAINE, *History and Antiquities of North Durham* (1852); LOW, *Durham* in S.P.C.K., *Diocesan Hist. Series* (London, 1881); BYEGATE, *Durham: the Cathedral and See* (London, 1889); LAPSLEY, *The County Palatine of Durham* in *Harvard Historical Studies* (London, 1900), VIII, a most valuable work on the constitutional powers of the bishops of Durham, with very full bibliography and an appendix on the *Records of the Palatinate.*—For Durham Liturgy, see *Rituale Ecclesiæ Dunelmensis*, SURTEES SOC. (London, 1839), X, and *Rites of Durham*, SURTEES SOC. (London, 1842), XV. The *Durham Breviary* is announced for publication by the HENRY BRADSHAW SOCIETY.—For the Episcopal Coinage, see RUDING, *Annals of the Coinage of Great Britain*, II; LEAKE, *Historical Account of English Money;* NOBLE, *Two Dissertations on the Mint of the Episcopal-Palatines of Durham;* BARTLET, *Episcopal Coins of Durham* in *Archæologia* (1778), reprinted (Newcastle, 1817), and LAPSLEY, *op. cit.*, VII. The general literature on the subject is very large. See THOMPSON, *Reference Catalogue of Books on Durham and Northumberland* (Newcastle-on-Tyne, 1888).

EDWIN BURTON.

Durham Rite.—The earliest document giving an account of liturgical services in the Diocese of Durham is the so-called "Rituale ecclesiæ Dunelmensis", also known as the "Ritual of King Ælfrith" [the King of Northumberland, who succeeded his brother Ecgfrith in 685, and who was a *vir in scripturis doctissimus* (Bede, Hist. Eccl., IV, xxvi)]. The MS. (in the library of Durham cathedral, A, IV, 19) is of the early ninth century. It contains *capitula*, chants, and especially collects, from the Epiphany to Easter, then a *proprium sanctorum*, a *commune sanctorum*, and many forms for blessings. The greater part has an interlinear Anglo-Saxon translation. At the end various scribes have used up the blank pages to write out a miscellaneous collection of hymns and exorcisms and a list of contractions used in books of canon law. Its connexion with Durham and Northumberland is shown by various allusions, such as that to St. Cuthbert in a collect (*intercedente beato Cudbertho Sacerdote;* p. 185 of the Surtees Soc. edition). This fragment represents the fusion of the Roman and Gallican uses that had taken place all over North-Western Europe since the Emperor Charles the Great (768–814) or even earlier (Duchesne, Origines du culte chrétien, 2nd ed., 89–99). Many parts of it exactly correspond to the Gregorian Sacramentary sent by Pope Adrian I to the emperor (between 784 and 791; Duchesne, op. cit., 114–119).

The great Benedictine monastery of Durham was founded by William of St. Carileph in 1083; he brought monks from Wearmouth and Jarrow to fill it. These monks served the cathedral till the suppression in 1538. The foundation of the cathedral was laid in 1093 and St. Cuthbert's body was brought to its shrine in 1104. A catalogue drawn up at Durham in 1395 gives a list of the books used by the monks for various services. Of such books not many remain. A Gradual of about the year 1500 with four leaves of a *Tonarium* is at Jesus College, Cambridge (MS. 22; Q. B. S.), and a Durham Missal written in the fourteenth century is in the British Museum (Harl. 5289). The parts of this Missal that correspond to Holy Week and Easter are printed in vol. CVII of the Surtees Society's publications (pp. 172–191; see also the "Westminster Missal", III, 1424, Henry Bradshaw Soc., 1897, where the Durham variants are given). But the most important document of this kind is the volume called "The Ancient Monuments, Rites and Customs of the Monastical Church of Durham before the Suppression". This book, written in 1593, exists in several manuscript copies and has been printed and edited on various occasions, lastly by the Surtees Society (vol. CVII, 1903; see bibliography). It is a detailed description, not only of the fabric of the cathedral, but also of the various rites, ceremonies, and special customs carried out by the monks who served it. From it we see that the Durham Rite was prac-

tically that of the North of England (corresponding in all its main points to that of York), with a few local modifications such as one would expect to find in a great and flourishing monastic church. The treatise begins with a description of the famous nine altars (ed. Surtees Soc., p. 7) and of the choir and high altar. The Blessed Sacrament was reserved in a silver pelican hung over the High Altar. It should be noted that a pelican in her piety was assumed as his arms by Richard Fox (Bishop of Durham, 1494–1502) and was constantly introduced into monuments built by him (so at Winchester and at Corpus Christi College, Oxford). The great paschal candlestick was a conspicuous and splendid feature of Easter ritual at Durham; it and the rite of the paschal candle are described in chapter iv (ed. cit., p. 10). The Office for Palm Sunday does not differ from that of Sarum and the other English uses (ed. cit., p. 179). On Maundy Thursday there was a procession with St. Cuthbert's relics. A special feature of the Good Friday service was the crucifix taken by two monks from inside a statue of Our Lady, for the Creeping to the Cross. On the same day the Blessed Sacrament was enclosed in a great statue of Christ on a side altar and candles were burned before it till Easter Day. The Holy Saturday service in the Durham Missal is given on pp. 185–187 of the Surtees Society edition. The monks sang the "Miserere" while they went in procession to the new fire. When the paschal candle is lit they sing a hymn, "Inventor rutili", with a verse that is repeated each time. There are only five Prophecies, and then follow the litanies. When "Omnes Sancti" is sung those who are to serve the Mass go out. The word *Accendite* is said and the candles are lighted. It is repeated three times; at the third repetition the bishop comes out to begin the Mass. All the bells (*signa*) are rung at the Kyrie eleison, the Gloria, and the Alleluia. Between three and four o'clock in the morning of Easter Day the Blessed Sacrament was brought in procession to the high altar, while they sang an antiphon, "Christus resurgens ex mortuis, iam non moritur", etc. Another statue of Christ Risen remained on the high altar during Easter week. On Ascension Day, Whit-Sunday, and Trinity Sunday processions went round the church, on Corpus Christi round the palace green, and on St. Mark's Day to Bow Church in the city (chs. lv, lvi). The rogation-days (three cross-daies) also had their processions. In all these the relics of St. Bede were carried and the monks appeared in splendid copes. The prior, especially, wore a cope of cloth of gold so heavy that he could only stand in it when it was supported by "his gentlemen" (ed. cit., p. 85). The prior had the right of wearing a mitre since Prior Berrington of Walworth (ch. lvi, ed. cit., p. 107).

Throughout the year the chapter Mass was sung at nine o'clock, Vespers at three p. m. On Thursdays, except in Advent, Septuagesima, and Lent, the Office of St. Cuthbert was sung in choir (ed. cit., p. 191). On Fridays there was a "Jesus-Mass" (a votive mass of the Holy Name), and the "Jesus-Antiphon" was sung after Complin (ed. cit., p. 220). This was also the custom at York, Lincoln, Lichfield, and Salisbury. On St. Cuthbert's Day (20 March) there was, naturally, a great feast and his relics were exposed. Chapter x (ed. cit., p. 16) describes the great book containing names of benefactors (Liber Vitæ) that was kept on the high altar, chapter xxi the forms for giving sanctuary to accused persons. They had to use the knocker, still shown to visitors, and, when they were received, to wear a black gown with a yellow cross "of St. Cuthbert" on the left shoulder (ed. cit., p. 41). No woman was allowed to approach the saint's tomb beyond a line of blue marble traced on the floor. To explain this, chapter xviii tells a legend about a king's daughter who falsely accused him and was eventually swallowed up by the earth. In the "Galilee" was a chapel of Our Lady for women (ch. xxii, ed. cit., p. 42). When a monk died his body was carried to St. Andrew's chapel, two monks watched before it all the time; after the dirge and the requiem Mass it was buried in the sanctuary garth with a chalice of wax laid on the breast (ch. xxiii). Priors were buried in the abbey church (xxv) and bishops in the sanctuary (xxvii). (See DURHAM, DIOCESE OF.)

The Anglo-Saxon *Rituale ecclesiæ Dunelmensis* is published (from the MS. at Durham) by the SURTEES SOCIETY (vol. X, 1840), and was re-edited by SWEET in his *Oldest English Texts* (1885). The *Ancient Monuments, Rites and Customs of the Monastical Church of Durham before the Suppression* exists in a MS. of 1620 in the Cosin library at Durham (MSS., B, II, 11) and in a MS. of 1656 belonging to Sir John Lawson, Bart., of Brough Hall, Catterick (Fol., pp. 1–93). From these two texts the edition of the SURTEES SOCIETY has been printed (vol. CVII, *Rites of Durham*, 1903). Other editions are: one curtailed and modernized by DAVIES (London, printed for W. Hensman in 1672); HUNTER, *Durham Cathedral as it was before the dissolution of the monasteries* (Durham, by J. Ross for Mrs. Waghorn, 1733; reprinted, Durham, 1733); and SANDERSON, *The Antiquities of the Abbey or Cathedral Church of Durham* (Newcastle-on-Tyne, 1767). The Durham *Obituary Roll* (c. 1468) was edited by RAINE for the Surtees Society (vol. XXXI, 1856) and the *Liber Vitæ Ecclesiæ Dunelmensis*, from a ninth-century MS., by STEVENSON for the same society (vol. XIII, 1841). The *Surtees Society Catalogue* (pp. 38, 115) gives a Durham *Canon Missæ*, bound up with a psalter, hymnary, and journal, of 1391 and 1416. Part of the Missal of the fourteenth century in the British Museum (Harl. 5289) is printed in vol. CVII of the Surtees Society (pp. 172–191). Occasional references to the Durham Rite will be found in ROCK, *Church of our Fathers*, ed. HART AND FRERE (4 vols., London, 1904), and in WORDSWORTH AND LITTLEDALE, *The Old Service-books of the English Church* (London, 1904).

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Durrow (Irish *Dairmagh*, Plain of the Oaks), SCHOOL OF, is delightfully situated in the King's County, a few miles from the town of Tullamore. St. Columba, who loved to build in close proximity to oak-groves, because of their natural beauty, as well as perhaps to divest them of their Druidic associations, found here, as in Derry, a site just after his heart. It was freely given to him by Aedh, son of Brendan, lord of the soil, in 553, and the saint lost no time in founding his monastery, which, with more or less constant personal supervision, he ruled till 563. When, in that year, either as a matter of penance, or as Adamnan says, "of choice for Christ's sake", he became an exile in the wilds of Scotland, he appointed a most estimable monk, Cormac Ua Liathain, to take his place. But owing to the jealousies that existed between the northern and the southern tribes, especially on the borderland, Cormac found it impossible to retain the office of prior, and so he fled from the monastery, leaving in charge a first cousin of Columba, Laisren by name, who, acceptable to both sides, governed the institution with conspicuous success. Durrow, during Columba's life and for centuries after his death, was a famous school, at one time being esteemed second to none in the country. The Venerable Bede styles it *Monasterium nobile in Hibernia*, and, at a later period, Armagh and itself were called the "Universities of the West". It will be ever noted for the useful and admirable practice of copying manuscripts, especially of the Sacred Scriptures, which had become quite a fine art amongst the masters and disciples there. Columba himself, who was an expert scribe, is generally credited with having written with his own hand the incomparable copy of the Four Gospels now known as the "Book of Durrow". It is a piece of the most exquisite workmanship, charming the mind as well as the eye with its intricate and highly ornamental details. An entry on the back of one of the folios of this remarkable book, which is now to be seen in Trinity College, Dublin, prays for a "remembrance of the scribe, Columba, who wrote this evangel in the space of twelve days".

Columba dearly loved Durrow. It held a place in his affections next to his own Derry, and while in Iona he manifested the tenderest interest in everything that concerned its welfare. When he was urging Cormac Ua Liathain to return to the monastery there,

ue recounted for him the manifold beauties of that "city devout, with its hundred crosses, without blemish, and without transgression", and added, "I pledge thee my unerring word, which may not be impugned, that death is better in reproachless Erin than life forever in Alba." Durrow, like Clonard, Derry, and the rest, was frequently ravaged by the Danish invaders, but its complete devastation was left for the fierce Norman invader, Hugh de Lacy. In 1186 he began the building of a castle for himself out of the stones of the dismantled monastery, but the axe of an Irish labouring man cut him short in his unholy work. The church and the school are long since gone; not a stone of the original building may now be found. There are, however, still to be seen at Durrow a churchyard, probably marking the ancient site, a Celtic cross, and a holy well, which will serve to keep the name and the fame of St. Columba fresh in the minds of the people forever.

ADAMNAN, *Life of Columba*, ed. REEVES (Dublin, 1857); also by FOWLER (London, 1905); *Life* in *The Book of Lismore;* HEALY, *Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars* (Dublin, 1890); GILBERT, *Facsimiles of Irish National MSS.;* WHITLEY STOKES in *Anecdota Oxoniensia* (Oxford, 1890).

JOHN HEALY.

Dutch Guiana. See GUIANA.

Duty.—The definition of the term *duty* given by lexicographers is: "something that is due"; "obligatory service"; "something that one is bound to perform or to avoid". In this sense we speak of a duty, duties; and, in general, the sum total of these duties is denoted by the abstract term in the singular. The word is also used to signify that unique factor of consciousness which is expressed in the foregoing definitions by "obligatory", "bound", "ought", and "moral obligation". Let us analyse this datum of consciousness. When, concerning a contemplated act, one forms the decision "I ought to do it", the words express an intellectual judgment. But unlike speculative judgments, this one is felt to be not merely declaratory. Nor is it merely preferential; it asserts itself as imperative and magisterial. It is accompanied by a feeling impelling one, sometimes effectively, sometimes ineffectively, to square his conduct with it. It presumes that there is a right way and a wrong way open, and that the right is better or more worthy than the wrong. All moral judgments of this kind are particular applications of a universal judgment which is postulated in each one of them: right is to be done; wrong is to be avoided. Another phenomenon of our moral consciousness is that we are aware from our consciousness that nature has constituted a hierarchical order among our feelings, appetites, and desires. We instinctively feel, for example, that the emotion of reverence is higher and nobler than the sense of humour; that it is more worthy of us as rational beings to find satisfaction in a noble drama than in watching a dog-fight; that the sentiment of benevolence is superior to that of selfishness. Furthermore we are conscious that, unless it has been weakened or atrophied by neglect, the sentiment attending moral judgments asserts itself as the highest of all; awakens in us the feeling of reverence; and demands that all other sentiments and desires, as motives of action, shall be reduced to subordination to the moral judgment. When action is conformed to this demand, there arises a feeling of self-approbation, while an opposite course is followed by a feeling of self-reproach. Starting from this analysis we may expose the theory of duty according to Catholic ethics.

DUTY IN CATHOLIC ETHICS.—The path of activity proper and congenial to every being is fixed and dictated by the nature which the being possesses. The cosmic order which pervades all the non-human universe is predetermined in the natures of the innumerable variety of things which make up the universe. For man, too, the course of action proper to him is indicated by the constitution of his nature. A great part of his activity is, like the entire movements of the non-human world, under the iron grip of determinism; there are large classes of vital functions, over which he has no volitional control; and his body is subject to the physical laws of matter. But, unlike all the lower world, he is himself the master of his action over a wide range of life which we know as conduct. He is free to choose between two opposite courses; he can elect, in circumstances innumerable, to do or not to do; to do this action, or to do that other which is incompatible with it. Does, then, his nature furnish no index for conduct? Is every form of conduct equally congenial and equally indifferent to human nature? By no means. His nature indicates the line of action which is proper, and the line which is abhorrent to it. This demand of nature is delivered partly in that hierarchical order which exists in our feelings and desires as motives of action; partly through the reflective reason which decides what form of action is consonant with the dignity of a rational being; comprehensively, and with immediate practical application to action, in those moral judgments involving the "ought". This function of reason, aided thus by good will and practical experience, we call conscience (q. v.).

We have now reached the first strand of the bond which we know as moral obligation, or duty. Duty is a debt owed to the rational nature of which the spokesman and representative is conscience, which imperatively calls for the satisfaction of the claim. But is this the be-all and the end-all of duty? The idea of duty, of indebtedness, involves another self or person to whom the debt is due. Conscience is not another self, it is an element of one's own personality. How can one be said, except through a figure of speech, to be indebted to oneself? Here we must take into consideration another characteristic of conscience. It is that conscience in a dim, undefinable, but very real way, seems to set itself over against the rest of our personality. Its intimations awake, as no other exercise of our reason does, feelings of awe, reverence, love, fear, shame, such as are called forth in us by other persons, and by persons only. The universality of this experience is testified to by the expressions men commonly employ when speaking of conscience; they call it a voice, a judge; they say that they must answer to conscience for their conduct. Their attitude towards it is as to something not completely identical with themselves; its whole genesis is not to be accounted for by describing it as one function of life. It is the effect of education and training, some say. Certainly education and training may do a great deal to develop this impression that in conscience there is another self implicated beyond ourselves. But the quickness with which the child responds to its instructor or educator on this point proves that he feels within himself something which confirms his teacher's lesson. Ethical philosophers, and conspicuously among them Newman, have argued that to him who listens reverently and obediently to the dictates of conscience, they inevitably reveal themselves as emanating, originally, from "a Supreme Governor, a Judge, holy, just, powerful, all-seeing, retributive". If, however, we accept Newman's view as universally true, we cannot easily admit that, as is generally asserted and believed, many men obey conscience and love righteousness, who nevertheless, do not believe in a personal, moral ruler of the universe. Why may not the most uncompromising theist admit that the moral guide which the Creator has implanted in our nature is powerful enough successfully to discharge its function, at least in occasional cases, without fully unfolding its implications? One of the leading Unitarian moralists has eloquently expressed this opinion. "The profound sense of the authority and even sacredness of the moral law is often conspicuous among men whose

thoughts apparently never turn to superhuman things, but who are penetrated by a secret worship of honour, truth and right. Were this noble state of mind brought out of its impulsive state and made to unfold its implicit contents, it would indeed reveal a source higher than human nature for the august authority of righteousness. But it is undeniable that that authority may be felt where it is not seen—felt as if it were the mandate of a Perfect Will, while yet there is no overt recognition of such a Will: i. e., conscience may act as human, before it is discovered to be divine. To the agent himself its whole history may seem to lie in his own personality and his visible social relations; and it shall nevertheless serve as his oracle, though it be hid from him Who it is that utters it." (Martineau, A Study of Religion, Introduc., p. 21.) Nevertheless it must be admitted that such persons are comparatively few; and they, too, testify to the implication of another self in the intimations of consciousness; for they, as Ladd says, "personify the conception of the sum-total of ethical obligations, they are fain to spell the words with capitals and swear allegiance to this purely abstract conception. They hypostatize and deify an abstraction as though it were itself existent and divine." (Ladd, Philosophy of Conduct, p. 385.)

The doctrine that conscience is autonomous, independent, sovereign, a law-giver deriving its authority from no higher source, will neither, logically speaking, satisfy the idea of duty, nor sufficiently safeguard morality. One cannot, after all, owe a debt to himself; he cannot lay a command on himself. If moral judgments can claim no higher origin than one's own reason, then under close, severe inspection they must be considered as merely preferential. The portentous magisterial tone in which conscience speaks is a mere delusion; it can show no warrant or title to the authority which it pretends to exercise. When, under stress of temptation, a man who believes in no higher legislator than conscience, finds arising in his mind the inevitable question, Why am I bound to obey my conscience when my desires run in another direction? he is perilously tempted to adjust his moral code to his inclinations; and the device of spelling duty with a capital will prove but a slender support to it against the attack of passion.

Reason solves the problem of duty, and vindicates the sanctity of the law of righteousness by tracing them to their source in God. As the cosmic order is a product and expression of the Divine Will, so, likewise, is the moral law which is expressed in the rational nature. God wills that we shape our free action or conduct to that norm. Reason recognizing our dependence on the Creator, and acknowledging His ineffable majesty, power, goodness, and sanctity, teaches us that we owe Him love, reverence, obedience, service, and, consequently, we owe it to Him to observe that law which He has implanted within us as the ideal of conduct. This is our first and all-comprehensive duty in which all other duties have their root. In the light of this truth conscience explains itself, and is transfigured. It is the accredited representative of the Eternal; He is the original Imponent of moral obligation; and disobedience to conscience is disobedience to Him. Infraction of the moral law is not merely a violence done to our rational nature; it is also an offence to God, and this aspect of its malice is designated by calling it sin. The sanctions of conscience, self-approbation, and self-reproach, are reinforced by the supreme sanction, which, if one may use the expression, acts automatically. It consists in this, that by obedience to the law we reach our perfection, and compass our supreme good; while, on the other hand, the transgressor condemns himself to miss that good in the attainment of which alone lies the happiness that is incorruptible. To obviate a possible misapprehension it may be remarked here that the distinction between right and wrong hangs not upon any arbitrary decree of the Divine Will. Right is right and wrong is wrong because the prototype of the created order, of which the moral law forms a part, is the Divine Nature itself, the ultimate ground of all truth intellectual and moral.

Erroneous Ethics.—We have already touched upon the main weakness of the Kantian theory, which is to treat conscience as autonomous. Another mistake of Kant is that in his system duty and right are made coterminous. A moment's reflection is sufficient to perceive that this is an error. There are many conceivable good actions which one can do, and which it would be highly praiseworthy to perform, yet which no reasonable person, however rigorous his ideal of conduct might be, would say one is bound to perform. Duty and right are two concentric circles. The inner one, duty, embraces all that is to be observed under penalty of failing to live rationally. The outer contains the inner, but, stretching far beyond, permits an indefinite extension to the paths of virtue that lead to consummate righteousness and sanctity. Every philosophic system which embraces as one of its tenets the doctrine of determinism thereby commits itself to the denial of the existence of moral obligation. Duty implies that the subject of it possesses the power to observe the law, or to disobey, and the power to choose between these alternatives. What reproach can a determinist mentor logically address to one who has committed a wrong action? "You ought not to have done so"? The culprit can reply: "But you have taught me that free will is a delusion; that no one can act otherwise than he does. So, under the circumstances in which I found myself, it was impossible for me to refrain from the action which you condemn. What, then, can you mean by saying that I ought not to have acted as I did? You reproach me; as well reproach a tiger for having eaten his man or a volcano for having ruined a village."

With regard to the existence of duty every form of pantheism, or monism, logically finds itself in the camp of determinism. When man is looked upon as one with the Infinite, his actions are not really his own, but belong properly to the Universal Being. The part assigned to him, in his activities, is similar to that played by a carbon burner in relation to the electric current generated by a dynamo. The Divine power passing through him clothes itself with only a seeming individuality, while the whole course of action, the direction which it takes, and the results in which it culminates, belong to the Supreme Being. If this were true, then lying, debauchery, theft, murder were equally as worthy as truthfulness, chastity, honesty, benevolence; for all would be equally manifestations of the one universal Divinity. Then a classification of conduct into two opposite categories might still be made from the standpoint of results; but the idea of moral worth, which is the very core of the moral life and the first postulate of duty, would have vanished. Hedonism of every shade—epicurean, utilitarian, egoistic, altruistic, evolutionary—which builds on one or another form of the "greatest happiness" principle and makes pleasure and pain the discriminating norm of right and wrong, is unable to vindicate any authority for duty, or even to acknowledge the existence of moral obligation. No combination of impulses, if they are estimated from the merely biological or purely empirical standpoint, can, by any juggling of words, be converted into a moral hierarchy. The hedonist is doomed to find all his endeavour to establish the basis of the moral order terminate in "is", but never in "ought", in a fact, but never in an ideal. Lecky has neatly summed up the hedonist solution of the problem of duty: "All that is meant by saying we ought to do an action is that if we do not do it we shall suffer."

Pleasure, say the epicurean and the egoist, is the only motive of action; and actions are good or bad

accordingly as they produce a surplus of pleasure over pain, or contribute to or diminish welfare. Then, we ask, must I always pursue what seems to me the most pleasurable or the most remunerative? If the answer is yes, we are again landed in determinism. If the reply is that I can choose, but that I ought to choose what produces the most happiness, then I ask, why ought I to choose the course which produces most happiness or pleasure if I prefer to do otherwise? To this question the epicurean and the egoist have no answer. Besides, the most pleasurable conduct may be one that all reasonable men condemn as wrong, because it is injurious to some one else. Here the egoist is compelled to hand the difficulty over to the altruist. The latter endeavours to dispose of it by pointing out that the object of good conduct is not merely the agent's own happiness, but that of everybody concerned. But again, why am I bound to take into account the welfare of others? and the altruist is silent. The evolutionist of the Spencerian type intervenes with a ponderous theory that in gauging the measure in which actions produce welfare or diminish it, not merely the immediate, but also and more especially, the remote results must be considered. He then proceeds to show that, as an hereditary consequence of our ancestors' experience that remote results are more important than immediate, we have come to fancy that remote results have a certain authoritativeness. Also, from unpleasant experiences of our ancestors, we inherit a tendency, when thinking of injurious actions, to think too of the external penalties which were attached to such actions. These two elements, blending into one, give rise, we are told, to the feeling of moral obligation. So the common conviction that moral obligation has really any binding authority is a mere delusion. Spencer is honest enough to draw the inevitable corollary of this doctrine which is that our sense of duty and moral obligation is transitory and destined to disappear. Ethical writers of the "independent morality" schools have devised a beautifully simple way of escaping from the embarrassment of accounting for the validity of moral obligation. They ignore the subject altogether and refer the disappointed inquirer to the metaphysician. Ethics, they blandly declare, is a descriptive, not a normative science; hence that imposing array of works professing to treat scientifically of morals, yet calmly ignoring the pivotal factor of the moral life.

Historic Development of the Idea of Duty.—To trace the development of the concept of duty would be to review the history of the human race. Even in the lowest races there is to be found some moral code, however crude and erroneous. Another universal fact is that the race has, everywhere and always, placed morals under a religious, or quasi-religious, sanction. The savage, in a measure corresponding to his crude moral and intellectual development, witnesses to this universal impulse by observing innumerable customs because he believes them to have some sanction higher than that of his fellow tribesmen or their chief. The great nations of antiquity, Chinese, Chaldean, Babylonian, Egyptian, saw in their deities the source or sanction of their moral codes—at least until the religious and the moral ideal became simultaneously corrupted. In Greece and Rome, likewise, religion and morals were intimately associated, until religion proved false to its trust. The same phenomenon is found in the Aryan race of India and Persia, while the Semitic peoples, especially the Jews, always continued to look to religion for the reason of their moral codes. When classic paganism had introduced among the gods the vices of men, the ancient tradition continued to be vindicated by the poets, and by some of the philosophers. The magnificent testimonies of the Greek tragic poets, of Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero to the superhuman origin of the moral law and duty need not be quoted here. But when religious tradition lost its force and philosophy became the guardian of morality, a conflict of rival schools, none of which possessed sufficient authority to make its tenets prevail with the mass of the people, was the inevitable result; and as religious faith declined, the tendency to find a non-religious basis for duty became more pronounced. The consequence was that the idea of duty faded; and systems arose, which, like our present day "independent morality", had no place for moral obligation.

The unity of the moral and religious ideal was restored and rendered perfect by Christianity. The Gospel vindicated the Divine origin of duty, and declared that its fulfilment constituted the very essence of religion. This idea has been the chief motor force to raise the Western world out of the moral chaos into which decaying paganism had dragged it. The doctrine that every man is an immortal being created by God to be united with Himself in an endless existence, provided that he observe the law of righteousness, in which God's will is expressed, sets forth the dignity of man and the sacredness of duty in their full nobility. The wickedness of moral delinquency reveals itself in this, that it is a sin against the Most High—an idea scarcely known to antiquity outside the Hebrew people. The Christian religion brought out more clearly and taught with the authority of God, the code of the natural law, much of which unaided reason developed only in hesitating accents and without the authority necessary to impose it effectively as obligatory on all. The Christian was taught that the fulfilment of duty is the one supreme concern of life to which all other interests must be made to bow, and that its fulfilment is enforced by the most tremendous sanctions conceivable. The Gospel gave a satisfactory solution to the anomaly which had perplexed philosophers and misled them to erroneous doctrines concerning the meaning of the moral life. How can virtue be man's perfection, good, and end, when the fulfilment of duty means in many cases, the frustration of many natural desires and wants? The history of duty, replies the Christian, lies not all within the confines of earthly life; its ultimate goal is beyond the grave. The Christian doctrine of the Fatherhood of God and the sonship of man leads to a clearer perception of the chief duties and of their importance. Human life is seen to be a sacred, inviolable thing in ourselves and in others; woman is the equal, not the slave of man; the family is ordained of God, and its corner-stone is monogamous marriage. The State, too, is placed on a firmer basis, since Christian doctrine teaches that it draws the warrant of its existence not from force, or a mere consensus of human wills, but from God. Finally, the Christian law of love correlates the outer circle of righteousness with the inner one of strict duty. Love of God becomes the adequate motive for striving after the highest personal sanctity; love of our neighbour for the widest exercise of benevolence far beyond the limits of strict duty. In the person of the Master, Christianity offers to us the flawless Exemplar of the moral ideal, the perfect conformity of will and action to the Divine Will. His example has proved potent enough to inspire with heroic loyalty to duty "the millions who, countless and nameless, the stern hard path have trod". The moral standards of our civilization have been developed and maintained by the efficiency of the Christian idea of duty. Contemporary conditions furnish unmistakable indications that these standards become debased and discredited when they are torn from the ground whence they sprang.

Duties.—The obligation of living according to our rational nature is the parent of all particular duties. These are generally divided into three groups—(1) duties to God, (2) duties towards ourselves, and (3) duties to others.—(1) To God, the Supreme Master of the universe, our Creator, the All Holy, All Good, we owe honour, service, obedience, and love. These

duties are comprehended under the general term religion. Since He is Truth itself, we owe it to Him to believe whatever He has revealed to us in a supernatural manner; to worship Him in the way which, in revelation, He has taught us is most pleasing to Him; and to obey the authority which He has constituted (see CHURCH). Reverence due to Him forbids all profanity and blasphemy of Him or whatever is sacred to Him. Lying is an offence against His Divine nature, which is Truth itself. These generic duties cover all the specific duties that we owe to God, and embrace, besides, those duties which devolve upon us as members of the Catholic Church.—(2) Our duties towards ourselves may all be included under one principle: life, the goods of person, mental and physical, have been given to us in trust, with the obligation of using them to obtain our supreme good and end. Hence we may not destroy them, or abuse them as if we were independent master of them. Therefore suicide, abuse of our faculties, mental or physical, exposing our life or health to danger without a reasonable motive, are prohibited; as also are all actions incompatible with the reverence that we owe to our moral nature. We are bound to strive for the development of our intellect and for temporal goods as far as these are necessary to the fulfilment of the moral law. As duty is a debt to some one other than ourselves, we cannot, strictly speaking, use the term duties *to* ourselves. They are due to God; they regard ourselves.—(3) All our duties towards others are implicitly contained in the Christian precept: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself". God wills the welfare of all men; hence the obligation of making His will the rule of mine binds me to will their welfare, and to order my conduct towards them with a due respect to the rational nature which they possess, and to the obligations which that nature imposes on them. The application of this principle gives birth to duties towards the minds and wills of others (prohibition of scandal and lying); to the lives of others (prohibition of murder, etc.); to their good reputation (prohibition of insult, detraction, or defamation of character).

As material goods are necessary to us in order to live according to the rational law, evidently God in imposing moral obligation wills also that we have at our disposal the means necessary to fulfil our duty. Hence arises that moral control over things which is called a right. The needs of a moral life require that some things should be permanently under our control; hence the rights of ownership. Now a right in one person is nugatory unless others are bound to respect it. So to every right there is a corresponding duty.

Thus far we have sketched the line of duty incumbent on each one towards others as individuals. Besides these there are social duties. The primary society, the family, which is the unit of civil society, has its foundation in our nature; and the relations which constitute it give rise to two groups of rights and correlative duties—conjugal and parental. Besides the family, a wider, broader, association of man with his fellows is needed, generally speaking, in order that he may develop his life with all its needs and potencies, in accordance with the dictates of reason. God has intended man to live in civil society, and man becomes the subject of duties and rights with regard to the society of which he is a member. The society, too, acquires a moral unity or personality which is also the subject of rights and duties. This system of social rights and duties has for its pivot the right possessed by the society to impose laws which constitute a binding obligation. This right, called authority, is derived from the natural law, ultimately from God. For, since He wills civil society as a means for the due development of human nature, He wills that authority without which it cannot exist. As the lower animals cannot be the subject of rights we do not owe them any duties; but we owe duties to God in their regard (see ETHICS; LAW: OBLIGATION).

ST. THOMAS, I, Q. xxii, a. 2, Q. lxxix, a. 2; II–II, Q. xviii, a. 5, Q. lxxi, a. 2; SUAREZ, *De legibus*, II; *De ultimo fine*, Tr. i, ch. iii; D'HULST, *Conférences de Notre-Dame* (1891), s. v. *Les Fondements de la Morale;* FARGES, *La Liberté et Le Devoir* (Paris, 1902); LECKY, *History of European Morals*, i; JOSEPH RICKABY, *Aquinas Ethicus*, QQ. xciii, xciv; IDEM, *Moral Philosophy*, I, vi; DE BATES, *Les Bases de la Morale* (Ghent, 1892); LADD, *Philosophy of Conduct* (New York, 1902), xv; NEWMAN, *A Grammar of Assent*, v; MARTINEAU, *A Study of Religion* (New York, 1888), Introduction; FOX, *Religion and Morality* (New York, 1899).

JAMES J. FOX.

Duvergier de Hauranne (or DU VERGER), JEAN (also called SAINT-CYRAN from an abbey he held *in commendam*), one of the authors of Jansenism, b. at Bayonne, France, 1581; d. in Paris, 1643. After studying the humanities in his native place, and philosophy at the Sorbonne, he went to Louvain, not to the university but to the Jesuit college, where he graduated, 1604, with a brilliant thesis admired by Justus Lipsius. His acquaintance with the future theologian of the Jansenist sect, Cornelius Jansen (Jansenius), a young disciple of the Baianist Jacques Janson, probably began at Louvain. In 1605 the two were in Paris, attending together the lessons of the Gallican, Edmond Richer, and studying Christian antiquity with a view to restoring it to its place of honour, usurped, as they claimed, by Scholasticism. These studies of patristic and especially Augustinian literature were pursued with incredible energy for wellnigh twelve years, at Paris, till 1611, and then at Campiprat (Cantipré), the home of Hauranne, under the protection of Bertrand d'Eschaux, Bishop of Bayonne, who made Duvergier canon of his cathedral, and Jansen principal of a newly-founded college. Owing, no doubt, to the translation of d'Eschaux from Bayonne to Tours, the two friends left Bayonne in 1617, Jansen returning to Louvain and Duvergier going to Poitiers where Bishop de la Rocheposay, a disciple of Scaliger and an enthusiastic humanist, received him as a friend, appointed him to a canonry and the priory of Bonneville, and later, 1620, resigned in his behalf the Abbey of Saint-Cyran-en-Brenne. The new commendatory prelate resided little in his abbey. In 1622 he returned definitively to Paris, the metropolis affording him better opportunities to further his plans. During the years 1617–1635 an assiduous correspondence was kept up between Duvergier and Jansen, of which there remain only "Lettres de Jansénius à Duverger de Hauranne", seized at the time of Saint-Cyran's incarceration. These letters, wherein conventional ciphers are frequently used, constantly mention the *affaire principale, projet, cabale*, that is, first and foremost, the composition of the "Augustinus" by Jansen, Saint-Cyran employing himself to enlist patrons for the so-called Augustinian system (see JANSENISM).

For greater security the two innovators occasionally met to discuss the progress of their joint work. One of these meetings probably gave rise to the much-debated *Projet de Bourg-Fontaine*. In his "Relation juridique de ce qui s'est passé à Poitiers touchant la nouvelle doctrine des Jansénistes" (Poitiers, 1654), Filleau stated on the authority of one of the conspirators then repentant, that six persons had secretly met in 1621 at the *chartreuse* of Bourg-Fontaine, near Paris, for the purpose of overthrowing Christianity and establishing deism in its stead. The names of the conspirators, only initialled by Filleau, were given in full by Bayle (Dict., s. v. "Arnauld"); that of Saint-Cyran heads the list. The Jansenists always protested against this story. Arnauld called it a "diabolical invention", and Pascal ridiculed it in his "Seizième lettre à un provincial". The Jesuit Father Sauvage's argument in his "Réalité du projet de Bourg-Fontaine démontrée par l'exécution"

(Paris, 1755) was refuted by D. Clémencet in "La vérité et l'innocence victorieuses de la calomnie ou huit lettres sur le projet de Bourg-Fontaine" (Paris, 1758). Although Clémencet's book was burned by order of the Parliament of Paris, still it never was answered. Guizot's remark that "the adepts of Jansenism passed insensibly from the tenets of Saint-Cyran and Montgeron to atheism and the worship of reason" (Civilisation en Europe, Lec. xii) may apply to some of the later Jansenists, but the charge of rationalism is obviously untenable when brought against the Jansenists of the first generation. Stripped of unsupported details and deductions, Filleau's narrative and Sauvage's arguments show, what is borne out by the letters of Jansenius and other documents of the time, a covert yet definite purpose, as early as 1621, to deeply modify the dogmas, moral practices, and constitution of the Church, St. Augustine being made responsible for such changes.

As noticed above, Duvergier's share was to win high influence in favour of the religious revolution. While at Poitiers he had met Richelieu, de Condren, and Arnauld d'Andilly. At Paris he sought out such men as Vincent de Paul, founder of the Congregation of the Mission; Olier, founder of Saint-Sulpice; Bérulle, superior of the French Oratory; Tarisse, superior of the Benedictines of Saint-Maur; Bourdoise, superior of Saint-Nicolas, and many more. It cannot be denied that these men were at first attracted by Saint-Cyran's affected asceticism, but when they understood his true aim they recoiled from him. The terse expression applied in the Roman Breviary to St. Vincent de Paul, *Sensit simul et exhorruit* (he shuddered on hearing), could be said of them all, with the exception of Bérulle and Arnauld d'Andilly. Bérulle never shared the errors of Duvergier and Jansen, but, being indebted to these two for the establishment of the French Oratory in the Netherlands, he failed to detect their real purpose and gave them a hold on his order which they never released. Owing to his Gallicanism and strong prejudices against the Jesuits, Arnauld d'Andilly fell an easy prey to Saint-Cyran's wiles and declamations, and even brought with him the whole Arnauld family, along with the Bernardine nuns of Port-Royal (q. v.). Adroitly and persistently Saint-Cyran pushed his way into this celebrated monastery, till, in 1636, he became its sole director. Not only were his innovations and rigorism eagerly accepted by the nuns, but Port-Royal became the centre of Jansenism, drawing a host of ecclesiastics, lawyers, writers, etc., all vying with one another to place themselves under the "spiritual domination" of the Abbé de Saint-Cyran. His incredible success and nefarious work are well described by M. Sépet (in Rev. des quest. hist., xlv, 534): "Taking advantage of the moral enthusiasm aroused by the religious awakening, an ardent and sombre sectarian, Saint-Cyran undertook to win souls over for the proud doctrine of absolute predestination to either salvation or damnation, also to an excessive rigorism to which the initiated easily accommodated themselves, while simple-hearted folk like Pascal risked life and reason in its practice."

Saint-Cyran was at the summit of his influence when an order of Richelieu sent him (1638) to the donjon of Vincennes. His incarceration has been variously explained both by friends and enemies. Richelieu gave the true reason when he said: "Saint-Cyran is more dangerous than six armies. . . . If Luther and Calvin had been arrested when they began to dogmatize, much trouble would have been spared the nations." (See Marandé, "Inconvénients d'état procédant du Jansénisme", Paris, 1653.) Jansenist writers unduly insist on the rigour of Saint-Cyran's captivity. As a matter of fact, he was given liberty enough to receive his friends, to read the first printed copy of "Augustinus", to collaborate with Antoine Arnauld on the "Fréquente Communion", published in 1643, to write his "Théologie familière" and the voluminous "Lettres chrétiennes et spirituelles", and even to make new recruits. In 1643, after Richelieu's death, Saint-Cyran recovered his liberty and returned in triumph to Port-Royal. The triumph, however, was clouded by the announcement that the "Augustinus" had been condemned at Rome. When the author heard of the condemnation he angrily protested that "Rome was going too far and ought to be taught a lesson"; a stroke of apoplexy, however, carried him off before he could execute his threat. Pierre de Pons, parish priest of Saint-Jacques du Haut-Pas, in a note quoted by Rapin (Hist. du Jans., p. 305), testified that Saint-Cyran died while being anointed, but had asked for neither absolution nor Viaticum, notwithstanding a certificate to the contrary, delivered by Mulsey, when importuned and bribed by the Jansenists.

Saint-Cyran was a prolific writer. His manuscripts, seized at the time of his arrest, formed no less than thirty-two thick folios. Amid the numerous writings ascribed to him by the "Dictionnaire des livres Jansénistes" (Antwerp, 1755), it is difficult to distinguish his genuine works, for he generally wrote anonymously, or under a false name, or in collaboration with others. Apart from two frivolous pamphlets written by Duvergier in his youth, "Question royale" (Paris, 1609), an apology for suicide under certain circumstances, and "Apologie pour . . . de la Rocheposay" (Poitiers, 1615), a thesis intended to show that bishops have a right to use arms, his principal works are: (1) "Somme des fautes . . . du P. Garasse" (Paris, 1626), with several additional pamphlets in support of it; the book itself was a vile attack on the Jesuits on occasion of a somewhat incautious book written by one of them, the heroic Father Garasse; (2) "Petrus Aurelius de hierarchiâ ecclesiasticâ" (Paris, 1631), written in collaboration with Duvergier's nephew, Barcos, and others. This book purports to be a defence of Richard Smith, vicar Apostolic in England, against the alleged machinations of the English Jesuits; in fact it aims at winning over to the Jansenist error the Catholic hierarchy whose prerogatives it exaggerates to the detriment of the Roman See. The scientific portion of it is taken from the "De republicâ christianâ" (1617) of the apostate Marc' Antonio de Dominis; the rest consists mainly of abuse of the Jesuits. By a singular inconsistency, Saint-Cyran bases the episcopal power not so much on the Sacrament of Orders as on the interior spirit. The *Evêque intérieur*, remarks Sainte-Beuve, is simply the *Directeur*, a name and office much coveted by Saint-Cyran. The clergy of France, taken by surprise, paid the expenses of the book but later ordered Sainte-Marthe's eulogy of Duvergier expunged from the "Gallia Christiana". (3) "Chapelet secret du très Saint-Sacrement" (Paris, 1632), a series of Quietist remarks on the attributes of Christ. This booklet, having become a kind of storm-centre, was prudently repudiated by Saint-Cyran who nevertheless wrote several tracts in its defence. (4) "Théologie familière" (Paris, 1642), a series of theologico-devotional tracts, the Jansenists' catechism, teeming with errors on nearly every subject, condemned by the Holy Office, 23 April, 1654. (5) "Lettres chrétiennes et spirituelles" (Paris, 1645); another series (Paris, 1744). Bossuet calls them dry and overwrought (*spiritualité sèche et alambiquée*). With the "Théologie familière" they exhibit a fair specimen of Saint-Cyran's galimatias and obscure asceticism. Saint-Cyran's writings were collected in his "Œuvres" (Lyons, 1679).

Besides a mass of unreliable Jansenist memoirs, e. g. by LANCELOT (Utrecht, 1738), DU FOSSÉ (Utrecht, 1739), ARNAULD D'ANDILLY (Utrecht, 1751), etc., see *Lettres de C. Jansénius à J. Du Verger de Hauranne*, ed. GERBERON (Cologne, 1702); *Saint-Cyran* in *Diction. des Jansénistes*, ed. MIGNE (Paris, 1847); RAPIN, *Hist. du Jansénisme* (Paris, 1865); IDEM,

Mémoires (Paris, 1865); SAINTE-BEUVE, *Port-Royal* (Paris, 1871), corrected by FUZET, *Les Jansénistes et leur dernier historien Sainte-Beuve* (Paris, 1876); JUNGMANN, *De Jansenismo* in *Dissert. selectæ in hist. eccl.* (Bruges, 1886), VI, 217; DALGAIRNS, *Introduction to Devotion to the Sacred Heart* (London, 1853); KROLL, *Causes of the Jansenist Heresy* in *Am. Cath. Quart. Rev.*, 1885; MATHIEU, *Jansénius et Saint-Cyran* in *Pages d'histoire: Renaissance et Réforme* (Paris, 1905); MAYNARD, *Vie de Saint Vincent de Paul;* FAILLON, *Vie de M. Olier.* For a lengthy bibliography see BRUNETIÈRE, *Hist. de la litt. française* (Paris, 1899).

J. F. SOLLIER.

Duvernay, LUDGER, a French-Canadian journalist and patriot, b. at Verchères, Quebec, 22 Jan., 1799; d. 28 Nov., 1852. A printer by trade, he founded and edited successively at Three Rivers, Quebec, "La Gazette des Trois-Rivières" (1817), "Le Constitutionnel" (1823), and "L'Argus" (1826). In 1827, with A. N. Morin, he founded in Montreal "La Minerve", one of the prominent papers of French Canada. He was imprisoned (1832) for protesting with Dr. Daniel Tracey, editor of the "Vindicator", against the arbitrariness of the Legislative Council. A medal was presented him in acknowledgment of his devotedness to the public good. Duvernay's chief title to fame is the foundation of the Society of St. John the Baptist (1834). The choice of the Precursor for the patron saint of the French-Canadians accorded with a time-honoured tradition mentioned in the Jesuit "Relations" (1646) as contemporary with the beginning of New France and inherited from the mother country. The maple leaf, now accepted by Canadians of every origin, was chosen as the national emblem and the motto adopted by Duvernay was: "Notre langue, nos institutions et nos lois". Elected for Lachenaie in 1837, he was forced to leave the country for participating in the Canadian Rebellion, and he took up his residence at Burlington, Vermont, where he founded "Le Patriote Canadien" (1849). The union of the two Canadas having been voted by the British Parliament and the principle of representative government adopted, peace was restored and political exiles were allowed to return. Duvernay began again the publication of "La Minerve", in which he extolled the introduction of responsible government, and criticized the Act of Union destined, by its authors, to absorb Lower Canada.

La Minerve (Montreal, 3 Dec., 1852); *Le Jour. de Québec* (Dec., 1852); CHOUINARD, *Fête Nat. des Canad. fran.* (Quebec, 1881).

LIONEL LINDSAY.



ANTOON VAN DYCK
By himself, Uffizi Gallery, Florence

Dyck, ANTOON (ANTHONIS) VAN, usually known as SIR ANTHONY VAN DYCK, Flemish portrait-painter, b. at Antwerp, 22 March, 1599; d. in London, 9 December, 1641. This great painter was the seventh child of a family of twelve, being the son of Frans Van Dyck, merchant in silk, linen, and kindred materials, and of Maria, daughter of Dirk Cuypers and Catherina Conincx. While still a boy he was placed, on the advice of Jan Brueghel, as a pupil in the studio of Hendrick Van Balen, who had been a pupil of Rubens. The young artist's development as a painter was rapid, for it is recorded that at the age of fourteen he painted a portrait of an old man, and a lawsuit in 1660 revealed the fact that he had also produced when quite a youth a series of heads exceedingly well painted. A proof of his skill is the fact that in 1618, before he was twenty, he was admitted to the freedom of the guild of St. Luke in Antwerp, an unusual distinction for a youthful painter. The tradition that Van Dyck was apprenticed to Rubens or was ever his pupil must be dismissed. Investigations have proved that he was regarded as a master in his art when he was introduced to the studio of Rubens. Here Van Dyck made one of the group of young men who assisted the master in his decorative works, which it would have been quite impossible for him to complete by himself.

In 1620, at the request of the Countess of Arundel, Van Dyck appears to have come to England and to have received commissions from James I for which he was paid in February, 1621. After executing these orders he returned to Antwerp and then determined to visit Italy, leaving in October, 1621, and remaining abroad for five years. He spent some time at Genoa, moved on to Rome, and then visited Florence; from here he went to Bologna, and later by way of Mantua to Venice. After this he was at Milan and finally in 1623 in Rome. The records of this journey remain in the famous "Chatsworth Sketch Book". His life in Rome was unsatisfactory, for he made many enemies, and soon left the Eternal City and settled in Genoa, where he was exceedingly popular. His portraits of the great nobility of Genoa rank among the finest in the world and form a magnificent and unrivalled series. In 1624 he visited Palermo, painting the portrait of Emmanuel of Savoy, Viceroy of Sicily, and some church pictures, but returned to Genoa and in 1626 left for Antwerp, probably on account of some complications with regard to the division of his father's estate. He visited Aachen and is believed to have gone on to Paris, while tradition states that he made a second visit to England. However, nothing definite is known of his movements until 1630 when he was at The Hague, and shortly afterwards back in his native town. Another tradition, which speaks of the rivalry between Rubens and Van Dyck, has to be discredited. Mr. Lionel Cust and others have shown that the two painters were not only on terms of equality with regard to their art, but that a generous and cordial friendship existed between them.

In 1632 Van Dyck went again to England and was graciously received by Charles I. He appears to have passed into the king's service immediately, as a warrant was issued on 21 May, 1632, for the payment of

an allowance to him, and a residence given him in Blackfriars. He had also a summer residence in the palace of Eltham, was knighted on 5 July, presented with a chain and medal of great value, and granted a pension of £200 a year to be paid quarterly. From the moment of his arrival commenced his great success as a portrait-painter in England. The king and queen sat to him frequently, and he was overwhelmed with commissions. In 1634–5 he received a pressing invitation to visit the court at Brussels and accepted it, but in 1635 he was back at Antwerp and in the same year returned to England, taking again his position as portrait-painter to Charles I and to Henrietta Maria. Of the king he painted no less than thirty-six portraits and about twenty-five of Queen Henrietta Maria, but perhaps the most beautiful works executed for the royal family were those in which he depicted the children of the royal pair. To this period belong the wonderful portraits of members of the English aristocracy to be found in so many of the great English houses. He prepared a scheme for decorating the walls of the banqueting-house at Whitehall, the sketches for which still exist, but the royal exchequer could not afford the work. In 1640 he decided to return to Antwerp. Rubens had died and Van Dyck was acknowledged the head of the Flemish School and entertained with great magnificence. He was disposed to settle permanently at Antwerp, but first went to Paris, desiring to obtain the commission to decorate the gallery of the Louvre. The work was, however, given to French artists and Van Dyck returned to London for a while, later on in the year, however, visiting Antwerp and Paris, and then coming back to London. When he arrived his health was in a critical condition, and despite the attentions of the royal physician he died at his house in Blackfriars eight days after his wife had given birth to a daughter. He was buried in St. Paul's Cathedral, and a monument was erected to his memory by order of the king, but the grave and monument perished with the cathedral in the great fire of 1666.

In portraiture Van Dyck is the greatest artist of Europe after Titian, and in works of decorative splendour perhaps only rivalled by Rubens. He was a man of luxurious and somewhat indolent habits, ambitious, proud, sensitive, and quick to take offence. In his portraits the elegance of the composition, the delicate expression of the heads, the truth and purity of his colouring, and the strong lifelike quality of expression give him the very highest position, and he is one of the few painters whom all critics have placed in the front rank. In a consideration of his art the brilliant and vigorous etchings must not be overlooked.

CUST, *Anthony Van Dyck* (London, 1900); IDEM, *The Chatsworth Sketch-Book* (London, 1902); IDEM, *Van Dyck* (London, 1903); DUPLESSIS, *Eaux-fortes de Van Dyck* (Paris, 1874); MICHIELS, *Van Dyck et ses élèves* (Paris, 1881); GUIFFREY, *Antoine Van Dyck* (Paris, 1882); LEMCKE, *Anton Van Dyck* (Leipzig, 1875); MUTHER, *Modern Painting* (London, 1905); MÜNTZ, *Histoire de la peinture* (Paris, 1881).

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Dying, PRAYERS FOR THE. See DEATH.

Dymoke, ROBERT, Confessor of the Faith, date of birth uncertain; d. at Lincoln, England, 11 Sept., 1580. He was the son of Sir Edward Dymoke (d. 1566) of Scrivelsby, Lincolnshire, hereditary King's Champion. In 1579 Dymoke received the martyr-priest, Blessed Richard Kirkman, at Scrivelsby, and maintained him as schoolmaster to his sons. He was himself, at the time, an occasional conformist to the State-religion but was reconciled in 1580 either by Kirkman or by Blessed Edmund Campion. In July, 1580, Dymoke and his wife, the Lady Bridget, eldest daughter and coheiress of Edward Clinton, Earl of Lincoln, were indicted for hearing Mass and for recusancy. Though he was quite helpless owing to paralysis, Dymoke was ordered by Bishop Cooper of Lincoln to be carried off to gaol, where he died, faithful to the end. He was much tormented in his last hours by the Protestant ministers who endeavoured to pervert him, and who, even when the dying man was half-unconscious, refused to leave him in peace. He left several children, his eldest son, Edward, being more than twenty-one years of age at the time of his father's death.

GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.* (London, 1885), II; CAMM, *Lives of the English Martyrs* (London, 1905), II, 579–583; LEE in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (London, 1903), XVI.

BEDE CAMM.

Dympna (DIMPNA), SAINT, virgin and martyr. The earliest historical account of the veneration of St. Dympna dates from the middle of the thirteenth century. Under Bishop Guy I of Cambrai (1238–47), Pierre, a canon of the church of Saint-Aubert at Cambrai, wrote a "Vita" of the saint, from which we learn that she had been venerated for many years in a church at Gheel (province of Antwerp, Belgium), which was dedicated to her. The author expressly states that he has drawn his biography from oral tradition. According to the narrative Dympna, the daughter of a pagan king of Ireland, became a Christian and was secretly baptized. After the death of her mother, who was of extraordinary beauty, her father desired to marry his own daughter, who was just as beautiful, but she fled with the priest Gerebernus and landed at Antwerp. Thence they went to the village of Gheel, where there was a chapel of St. Martin, beside which they took up their abode. The messengers of her father, however, discovered their whereabouts; the father betook himself thither and renewed his offer. Seeing that all was in vain, he commanded his servants to slay the priest, while he himself struck off the head of his daughter. The corpses were put in sarcophagi and entombed in a cave, where they were found later. The body of St. Dympna was buried in the church of Gheel, and the bones of St. Gerebernus were transferred to Xanten. This narrative is without any historical foundation, being merely a variation of the story of the king who wanted to marry his own daughter, a motif which appears frequently in popular legends. Hence we can conclude nothing from it as to the history of St. Dympna and the time in which she lived. That she is identical with St. Damhnat of Ireland cannot be proved. There are at Gheel fragments of two simple ancient sarcophagi in which tradition says the bodies of Dympna and Gerebernus were found. There is also a quadrangular brick, said to have been found in one of the sarcophagi, bearing two lines of letters read as DYMPNA. The discovery of this sarcophagus with the corpse and the brick was perhaps the origin of the veneration. In Christian art St. Dympna is depicted with a sword in her hand and a fettered devil at her feet. Her feast is celebrated 15 May, under which date she is also found in the Roman martyrology.

From time immemorial, the saint was invoked as patroness against insanity. The Bollandists have published numerous accounts of miraculous cures, especially between 1604 and 1668. As a result, there has long been a colony for lunatics at Gheel; even now there are sometimes as many as fifteen hundred, whose relatives invoke St. Dympna for their cure. The insane are treated in a peculiar manner; it is only in the beginning that they are placed in an institution for observation; later they are given shelter in the homes of the inhabitants, take part in their agricultural labours, and are treated very kindly. They are watched without being conscious of it. The treatment produces good results. The old church of St. Dympna in Gheel was destroyed by fire in 1489. The new church was consecrated in 1532 and is still standing. Every year on the feast of the saint and on the Tuesday after Pentecost numerous pilgrims visit her shrine. In Gheel there is also a fraternity under her name. For an interesting account of Gheel, see Mrs. Byrne, "The City of the Simple" (London, 1869).

Acta SS., May, III, 477–97; OLDEN in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; GAMMACK in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v. *Dimpna;* VAN CRAEWINCKEL, *Een lelie onder de doornen, de h. maghet Dympna* (Antwerp, 1652); BOGAERTS, *Dympne d'Irlande; légende du VII^e siècle* (Antwerp, 1840); KUYL, *Legende der martelaaren van Gheel, ss. Dymphna en Gerebernus* (Antwerp, 1860); IDEM, *Gheel vermmeerderd door den eerdienst der hl. Dymphna* (Antwerp, 1863); HEUCKENKAMP, *Die hl. Dimphna* (Halle, Saxony, 1887); JANSSENS, *Ste Dimphne, patronne de Gheel* (Lierre, 1894); VAN DER ESSEN, *Etude critique et littéraire sur les Vitæ des saints mérovingiens de l'ancienne Belgique* (Louvain, 1907), 313–20.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Dynamism, a general name for a group of philosophical views concerning the nature of matter. However different they may be in other respects, all these views agree in making matter consist essentially of simple and indivisible units, substances, or forces. Dynamism is sometimes used to denote systems that admit not only matter and extension, but also determinations, tendencies, and forces intrinsic and essential to matter. More properly, however, it means exclusive systems that do away with the dualism of matter and force by reducing the former to the latter. Here we shall limit ourselves to this strict form of dynamism, first, indicating its chief advocates and its characteristic presentations, secondly, comparing these in order to see the points of agreement and of difference.

I. We have but a vague and incomplete knowledge of the doctrines held by the Pythagorean School, but it seems that they may rightly be considered as at least the forerunners of modern dynamism. From Aristotle's "Metaphysics" we gather that the Pythagoreans, imbued with a mathematical spirit and accustomed to mathematical methods, came to look upon the principles (ἀρχαί) of numbers as the principles of things themselves, to assert that the elements (στοιχεῖα) of numbers were also the elements of reality, and that the whole heaven was a harmony and a number. Various geometrical figures are but different combinations of numbers, the unit being a point; from points are formed lines, from lines, surfaces, and from surfaces, solids; and geometrical figures are the very substance of things. Hence, finally, "physical bodies are composed of numbers". Among the Arabian philosophers, the Mutacallimûn were atomists. The atom is the only substance, and all atoms are perfectly identical in nature. The identity, however, is not of a positive, but of a merely negative character, for these primitive elements of matter are simple substances and nothing else. They have no determinations whatever, no weight, no shape, no quantity, no extension. The atom is an indivisible and simple substantial point, the necessary subject of all accidents or determinations, and incapable of existing without them.

Leibniz's doctrine is a reaction against both the material mechanicism of Descartes and the substantial monism of Spinoza. The essence of matter cannot be extension. The laws of mechanics cannot themselves be understood without using the notion of force. Moreover, "a substance is a being capable of action", and "what does not act does not deserve the name of substance". Hence substance implies unity and individuality, and the real substance cannot be the "material" atom (*atome de matière*). Having extension, such an atom is composed of parts and divisible without limit; it has no real unity. The elements which compose material substances are "formal" or "substantial" atoms (*atomes de substance*), simple and without parts. They are called monads. Bodies are "multitudes" and "aggregates", and the simple substances are units and elements. As they have no parts, monads have "neither extension, nor shape, nor possible divisibility. They are the true atoms of nature, and, in a word, the elements of things." Since it is impossible for two beings to be perfectly alike, every monad is different from every other. Monads have no external, but only an internal, activity, which is twofold: perception and appetition. All monads are, in various degrees, representations of the whole universe, but this representation or perception becomes clearly conscious (apperception), and is accompanied with attention, memory, and reflection, only in higher monads. Appetition is the activity of the internal principle by which the passage from one perception to another is effected. The relative perfection of the monads depends on the degree of clearness of their perceptions. Some unite to form an organism whose centre of unity is a higher monad or soul. This system is completed by the supposition of a pre-established harmony. The order and harmony of the world are the result not of an interaction between monads, but of a pre-arranged plan of the Creator who has endowed them with their power of internal evolution. In the main, Christian Wolff reproduced and systematized Leibniz's theory.

According to Boscovich (q. v.) "the first elements of matter are points absolutely indivisible and without any extension. They are spread throughout an immense vacuum in such a way as to be always at some distance from one another. The distance may increase or decrease indefinitely, but can never disappear completely without a compenetration of the points themselves, for contact between them is impossible" (Theoria Philosophiæ Naturalis, no. 7). Hence there can be no continuous extension. The elements are all homogeneous, and, by their numbers, distances, arrangements, activities, and relations produce the diversity of material substances. They have no perception and no appetition. According to their distances, they have a determination to diminish or to increase the interval that separates them. This very determination Boscovich calls force, attractive in the former case, repulsive in the latter. The law of these forces is the following: if the distance between them is infinitesimal, they are repulsive, and the more so in proportion as the distance is smaller; if the distance, although remaining always very small, is increased a little, the repulsive force becomes first less intense, then null, and at a still larger distance is changed into an attractive force. This attraction again, with the increase of distance, goes on augmenting, then diminishing, till it becomes again null, and changes into a repulsion, which, in turn, by the same gradual process, becomes attraction. Such changes may be repeated several times, but only while the distance, though increasing, remains infinitesimal. At greater distances the force is exclusively attractive. To explain the interaction of the points, Boscovich had to admit an *actio in distans;* yet he also admits the possibility of a Divinely pre-established harmony and even of occasionalism.

In his pre-critical period, Kant admitted physical monads, that is, simple and indivisible substances. His later views may be summed up as follows: matter is divisible without limit, but not actually divided into separate atoms. Matter is what fills up a space, and to fill up a space is to defend it against any mobile which should try to penetrate it. Hence matter is essentially resistance and force. It is not impenetrable, in the absolute or mathematical sense of the Cartesians, but in a relative sense and in varying degrees; it may be compressed and condensed. There are two distinct forces, repulsion and attraction. The former is the primary constituent of matter, since by it other things are excluded from the space it occupies. It produces extension, and, without it, matter would be reduced to a geometrical point. However, attraction is also essential to the occupancy of an assignable space, for otherwise matter would be scattered without limit. Repulsion can act only by contact; attraction may also act at a distance. From these two forces Kant derives all the properties of matter. It must be remembered that this theory is an explanation of the phenomenon only, the noumenon being inaccessible to our mind. This idealistic feature was carried still further by the German Transcendentalists; among them Schelling proposes a view the main lines of which agree with that of Kant. In more recent times,

CHARLES I IN ARMOUR
THE HERMITAGE, ST. PETERSBURG

VAN DYCK

THREE CHILDREN OF CHARLES I
PINACOTECA, TURIN

HENRIETTA MARIA, WIFE OF CHARLES I
THE HERMITAGE, ST. PETERSBURG

Herbart, Lotze, von Hartmann, Renouvier, to mention only a few names among many, also hold dynamic theories modified by their special points of view and philosophical systems. To these may be added some Catholic philosophers, e. g. the Sulpician Branchereau, and the Jesuits Carbonnelle and Palmieri. Among scientists, Ampère, Cauchy, Faraday, and others are also in favour of dynamism. Faraday's theory is substantially the same as that of Boscovich. That theory, namely, that "atoms . . . are mere centres of forces or powers, not particles of matter in which the powers themselves reside", has "a great advantage over the more usual notion". "A mind just entering on the subject may consider it difficult to think of the powers of matter independent of a separate something to be called *the matter*, but it is certainly far more difficult, and indeed impossible, to think of or imagine that *matter* independent of the powers. Now the powers we know and recognize in every phenomenon of the creation, the abstract matter in none; why, then, assume the existence of that of which we are ignorant, which we cannot conceive, and for which there is no philosophical necessity?" (A Speculation touching Electric Conduction and the Nature of Matter, pp. 290, 291).

To-day there is a tendency to substitute the concept of energy for that of force. Hence Professor Ostwald's "energetic theory". Matter is to be looked upon as a complex of energies arranged together in space. The concept of matter resolves itself into that of energy, since the manifestations of energy are all we know of the external world. Energy is the common substance, for it is that which exists in space and time; it is also the differentiating principle of whatever exists in space and time. Recent scientific discoveries, especially those in the field of radio-activity, seem to strengthen philosophical reason and lead to a more specific dynamism. The atom (q. v.) can no longer be considered as being what its name implies, namely indivisible. Atoms of different chemical elements are spheres of positive electrification enclosing a number of corpuscles, all homogeneous, having identical properties, and negatively electrified. Some physicists still attribute to these corpuscles a real, though infinitesimal, extension; they admit a nucleus or carrier of the electric charge, and this nucleus alone is what we call matter. But this is denied by others for whom the corpuscle contains nothing material in the sense in which we commonly use that term. It is all electricity and nothing but electricity. Indeed the only reason for admitting anything else would be the necessity of explaining the mass and inertia of the corpuscle. But electricity itself possesses mass and inertia; or rather the mechanical inertia of matter is identical with the self-induction of the electric current, and the mass results from the velocity of the current. It has been calculated that the whole mass and inertia of the corpuscle are accounted for by its electrical charge alone and its velocity. Hence the name "electron" given to the corpuscle; it is the ultimate unit of so-called matter. This is known as the electronic theory of matter.

II. The preceding outline shows that the term *dynamism*, like all other general names of philosophical systems, is very vague, and applies to a number of widely different views originating from different considerations and supported by different arguments, namely: (1) Extension being essentially divisible, the ultimate unit must lack extension, otherwise it would be itself composed of parts, divisible and not one. (2) Matter is essentially active; to reduce it to mere extension is to ignore one of its fundamental aspects. (3) Even extension manifests itself exclusively through forces, and (4) matter as such is unknowable and unthinkable. (5) Scientific facts lead to an electronic theory. (6) Matter is, therefore, to say the least, absolutely useless, and dynamism, being a simpler, yet adequate, explanation, is preferable. Without entering into a discussion of the system, we may note briefly that the extension which is infinitely divisible is abstract, not concrete, mathematical, not physical, extension. For Aristotle and the Scholastics, physical matter is composed of two essential and inseparable principles, primary matter and substantial form (q. v.), the latter being the principle of unity and activity. Moreover, to admit the essential activity of matter does not necessarily imply that matter is nothing but activity. And if matter does not manifest itself to the senses except through forces and energies, it does not follow that it is not the necessary subject and carrier of these forces. In order to establish dynamism, it is not sufficient to overthrow materialism. If there is no matter, it is difficult to understand the forces themselves; for then, what is attracted? what moves, rotates, vibrates, etc.? Do not forces require a subject? It is clear that simple elements cannot give real extension. Can they even explain the phenomenon itself of extension, when not only physical bodies but the organism itself and the sense-organs are denied real extension? The facts and nature of radio-activity are not as yet sufficiently explored to furnish a safe basis for a definite theory of matter. Further, the necessity of admitting an *actio in distans* is also considered as an objection against some forms at least of dynamism.

Dynamism is opposed to the objective dualism of matter and energy, and also to mechanical materialism, according to which, matter, endowed with extension, is of itself an inert and indifferent vehicle of motion. It is not opposed to atomism in general, but only to some forms of it. Some dynamists, like Kant, admit the continuity of the forces constituting matter, but the majority admit centres or atoms of forces acting on one another. Atomism, therefore, is either material or dynamic, and dynamism may admit atomism or continuity. How far even dynamism is irreconcilable with hylomorphism (q. v.) in its most general meaning, it is difficult to determine. Leibniz speaks of primary matter and of substantial form, or entelechy. And the common elements of all things must be conceived as being only *in potentiâ* with regard to the actual diverse substances which they constitute. Again, the dynamic elements may be purely physical, or, as with Leibniz, they may have, in various degrees, a psychical nature, thus implying a sort of panpsychism. Leibniz also considers them as essentially different; commonly they are considered as identical in nature. Dynamism in general may be adapted to and modified by such philosophical systems as determinism or freedom, substantialism or phenomenalism, idealism or realism, monism or theism, etc. In itself, it is not inconsistent with any essential Catholic doctrine.

In conclusion, it may be interesting to note the contrast between the modern and the Aristotelean terminology. Aristotle's δύναμις and ἐνέργεια (see ACTUS ET POTENTIA) are essentially opposed. To-day, they have come to be almost synonymous, and energetism is one of the dynamic views of matter.

LEIBNIZ, *Œuvres philosophiques* (Paris, 1867), especially *Monadologie; Principes de la nature et de la grâce; Système nouveau de la nature; Théodicée; Nouveaux essais sur l'entendement;* WOLFF, *Cosmologia generalis* (new ed. Frankfort and Leipzig, 1737), especially secs. 176 sqq., 221 sqq.; BOSCOVICH, *Theoria philosophiæ naturalis* (Venice, 1763); KANT, *Werke* (Berlin, 1902), especially *Monadologia physica*, I, 473 and *Metaphysische Anfangsgrunde der Naturwissenschaft*, IV, 465; FARADAY, *Experimental Researches in Electricity* (London, 1839–1855), especially *Thoughts on Ray-vibrations*, III, 448 and *A Speculation touching Electric Conduction and the Nature of Matter*, II, 284, both reprinted from *Philosophical Magazine*, XXIV, XXVIII; OSTWALD, *Vorlesungen über Naturphilosophie* (2nd ed. Leipzig, 1902); MABILLEAU, *Hist. de la phil. atomistique* (Paris, 1895); NYS, *Cosmologie* (2nd ed. Louvain, 1906). Cf. also histories of philosophy, works on radio-activity by CURIE, RUTHERFORD, LODGE, THOMSON, LE BON, etc. and the less technical presentation of DUNCAN, *The New Knowledge* (New York, 1906) and JONES, *The Electrical Nature of Matter and Radio-activity* (New York, 1906); EISLER, *Wörterbuch der philosophischen Begriffe* (2nd ed. Berlin, 1904), s. v. *Monade, Materie*, etc.

C. A. DUBRAY.

Dysibod. See DISIBOD, SAINT.

E

Eadfrid, Bishop of Lindisfarne. See CUTHBERT, SAINT; LINDISFARNE GOSPELS.

Eadmer, precentor of Canterbury and historian, b. 1064 (?); d. 1124 (?). Brought up at Christ Church *ab infantiâ,* he became after St. Anselm's consecration, in 1079, his intimate companion. After Anselm's death his chief occupation was writing. He had made notes of the saint's doings and discourses and of the affairs in which he had been engaged, and from these he compiled his chief works, the "Historia Novorum" and the "Vita S. Anselmi" (ed. M. Rule, 1884, in Rolls Series). Eadmer's "Opuscula" comprise verses on Sts. Dunstan and Edward, the lives of Sts. Wilfrid, Odo, Dunstan, Oswald, Bregwin (printed in Wharton, Anglia Sancta). Of his theological works the most noteworthy is the "De conceptione Sanctæ Mariæ", a tract of much importance for the development of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception (see Thurston's ed., Freiburg, 1904, and "The Month", July and August, 1904, for the discussion of the date of his death). In 1121 he was elected to the See of St. Andrews, but by refusing to be ordained except by the Archbishop of York, he put an insuperable bar to his own promotion.

Notices of this important writer are found in all treatises on English and on ecclesiastical writers. Besides the works cited above, see: LIEBERMANN, *Ungedruckte anglo-normannische Geschichtsquellen* (Strasburg, 1879); RAGEY, *Eadmer* (Paris, 1892).

J. H. POLLEN.

Eanbald, the name of two Archbishops of York.—EANBALD I, date of birth unknown; d. 10 August, 796. Most of his life was probably spent in the monastery of York. As one of the officials in the monastery, he, conjointly with Alcuin, superintended the rebuilding of the minster. Albert, in his declining years, chose Eanbald to be his coadjutor and successor. He succeeded to the archbishopric in 782 (some say 778). His first care was to obtain the pallium and Alcuin went to Rome to bring it; on his return Eanbald was solemnly confirmed in his office. He lived in troublous times. Nevertheless Eanbald carried on the School of York and treasured its great library. In August, 791, he consecrated Baldulf Bishop of Whitherne. His last public act was on 25 June, 796, when he crowned Eardulf King of Northumbria. He died at the monastery of Etlete or Edete. His body was taken to York and buried in the minster.

EANBALD II, date of birth unknown; died 810 or 812. He received his education in the famous School of York where he was Alcuin's pupil. On the death of Eanbald I he was chosen his successor. On 8 Sept., 797, having received the pallium from Rome, he was solemnly confirmed in the archbishopric.

He assisted Ethelard, Archbishop of Canterbury, to recover the prerogatives of which he had been despoiled by Offa. In 798 he assembled his clergy in synod at Pinchenheale (Finchale, near Durham) and there enacted a number of wise regulations relating to the ecclesiastical courts and the observance of Easter. Some think he was the author of a volume of decrees and that he was the first to introduce the Roman Ritual in the church of York.

Eanbald I: RAINE, *Fasti Eboracenses* (London, 1863), I, 106 sqq.; *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle,* ad ann. 780, 791, 795, 796; SYMEON OF DURHAM, *Hist. Regum* in *R. S.,* II, 58.—Eanbald II: RAINE, *Fasti Eboracenses* (London, 1863), I, 109 sqq.; *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle,* ad ann. 796; LINGARD, *History of England* (London, 1854), I, 73, 81; *Alcuini Opera* (1777), I, 62–3, 217, 231, 233–4.

G. E. HIND.

Earth, AGE OF THE. See MAN.

Easter.—The English term, according to the Ven. Bede (De temporum ratione, I, v), relates to Eôstre, a Teutonic goddess of the rising light of day and spring, which deity, however, is otherwise unknown, even in the Edda (Simrock, Mythol., 362); Anglo-Saxon, *eâster, eâstron;* Old High German, *ôstra, ôstrara, ôstrarûn;* German, *Ostern.* April was called *easter-monadh.* The plural *eâstron* is used, because the feast lasts seven days. Like the French plural *Pâques,* it is a translation from the Latin *Festa Paschalia,* the entire octave of Easter. The Greek term for Easter, πάσχα, has nothing in common with the verb πάσχειν, "to suffer", although by the later symbolic writers it was connected with it; it is the Aramaic form of the Hebrew word *pesach* (*transitus,* passover). The Greeks call Easter the πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον; Good Friday the πάσχα σταυρώσιμον. The respective terms used by the Latins are *Pascha resurrectionis* and *Pascha crucifixionis.* In the Roman and Monastic Breviaries the feast bears the title *Dominica Resurrectionis;* in the Mozarabic Breviary, *In Lætatione Diei Paschæ Resurrectionis;* in the Ambrosian Breviary, *In Die Sancto Paschæ.* The Romance languages have adopted the Hebrew-Greek term: Latin, *Pascha;* Italian, *Pasqua;* Spanish, *Pascua;* French, *Pâques.* Also some Celtic and Teutonic nations use it: Scotch, *Pask;* Dutch, *Paschen;* Danish, *Paaske;* Swedish, *Pâsk;* even in the German provinces of the Lower Rhine the people call the feast *Paisken* not *Ostern.* The word is, principally in Spain and Italy, identified with the word "solemnity" and extended to other feasts, e. g. Sp., *Pascua florida,* Palm Sunday; *Pascua de Pentecostes,* Pentecost; *Pascua de la Natividad,* Christmas; *Pascua de Epifania,* Epiphany. In some parts of France also First Communion is called *Pâques,* whatever time of the year administered.

THE FEAST.—Easter is the principal feast of the ecclesiastical year. Leo I (Sermo xlvii in Exodum) calls it the greatest feast (*festum festorum*), and says that Christmas is celebrated only in preparation for Easter. It is the centre of the greater part of the ecclesiastical year. The order of Sundays from Septuagesima to the last Sunday after Pentecost, the feast of the Ascension, Pentecost, Corpus Christi, and all other movable feasts, from that of the Prayer of Jesus in the Garden (Tuesday after Septuagesima) to the feast of the Sacred Heart (Friday after the octave of Corpus Christi), depend upon the Easter date. Commemorating the slaying of the true Lamb of God and the Resurrection of Christ, the corner-stone upon which faith is built, it is also the oldest feast of the Christian Church, as old as Christianity, the connecting link between the Old and New Testaments. That the Apostolic Fathers do not mention it and that we first hear of it principally through the controversy of the Quartodecimans are purely accidental. The connexion between the Jewish Passover and the Christian feast of Easter is real and ideal. Real, since Christ died on the first Jewish Easter Day; ideal, like the relation between type and reality, because Christ's death and Resurrection had its figures and types in the Old

Law, particularly in the paschal lamb, which was eaten towards evening of the 14th of Nisan. In fact, the Jewish feast was taken over into the Christian Easter celebration; the liturgy (*Exultet*) sings of the passing of Israel through the Red Sea, the paschal lamb, the column of fire, etc. Apart, however, from the Jewish feast, the Christians would have celebrated the anniversary of the death and the Resurrection of Christ. But for such a feast it was necessary to know the exact calendar date of Christ's death. To know this day was very simple for the Jews; it was the day after the 14th of the first month, the 15th of Nisan of their calendar. But in other countries of the vast Roman Empire there were other systems of chronology. The Romans from 45 B. C. had used the reformed Julian calendar; there were also the Egyptian and the Syro-Macedonian calendar (see CALENDAR). The foundation of the Jewish calendar was the lunar year of 354 days, whilst the other systems depended on the solar year. In consequence the first days of the Jewish months and years did not coincide with any fixed days of the Roman solar year. Every fourth year of the Jewish system had an intercalary month. Since this month was inserted, not according to some scientific method or some definite rule, but arbitrarily, by command of the Sanhedrin, a distant Jewish date can never with certainty be transposed into the corresponding Julian or Gregorian date (Ideler, Chronologie, I, 570 sq.). The connexion between the Jewish and the Christian Pasch explains the movable character of this feast. Easter has no fixed date, like Christmas, because the 15th of Nisan of the Semitic calendar was shifting from date to date on the Julian calendar. Since Christ, the true Paschal Lamb, had been slain on the very day when the Jews, in celebration of their Passover, immolated the figurative lamb, the Jewish Christians in the Orient followed the Jewish method, and commemorated the death of Christ on the 15th of Nisan and His Resurrection on the 17th of Nisan, no matter on what day of the week they fell. For this observance they claimed the authority of St. John and St. Philip.

In the rest of the empire another consideration predominated. Every Sunday of the year was a commemoration of the Resurrection of Christ, which had occurred on a Sunday. Because the Sunday after 14 Nisan was the historical day of the Resurrection, at Rome this Sunday became the Christian feast of Easter. Easter was celebrated in Rome and Alexandria on the first Sunday after the first full moon after the spring equinox, and the Roman Church claimed for this observance the authority of Sts. Peter and Paul. The spring equinox in Rome fell on 25 March; in Alexandria on 21 March. At Antioch Easter was kept on the Sunday after the Jewish Passover. (See EASTER CONTROVERSY.) In Gaul a number of bishops, wishing to escape the difficulties of the paschal computation, seem to have assigned Easter to a fixed date of the Roman calendar, celebrating the death of Christ on 25 March, His Resurrection on 27 March (Marinus Dumiensis in P. L., LXXII, 47–51), since already in the third century 25 March was considered the day of the Crucifixion (Computus Pseudocyprianus, ed. Lersch, Chronologie, II, 61). This practice was of short duration. Many calendars in the Middle Ages contain these same dates (25 March, 27 March) for purely historical, not liturgical, reasons (Grotefend, Zeitrechnung, II, 46, 60, 72, 106, 110, etc.). The Montanists in Asia Minor kept Easter on the Sunday after 6 April (Schmid, Osterfestberechnung in der abendländischen Kirche). The First Council of Nicæa (325) decreed that the Roman practice should be observed throughout the Church. But even at Rome the Easter term was changed repeatedly. Those who continued to keep Easter with the Jews were called Quartodecimans (14 Nisan) and were excluded from the Church (see QUARTODECIMANS). The *computus paschalis*, the method of determining the date of Easter and the dependent feasts, was of old considered so important that Durandus (Rit. div. off., 8, c. i) declares a priest unworthy of the name who does not know the *computus paschalis*. The movable character of Easter (22 March to 25 April) gives rise to inconveniences, especially in modern times. For decades scientists and other people have worked in vain for a simplification of the computus, assigning Easter to the first Sunday in April or to the Sunday nearest to the 7th of April. Some even wish to put every Sunday to a certain date of the month, e. g. beginning with New Year's always on a Sunday, etc. [See L. Günther, "Zeitschrift Weltall" (1903); Sandhage and P. Dueren in "Pastor bonus" (Trier, 1906); C. Tondini, "L'Italia e la questione del Calendario" (Florence, 1905).]

THE EASTER OFFICE AND MASS.—The first Vespers of Easter are connected now with the Mass of Holy Saturday, because that Mass was formerly celebrated in the evening (see HOLY SATURDAY); they consist of only one psalm (cxvi) and the Magnificat. The Matins have only one Nocturn; the Office is short, because the clergy were busy with catechumens, the reconciliation of sinners, and the distribution of alms, which were given plentifully by the rich on Easter Day. This peculiarity of reciting only one Nocturn was extended by some churches from the octave of Easter to the entire paschal time, and soon to all the feasts of the Apostles and similar high feasts of the entire ecclesiastical year. This observance is found in the German Breviaries far up into the nineteenth century ("Brev. Monaster.", 1830; Bäumer, "Brevier", 312). The octave of Easter ceases with None of Saturday and on Sunday the three Nocturns with the eighteen psalms of the ordinary Sunday Office are recited. Many churches, however, during the Middle Ages and later (Brev. Monaster., 1830), on Low Sunday (*Dominica in Albis*) repeated the short Nocturn of Easter Week. Before the *usus Romanæ Curiæ* (Bäumer, Brev., 319) was spread by the Franciscans over the entire Church the eighteen (or twenty-four) psalms of the regular Sunday Matins were, three by three, distributed over the Matins of Easter Week (Bäumer, 301). This observance is still one of the peculiarities of the Carmelite Breviary. The simplified Breviary of the Roman Curia (twelfth century) established the custom of repeating Psalms i, ii, iii, every day of the octave. From the ninth to the thirteenth century, in most dioceses, during the entire Easter Week the two precepts of hearing Mass and of abstaining from servile work were observed (Kellner, Heortologie, 17); later on this law was limited to two days (Monday and Tuesday), and, since the end of the eighteenth century, to Monday only. In the United States even Monday is no holiday of obligation. The first three days of Easter Week are doubles of the first class, the other days semi-doubles. During this week, in the Roman Office, through immemorial custom the hymns are omitted, or rather were never inserted. The ancient ecclesiastical Office contained no hymns, and out of respect for the great solemnity of Easter and the ancient jubilus "Hæc Dies", the Roman Church did not touch the old Easter Office by introducing hymns. Therefore to the present day the Office of Easter consists only of psalms, antiphons, and the great lessons of Matins. Only the "Victimæ Paschali" was adopted in most of the churches and religious orders in the Second Vespers. The Mozarabic and Ambrosian Offices use the Ambrosian hymn "Hic est dies verus Dei" in Lauds and Vespers, the Monastic Breviary, "Ad cœnam Agni providi" at Vespers, "Chorus novæ Jerusalem" at Matins, and "Aurora lucis rutilat" at Lauds. The Monastic Breviary has also three Nocturns on Easter Day. Besides the hymns the chapter is omitted and the Little Hours have no antiphons; the place of the hymns,

chapters, and little responses is taken by the jubilus, "Hæc Dies quam fecit Dominus, exultemus et lætemur in eâ". The Masses of Easter Week have a sequence of dramatic character, "Victimæ paschali", which was composed by Wipo, a Burgundian priest at the courts of Conrad II and Henry III. The present Preface is abridged from the longer Preface of the Gregorian Sacramentary. The "Communicantes" and "Hanc igitur" contain references to the solemn baptism of Easter eve. To the "Benedicamus Domino" of Lauds and Vespers and to the "Ite Missa est" of the Mass two alleluias are added during the entire octave. Every day of the octave has a special Mass; an old MS. Spanish missal of 855 contains three Masses for Easter Sunday; the Gallican missals have two Masses for every day of the week, one of which was celebrated at four in the morning, preceded by a procession (Migne, La Liturgie Catholique, Paris, 1863, p. 952). In the Gelasian Sacramentary every day of Easter Week has its own Preface (Probst, Sacramentarien, p. 226).

To have a correct idea of the Easter celebration and its Masses, we must remember that it was intimately connected with the solemn rite of baptism. The preparatory liturgical acts commenced on the eve and were continued during the night. When the number of persons to be baptized was great, the sacramental ceremonies and the Easter celebration were united. This connexion was severed at a time when, the discipline having changed, even the recollection of the old traditions was lost. The greater part of the ceremonies was transferred to the morning hours of Holy Saturday. This change, however, did not produce a new liturgical creation adapted to the new order of things. The old baptismal ceremonies were left untouched and have now, apparently, no other reason for preservation than their antiquity. The gap left in the liturgical services after the solemnities of the night had been transferred to the morning of Holy Saturday was filled in France, Germany, and some other countries by a twofold new ceremony, which, however, was never adopted in Rome.—*First*, there was the commemoration of the Resurrection of Christ. At midnight, before Matins, the clergy in silence entered the dark church and removed the cross from the sepulchre to the high altar. Then the candles were lit, the doors opened, and a solemn procession was held with the cross through the church, the cloister, or cemetery. Whilst the procession moved from the altar to the door, the beautiful old antiphon, "Cum Rex gloriæ", was sung, the first part softly (*humili ac depressâ voce*), to symbolize the sadness of the souls in limbo; from *Advenisti desiderabilis* the singers raised their voices in jubilation whilst the acolytes rang small bells which they carried. The full text of this antiphon, which has disappeared from the liturgy, follows:

> Cum rex gloriæ Christus infernum debellaturus intraret, et chorus angelicus ante faciem ejus portas principum tolli præciperet, sanctorum populus, qui tenebatur in morte captivus, voce lacrimabili clamabat dicens: Advenisti desiderabilis, quem expectabamus in tenebris, ut educeres hac nocte vinculatos de claustris. Te nostra vocabant suspiria, te larga requirebant lamenta, tu factus est spes desperatis, magna consolatio in tormentis. Alleluja.

When the procession returned, in many churches the "Attollite portas" (Ps. xxiii) was sung at the door, in order to symbolize the victorious entry of Christ into limbo and hell. After the procession Matins were sung. In later centuries the Blessed Sacrament took the place of the cross in the procession. This ceremony is, with the approval of the Holy See, still held in Germany on the eve of Easter with simpler ceremonies, in the form of a popular devotion.—*Second*, the visitation of the Sepulchre. After the third lesson of the Nocturn two clerics, representing the holy women, went to the empty sepulchre where another cleric (angel) announced to them that the Saviour was risen. The two then brought the message to the choir, whereupon two priests, impersonating Peter and John, ran to the tomb and, finding it empty, showed to the people the linen in which the body had been wrapped. Then the choir sang the "Te Deum" and the "Victimæ paschali". In some churches, e. g. at Rouen, the apparition of Christ to Mary Magdalen was also represented. Out of this solemn ceremony, which dates back to the tenth century, grew the numerous Easter plays. (Nord-Amerikanisches Pastoralblatt, Oct., 1907, p. 149, has a long article on these two ceremonies.) The Easter plays in the beginning used only the words of the Gospels and the "Victimæ paschali"; in the course of development they became regular dramas, in Latin or vernacular verses, which contained the negotiation between the vender of unguents and the three women, the dialogue between Pilate and the Jews asking for soldiers to guard the Sepulchre, the contest of Peter and John running to the tomb, the risen Saviour appearing to Magdalen, and the descent of Christ into hell. Towards the end of the Middle Ages the tone of these plays became worldly, and they were filled with long burlesque speeches of salve-dealers, Jews, soldiers, and demons (Creizenach, Gesch. des neuen Dramas, Halle, 1893).

The procession combined with the solemn Second Vespers of Easter Sunday is very old. There was great variety in the manner of solemnizing these Vespers. The service commenced with the nine Kyrie Eleisons, sung as in the Easter Mass, even sometimes with the corresponding trope *lux et origo boni*. After the third psalm the whole choir went in procession to the baptismal chapel, where the fourth psalm, the "Victimæ paschali", and the Magnificat were sung; thence the procession moved to the great cross at the entrance to the sanctuary (choir), and from there, after the fifth psalm and the Magnificat were sung, to the empty sepulchre, where the services were concluded. The Carmelites and a number of French dioceses, e. g. Paris, Lyons, Besançon, Chartres, Laval, have, with the permission of the Holy See, retained these solemn Easter Vespers since the re-introduction of the Roman Breviary. But they are celebrated differently in every diocese, very much modernized in some churches. At Lyons the Magnificat is sung three times. In Cologne and Trier the solemn Vespers of Easter were abolished in the nineteenth century (Nord-Amerikanisches Pastoralblatt, April, 1908, p. 50). Whilst the Latin Rite admits only commemorations of saints in Lauds, Mass, and Vespers from Wednesday in Easter Week and excludes any commemoration on the first three days of the week, the Greek and Russian Churches transfer the occurring Offices (canons) of the saints from Matins to Complin during the entire octave, even on Easter Sunday. After the Anti-pascha (Low Sunday), the canons and other canticles of Easter are continued in the entire Office up to Ascension Day, and the canons of the saints take only the second place in Matins. Also the Greeks and Russians have a solemn procession at midnight, before Matins, during which they sing at the door of the church Ps. lxvii, repeating after each verse the Easter antiphon. When the procession leaves, the church is dark; when it returns, hundreds of candles and coloured lamps are lit to represent the splendour of Christ's Resurrection. After Lauds all those who are present give each other the Easter kiss, not excluding even the beggar. One says: "Christ is risen"; the other answers: "He is truly risen"; and these words are the Russians' greeting during Easter time. A similar custom had, through the influence of the Byzantine court, been adopted at Rome for a time. The greeting was: *Surrexit Dominus vere;* R. *Et apparuit Simoni.* (Maximilianus, Princ. Sax., Prælect. de liturg. Orient., I, 114; Martène, De

antiq. Eccl. rit., c. xxv, 5.) The Armenian Church during the entire time from Easter to Pentecost celebrates the Resurrection alone to the exclusion of all feasts of the saints. On Easter Monday they keep All Souls' Day, the Saturday of the same week the Decollation of St. John, the third Sunday after Easter the founding of the first Christian Church on Sion and of the Church in general, the fifth Sunday the Apparition of the Holy Cross at Jerusalem, then on Thursday the Ascension of Christ, and the Sunday after the feast of the great Vision of St. Gregory. From Easter to Ascension the Armenians never fast nor do they abstain from meat (C. Tondini de Quaranghi, Calendrier de la Nation Arménienne). In the Mozarabic Rite of Spain, after the Pater Noster on Easter Day and during the week the priest intones the particula "Regnum" and sings "Vicit Leo de Tribu Juda radix David Alleluja". The people answer: "Qui sedes super Cherubim radix David. Alleluja". This is sung three times (Missale Mozarab.). In some cities of Spain before sunrise two processions leave the principal church; one with the image of Mary covered by a black veil; another with the Blessed Sacrament. The processions move on in silence until they meet at a predetermined place; then the veil is removed from the image of Mary and the clergy with the people sing the "Regina Cœli" (Guéranger, Kirchenjahr, VII, 166). For the sanctuary at Emmaus in the Holy Land the Holy See has approved a special feast on Easter Monday, "Solemnitas manifestationis D. N. I. Chr. Resurg., Titul. Eccles. dupl. I Cl.", with proper Mass and Office (Cal. Rom. Seraph. in Terræ S. Custodia, 1907).

Peculiar Customs of Easter Time.—1. *Risus Paschalis.*—This strange custom originated in Bavaria in the fifteenth century. The priest inserted in his sermon funny stories which would cause his hearers to laugh (*Ostermärlein*), e. g. a description of how the devil tries to keep the doors of hell locked against the descending Christ. Then the speaker would draw the moral from the story. This Easter laughter, giving rise to grave abuses of the word of God, was prohibited by Clement X (1670–1676) and in the eighteenth century by Maximilian III and the bishops of Bavaria (Wagner, De Risu Paschali, Königsberg, 1705; Linsemeier, Predigt in Deutschland, Munich, 1886).

2. *Easter Eggs.*—Because the use of eggs was forbidden during Lent, they were brought to the table on Easter Day, coloured red to symbolize the Easter joy. This custom is found not only in the Latin but also in the Oriental Churches. The symbolic meaning of a new creation of mankind by Jesus risen from the dead was probably an invention of later times. The custom may have its origin in paganism, for a great many pagan customs, celebrating the return of spring, gravitated to Easter. The egg is the emblem of the germinating life of early spring. Easter eggs, the children are told, come from Rome with the bells which on Thursday go to Rome and return Saturday morning. The sponsors in some countries give Easter eggs to their god-children. Coloured eggs are used by children at Easter in a sort of game which consists in testing the strength of the shells (Kraus, Real-Encyklopädie, s. v. Ei). Both coloured and uncoloured eggs are used in some parts of the United States for this game, known as "egg-picking". Another practice is the "egg-rolling" by children on Easter Monday on the lawn of the White House in Washington.

3. *The Easter Rabbit* lays the eggs, for which reason they are hidden in a nest or in the garden. The rabbit is a pagan symbol and has always been an emblem of fertility (Simrock, Mythologie, 551).

4. In France *handball playing* was one of the Easter amusements, found also in Germany (Simrock, op. cit., 575). The ball may represent the sun, which is believed to take three leaps in rising on Easter morning. Bishops, priests, and monks, after the strict discipline of Lent, used to play ball during Easter week (Beleth, Expl. Div. off., 120). This was called *libertas Decembrica*, because formerly in December the masters used to play ball with their servants, maids, and shepherds. The ball game was connected with a dance, in which even bishops and abbots took part. At Auxerre, Besançon, etc. the dance was performed in church to the strains of the "Victimæ paschali". In England, also, the game of ball was a favourite Easter sport in which the municipal corporation engaged with due parade and dignity. And at Bury St. Edmunds, within recent years, the game was kept up with great spirit by twelve old women. After the game and the dance a banquet was given, during which a homily on the feast was read. All these customs disappeared for obvious reasons (Kirchenlex., IV, 1414).

5. On Easter Monday the women had a right to strike their husbands, on Tuesday the men struck their wives, as in December the servants scolded their masters. Husbands and wives did this "ut ostendant sese mutuo debere corrigere, ne illo tempore alter ab altero thori debitum exigat" (Beleth, I, c. cix; Durandus, I, c. vi, 86). In the northern parts of England the men parade the streets on Easter Sunday and claim the privilege of lifting every woman three times from the ground, receiving in payment a kiss or a silver sixpence. The same is done by the women to the men on the next day. In the Neumark (Germany) on Easter Day the men servants whip the maid servants with switches; on Monday the maids whip the men. They secure their release with Easter eggs. These customs are probably of pre-Christian origin (Reinsberg-Düringsfeld, Das festliche Jahr, 118).

6. *The Easter Fire* is lit on the top of mountains (Easter mountain, *Osterberg*) and must be kindled from new fire, drawn from wood by friction (*nodfyr*); this is a custom of pagan origin in vogue all over Europe, signifying the victory of spring over winter. The bishops issued severe edicts against the sacrilegious Easter fires (Conc. Germanicum, a. 742, c. v; Council of Lestines, a. 743, n. 15), but did not succeed in abolishing them everywhere. The Church adopted the observance into the Easter ceremonies, referring it to the fiery column in the desert and to the Resurrection of Christ; the new fire on Holy Saturday is drawn from flint, symbolizing the Resurrection of the Light of the World from the tomb closed by a stone (Missale Rom.). In some places a figure was thrown into the Easter fire, symbolizing winter, but to the Christians on the Rhine, in Tyrol and Bohemia, Judas the traitor (Reinsberg-Düringsfeld, Das festliche Jahr, 112 sq.).

7. At Puy in France, from time immemorial to the tenth century, it was customary, when at the first psalm of Matins a canon was absent from the choir, for some of the canons and vicars, taking with them the processional cross and the holy water, to go to the house of the absentee, sing the "Hæc Dies", sprinkle him with water, if he was still in bed, and lead him to the church. In punishment he had to give a breakfast to his conductors. A similar custom is found in the fifteenth century at Nantes and Angers, where it was prohibited by the diocesan synods in 1431 and 1448. In some parts of Germany parents and children try to surprise each other in bed on Easter morning to apply the health-giving switches (Freyde, Ostern in deutscher Sage, Sitte und Dichtung, 1893).

8. In both the Oriental and Latin Churches, it is customary to have those victuals which were prohibited during Lent blessed by the priests before eating them on Easter Day, especially meat, eggs, butter, and cheese (Ritualbücher, Paderborn, 1904; Maximilianus, Liturg. or., 117). Those who ate before the food was blessed, according to popular belief, were punished by God, sometimes instantaneously (Migne, Liturgie, s. v. Pâques).

9. On the eve of Easter the homes are blessed (Rit. Rom., tit. 8, c. iv) in memory of the passing of the angel in Egypt and the signing of the door-posts

with the blood of the paschal lamb. The parish priest visits the houses of his parish; the papal apartments are also blessed on this day. The room, however, in which the pope is found by the visiting cardinal is blessed by the pontiff himself (Moroni, Dizionariq, s. v. Pasqua).

10. The Greeks and Russians after their long, severe Lent make Easter a day of popular sports. At Constantinople the cemetery of Pera is the noisy rendezvous of the Greeks; there are music, dances, and all the pleasures of an Oriental popular resort; the same custom prevails in the cities of Russia. In Russia anyone can enter the belfries on Easter and ring the bells, a privilege of which many persons avail themselves.

DUCHESNE, *Orig. du Culte Chrét.* (Paris, 1889); KELLNER, *Heortologie* (Freiburg im Br., 1906); PROBST, *Die ältesten römischen Sacramentarien und Ordines* (Münster, 1892); GUÉRANGER, *Das Kirchenjahr*, Ger. tr. (Mainz, 1878), V, 7; KRAUS, *Real-Encyk.*; BERNARD, *Cours de Liturgie Romaine;* HAMPSON, *Calendarium Medii Ævi* (London, 1857); *Kirchenlex.*, IX, cols. 1121–41; NILLES, *Calendarium utriusque Ecclesiæ* (Innsbruck, 1897); MIGNE, *La Liturgie Catholique* (Paris, 1863); BINTERIM, *Denkwürdigkeiten* (Mainz, 1837); GROTEFEND, *Zeitrechnung* (Hanover, 1891–1898); LERSCH, *Einleitung in die Chronologie* (Freiburg, 1899); BACH, *Die Osterberechnung* (Freiburg, 1907); SCHWARTZ, *Christliche und jüdische Ostertafeln* (Berlin, 1905); *Suntne Latini Quartodecimani?* (Prague, 1906); DUCHESNE, *La question de la Pâque du Concile de Nicée* in *Revue des quest. histor.* (1880), 5 sq.; KRUSCH, *Studien zur christlich-mittelalterlichen Chronologie* (Leipzig, 1880); ROCK, *The Church of Our Fathers* (London, 1905), IV; ALBERS, *Festtage des Herrn und seiner Heiligen* (Paderborn, 1890).

FREDERICK G. HOLWECK.

EASTER CONTROVERSY.—Ecclesiastical history preserves the memory of three distinct phases of the dispute regarding the proper time of observing Easter. It will add to clearness if we in the first place state what is certain regarding the date and the nature of these three controversies.

FIRST PHASE.—The first was mainly concerned with the lawfulness of celebrating Easter on a weekday. We read in Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., V, xxiii): "A question of no small importance arose at that time [i. e. the time of Pope Victor, about A. D. 190]. The dioceses of all Asia, as from an older tradition, held that the fourteenth day of the moon, on which day the Jews were commanded to sacrifice the lamb, should always be observed as the feast of the life-giving pasch [ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ σωτηρίου Πάσχα ἑορτῆς], contending that the fast ought to end on that day, whatever day of the week it might happen to be. However it was not the custom of the churches in the rest of the world to end it at this point, as they observed the practice, which from Apostolic tradition has prevailed to the present time, of terminating the fast on no other day than on that of the Resurrection of Our Saviour. Synods and assemblies of bishops were held on this account, and all with one consent through mutual correspondence drew up an ecclesiastical decree that the mystery of the Resurrection of the Lord should be celebrated on no other day but the Sunday and that we should observe the close of the paschal fast on that day only." These words of the Father of Church History, followed by some extracts which he makes from the controversial letters of the time, tell us almost all that we know concerning the paschal controversy in its first stage. A letter of St. Irenæus is among the extracts just referred to, and this shows that the diversity of practice regarding Easter had existed at least from the time of Pope Sixtus (c. 120). Further, Irenæus states that St. Polycarp, who, like the other Asiatics, kept Easter on the fourteenth day of the moon, whatever day of the week that might be, following therein the tradition which he claimed to have derived from St. John the Apostle, came to Rome c. 150 about this very question, but could not be persuaded by Pope Anicetus to relinquish his Quartodeciman observance. Nevertheless he was not debarred from communion with the Roman Church, and St. Irenæus, while condemning the Quartodeciman practice, nevertheless reproaches Pope Victor (c. 189–99) with having excommunicated the Asiatics too precipitately and with not having followed the moderation of his predecessor. The question thus debated was therefore primarily whether Easter was to be kept on a Sunday, or whether Christians should observe the Holy Day of the Jews, the fourteenth of Nisan, which might occur on any day of the week. Those who kept Easter with the Jews were called Quartodecimans or τηροῦντες (observants); but even in the time of Pope Victor this usage hardly extended beyond the Churches of Asia Minor. After the pope's strong measures the Quartodecimans seem to have gradually dwindled away. Origen in the "Philosophumena" (VIII, xviii) seems to regard them as a mere handful of wrong-headed nonconformists.

SECOND PHASE.—The second stage in the Easter controversy centres round the Council of Nicæa (A. D. 325). Granted that the great Easter festival was always to be held on a Sunday, and was not to be coincident with a particular phase of the moon, which might occur on any day of the week, a new dispute arose as to the determination of the Sunday itself. The text of the decree of the Council of Nicæa which settled, or at least indicated a final settlement of, the difficulty has not been preserved to us, but we have an important document inserted in Eusebius's "Life of Constantine" (III, xviii sq.). The emperor himself, writing to the Churches after the Council of Nicæa, exhorts them to adopt its conclusions and says among other things: "At this meeting the question concerning the most holy day of Easter was discussed, and it was resolved by the united judgment of all present that this feast ought to be kept by all and in every place on one and the same day. . . And first of all it appeared an unworthy thing that in the celebration of this most holy feast we should follow the practice of the Jews, who have impiously defiled their hands with enormous sin . . . for we have received from our Saviour a different way. . . And I myself have undertaken that this decision should meet with the approval of your Sagacities in the hope that your Wisdoms will gladly admit that practice which is observed at once in the city of Rome and in Africa, throughout Italy and in Egypt . . . . with entire unity of judgment." From this and other indications which cannot be specified here (see, e. g., Eusebius, "De Paschate" in Schmid, "Osterfestfrage", pp. 58–59) we learn that the dispute now lay between the Christians of Syria and Mesopotamia and the rest of the world. The important Church of Antioch was still dependent upon the Jewish calendar for its Easter. The Syrian Christians always held their Easter festival on the Sunday after the Jews kept their Pasch. On the other hand at Alexandria, and seemingly throughout the rest of the Roman Empire, the Christians calculated the time of Easter for themselves, paying no attention to the Jews. In this way the date of Easter as kept at Alexandria and Antioch did not always agree; for the Jews, upon whom Antioch depended, adopted very arbitrary methods of intercalating embolismic months (see CALENDAR, Vol. III, p. 158) before they celebrated Nisan, the first spring month, on the fourteenth day of which the paschal lamb was killed. In particular we learn that they had become neglectful (or at least the Christians of Rome and Alexandria declared they were neglectful) of the law that the fourteenth of Nisan must never precede the equinox (see Schwartz, Christliche und jüdische Ostertafeln, pp. 138 sqq.). Thus Constantine in the letter quoted above protests with horror that the Jews sometimes kept two Paschs in one year, meaning that two Paschs sometimes fell between one equinox and the next.

The Alexandrians, on the other hand, accepted it as a first principle that the Sunday to be kept as Easter Day must necessarily occur after the vernal equinox, then identified with 21 March of the Julian year. This

was the main difficulty which was decided by the Council of Nicæa. Even among the Christians who calculated Easter for themselves there had been considerable variations (partly due to the difference of the lunar cycle adopted, partly to a divergent reckoning of the date of the equinox), and as recently as 314, in the Council of Arles, it had been laid down that in future Easter should be kept *uno die et uno tempore per omnem orbem*, and that to secure this uniformity the pope should send out letters to all the Churches. The Council of Nicæa seems to have extended further the principle here laid down. As already stated, we have not its exact words, but we may safely infer from scattered notices that the council ruled: (1) that Easter must be celebrated by all throughout the world on the same Sunday; (2) that this Sunday must follow the fourteenth day of the paschal moon; (3) that that moon was to be accounted the paschal moon whose fourteenth day followed the spring equinox; (4) that some provision should be made, probably by the Church of Alexandria as best skilled in astronomical calculations, for determining the proper date of Easter and communicating it to the rest of the world (see St. Leo to the Emperor Marcian in Migne, P. L., LIV, 1055). This ruling of the Council of Nicæa did not remove all difficulties nor at once win universal acceptance amongst the Syrians. But to judge from the strongly worded canon i of the Council of Antioch (A. D. 341; see Hefele-Leclercq, "Conciles", I, 714), as also from the language of the Apostolic Constitutions and Canons (see Schmid, Osterfestfrage, p. 63), the Syrian bishops loyally co-operated in carrying into effect the decision of the Council of Nicæa. In Rome and Alexandria the lunar cycles by which the occurrence of Easter was determined were not uniform. Rome, after the hundred-and-twelve-year cycle of Hippolytus, adopted an eighty-four-year cycle, but neither gave satisfactory results. Alexandria adhered to the more accurate nineteen-year cycle of Meton. But it seems to be clearly established by the most recent researches (see Schwartz, op. cit., pp. 28–29) that the lunar cycles were never understood to be more than aids towards ascertaining the correct date of Easter, also that where the calculations of Rome and Alexandria led to divergent results, compromises were made upon both sides and that the final decision always lay with accepted ecclesiastical authority.

THIRD PHASE.—It was to the divergent cycles which Rome had successively adopted and rejected in its attempt to determine Easter more accurately that the third stage in the paschal controversy was mainly due. The Roman missionaries coming to England in the time of St. Gregory the Great found the British Christians, the representatives of that Christianity which had been introduced into Britain during the period of the Roman occupation, still adhering to an ancient system of Easter-computation which Rome itself had laid aside. The British and Irish Christians were not Quartodecimans, as some unwarrantably accused them of being, for they kept the Easter festival upon a Sunday. They are supposed (e. g. by Krusch) to have observed an eighty-four-year cycle and not the five-hundred-and-thirty-two-year cycle of Victorius which was adopted in Gaul, but the most recent investigator of the question (Schwartz, p. 103) declares it to be impossible to determine what system they followed and himself inclines to the opinion that they derived their rule for the determining of Easter direct from Asia Minor. (See, however, the very opposite conclusions of Joseph Schmid, "Die Osterfestberechnung auf den britischen Inseln", 1904.) The story of this controversy, which, together with the difference in the shape of tonsure, seems to have prevented all fraternization between the British Christians and the Roman missionaries, is told at length in the pages of Bede. The British appealed to the tradition of St. John, the Romans to that of St. Peter, both sides with little reason, and neither without the suspicion of forgery. It was not until the Synod of Whitby in 664 that the Christians of Northern Britain, who had derived their instruction in the Faith from the Scottish (i. e. Irish) missionaries, at last at the instance of Bishop Wilfrid and through the example of King Oswy accepted the Roman system and came into friendly relations with the bishops of the South. Even then in Ireland and in parts of the North some years passed before the adoption of the Roman Easter became general (Moran, Essays on the Origin, Doctrines and Discipline of the Early Irish Church, Dublin, 1864).

POINTS OF OBSCURITY.—These are the facts regarding the Easter controversy which are now generally admitted. Many other subsidiary details have an important bearing on the case but are more matters of conjecture. There is, for example, the perplexing doubt whether the Crucifixion of Christ took place on the fourteenth or fifteenth of Nisan. The Synoptists seem to favour the latter, St. John the former date. Clearly we should expect to find that according to the answer given to this question, the position of the earliest possible Easter Sunday in the lunar month would also change. Again, there is the problem, much debated by modern scholars, whether the Pasch which the early Christians desired to commemorate was primarily the Passion or the Resurrection of Christ. Upon this point also our data do not admit of a very positive answer. It has been very strongly urged that the writers of the first two centuries who speak of the Pasch have always in view the *πάσχα σταυρώσιμον*, the Crucifixion Day, when Jesus Christ Himself was offered as the Victim, the antitype of the Jewish paschal lamb. Supporters of this opinion often contend that the Resurrection was held to be sufficiently commemorated by the weekly Sunday, on the vigil of which the night-watch was kept, the Liturgy being celebrated in the morning. In any case it must be admitted that while in the New Testament we have definite mention of the observance of the Sunday, or "Lord's day", there is no conclusive evidence in the first century or more of the keeping of the Pasch as a festival. Some are inclined to think that the Christian Easter first appears as setting a term to the great paschal fast which, as we learn from Irenæus, was very variously kept in the sub-Apostolic Age. Another class of obscure and rather intricate questions, about which it is difficult to speak positively, regards the limits of the paschal period as laid down by the computation of Rome before the tables of Dionysius Exiguus and the Metonic cycle were finally adopted there in 525. According to one system Easter Day might fall between the fourteenth and twentieth day inclusive of the paschal moon; and although this implies that when Easter fell on the fourteenth it coincided with the Jewish Pasch, the Roman Church, observing its eighty-four-year cycle, at one time permitted this (so at least Krusch contends; see "Der 84-jahrige Ostercyclus und seine Quellen", pp. 20 and 65). Certain it is that the data of the *supputatio Romana* did not always agree with those of Alexandria, and in particular it seems that Rome, rejecting 22 March as the earliest possible date of Easter, only allowed the 23rd, while, on the other hand, the latest possible date according to the Roman system was 21 April. This sometimes brought about an *impasse* which was relieved only by accepting the Alexandrian solution. Other computations allowed Easter to fall between the fifteenth and twenty-first day of the paschal moon and others between the sixteenth and the twenty-second.

What is perhaps most important to remember, both in the solution adopted in 525 and in that officially put forward at the time of the reform of the calendar by Gregory XIII, is this, that the Church throughout held that the determination of Easter was primarily a matter of ecclesiastical discipline and not of astronomical science. As Professor De Morgan long ago clearly

recognized, the moon according to which Easter is calculated is not the moon in the heavens nor even the mean moon, i. e. a moon travelling with the average motion of the real moon, but simply the moon of the calendar. This calendar moon is admittedly a fiction, though it departs very little from the actual astronomical facts; but in following the simple rule given for the dependence of Easter upon the moon of the calendar, uniformity is secured for all countries of the world. According to this rule, Easter Sunday is the first Sunday which occurs after the first full moon (or more accurately after the first fourteenth day of the moon) following the 21st of March. As a result, the earliest possible date of Easter is 22 March, the latest 25 April.

The bibliography of this subject is vast, and most ecclesiastical encyclopedias devote more or less space to it. For practical purposes the text and notes of HEFELE-LECLERCQ, *Conciles*, I, 133–151 and 450–488, supply all that is necessary; though LECLERCQ refers to the article *Comput paschal* in the *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie* for fuller treatment.

Among the more important contributions to the subject the following may be named: KRUSCH, *Studien zur christlich-mittelalterlichen Chronologie* (Leipzig, 1880); IDEM in *Neues Archiv* (1884), 101–169; RÜHL, *Chronologie des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit* (Berlin, 1897), 110–165; SCHMID, *Die Osterfestfrage auf dem ersten allgemeinen Conzil von Nicäa* (Vienna, 1905); IDEM, *Die Osterfestberechnung auf den britischen Inseln* (Ratisbon, 1904); HILGENFELD, *Der Paschastreit der alten Kirche* (1860); SCHWARTZ, *Christliche und jüdische Ostertafeln* (Berlin, 1905) in the *Abhandlungen* of the Göttingen Academy: this is a work of the very highest importance; SCHÜRER, *Die Passastreitigkeiten des 2. Jahrhunderts* in *Zeitschrift f. histor. Theol.* (1870); DUCHESNE, *Hist. Anc. de l'Eglise* (Paris, 1906), I, 285–291; KELLNER, *Heortologie* (1906); DUCHESNE in *Revue des Quest. Hist.* (1880); ANSCOMBE AND TURNER in *Eng. Historical Review* (1895), 515, 699; WICKLIN in *Journal of Philology* (1901), 137–151. See also the bibliography given under CHRONOLOGY, GENERAL; and DOMINICAL LETTER.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Easter among the Jews. See PASSOVER.

Easter Candle. See CANDLES.

Easter Communion. See COMMANDMENTS OF THE CHURCH.

Easter Confession. See COMMANDMENTS OF THE CHURCH.

Easter Cycle. See CALENDAR, CHRISTIAN; EASTER.

Eastern Churches.—I. DEFINITION OF AN EASTERN CHURCH.—An accident of political development has made it possible to divide the Christian world, in the first place, into two great halves, Eastern and Western. The root of this division is, roughly and broadly speaking, the division of the Roman Empire made first by Diocletian (284–305), and again by the sons of Theodosius I (Arcadius in the East, 395–408; and Honorius in the West, 395–423), then finally made permanent by the establishment of a rival empire in the West (Charles the Great, 800). The division of Eastern and Western Churches, then, in its origin corresponds to that of the empire. Western Churches are those that either gravitate around Rome or broke away from her at the Reformation. Eastern Churches depend originally on the Eastern Empire at Constantinople; they are those that either find their centre in the patriarchate of that city (since the centralization of the fourth century) or have been formed by schisms which in the first instance concerned Constantinople rather than the Western world. Another distinction, that can be applied only in the most general and broadest sense, is that of language. Western Christendom till the Reformation was Latin; even now the Protestant bodies still bear unmistakably the mark of their Latin ancestry. It was the great Latin Fathers and Schoolmen, St. Augustine (d. 430) most of all, who built up the traditions of the West; in ritual and canon law the Latin or Roman school formed the West. In a still broader sense the East may be called Greek. True, many Eastern Churches know nothing of Greek; the oldest (Nestorians, Armenians, Abyssinians) have never used Greek liturgically nor for their literature; nevertheless they too depend in some sense on a Greek tradition. Whereas our Latin Fathers have never concerned them at all (most Eastern Christians have never even heard of our schoolmen or canonists), they still feel the influence of the Greek Fathers, their theology is still concerned about controversies carried on originally in Greek and settled by Greek synods. The literature of those that do not use Greek is formed on Greek models, is full of words carefully chosen or composed to correspond to some technical Greek term, even of Greek derivatives. The root of the distinction, then, in the broadest terms, is: that a Western Church is one originally dependent on Rome, whose traditions are Latin; an Eastern Church looks rather to Constantinople (either as a friend or an enemy) and inherits Greek ideas.

The point may be stated more scientifically by using the old division of the patriarchates. Originally (e. g. at the Council of Nicæa, A. D. 325, can. vi) there were three patriarchates, those of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. Further legislation formed two more at the expense of Antioch: Constantinople in 381 and 451; Jerusalem in 451. In any case the Roman patriarchate was always enormously the greatest. *Western Christendom may be defined quite simply as the Roman patriarchate and all Churches that have broken away from it. All the others, with schismatical bodies formed from them, make up the Eastern half.* But it must not be imagined that either half is in any sense one Church. The Latin half was so (in spite of a few unimportant schisms) till the Reformation. To find a time when there was one Eastern Church we must go back to the centuries before the Council of Ephesus (431). Since that council there have been separate schismatical Eastern Churches whose number has grown steadily down to our own time. The Nestorian heresy left a permanent Nestorian Church, the Monophysite and Monothelete quarrels made several more, the reunion with Rome of fractions of every Rite further increased the number, and quite lately the Bulgarian schism has created yet another; indeed it seems as if two more, in Cyprus and Syria, are being formed at the present moment (1908).

We have now a general criterion by which to answer the question: What is an Eastern Church? Looking at a map, we see that, roughly, the division between the Roman patriarchate and the others forms a line that runs down somewhat to the east of the River Vistula (Poland is Latin), then comes back above the Danube, to continue down the Adriatic Sea, and finally divides Africa west of Egypt. Illyricum (Macedonia and Greece) once belonged to the Roman patriarchate, and Greater Greece (Southern Italy and Sicily) was intermittently Byzantine. But both these lands eventually fell back into the branches that surrounded them (except for the thin remnant of the Uniat Italo-Greeks). We may, then, say that any ancient Church east of that line is an Eastern Church. To these we must add those formed by missionaries (especially Russians) from one of these Churches. Later Latin and Protestant missions have further complicated the tangled state of the ecclesiastical East. Their adherents everywhere belong of course to the Western portion.

II. CATALOGUE OF THE EASTERN CHURCHES.—It is now possible to draw up the list of bodies that answer to our definition. We have already noted that they are by no means all in communion with each other, nor have they any common basis of language, rite, or faith. All are covered by a division into the great Orthodox Church, those formed by the Nestorian and Monophysite heresies (the original Monotheletes are now all Uniats), and lastly the Uniat Churches corresponding in each case to a schismatical body. Theologically, to Catholics, the vital distinction is between Catholic Uniats, on the one hand, and schismatics or

heretics, on the other. But it is not convenient to start from this basis in cataloguing Eastern Churches. Historically and archæologically, it is a secondary question. Each Uniat body has been formed from one of the schismatical ones; their organizations are comparatively late, dating in most cases from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Moreover, although all these Uniats of course agree in the same Catholic Faith that we profess, they are not organized as one body. Each branch keeps the rites (with in some cases modifications made at Rome for dogmatic reasons) of the corresponding schismatical body, and has an organization modelled on the same plan. In faith a Uniat Armenian, for instance, is joined to Uniat Chaldees and Copts, and has no more to do with schismatical Armenians than with Nestorians or Abyssinians. Nor does he forget this fact. He knows quite well that he is a Catholic in union with the Pope of Rome, and that he is equally in union with every other Catholic. Nevertheless, national customs, languages, and rites tell very strongly on the superficies, and our Uniat Armenian would certainly feel very much more at home in a non-Uniat church of his own nation than in a Uniat Coptic, or even Latin, church. Outwardly, the bond of a common language and common liturgy is often more apparent than what everyone knows to be the essential and radical division of a schism. Indeed these Uniat bodies in many cases still faintly reflect the divisions of their schismatical relations. What in one case is a schism (as for instance between Orthodox and Jacobites) still remains as a not very friendly feeling between the different Uniat Churches (in this case Melkites and Catholic Syrians). Certainly, such feeling is a very different thing from formal schism, and the leaders of the Uniat Churches, as well as all their more intelligent members and all their well-wishers, earnestly strive to repress it. Nevertheless, quarrels between various Uniat bodies fill up too large a portion of Eastern Church history to be ignored; still, to take another instance, anyone who knows Syria knows that the friendship between Melkites and Maronites is not enthusiastic. It will be seen, then, that for purposes of tabulation we cannot conveniently begin by cataloguing the Catholic bodies on the one side and then classing the schismatics together on the other. We must arrange these Churches according to their historic basis and origin: first, the larger and older schismatical Churches; then, side by side with each of these, the corresponding Uniat Church formed out of the schismatics in later times.

A. Schismatical Churches.

1. The first of the Eastern Churches in size and importance is the great *Orthodox Church*. This is, after that of the Catholics, considerably the largest body in Christendom. The Orthodox Church now counts about a hundred millions of members. It is the main body of Eastern Christendom, that remained faithful to the decrees of Ephesus and Chalcedon when Nestorianism and Monophysitism cut away the national Churches in Syria and Egypt. It remained in union with the West till the great schism of Photius and then that of Cærularius, in the ninth and eleventh centuries. In spite of the short-lived reunions made by the Second Council of Lyons (1274) and the Council of Florence (1439), this Church has been in schism ever since. The "Orthodox" (it is convenient as well as courteous to call them by the name they use as a technical one for themselves) originally comprised the four Eastern patriarchates: Alexandria and Antioch, then Constantinople and Jerusalem. But the balance between these four patriarchates was soon upset. The Church of Cyprus was taken away from Antioch and made autocephalous (i. e. extra-patriarchal) by the Council of Ephesus (431). Then, in the fifth century, came the great upheavals of Nestorianism and Monophysitism, of which the result was that enormous numbers of Syrians and Egyptians fell away into schism. So the Patriarchs of Antioch, Jerusalem (this was always a very small and comparatively unimportant centre), and Alexandria, losing most of their subjects, inevitably sank in importance. The Moslem conquest of their lands completed their ruin, so that they became the merest shadows of what their predecessors had once been. Meanwhile Constantinople, honoured by the presence of the emperor, and always sure of his favour, rose rapidly in importance. Itself a new see, neither Apostolic nor primitive (the first Bishop of Byzantium was Metrophanes, in 325), it succeeded so well in its ambitious career that for a short time after the great Eastern schism it seemed as if the Patriarch of New Rome would take the same place over the Orthodox Church as did his rival the Pope of Old Rome over Catholics. It is also well known that it was this insatiable ambition of Constantinople that was chiefly responsible for the schism of the ninth and eleventh centuries. The Turkish conquest, strangely enough, still further strengthened the power of the Byzantine patriarch, inasmuch as the Turks acknowledged him as the civil head of what they called the "Roman nation" (*Rum millet*), meaning thereby the whole Orthodox community of whatever patriarchate. For about a century Constantinople enjoyed her power. The other patriarchs were content to be her vassals, many of them even came to spend their useless lives as ornaments of the chief patriarch's court, while Cyprus protested faintly and ineffectually that she was subject to no patriarch. The bishop who had climbed to so high a place by a long course of degrading intrigue could for a little time justify in the Orthodox world his usurped title of Œcumenical Patriarch. Then came his fall; since the sixteenth century he has lost one province after another, till now he too is only a shadow of what he once was, and the real power of the Orthodox body is in the new independent national Churches with their "holy Synods"; while high over all looms the shadow of Russia. The separation of the various national Orthodox Churches from the patriarchate of Constantinople forms the only important chapter in the modern history of this body. The principle is always the same. More and more has the idea obtained that political modifications should be followed by the Church, that is to say that the Church of an independent State must be itself independent of the patriarch. This by no means implies real independence for the national Church; on the contrary, in each case the much severer rule of the Government is substituted for the distant authority of the Œcumenical Patriarch. Outside the Turkish Empire, in Russia and the Balkan States, the Orthodox Churches are shamelessly Erastian—by far the most Erastian of all Christian bodies. The process began when the great Church of Russia was declared autocephalous by the Czar Feodor Ivanovitch, in 1589. Jeremias II of Constantinople took a bribe to acknowledge its independence. Peter the Great abolished the Russian patriarchate (of Moscow) and set up a "Holy Governing Synod" to rule the national Church in 1721. The Holy Synod is simply a department of the government through which the czar rules over his Church as absolutely as over his army and navy. The independence of Russia and its Holy Synod have since been copied by each Balkan State. But this independence does not mean schism. Its first announcement is naturally very distasteful to the patriarch and his court. He often begins by excommunicating the new national Church root and branch. But in each case he has been obliged to give in finally and to acknowledge one more "Sister in Christ" in the Holy Synod that has displaced his authority. Only in the specially difficult and bitter case of the Bulgarian Church has a permanent schism resulted. Other causes have led to the establishment of a few other independent Churches, so that now the great Orthodox communion consists of sixteen independent Churches, each of which (except

that of the Bulgars) is recognized by, and in communion with, the others.

These Churches are (1) The Great Church, that is, the patriarchate of Constantinople that takes precedence of the others. It covers Turkey in Europe (except where its jurisdiction is disputed by the Bulgarian Exarch) and Asia Minor. Under the Œcumenical Patriarch are seventy-four metropolitans and twenty other bishops. Outside this territory the Patriarch of Constantinople has no jurisdiction. He still has the position of civil head of the Roman Nation throughout the Turkish Empire, and he still intermittently tries to interpret this as including some sort of ecclesiastical jurisdiction—he is doing so at this moment in Cyprus—but in modern times especially each attempt is at once met by the most pronounced opposition on the part of the other patriarchs and national Churches, who answer that they acknowledge no head but Christ, no external authority but the seven Œcumenical Synods. The Œcumenical Patriarch, however, keeps the right of alone consecrating the chrism (*myron*) and sending it to the other Orthodox Churches, except in the cases of Russia and Rumania, which prepare it themselves. Bulgaria gets hers from Russia, Greece has already mooted the question of consecrating her own *myron*, and there seems no doubt that Antioch will do so too when the present stock is exhausted. So even this shadow of authority is in a precarious state.

(2) Alexandria (covering all Egypt as far as it is Orthodox) with only four metropolitans. (3) Antioch, extending over Syria from the Mediterranean to the Euphrates as far as any Orthodox live so far East, touching the Great Church along the frontier of Asia Minor to the north and Palestine to the south, with twelve metropolitans and two or three titular bishops who form the patriarchal curia. (4) Jerusalem, consisting of Palestine, from Haifa to the Egyptian frontier, with thirteen metropolitans. (5) Cyprus, the old autocephalous Church, with an archbishop [whose succession (1908), after eight years, rends the whole Orthodox world] and three suffragans. Then come the new national Churches, arranged here according to the date of their foundation, since they have no precedence. (6) Russia (independent since 1589). This is enormously the preponderating partner, about eight times as great as all the others put together. The Holy Synod consists of three metropolitans (Kiev, Moscow, and Petersburg), the Exarch of Georgia, and five or six other bishops or archimandrites appointed at the czar's pleasure. There are eighty-six Russian dioceses, to which must be added missionary bishops in Siberia, Japan, North America, etc. (7) Carlovitz (1765), formed of Orthodox Serbs in Hungary, with six suffragan sees. (8) Czernagora (1765), the one independent diocese of the Black Mountain. (9) The Church of Sinai, consisting of one monastery recognized as independent of Jerusalem in 1782. The hegumenos is an archbishop. (10) The Greek Church (1850): thirty-two sees under a Holy Synod on the Russian model. (11) Hermannstadt (Nagy-Szeben, 1864), the Church of the Vlachs in Hungary, with three sees. (12) The Bulgarian Church under the exarch, who lives at Constantinople. In Bulgaria are eleven sees with a Holy Synod. The exarch, however, claims jurisdiction over all Bulgars anywhere (especially in Macedonia) and has set up rival exarchist metropolitans against the patriarchist ones. The Bulgarian Church is recognized by the Porte and by Russia, but is excommunicate, since 1872, by the Great Church and is considered schismatical by all Greeks. (13) Czernovitz (1873), for the Orthodox in Austria, with four sees. (14) Servia (1879), the national Church of that country, with five bishops and a Holy Synod. The Serbs in Macedonia are now agitating to add two more sees (Uskub and Monastir) to this Church, at the further cost of Constantinople. (15) Rumania (1885), again a national Church with a Holy Synod and eight sees. (16) Herzegovina and Bosnia, organized since the Austrian occupation (1880) as a practically independent Church with a vague recognition of Constantinople as a sort of titular primacy. It has four sees.

This ends the list of allied bodies that make up the Orthodox Church (see Fortescue, "Orthodox Eastern Church", x, 273–337). Next come, in order of date, the old heretical Eastern Churches.

2. The *Nestorians* are now only a pitiful remnant of what was once a great Church. Long before the heresy from which they have their name, there was a flourishing Christian community in Chaldea and Mesopotamia. According to their tradition it was founded by Addai and Mari (Addeus and Maris), two of the seventy-two Disciples. The present Nestorians count Mar Mari as the first Bishop of Ctesiphon and predecessor of their patriarch. In any case this community was originally subject to the Patriarch of Antioch. As his vicar, the metropolitan of the twin-cities of Seleucia and Ctesiphon (on either side of the Tigris, north-east of Babylon) bore the title of catholicos. One of these metropolitans was present at the Council of Nicæa in 325. The great distance of this Church from Antioch led in early times to a state of semi-independence that prepared the way for the later schism. Already in the fourth century the Patriarch of Antioch waived his right of ordaining the catholicos of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, and allowed him to be ordained by his own suffragans. In view of the great importance of the right of ordaining, as a sign of jurisdiction throughout the East, this fact is important. But it does not seem that real independence of Antioch was acknowledged or even claimed till after the schism. In the fifth century the influence of the famous Theodore of Mopsuestia and that of his school at Edessa spread the heresy of Nestorius throughout this extreme Eastern Church. Naturally, the later Nestorians deny that their fathers accepted any new doctrine at that time, and they claim that Nestorius learned from them rather than they from him ("Nestorius eos secutus est, non ipsi Nestorium", Ebed-Jesu of Nisibis, about 1300. Assemani, "Bibl. Orient.", III, 1, 355). There may be truth in this. Theodore and his school had certainly prepared the way for Nestorius. In any case the rejection of the Council of Ephesus (431) by these Christians in Chaldea and Mesopotamia produced a schism between them and the rest of Christendom. When Babæus, himself a Nestorian, became catholicos, in 498, there were practically no more Catholics in those parts. From Ctesiphon the Faith had spread across the frontier into Persia, even before that city was conquered by the Persian king (224). The Persian Church, then, always depended on Ctesiphon and shared its heresy. From the fifth century this most remote of the Eastern Churches has been cut off from the rest of Christendom, and till modern times was the most separate and forgotten community of all. Shut out from the Roman Empire (Zeno closed the school of Edessa in 489), but, for a time at least, protected by the Persian kings, the Nestorian Church flourished around Ctesiphon, Nisibis (where the school was reorganized), and throughout Persia. Since the schism the catholicos occasionally assumed the title of patriarch. The Church then spread towards the East and sent missionaries to India and even China. A Nestorian inscription of the year 781 has been found at Singan Fu in China (J. Heller, S.J., "Prolegomena zu einer neuen Ausgabe der nestorianischen Inschrift von Singan Fu", in the "Verhandlungen des VII. internationalen Orientalistencongresses", Vienna, 1886, pp. 37 sq.). Its greatest extent was in the eleventh century, when twenty-five metropolitans obeyed the Nestorian patriarch. But since the end of the fourteenth century it has gradually sunk to a very small sect, first, because of a fierce

persecution by the Mongols (Timur Leng), and then through internal disputes and schisms. Two great schisms as to the patriarchal succession in the sixteenth century led to a reunion of part of the Nestorian Church with Rome, forming the Uniat Chaldean Church. At present there are about 150,000 Nestorians living chiefly in highlands west of Lake Urumiah. They speak a modern dialect of Syriac (Maclean, "Grammar of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac", Cambridge, 1895; Nöldeke, "Grammatik der neusyrischen Sprache", 1868). The patriarchate descends from uncle to nephew, or to younger brothers, in the family of Mama; each patriarch bears the name Simon (Mar Shimun) as a title. Ignoring the Second General Council, and of course strongly opposed to the Third (Ephesus), they only acknowledge the First Nicene (325). They have a Creed of their own (Hahn, "Bibliothek der Symbole", p. 74), formed from an old Antiochene Creed, which does not contain any trace of the particular heresy from which their Church is named. Indeed it is difficult to say how far any Nestorians now are conscious of the particular teaching condemned by the Council of Ephesus, though they still honour Nestorius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and other undoubted heretics as saints and doctors. The patriarch rules over twelve other bishops (the list in Silbernagl, "Verfassung", p. 267). Their hierarchy consists of the patriarch, metropolitans, bishops, chorepiscopi, archdeacons, priests, deacons, subdeacons, and readers. There are also many monasteries. They use Syriac liturgically written in their own (Nestorian) form of the alphabet. The patriarch, who now generaliy calls himself "Patriarch of the East", resides at Kochanes, a remote valley of the Kurdish mountains by the Zab, on the frontier between Persia and Turkey. He has an undefined political jurisdiction over his people, though he does not receive a *berat* from the Sultan. In many ways this most remote Church stands alone; it has kept a number of curious and archaic customs (such as the perpetual abstinence of the patriarch, etc.) that separate it from other Eastern Churches almost as much as from those of the West. Lately the Archbishop of Canterbury's mission to the Nestorians has aroused a certain interest about them in England.

All the other separated Eastern Churches are formed by the other great heresy of the fourth century, Monophysitism. There are first the national Churches of Egypt, Syria, and Armenia.

3. The *Copts* form the Church of Egypt. Monophysitism was in a special sense the national religion of Egypt. As an extreme opposition to Nestorianism, the Egyptians believed it to be the faith of their hero St. Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444). His successor, Dioscurus (444–55), was deposed and excommunicated by the Council of Chalcedon (451). From his time the Monophysite party gained ground very quickly among the native population, so that soon it became the expression of their national feeling against the Imperial (Melchite, or Melkite) garrison and government officials. Afterwards, at the Moslem invasion (641), the opposition was so strong that the native Egyptians threw in their lot with the conquerors against the Greeks. The two sides are still represented by the native Monophysites and the Orthodox minority. The Monophysites are sometimes called Jacobites here as in Syria; but the old national name *Copt* (Gr. Αἰγύπτιος) has become the regular one for their Church as well as for their nation. Their patriarch, with the title of Alexandria, succeeds Dioscurus and Timothy the Cat, a fanatical Monophysite. He lives at Cairo, ruling over thirteen dioceses (Silbernagl, p. 289) and about 500,000 subjects. For him, too, the law is perpetual abstinence. There are many monasteries. The Copts use their old language liturgically and have in it a number of liturgies all derived from the original Greek rite of Alexandria (St. Mark). But Coptic is a dead language, so much so that even most priests understand very little of it. They all speak Arabic, and their service books give an Arabic version of the text in parallel columns. This Church is, on the whole, in a poor state. The Copts are mostly fellaheen who live by tilling the ground, in a state of great poverty and ignorance. And the clergy share the same conditions. Lately there has been something of a revival among them, and certain rich Coptic merchants of Cairo have begun to found schools and seminaries and generally to promote education and such advantages among their nation. One of these, M. Gabriel Labib, who is editing their service books, promises to be a scholar of some distinction in questions of liturgy and archæology.

4. The *Church of Abyssinia*, or Ethiopia, always depended on Egypt. It was founded by St. Frumentius, who was ordained and sent by St. Athanasius in 326. So Abyssinia has always acknowledged the supremacy of the Patriarch of Alexandria and still considers its Church as a daughter-church of the See of St. Mark. The same causes that made Egypt Monophysite affected Abyssinia equally. She naturally, almost inevitably, shared the schism of the mother Church. So Abyssinia is still Monophysite, and acknowledges the Coptic patriarch as her head. There is now only one bishop of Abyssinia (there were once two) who is called *Abuna* (Our Father) and resides at Adeva (the old see was Axum). He is always a Coptic monk consecrated and sent by the Coptic patriarch. It does not seem, however, that there is now much communication between Cairo and Adeva, though the patriarch still has the right of deposing the Abuna. Abyssinia has about three million inhabitants, nearly all members of the national Church. There are many monks and an enormous number of priests, whom the Abuna ordains practically without any previous preparation or examination. The Abyssinians have liturgies, again, derived from those of Alexandria in the old (classical) form of their language. The Abyssinian Church, being the religion of a more than half barbarous people, cut off by the schism from relations with any other Christian body except the poor and backward Copts, is certainly the lowest representative of the great Christian family. The people have gradually mixed up Christianity with a number of pagan and magical elements, and are specially noted for strong Jewish tendencies (they circumcise and have on their altars a sort of Ark of the Covenant containing the Ten Commandments). Lately Russia has developed an interest in the Abyssinians and has begun to undertake schemes for educating them, and, of course, at the same time, converting them to Orthodoxy.

5. The *Jacobites* are the Monophysites of Syria. Here, too, chiefly out of political opposition to the imperial court, Monophysitism spread quickly among the native population, and here, too, there was the same opposition between the Syrian Monophysites in the country and the Greek Melkites in the cities. Severus of Antioch (512–18) was an ardent Monophysite. After his death the Emperor Justinian (527–65) tried to cut off the succession by having all bishops suspect of heresy locked up in monasteries. But his wife Theodora was herself a Monophysite; she arranged the ordination of two monks of that party, Theodore and James. It is from this James, called Zanzalos and Baradaï (Jacob Baradæus), that they have their name (*Ia'qobaie*, "Jacobite"); it is sometimes used for any Monophysite anywhere, but had better be kept for the national Syrian Church. James found two Coptic bishops, who with him ordained a whole hierarchy, including one Sergius of Tella as Patriarch of Antioch. From this Sergius the Jacobite patriarchs descend. Historically, the Jacobites of Syria are the national Church of their country, as much as the Copts in Egypt; but they by no means form so exclusively the religion of the native popula-

tion. Syria never held together, was never so compact a unity as Egypt. We have seen that the Eastern Syrians expressed their national, anti-Imperial feeling by adopting the extreme opposite heresy, Nestorianism, which, however, had the same advantage of not being the religion of Cæsar and his court. Among the Western Syrians, too, there has always been a lack of cohesion. They had in Monophysite times two patriarchates (Antioch and Jerusalem) instead of one. In all quarrels, whether political or theological, whereas the Copts move like one man for the cause of Egypt and the "Christian Pharaoh", the Syrians are divided amongst themselves. So there have always been many more Melkites in Syria, and the Jacobites were never an overwhelming majority. Now they are a small minority (about 80,000) dwelling in Syria, Mesopotamia, Kurdistan. Their head is the Jacobite Patriarch of "Antioch and all the East". He always takes the name Ignatius and dwells either at Diarbekir or Mardin in Mesopotamia. Under him, as first of the metropolitans, is the Maphrian, a prelate who was originally set up to rule the Eastern Jacobites as a rival of the Nestorian catholicos. Originally the maphrian had a number of special rights and privileges that made him almost independent of his patriarch. Now he has only precedence of other metropolitans, a few rights in connexion with the patriarch's election and consecration (when the patriarch dies he is generally succeeded by the maphrian) and the title "Maphrian and Catholicos of the East". Besides these two, the Jacobites have seven metropolitans and three other bishops. As in all Eastern Churches, there are many monks, from whom the bishops are always taken. The Syrian Jacobites are in communion with the Copts. They name the Coptic patriarch in the Liturgy, and the rule is that each Syrian patriarch should send an official letter to his brother of Alexandria to announce his succession. This implies a recognition of superior rank which is consistent with the old precedence of Alexandria over Antioch. At Mardin still linger the remains of an old pagan community of Sun-worshippers who in 1762 (when the Turks finally decided to apply to them, too, the extermination that the Koran prescribes for pagans) preferred to hide under the outward appearance of Jacobite Christianity. They were, therefore, all nominally converted, and they conform to the laws of the Jacobite Church, baptize, fast, receive all sacraments and Christian burial. But they only marry among themselves and every one knows that they still practise their old pagan rites in secret. There are about one hundred families of these people, still called *Shamsiyeh* (people of the Sun).

6. The *Malabar Christians* in India have had the strangest history of all these Eastern Churches. For, having been Nestorians, they have now veered round to the other extreme and have become Monophysites. We hear of Christian communities along the Malabar coast (in Southern India from Goa to Cape Comorin) as early as the sixth century (Silbernagl, op. cit., 317; see also Germann, "Die Kirche der Thomaschristen", quoted below). They claim the Apostle St. Thomas as their founder (hence their name "Thomas-Christians", or "Christians of St. Thomas"). In the first period they depended on the Catholicos of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, and were Nestorians like him. They are really one of the many missionary Churches founded by the Nestorians in Asia. In the sixteenth century the Portuguese succeeded in converting a part of this Church to reunion with Rome. A further schism among these Uniats led to a complicated situation, of which the Jacobite patriarch took advantage by sending a bishop to form a Jacobite Malabar Church. There were then three parties among them: Nestorians, Jacobites, and Uniats. The line of Nestorian metropolitans died out (it has been revived lately) and nearly all the non-Uniat Thomas-Christians may be counted as Monophysites since the eighteenth century. But the Jacobite patriarch seems to have forgotten them, so that after 1751 they chose their own hierarchy and were an independent Church. In the nineteenth century, after they had been practically rediscovered by the English, the Jacobites in Syria tried to reassert authority over Malabar by sending out a metropolitan named Athanasius. Athanasius made a considerable disturbance, excommunicated the hierarchy he found, and tried to reorganize this Church in communion with the Syrian patriarch. But the Rajah of Travancore took the side of the national Church and forced Athanasius to leave the country. Since then the Thomas-Christians have been a quite independent Church whose communion with the Jacobites of Syria is at most only theoretic. There are about 70,000 of them under a metropolitan who calls himself "Bishop and Gate of all India". He is always named by his predecessor, i. e. each metropolitan chooses a coadjutor with the right of succession. The Thomas-Christians use Syriac liturgically and describe themselves generally as "Syrians".

7. The *Armenian Church* is the last and the most important of these Monophysite bodies. Although it agrees in faith with the Copts and Jacobites it is not in communion with them (a union arranged by a synod in 726 came to nothing) nor with any other Church in the world. This is a national Church in the strictest sense of all: except for the large Armenian Uniat body that forms the usual pendant, and for a very small number of Protestants, every Armenian belongs to it, and it has no members who are not Armenians. So in this case the name of the nation and of the religion are really the same. Only, since there are the Uniats, it is necessary to distinguish whether an Armenian belongs to them or to the schismatical (Monophysite) Church. Because of this distinction it is usual to call the others Gregorian Armenians—after St. Gregory the Illuminator—another polite concession of form on our part akin to that of "Orthodox" etc. Quite lately the Gregorian Armenians have begun to call themselves Orthodox. This has no meaning and only confuses the issue. Of course each Church thinks itself really Orthodox, and Catholic and Apostolic and Holy too. But one must keep technical names clear, or we shall always talk at cross purposes. The polite convention throughout the Levant is that we are Catholics, that people in communion with the "Œcumenical Patriarch" are Orthodox, and that Monophysite Armenians are Gregorian. They should be content with what is an honourable title to which we and the Orthodox do not of course think that they have really any right. They have no real right to it, because the Apostle of Armenia, St. Gregory the Illuminator (295), was no Monophysite, but a Catholic in union with Rome. The Armenian Church was in the first period subject to the Metropolitan of Cæsarea; he ordained its bishops. It suffered persecution from the Persians and was an honoured branch of the great Catholic Church till the sixth century. Then Monophysitism spread throughout Armenia from Syria, and in 527 the Armenian primate, Nerses, in the Synod of Duin, formally rejected the Council of Chalcedon. The schism became quite manifest in 552, when the primate, Abraham I, excommunicated the Church of Georgia and all others who accepted the decrees of Chalcedon. From that time the national Armenian Church has been isolated from the rest of Christendom; the continual attempts at reunion made by Catholic missionaries, however, have established a considerable body of Armenian Uniats. The Armenians are a prolific and widespread race. They are found not only in Armenia, but scattered all over the Levant and in many cities of Europe and America. As they always bring their Church with them, it is a large and important community, second only to the Orthodox in size among Eastern Churches. There are about three mil-

tions of Gregorian Armenians. Among their bishops four have the title of patriarch. The first is the Patriarch of Etchmiadzin, who bears as a special title that of *catholicos*. Etchmiadzin is a monastery in the province of Erivan, between the Black and the Caspian Seas, near Mount Ararat (since 1828 Russian territory). It is the cradle of the race and their chief sanctuary. The catholicos is the head of the Armenian Church and to a great extent of his nation too. Before the Russian occupation of Erivan he had unlimited jurisdiction over all Gregorian Armenians and was something very like an Armenian pope. But since he sits under the shadow of Russia, and especially since the Russian Government has begun to interfere in his election and administration, the Armenians of Turkey have made themselves nearly independent of him. The second rank belongs to the Patriarch of Constantinople. They have had a bishop at Constantinople since 1307. In 1461 Mohammed II gave this bishop the title of Patriarch of the Armenians, so as to rivet their loyalty to his capital and to form a *millet* (nation) on the same footing as the *Rum millet* (the Orthodox Church). This patriarch is the person responsible to the Porte for his race, has the same privileges as his Orthodox rival, and now uses the jurisdiction over all Turkish Armenians that formerly belonged to the catholicos. Under him, and little more than titular patriarchs, are those of Sis in Cilicia (a title kept after a temporary schism in 1440) and Jerusalem (whose title was assumed illegally in the eighteenth century). The Armenians have seven dioceses in the Russian Empire, two in Persia, and thirty-five in Turkey. They distinguish archbishops from bishops by an honorary precedence only and have an upper class of priests called Vartapeds, who are celibate and provide all the higher offices (bishops are always taken from their ranks). There are, of course, as in all Eastern Churches, many monks. In many ways the Armenian (Gregorian) Church has been influenced by Rome, so that they are among Eastern schismatical bodies the only one that can be described as at all latinized. Examples of such influence are their use of unleavened bread for the Holy Eucharist, their vestments (the mitre is almost exactly the Roman one), etc. This appears to be the result of opposition to their nearer rivals, the Orthodox. In any case, at present the Armenians are probably nearer to the Catholic Church and better disposed for reunion than any other of these communions. Their Monophysitism is now very vague and shadowy—as indeed is the case with most Monophysite Churches. It is from them that the greatest proportion of Uniats have been converted.

This brings us to the end of the Monophysite bodies and so to the end of all schismatical Eastern Churches. A further schism was indeed caused by the Monothelete heresy in the seventh century, but the whole of the Church then formed (the Maronite Church) has been for many centuries reunited with Rome. So Maronites have their place only among the Uniats.

We have, then, as schismatical Eastern Churches, first, the great Orthodox Church, then one Church formed by the Nestorian heresy and five as the result of Monophysitism (those of the Copts, Abyssinians, Jacobites, Malabar Christians, and Armenians). Corresponding to each of these is a Uniat Church, with one additional entirely Uniat community (the Maronites).

B. Uniat Churches.—The definition of a Uniat is: a Christian of any Eastern rite in union with the pope: i. e. a Catholic who belongs not to the Roman, but to an Eastern rite. They differ from other Eastern Christians in that they are in communion with Rome, and from Latins in that they have other rites. A curious, but entirely theoretic, question of terminology is: Are Milanese and Mozarabic Catholics Uniats? If we make rite our basis, they are. That is, they are Catholics who do not belong to the Roman Rite. The point has sometimes been urged rather as a catch than seriously. As a matter of fact, the real basis, though it is superficially less obvious than rite, is patriarchate. Uniats are Catholics who do not belong to the Roman patriarchate. So these two remnants of other rites in the West do not constitute Uniat Churches. In the West, rite does not always follow patriarchate; the great Gallican Church, with her own rite, was always part of the Roman patriarchate; so are Milan and Toledo. This, however, raises a new difficulty; for it may be urged that in that case the Italo-Greeks are not Uniats, since they certainly belong to the Roman patriarchate. They do, of course; and they always have done so legally. But the constitution of these Italo-Greek Churches was originally the result of an attempt on the part of the Eastern emperors (Leo III, 717–741, especially; see "Orth. Eastern Church", 45–47) to filch them from the Roman patriarchate and join them to that of Constantinople. Although the attempt did not succeed, the descendants of the Greeks in Calabria, Sicily, etc., have kept the Byzantine Rite. They are an exception to the rule, invariable in the East, that rite follows patriarchate, and are an exception to the general principle about Uniats too. As they have no diocesan bishops of their own, on this ground it may well be denied that they form a Uniat Church. An Italo-Greek may best be defined as a member of the Roman patriarchate in Italy, Sicily, or Corsica, who, as a memory of older arrangements, is still allowed to use the Byzantine Rite. With regard to the fundamental distinction of patriarchate, it must be noted that it is no longer purely geographical. A Latin in the East belongs to the Roman patriarchate as much as if he lived in the West; Latin missionaries everywhere and the new dioceses in Australia and America count as part of what was once the patriarchate of Western Europe. So also the Melkites in Leghorn, Marseilles, and Paris belong to the (Uniat) Byzantine patriarchate, though, as foreigners, they are temporarily subject to Latin bishops.

A short enumeration and description of the Uniats will complete this picture of the Eastern Churches. It is, in the first place, a mistake (encouraged by Eastern schismatics and Anglicans) to look upon these Uniats as a sort of compromise between Latin and the other rites, or between Catholics and schismatics. Nor is it true that they are Catholics to whom grudging leave has been given to keep something of their national customs. Their position is quite simple and quite logical. They represent exactly the state of the Eastern Churches before the schisms. They are entirely and uncompromisingly Catholics in our strictest sense of the word, quite as much as Latins. They accept the whole Catholic Faith and the authority of the pope as visible head of the Catholic Church, as did St. Athanasius, St. Basil, St. John Chrysostom. They do not belong to the pope's patriarchate, nor do they use his rite, any more than did the great saints of Eastern Christendom. They have their own rites and their own patriarchs, as had their fathers before the schism. Nor is there any idea of compromise or concession about this. The Catholic Church has never been identified with the Western patriarchate. The pope's position as patriarch of the West is as distinct from his papal rights as is his authority as local Bishop of Rome. It is no more necessary to belong to his patriarchate in order to acknowledge his supreme jurisdiction than it is necessary to have him for diocesan bishop. The Eastern Catholic Churches in union with the West have always been as much the ideal of the Church Universal as the Latin Church. If some of those Eastern Churches fall into schism, that is a misfortune which does not affect the others who remain faithful. If all fall away, the Eastern half of the Church disappears for a time as an actual fact; it remains as a theory and an ideal to be realized again as soon as they, or some of them, come back to union with Rome.

This is what has happened. There is at any rate no certain evidence of continuity from time before the schism in any of these Uniat Churches. Through the bad time, from the various schisms to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, there are traces, isolated cases, of bishops who have at least wished for reunion with the West; but it cannot be claimed that any considerable body of Eastern Christians have kept the union throughout. The Maronites think they have, but they are mistaken; the only real case is that of the Italo-Greeks (who have never been schismatic). Really the Uniat Churches were formed by Catholic missionaries since the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. And as soon as any number of Eastern Christians were persuaded to reunite with the West, the situation that had existed before the schisms became an actual one again. They became Catholics; no one thought of asking them to become Latins. They were given bishops and patriarchs of their own as successors of the old Catholic Eastern bishops before the schism, and they became what all Eastern Christians had once been—Uniats. That the Uniats are comparatively small bodies is the unfortunate result of the fact that the majority of their countrymen prefer schism. Our missionaries would willingly make them larger ones. But, juridically, they stand exactly where all the East once stood, before the Greek schism, or during the short-lived union of Florence (1439–53). And they have as much right to exist and be respected as have Latins, or the great Catholic bishops in the East had during the first centuries. The idea of latinizing all Eastern Catholics, sometimes defended by people on our side whose zeal for uniformity is greater than their knowledge of the historical and juridical situation, is diametrically opposed to antiquity, to the Catholic system of ecclesiastical organization, and to the policy of all popes. Nor has it any hope of success. The East may become Catholic again; it will never be what it never has been—Latin.

1. The *Byzantine Uniats* are those who correspond to the Orthodox. They all use the same (Byzantine) Rite; but they are not all organized as one body. They form seven groups: (a) the Melkites in Syria and Egypt (about 110,000), under a Patriarch of Antioch who administers, and bears the titles of, Alexandria and Jerusalem too. They have eleven dioceses and use Arabic liturgically with fragments of Greek, though any of their priests may (and some do) celebrate entirely in Greek. The old name "Melkite", which meant originally one who accepted the decrees of Chalcedon (and the imperial laws), as against the Jacobites and Copts, is now used only for these Uniats. (b) There are a few hundred Uniats of this Rite in Greece and Turkey in Europe. They use Greek liturgically and depend on Latin delegates at Constantinople and Athens. (c) One Georgian congregation of Constantinople (last remnant of the old Georgian Church destroyed by Russia), who use their own language and obey the Latin Delegate. (d) The Ruthenians, of whom there are nearly four millions in Austria-Hungary and hidden still in corners of Russia. They use Old Slavonic. (e) The Bulgarian Uniats (about 13,000), under two vicars Apostolic, who also use Old Slavonic. (f) Rumanian Uniats (about a million and a half) in Rumania, but chiefly in Transylvania. They have four bishops and use their own language in the liturgy. (g) The Italo-Greeks (about 50,000), a remnant of the old Church of Greater Greece. They are scattered about Calabria and Sicily, have a famous monastery near Rome (Grottaferrata) and colonies at Leghorn, Malta, Algiers, Marseilles, and Corsica, besides a church (St-Julien le Pauvre) at Paris. They use Greek liturgically, but, living as they do surrounded by Latins, they have considerably latinized their rites.

This completes the list of Byzantine Uniats, of whom it may be said that the chief want is organization among themselves. There has often been talk of restoring a Uniat (Melkite) Patriarch of Constantinople. It was said that Pope Leo XIII intended to arrange this before he died. If such a revival ever is made, the patriarch would have jurisdiction, or at least a primacy, over all Catholics of his Rite; in this way the scattered unities of Melkites in Syria, Ruthenians in Hungary, Italo-Greeks in Sicily, and so on, would be linked together as are all other Uniat Churches.

2. The *Chaldees* are Uniats converted from Nestorianism. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries a complicated series of quarrels and schisms among the Nestorians led to not very stable unions of first one and then another party with the Holy See. Since that time there has always been a Uniat Patriarch of the Chaldees, though several times the person so appointed fell away into schism again and had to be replaced by another. The Chaldees are said now to number about 70,000 souls (Silbernagl, op. cit., 354; but Werner, "Orbis Terr. Cath.", 166, gives the number as 33,000). Their primate lives at Mosul, having the title of Patriarch of Babylon. Under him are two archbishoprics and ten other sees. There are monasteries whose arrangements are very similar to those of the Nestorians. The liturgical books (in Syriac, slightly revised from the Nestorian ones) are printed by the Dominicans at Mosul. Most of their canon law depends on the Bull of Pius IX, "Reversurus" (12 July, 1867), published for the Armenians and extended to the Chaldees by another Bull, "Cum ecclesiastica" (31 Aug., 1869). They have some students at the Propaganda College in Rome.

3. The *Uniat Copts* have had a vicar Apostolic since 1781. Before that (in 1442 and again in 1713) the Coptic patriarch had submitted to Rome, but in neither case was the union of long duration. As the number of Catholics of this Rite has increased very considerably of late years, Leo XIII in 1895 restored the Uniat patriarchate. The patriarch lives at Cairo and rules over about 20,000 Catholic Copts.

4. The *Abyssinians*, too, had many relations with Rome in past times, and Latin missionaries built up a considerable Uniat Abyssinian Church. But repeated persecutions and banishment of Catholics prevented this community from becoming a permanent one with a regular hierarchy. Now that the Government is tolerant, some thousands of Abyssinians are Uniats. They have an Apostolic vicar at Keren. If their numbers increase, no doubt they will in time be organized under a Uniat Abuna who should depend on the Uniat Coptic patriarch. Their liturgy, too, is at present in a state of disorganization. It seems that the Monophysite Abyssinian books will need a good deal of revision before they can be used by Catholics. Meanwhile the priests ordained for this rite have a translation of the Roman Mass in their own language, an arrangement that is not meant to be more than a temporary expedient.

5. The *Catholic Syrian Church* dates from 1781. At that time a number of Jacobite bishops, priests, and lay people, who had agreed to reunion with Rome, elected one Ignatius Giarve to succeed the dead Jacobite patriarch, George III. Giarve sent to Rome asking for recognition and a pallium, and submitting in all things to the pope's authority. But he was then deposed by those of his people who clung to Jacobitism, and a Jacobite patriarch was elected. From this time there have been two rival successions. In 1830 the Catholic Syrians were acknowledged by the Turkish Government as a separate *millet*. The Uniat patriarch lives at Beirut, most of his flock in Mesopotamia. Under him are three archbishops and six other bishops, five monasteries, and about 25,000 families.

6. There is also a *Uniat Church of Malabar* formed by the Synod of Diamper in 1599. This Church, too, has passed through stormy periods; quite lately, since

the Vatican Council, a new schism has been formed from it of about 30,000 people who are in communion with neither the Catholics, nor the Jacobites, nor the Nestorians, nor any one else at all. There are now about 200,000 Malabar Uniats under three vicars Apostolic (at Trichur, Changanacherry, and Ernaculam).

7. The *Uniat Armenians* are an important body numbering altogether about 130,000 souls (Silbernagl, 344). Like their Gregorian countrymen they are scattered about the Levant, and they have congregations in Austria and Italy. There have been several more or less temporary reunions of the Armenian Church since the fourteenth century, but in each case a rival Gregorian party set up rival patriarchs and bishops. The head of the Catholic Armenians is the Uniat Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople (since 1830), in whom is joined the patriarchate of Cilicia. He always takes the name Peter, and rules over three titular archbishops and fourteen sees, of which one is Alexandria and one Ispahan in Persia (Werner, 151; Silbernagl, 346). After much dispute he is now recognized by the Porte as the head of a separate *millet*, and he also represents before the Government all other Uniat bodies that have as yet no political organization. There are also many Uniat Armenians in Austria-Hungary who are subject in Transylvania to the Latin bishops, but in Galicia to the Armenian Archbishop of Lemberg. In Russia there is an Armenian Uniat See of Artvin immediately subject to the pope. The Mechitarists (founded by Mechitar of Sebaste in 1711) are an important element of Armenian Catholicism. They are monks who follow the Rule of St. Benedict and have monasteries at San Lazzaro outside Venice, at Vienna, and in many towns in the Balkans, Armenia, and Russia. They have missions all over the Levant, schools, and presses that produce important liturgical, historical, and theological works. Since 1869 all Armenian Catholic priests must be celibate.

8. Lastly, the *Maronite Church* is entirely Uniat. There is much dispute as to its origin and the reason of its separation from the Syrian national Church. It is certain that it was formed around monasteries in the Lebanon founded by a certain John Maro in the fourth century. In spite of the indignant protests of all Maronites (Assemani, "Bibl. Orient.", II, 291 sq.; J. Debs, Maronite Bishop of Beirut, "Les Maronites du Liban, leur constante persévérance dans la Foi catholique" etc.), there is no doubt that they were separated from the old See of Antioch by the fact that they were Monotheletes. They were reunited to the Roman Church in the twelfth century, and then (after a period of wavering) since 1216, when their patriarch, Jeremias II, made his definite submission, they have been unswervingly faithful, alone among all Eastern Churches. As in other cases, the Maronites, too, are allowed to keep their old organization and titles. Their head is the Maronite "Patriarch of Antioch and all the East", successor to Monothelete rivals of the old line, who, therefore, in no way represents the original patriarchate (Duchesne, "Origines du culte chrétien", second ed., p. 65, note). He is also the civil head of his nation, although he has no *berat* from the sultan, and lives in a large palace at Bkerki in the Lebanon. He has under him nine sees and several titular bishops. There are many monasteries and convents. The present law of the Maronite Church was drawn up by the great national council held in 1736 at the monastery of Our Lady of the Almond Trees (Deir Saïdat al-Luaize), in the Lebanon. There are about 300,000 Maronites in the Lebanon and scattered along the Syrian coast. They also have colonies in Egypt and Cyprus, and numbers of them have lately begun to emigrate to America. They have a national college at Rome.

This completes the list of all the Eastern Churches, whether schismatical or Uniat.

In considering their general characteristics we must first of all again separate the Uniats from the others. Uniats are Catholics, and have as much right to be so treated as Latins. As far as faith and morals go they must be numbered with us; as far as the idea of an Eastern Church may now seem to connote schism or a state of opposition to the Holy See, they repudiate it as strongly as we do. Nevertheless, their position is very important as being the result of relations between Rome and the East, and as showing the terms on which reunion between East and West is possible.

III. Characteristics of the Schismatical Eastern Churches.—Although these Churches have no communion among themselves, and although many of them are bitterly opposed to the others, there are certain broad lines in which they may be classed together and contrasted with the West.

The first of these is their *national feeling*. In all these groups the Church is the nation; the vehement and often intolerant ardour of what seems to be their religious conviction is always really national pride and national loyalty under the guise of theology. This strong national feeling is the natural result of their political circumstances. For centuries, since the first ages, various nations have lived side by side and have carried on bitter opposition against each other in the Levant. Syria, Egypt, Mesopotamia, and the Balkans have never had one homogeneous population speaking one language. From the beginning, nationality in these parts has been a question not of the soil, but of a community held together by its language, striving for supremacy with other communities. The Roman contest accentuated this. Rome and then Constantinople was always a foreign tyranny to Syrians and Egyptians. And already in the fourth century of the Christian Era they began to accentuate their own nationalism, crushed in politics, by taking up an anti-imperial form of religion, by which they could express their hatred for the Government. Such an attitude has characterized these nations ever since. Under the Turk, too, the only possible separate organization was and is an ecclesiastical one. The Turk even increased the confusion. He found a simple and convenient way of organizing the subject Christians by taking their religion as a basis. So the Porte recognizes each sect as an artificial nation (*millet*). The Orthodox Church became the "Roman nation" (*Rum millet*), inheriting the name of the old Empire. Then there were the "Armenian nation" (*Ermeni millet*), the "Coptic nation", and so on. Blood has nothing to do with it. Any subject of the Porte who joins the Orthodox Church becomes a Roman and is submitted politically to the œcumenical patriarch; a Jew who is converted by Armenians becomes an Armenian. True, the latest development of Turkish politics has modified this artificial system, and there have been during the nineteenth century repeated attempts to set up one great Ottoman nation. But the effect of centuries is too deeply rooted, and the opposition between Islam and Christianity too great, to make this possible. A Mohammedan in Turkey, whether Turk, Arab, or negro, is simply a Moslem, and a Christian is a Roman, or Armenian, or Maronite, etc. Our Western idea of separating politics from religion, of being on the one hand loyal citizens of our country and on the other, as a quite distinct thing, members of some Church, is unknown in the East. The *millet* is what matters; and the *millet* is a religious body. So obvious does this identification seem to them that till quite lately they applied it to us. A Catholic was (and still is to the more remote and ignorant people) a "French Christian", a Protestant an "English Christian"; in speaking French or Italian, Levantines constantly use the word *nation* for *religion*. Hence it is, also, that there are practically no conversions from one religion to another. Theology, dogma, or any kind of religious conviction counts for little or nothing. A man

keeps to his *millet* and hotly defends it, as we do to our fatherlands; for a Jacobite to turn Orthodox would be like a Frenchman turning German.

We have noted that religious conviction counts for little. It is hard to say how much any of these bodies (Nestorian or Monophysite) are now even conscious of what was once the cardinal issue of their schism. The bishops and more educated clergy have no doubt a general and hazy idea of the question—Nestorians think that everyone else denies Christ's real manhood, Monophysites that all their opponents "divide Christ". But what stirs their enthusiasm is not the metaphysical problem; it is the conviction that what they believe is the faith of their fathers, the heroes of their "nation" who were persecuted by the other *millets*, as they are to-day (for there everyone thinks that everyone else persecutes his religion). Opposed to all these little *milāl* (plural of *millet*) there looms, each decade mightier and more dangerous, the West, Europe, *Frengistan* (of which the United States, of course, forms part to them). Their lands are overrun with *Frengis; Frengi* schools tempt their young men, and *Frengi* churches, with eloquent sermons and attractive services, their women. They frequent the schools assiduously; for the Levantine has discovered that arithmetic, French, and physical science are useful helps to earning a good living. But to accept the *Frengi* religion means treason to their nation. It is a matter of course to them that we are Catholics or Protestants, those are our *milāl;* but an Armenian, a Copt, a Nestorian does not become a *Frengi*. Against this barrier argument, quotation of Scripture, texts of Fathers, accounts of Church history, break in vain. Your opponent listens, is perhaps even mildly interested, and then goes about his business as before. *Frengis* are very clever and learned; but of course he is an Armenian, or whatever it may be. Sometimes whole bodies move (as Nestorian dioceses have lately begun to coquet with Russian Orthodoxy), and then every member moves too. One cleaves to one's *millet* whatever it does. Certainly, if the heads of any body can be persuaded to accept reunion with Rome, the rank and file will make no difficulty, unless there be another party strong enough to proclaim that those heads have deserted the nation.

The second characteristic, a corollary of the first, is the *intense conservatism* of all these bodies. They cling fanatically to their rites, even to the smallest custom —because it is by these that the *millet* is held together. Liturgical language is the burning question in the Balkans. They are all Orthodox, but inside the Orthodox Church there are various *milāl*—Bulgars, Vlachs, Serbs, Greeks, whose bond of union is the language used in church. So one understands the uproar made in Macedonia about language in the liturgy; the revolution among the Serbs of Uskub in 1896, when their new metropolitan celebrated in Greek (Orth. Eastern Church, 326); the ludicrous scandal at Monastir, in Macedonia, when they fought over a dead man's body and set the whole town ablaze because some wanted him to be buried in Greek and some in Rumanian (op. cit., 333). The great and disastrous Bulgarian schism, the schism at Antioch, are simply questions of the nationality of the clergy and the language they use.

It follows then that the great difficulty in the way of reunion is this question of nationality. Theology counts for very little. Creeds and arguments, even when people seem to make much of them, are really only shibboleths, convenient expressions of what they really care about—their nation. The question of nature and person in Christ, the *Filioque* in the Creed, azyme bread, and so on do not really stir the heart of the Eastern Christian. But he will not become a *Frengi*. Hence the importance of the Uniat Churches. Once for all these people will never become Latins, nor is there any reason why they should. The wisdom of the Holy See has always been to restore union, to insist on the Catholic Faith, and for the rest to leave each *millet* alone with its own native hierarchy, its own language, its own rites. When this is done we have a Uniat Church.

IV. Rome and the Eastern Churches.—The attempts at reunion date from after the schism of Michael Cærularius (1054). Before that Rome was little concerned about the older Nestorian and Monophysite schisms. The conversion of these people might well be left to their neighbours, the Catholics of the Eastern Empire. Naturally, in those days the Greeks set about this conversion in the most disastrous way conceivable. It was the Government of Constantinople that tried to convert them back along the most impossible line, by destroying their nationality and centralizing them under the patriarch of the imperial city. And the means used were, frankly and crudely, persecution. Monophysite conventicles were broken up by imperial soldiers, Monophysite bishops banished or executed. Of course this confirmed their hatred of Cæsar and Cæsar's religion. The East, before as well as after the great schism, did nothing towards pacifying the schismatics at its gates. Only quite lately has Russia taken a more reasonable and conciliatory attitude towards Nestorians in Persia and Abyssinians, who are outside her political power. Her attitude towards people she can persecute may be seen in her abominable treatment of the Armenians in Russia. It was, in the first instance, with the Orthodox that Rome treated with a view to reunion. The Second Council of Lyons (1274) and the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438–39) were the first efforts on a large scale. And at Florence were at least some representatives of all the other Eastern Churches; as a kind of supplement to the great affair of the Orthodox, reunion with them was considered too. None of these reunions were stable. Nevertheless they were, and they remain, important facts. They (the union of Florence especially) were preceded by elaborate discussions in which the attitudes of East and West, Orthodox and Catholic, were clearly compared. Every question was examined—the primacy, the *Filioque*, azyme bread, purgatory, celibacy, etc. The Council of Florence has not been forgotten in the East. It showed Eastern Christians what the conditions of reunion are, and it has left them always conscious that reunion is possible and is greatly desired by Rome. And on the other hand it remains always as an invaluable precedent for the Roman Court. The attitude of the Holy See at Florence was the only right one: to be quite unswerving in the question of faith and to concede everything else that possibly can be conceded. There is no need of uniformity in rites or in canon law; as long as practices are not absolutely bad and immoral, each Church may work out its own development along its own lines. Customs that would not suit the West may suit the East very well; and we have no right to quarrel with such customs as long as they are not forced upon us. So, at Florence, in all these matters there was no attempt at changing the old order. Each Church was to keep its own liturgy and its own canon law as far as that was not incompatible with the Roman primacy, which is *de fide*. The very decree that proclaimed the primacy added the clause, that the pope guides and rules the whole Church of God "without prejudice to the rights and privileges of the other patriarchs". And the East was to keep its married clergy and its leavened bread, was not to say the *Filioque* in the Creed, nor use solid statues, nor do any of the things they resent as being Latin. This has been the attitude of Rome ever since. Many popes have published decrees, Encyclicals, Bulls that show that they have never forgotten the venerable and ancient Churches cut off from us by these schisms; in all these documents consistently the tone and attitude are the same. If there has been any latinizing movement among Uniats, it has sprung up among themselves; they have

occasionally been disposed to copy practices of the far richer and mightier Latin Church with which they are united. But all the Roman documents point the other way. If any Eastern customs have been discouraged or forbidden, it is because they were obviously abuses and immoral like the quasi-hereditary patriarchate of the Nestorians, or sheer paganism like the superstitions forbidden by the Maronite Synod of 1736. True, their liturgical books have been altered in places; true also that in the past these corrections were made sometimes by well-meaning officials of Propaganda whose liturgical knowledge was not equal to their pious zeal. But in this case, too, the criterion was not conformity with the Roman Rite, but purification from supposed (sometimes mistakenly supposed) false doctrine. That the Maronite Rite is so latinized is due to its own clergy. It was the Maronites themselves who insisted on using our vestments, our azyme bread, our Communion under one kind, till these things had to be recognized, because they were already ancient customs to them prescribed by the use of generations.

A short survey of papal documents relating to the Eastern Churches will make these points clear.—Before Pius IX, the most important of these documents was Benedict XIV's Encyclical "Allatæ sunt" of 2 July, 1755. In it the pope is able to quote a long list of his predecessors who had already cared for the Eastern Churches and their rites. He mentions acts of Innocent III (1198–1216), Honorius III (1216–27), Innocent IV (1243–54), Alexander IV (1254–61), Gregory X (1271–76), Nicholas III (1277–80), Eugene IV (1431–47), Leo X (1513–21), Clement VII (1523–34), Pius IV (1559–65), all to this effect. Gregory XIII (1572–85) founded at Rome colleges for Greeks, Maronites, Armenians. In 1602 Clement VIII published a decree allowing Ruthenian priests to celebrate their rite in Latin churches. In 1624 Urban VIII forbade Ruthenians to become Latins, and Clement IX, in 1669, published the same order for Uniat Armenians (Allatæ sunt, I). Benedict XIV not only quotes these examples of former popes, he confirms the same principle by new laws. In 1742 he had reestablished the Ruthenian Church with the Byzantine Rite after the national Council of Zamosc, confirming again the laws of Clement VIII in 1595. When the Melkite Patriarch of Antioch wanted to change the use of the Presanctified Liturgy in his Rite, Benedict XIV answered: "The ancient rubrics of the Greek Church must be kept unaltered, and your priests must be made to follow them" (Bullarium Ben. XIV., Tom. I). He ordains that Melkites who, for lack of a priest of their own Rite, had been baptized by a Latin, should not be considered as having changed to our Use: "We forbid absolutely that any Catholic Melkites who follow the Greek Rite should pass over to the Latin Rite" (ib., cap. xviii). The Encyclical "Allatæ sunt" forbids missionaries to convert schismatics to the Latin Rite; when they become Catholics they must join the corresponding Uniat Church (XI). In the Bull "Etsi pastoralis" (1742) the same pope orders that there shall be no precedence because of Rite. Each prelate shall have rank according to his own position or the date of his ordination; in mixed dioceses, if the bishop is Latin (as in Southern Italy), he is to have at least one vicar-general of the other Rite (IX).

Most of all did the last two popes show their concern for Eastern Christendom. Each by a number of Acts carried on the tradition of conciliation towards the schismatical Churches and of protection of Uniat Rites. Pius IX, in his Encyclical "In Suprema Petri" (Epiphany, 1848), again assures non-Uniats that "we will keep unchanged your liturgies, which indeed we greatly honour"; schismatic clergy who join the Catholic Church are to keep the same rank and position as they had before. In 1853 the Uniat Rumanians were given a bishop of their own Rite, and in the Allocution made on that occasion, as well as in the one to the Armenians on 2 February, 1854, he again insists on the same principle. In 1860 the Bulgars, disgusted with the Phanar (the Greeks of Constantinople), approached the Catholic Armenian patriarch, Hassun; he, and the pope confirming him, promised that there should be no latinizing of their Rite. Pius IX founded, 6 January, 1862, a separate department for the Oriental Rites as a special section of the great Propaganda Congregation. Leo XIII in 1888 wrote a letter to the Armenians (Paterna charitas) in which he exhorts the Gregorians to reunion, always on the same terms. But his most important act, perhaps the most important of all documents of this kind, is the Encyclical "Orientalium dignitas ecclesiarum" of 30 November, 1894. In this letter the pope reviewed and confirmed all similar acts of his predecessors and then strengthened them by yet severer laws against any form of latinizing the East. The first part of the Encyclical quotes examples of the care of former popes for Eastern Rites, especially of Pius IX; Pope Leo remembers also what he himself has already done for the same cause—the foundation of colleges at Rome, Philippopoli, Adrianople, Athens, and St. Ann at Jerusalem. He again commands that in these colleges students should be exactly trained to observe their own rites. He praises these venerable Eastern liturgies as representing most ancient and sacred traditions, and quotes again the text that has been used so often for this purpose, *circumdata varietate* applied to the queen, who is the Church (Ps. xliv, 10). The Constitutions of Benedict XIV against latinizers are confirmed; new and most severe laws are promulgated: any missionary who tries to persuade a Uniat to join the Latin Rite is *ipso facto* suspended, and is to be expelled from his place. In colleges where boys of different Rites are educated there are to be priests of each Rite to administer the sacraments. In case of need one may receive a sacrament from a priest of another Rite; but for Communion it should be, if possible, at least one who uses the same kind of bread. No length of use can prescribe a change of Rite. A woman in marrying may conform to her husband's Rite, but if she becomes a widow she must go back to her own.

In the Encyclical "Præclara gratulationis", of 20 June, 1894, that has been often described as "Leo XIII's testament", he again turned to the Eastern Churches and invited them in the most courteous and the gentlest way to come back to communion with us. He assures schismatics that no great difference exists between their faith and ours, and repeats once more that he would provide for all their customs without narrowness (Orth. Eastern Church, 434, 435). It was this letter that called forth the unpardonably offensive answer of Anthimos VII of Constantinople (op. cit., 435–438). Nor, as long as he lived, did Leo XIII cease caring for Eastern Churches. On 11 June, 1895, he wrote the letter "Unitas christiana" to the Copts, and on 24 December of the same year he restored the Uniat Coptic patriarchate. Lastly, on 19 March, 1895, in a *motu proprio*, he again insisted on the reverence due to the Eastern Churches and explained the duties of Latin delegates in the East. As a last example of all, Pius X in his Allocution, after the now famous celebration of the Byzantine Liturgy in his presence on 12 February, 1908, again repeated the same declaration of respect for Eastern rites and customs and the same assurance of his intention to preserve them (Echos d'Orient, May, 1908, 129–31). Indeed this spirit of conservatism with regard to liturgies is in our own time growing steadily at Rome with the increase of liturgical knowledge, so that there is reason to believe that whatever unintentional mistakes have been made in the past (chiefly with regard to the Maronite and Uniat Armenian rites) will now gradually be corrected, and that the tradition of the most entire acceptance and recognition of other rites

in the East will be maintained even more firmly than in the past.

On the other hand, in spite of occasional outbursts of anti-papal feeling on the part of the various chiefs of these Churches, it is certain that the vision of unity is beginning to make itself seen very widely in the East. In the first place, education and contact with Western Europeans inevitably breaks down a great part of the old prejudice, jealousy, and fear of us. It was a Latin missionary who said lately: "They are finding out that we are neither so vicious nor so clever as they had thought." And with this intercourse grows the hope of regeneration for their own nations by contact with the West. Once they realize that we do not want to eat them up, and that their *milāl* are safe, whatever happens, they cannot but see the advantages we have to offer them. And with this feeling goes the gradual realization of something larger in the way of a Church than their own *milāl*. Hitherto, it was difficult to say what the various Eastern schismatics understood by the "Catholic Church" in the creed. The Orthodox certainly always mean their own communion only ("Orth. Eastern Church", 366–370); the other smaller bodies certainly hold that they alone have the true faith; every one else—especially Latins—is a heretic. So, presumably, for them, too, the Catholic Church is only their own body. But this is passing with the growth of more knowledge of other countries and a juster sense of perspective. The Nestorian who looks at a map of the world can hardly go on believing that his sect is the only and whole Church of Christ. And with the apprehension of larger issues there comes the first wish for reunion. For a Church consisting of mutually excommunicate bodies is a monstrosity that is rejected by everyone (except perhaps some Armenians) in the East.

The feeling out towards the West for sympathy, help, and perhaps eventually communion, is in the direction of Catholics, not of Protestants. Protestantism is too remote from all their theology, and its principles are too destructive of all their system for it to attract them. Harnack notes this of Russians: that their more friendly feeling towards the West tends Romeward, not in an Evangelical direction (Reden und Aufsätze, II, 279); it is at least equally true of other Eastern Churches. When the conviction has spread that they have everything to gain by becoming again members of a really universal Church, that union with Rome means all the advantages of Western ideas and a sound theological position, and that, on the other hand, it leaves the national *millet* untouched, un-latinized, and only the stronger for so powerful an alliance, then indeed the now shadowy and remote issues about nature and person in Christ, the entirely artificial grievances of the *Filioque* and our azyme bread will easily be buried in the dust that has gathered over them for centuries, and Eastern Christians may some day wake up and find that there is nothing to do but to register again a union that ought never to have been broken.

Eastern Churches in General.—KATTENBUSCH, *Lehrbuch der vergleichenden Confessionskunde* (Freiburg im Br., 1892), I; SILBERNAGL, *Verfassung und gegenwärtiger Bestand sämtlicher Kirchen des Orients* (2nd ed., Ratisbon, 1904); DÖLLINGER, *Ueber die Wiedervereinigung der christlichen Kirchen* (Munich, 1888); DUCHESNE *Eglises Séparées* (Paris, 1896), tr. MATHEWS, *The Churches Separated from Rome* (London, 1908); LEQUIEN, *Oriens Christianus* (3 vols., Paris, 1740); D'AVRIL, *Les églises autonomes et autocéphales* (Paris, 1895).

Separate Churches.—FORTESCUE, *The Orthodox Eastern Church* (London, 1907), and works mentioned in the bibliography, pp. xv-xxvii; DENZINGER, *Ritus Orientalium* (2 vols., Würzburg, 1863); ASSEMANI, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* (Rome, 1719–28); BADGER, *The Nestorians and their Ritual* (2 vols., London, 1852); PERKINS, *A Residence of Eight Years in Persia among the Nestorian Christians* (New York, 1843); WIGRAM, *The Doctrinal Position of the Assyrian or East Syrian Church* (London, 1908); VANSLEB, *Histoire de l'église d'Alexandrie* (Paris, 1677); ABUDACHNA, *Historia Jacobitarum seu Coptorum in Ægypto, Lybia, Nubia, Æthiopia habitantium*, ed. SEELEN (Lübeck, 1733); WERNER, *Lehre und Geschichte der Abessinischen Kirche* in *Zeitschrift für kath. Theol.* (1892). *For the Syrian Jacobites*, see ASSEMANI, *op. cit. supra*, II; KLEYN, *Jacobus Baradeus de Stichter der Syrische monophysietische Kerk* (Leyden, 1882); LYNCH, *Armenia* (2 vols., London, 1901); GERMANN, *Die Kirche der Thomaschristen* (Gütersloh, 1877); RAE, *The Syrian Church in India* (London, 1892).

The Uniats.—*Missiones Catholicæ* (Rome, Propaganda Press, 1907); KÖHLER, *Die kathol. Kirchen des Morgenlandes* (Darmstadt, 1898); WERNER, *Orbis Terrarum Catholicus* (Freiburg im Br., 1890), x, xi, xv, xvi-xxiv; SILBERNAGL, *op. cit.*, Pt. II, 325–85; NILLES, *Kalendarium manuale* (2nd ed., 2 vols., Innsbruck, 1896–7), contains valuable notes and statistics of Uniat Churches; D'AVRIL, *Documents relatifs aux églises d'Orient* (3rd ed., Paris, 1885), a selection of documents to illustrate their relations with Rome; GEORGE EBEDJESU KHAYYATH, *Syri orientales seu Chaldæi Nestoriani et Rom. Pontificum primatus* (Rome, 1870); GIAMIL, *Genuinæ relationes inter sedem Apostolicam et Assyriorum orientalium seu Chaldæorum ecclesiam* (Rome, 1902); VERNIER, *Histoire du patriarcat arménien catholique* (Paris, 1891); MURAD, *Notice historique sur l'origine de la nation Maronite* (Paris, 1844); DEBS, *Les Maronites du Liban* (Paris, 1875).

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Easterwine (or EOSTERWINI), Abbot of Wearmouth, was the nephew of St. Benedict Biscop; b. 650, d. 7 March, 686. Descended from the noblest stock of Northumbria, as a young man he led the life of a soldier in the army of King Egfrid, the son of Oswy. When twenty-four years old he gave up the soldier's profession to become a monk in the monastery of Wearmouth, then ruled over by St. Benedict Biscop. He is described as a noble youth, conspicuous for his humility and bodily activity, but withal infinitely gentle; a most exact observer of rule and one who loved to perform the lowliest work. He was ordained priest in the year 679, and in 682 St. Benedict appointed him abbot of Wearmouth as coadjutor to himself. As superior "when he was compelled to reprove a fault, it was done with such tender sadness that the culprit felt himself incapable of any new offence which should bring a cloud over the benign brightness of that beloved face". In the year 686 a deadly pestilence overspread the country; it attacked the community at Wearmouth and the youthful abbot was one of its victims. He bade farewell to all, the day before he died, and passed away on 7 March, when only thirty-six years old. St. Benedict was absent in Rome at the time of his death and Sigfried was chosen by the monks as his successor. Easterwine is not known to have been the author of any works.

MONTALEMBERT, *The Monks of the West* (London, 1847), IV, 450 sqq.; BEDE, *Vitæ abbatum in Wiramutha et Girvum* in *Opera Omnia*, VII; *Acta SS.* (Venice, 1735), March, VIII, 650.

G. E. HIND.

Easton, ADAM, Cardinal, b. at Easton in Norfolk; d. at Rome, 15 Sept. (according to others, 20 Oct.), 1397. He joined the Benedictines at Norwich. He probably accompanied Archbishop Langham to Rome and, being a man of learning and ability, obtained a post in the Curia. He was made Cardinal-priest of the title of St. Cecilia by Urban VI, probably in Dec., 1381. On 7 March, 1381 or 1382, he was nominated Dean of York. In 1385 he was imprisoned by Urban on a charge of conspiring with five other cardinals against the pope and was deprived of his cardinalate and deanery. The next pope, Boniface IX, restored his cardinalate 18 Dec., 1389, and for a time Easton returned to England, where he held a prebend in Salisbury cathedral, which he subsequently exchanged for the living of Heygham in Norwich. He wrote many works, none of which are extant, and is stated to have composed the Office for the Visitation of Our Lady.

CIACCONIUS, *Vitæ Pontif.* (Rome, 1677); GODWIN, *de Præsulibus Angliæ* (London, 1742), 793; WILLIAMS, *Lives of the English Cardinals* (London, 1868), I, vii; CREIGHTON, *History of the Papacy* (London, 1882), I, 80 sqq.; POOLE in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.

EDWIN BURTON.

East Syrian Rite. See SYRIAN RITE.

Eata, SAINT, second Bishop of Hexham; date of birth unknown; d. 26 October, 686. Whether this disciple of St. Aidan was of the English, or of the abo-

Sees and Vicariates of ORIENTAL RITES

This column contains the titles of the sees; only residences are marked on map by signs.

ARMENIAN RITE

Austria—Archdiocese: Lemberg.
Russia—Diocese: Artvin.
Turkey—Patriarchate: Cilicia.
Archdioceses: Sivas-Tokat, Aleppo, Mardin.
Dioceses: Adana, Diarbekir, Angora, Cæsarea (Cappadocia), Erzerum, Kharput, Marash, Malatia, Mush, Brusa, Trebizond, Ispahan (Persia), Alexandria (Egypt).

COPTIC RITE

Patriarchate: Alexandria (Egypt).
Dioceses: Hermopolis Magna, Thebes.

ABYSSINIAN RITE

Under the Latin Vicariate Apostolic of Abyssinia.

GREEK RITE

Under the Latin Delegates at Constantinople and Athens.

GREEK RUMANIAN RITE

Archdiocese: Fogaras-Alba Julia (Hungary).
Dioceses: Számos-Ujvár (Armenierstadt), Nagy-Várad (Grosswardein), Lugos.

GREEK RUTHENIAN RITE

Archdiocese: Lemberg (Austria-Hungary).
Dioceses: Przemysl-Sanok-Sambor, Stanislavoff, Kreuz (Körös), Eperies, Munkács; Russia: Chelm-Belz, Minsk.

GREEK BULGARIAN RITE

Vicariates Apostolic: Thrace, Macedonia.

GREEK MELCHITE RITE

Patriarchate: Antioch.
Archdioceses: Aleppo, Bostra-Hauran, Tyre.
Dioceses: Beirut-Gibail, Cæsarea-Philippi, Damascus, Baalbek, Homs, Sidon, Acre, Tripoli, Zahleh.

SYRIAN RITE

Patriarchate: Antioch.
Archdioceses: Bagdad (Babylon), Damascus, Homs.
Dioceses: Aleppo, Beirut, Gezireh, Mardin-Amida, Mosul.

SYRO-CHALDEAN RITE

Patriarchate: Bagdad (Babylon).
Archdioceses: Amida, Kerkuk.
Dioceses: Amadia-Akra, Gezireh, Mardin, Mosul, Salmas, Sert, Sena, Urmia, Zakhu.

SYRO-MARONITE RITE

Patriarchate: Antioch.
Archdioceses: Aleppo, Beirut, Cyprus, Damascus, Tyre-Sidon, Tripoli.
Dioceses: Baalbek, Gibail-Batrun.

SYRO-MALABAR RITE

Vicariates Apostolic: Trichur, Changanacherry, Ernaculam.

COPYRIGHT, 1909, BY ROBERT APPLETON CO.

iginal Pictish, race, there is no means of judging. As early as 651 he was elected Abbot of Melrose, which was then within the metropolitan jurisdiction of York. With the increase of the Christian population in north-eastern Britain, the spiritual government of a territory so wide as that which was then called Northumbria became too heavy a charge for one see; accordingly, in 678 Archbishop Theodore constituted Bernicia (that part of the Northumbrian realm which lay to the north of the River Tees) a suffragan diocese and consecrated Eata its bishop. The new diocese was to have two episcopal sees, one at Hexham and the other at Lindisfarne, at the two extremities of what is now the County of Northumberland. Eata was to be styled "Bishop of the Bernicians". This arrangement lasted only three years, and the See of Hexham was then assigned to Trumbert, while Eata kept Lindisfarne. In 684, after the death of Trumbert, St. Cuthbert was elected Bishop of Hexham, but when the latter expressed a desire to remain in his old home rather than remove to the more southern see, Eata readily consented to exchange with him, and for the last two years of his life occupied the See of Hexham, while Cuthbert ruled as bishop at Lindisfarne. Like most of the early saints of the English Church, St. Eata was canonized by general repute of sanctity among the faithful in the regions which he helped to Christianize. His feast is kept on 26 October, the day of his death.

Acta SS. (1864), XI, 922 sqq.; RAINE, *Miscellanea biogr.* (Surtees Soc., 1838), XV, 119; TWISDEN ed., RICHARD OF HEXHAM, *Chronicles;* BEDE, *Hist. Eccl.*, III, IV; HUNT in *Dict. Nat. Biogr.*, s. v.; BRIGHT in *Dict. Christ. Biogr.*, s. v.

E. MACPHERSON.

Ebbo (EBO), Archbishop of Reims, b. towards the end of the eighth century; d. 20 March, 851. Though born of German serfs, he was educated at the court of Charlemagne who gave him his liberty. After his elevation to the priesthood he became librarian of Louis le Débonnaire and was his councillor in the government of Aquitaine. When Louis became emperor he appointed Ebbo archbishop of the vacant See of Reims in 816. Acting on the suggestion of the emperor, he went to Rome in 822, in order to obtain permission from Pope Paschal I to preach the Gospel to the Danes. The pope not only gave his sanction but also appointed Ebbo papal legate for the North. In company with a certain Halitgar, probably the one who was Bishop of Cambrai (817–831), and Willerich, Bishop of Bremen, he set out for Denmark in the spring of 823, and after preaching with some success during the following summer he returned to France in the autumn of the same year. Twice again he returned to Denmark, but each time his stay was of short duration and without any lasting effect on the pagan Danes whose Christianization was brought about a few years later by St. Ansgar. When, in 830, the sons of the emperor rose in rebellion against their father, Ebbo supported the emperor; but three years later he turned against him and on 13 November, 833, presided at the shameful scene enacted in the Church of St. Mary at Soissons, where the aged emperor was deposed and compelled to perform public penance for crimes which he had not committed. As a reward for this disgraceful act Ebbo received the rich Abbey of St. Vaast from Lothaire. He continued to support the rebellious Lothaire even after Louis had been solemnly reinstated in March, 834. Being prevented by a severe attack of the gout from following Lothaire to Italy he took refuge in the cell of a hermit near Paris, but was found out and sent as prisoner to the Abbey of Fulda. On 2 February, 835, he appeared at the Synod of Thionville, where in the presence of the emperor and forty-three bishops he solemnly declared the monarch innocent of the crimes of which he had accused him at Soissons, and on 28 February, 835, made a public recantation from the pulpit of the cathedral of Metz.

Returning to the synod at Thionville, Ebbo was deposed by the emperor and the assembled bishops and brought back as prisoner to the Abbey of Fulda. Somewhat later he was given in custody to Bishop Fréculf of Lisieux and afterwards to Abbot Boso of Fleury. When Lothair became emperor, Ebbo was restored to the See of Reims, in December, 840, but a year later, when Charles the Bald invaded the north-eastern part of France, he was again driven from his see. Many had considered Ebbo's reinstatement by Lothair unlawful, and Hincmar, who became Archbishop of Reims in 845, refused to recognize the ordinations administered by him after his reinstatement. The Council of Soissons(853) declared the ordinations invalid. There seems to be little doubt that the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals have as their author one of the ecclesiastics ordained by Ebbo after his reinstatement. Ebbo found shelter at the court of Lothair, who gave him the incomes of several abbeys and used him for various legations. In 844 Ebbo requested Pope Sergius II to restore him to the See of Reims but was admitted only to lay communion. A few other attempts to regain his former see were likewise unsuccessful. When Lothair could make no further use of Ebbo he discarded him, but Ebbo found a supporter in Louis the German, who appointed him Bishop of Hildesheim some time between April, 845, and October, 847. Ebbo is the author of the "Apologeticum Ebbonis", a short apologetic narrative of his deposition and reinstatement. It is published in Mansi, "Amplissima Collectio Conciliorum", XIV, 775–9, and in Migne, P. L., CXVI, 11–16.

FLODOARDUS, *Historia Remensis Ecclesiæ* in *Mon. Germ. Hist., Script.*, XIII, 467 sqq.; GUIZOT, *Histoire de l'Eglise de Rheims* (Paris, 1824), 193–220; MANN, *The Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages* (London and St. Louis, 1906), II, 246 sqq. et passim; HEFELE, *Conciliengeschichte* (Freiburg im Br., 1879), IV, passim; HAUCK, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* (Leipzig, 1900), II, 670 sqq. et passim; SIMSON, *Jahrbücher des fränkischen Reiches unter Ludwig dem Frommen* (Leipzig, 1874), I, 207 sqq.; SCHRÖRS, *Hinkmar, Erzbischof von Reims* (Freiburg im Br., 1884), 27 sqq.; WATTENBACH, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter*, 7th ed. (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1904), I, 326, et passim.

MICHAEL OTT.

Ebendorfer, THOMAS, German chronicler, professor, and statesman, b. 12 August, 1385, at Haselbach, in Upper Austria; d. at Vienna, 8 Jan., 1464. He made his higher studies at the University of Vienna, where in 1412 he received the degree of Master of Arts. Until 1427 he was attached to the Faculty of Arts and lectured on Aristotle and Latin grammar. After 1419 he was also admitted to the theological faculty as *cursor biblicus*. In 1427 he was made licentiate and in 1428 master of theology; soon after he became dean of the theological faculty, in which body he was a professor until his death. Three several times, 1423, 1429, and 1445 he was rector of the University of Vienna; he was also canon of St. Stephen's, and engaged in the apostolic ministry as preacher and as pastor of Perchtoldsdorf and of Falkenstein near Vienna. He ranks high among the professors of the University of Vienna in the fifteenth century. In the struggles which it had to sustain he championed the rights and interests of the university with zeal and energy. He represented the university at the Council of Basle (1432–34), took an active part in all its discussions, and was one of the delegates sent by the council to Prague to confer with the Hussites. From 1440 to 1444 he was sent to various cities as ambassador of Emperor Frederick III. He disapproved of the attitude of the Council of Basle towards both pope and emperor, and eventually withdrew from it. His advocacy of the rights of the Vienna University, coupled with the attacks of his opponents lost him the favour of the emperor, who saw in him a secret enemy. In 1451 and 1452 he was in Italy and went to Rome where he obtained from the pope a confirmation of the privileges of the University of Vienna. In the war

between Frederick III and Albert of Brandenburg he tried to act as mediator but only fell into greater disfavour with Frederick. His last years were clouded by the disturbances of the years 1461–1463 during which Austria had much to suffer from the Bohemian king, George of Podiebrad, and from internal conflicts.

Ebendorfer is one of the most prominent chroniclers of the fifteenth century. His "Chronicon Austriæ" is a dull but frank and very detailed history of Austria to 1463. From 1400 on it is an indispensable source of Austrian history (ed. Pez in "Scriptores rerum Austriacarum", II, Leipzig, 1725, 689–986; in this edition all of Book I and part of Book II were omitted). His account of the Council of Basle appears in the "Diarium gestorum concilii Basileensis pro reductione Bohemorum" (ed. Birk in Monumenta concilii Basileensis, Scriptores, I, Vienna, 1875, 701–783). He wrote also a history of the Roman emperors, "Chronica regum Romanorum"; Books VI and VII, which are of independent value as sources, were edited by Pribram in the "Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung", third supplementary volume (Innsbruck, 1890–94), 38–222. Many of his writings are as yet unedited, among them commentaries on Biblical books, sermons, "Liber de schismatibus", "Liber Pontificum Romanorum" (see Levinson, "Thomas Ebendorfers Liber Pontificum" in "Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung", XX, 1899, 69–99).

ASCHBACH, *Gesch. der Wiener Universität* (Vienna, 1865), 493–525; ZEISSBERG, *Thomas Ebendorfer als Geschichtsschreiber* in *Oesterr. Wochenschrift für Literatur und Kunst* (1864), III, 769–810; *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie* (Leipzig, 1877), s. v.; HURTER, *Nomenclator* (Innsbruck, 1906), II, 932 sq.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Eberhard, MATTHIAS, Bishop of Trier, b. 15 Nov., 1815, at Trier (Germany), d. there 30 May, 1876. After successfully completing the gymnasium course of his native town, he devoted himself to the study of theology, was ordained in 1839, and soon after made assistant at St. Castor's in Coblenz. In 1842 Bishop Arnoldi made him his private secretary, and, at the end of the same year, professor of dogmatics in the seminary of Trier. From 1849 to 1862 he was director of the seminary and also preacher at the cathedral; in 1850 he became a member of the chapter; from 1852 to 1856 he was representative of his fellow-citizens in the Prussian Lower Chamber, where he joined the Catholic section. On 7 April, 1862, he was preconized as auxiliary Bishop of Trier; after Arnoldi's death he was proposed for the episcopal see, but the Prussian Government acknowledged him only after the death of Arnoldi's successor, Pelldram, 16 July, 1867. Having chosen St. Charles Borromeo for his ideal, he spared no exertion, on the one hand, to make his clergy learned, zealous, devout, and thoroughly cultured, and on the other to cultivate a truly Christian and religious spirit in the people. To attain this double end, he bestowed very great care upon his seminary and demanded a conscientious observation of his rules on the pastoral conferences and the annual retreat. In the parishes he insisted on the instruction in Christian doctrine and on the giving of missions, took care that religious associations were established, especially among the youths and men, and tried to found everywhere good libraries for the people. At the Vatican Council he appeared several times as a speaker; he belonged to the minority of the bishops, who considered the definition of the pope's infallibility as inopportune for the time being; but as soon as the matter had been decided, he published the constitution at once. When, in the beginning of the seventies, the Prussian Government wished to fetter bishops and priests by its ecclesiastico-political legislation, Bishop Eberhard unflinchingly defended the rights of the Church and thus became one of the first victims of the so-called *Kulturkampf*. At first he was fined an exorbitant sum, but since he could not pay it, he was retained in the prison of Trier from 6 March to 31 December, 1874. New persecutions began after he had been dismissed; the flourishing institutions which belonged to the Church were closed and the appointment of priests was made impossible; the grief at the unhappy condition of his diocese accelerated his death. He is the author of a dissertation "De tituli Sedis Apostolicæ ad insigniendam sedem Romanam usu antiquo ac vi singulari" (Trier, 1846). His sermons, masterpieces of oratory, were edited after his death by Ditscheid in 6 vols. (Trier, 1877–1883; Freiburg, 1894–1903).

MÜLLER, *Matthias Eberhard* (Würzburg, 1874); KRAFT, *Matthias Eberhard* (Trier, 1878); DITSCHEID, *Matthias Eberhard im Kulturkampf* (Trier, 1900).

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

Eberhard of Ratisbon (or SALZBURG; also called EBERHARDUS ALTAHENSIS), a German chronicler who flourished about the beginning of the fourteenth century. Hardly anything is known of his life; the only positive facts are obtained from documents of the years 1294–1305, which show that within this period he was active as a *magister*, Augustinian canon, and archdeacon. He is the author of a chronicle that begins with the election of Rudolf of Hapsburg and extends to 1305. He desired to give an account of Bavarian history only, but was unable to fully execute this intention. In reality he describes more or less fully events occurring outside of Bavaria that seem to him of importance. The value of the chronicle is increased by the greater detail with which he treats the last five years, and in this part are also added important letters which serve to make the narrative more life-like. There is no doubt that the work was influenced by Hermann, the celebrated Abbot of Niederaltaich, the founder of a new and brilliant period of annalistic writing and to whom is due a wonderful development in the art of historical writing in Bavaria during the latter half of the thirteenth century. The "Annales" of Eberhard were formerly held to be a direct continuation of Hermann's chronicle, but in the introduction to his edition of the "Annales" Jaffé has disproved this hypothesis. Eberhard's chronicle is, rather, an independent work, connected with its continuations (the so-called "Continuatio Altahensis" and the "Continuatio Ratisponensis") only by their occasional paraphrases of what Eberhard has said or by information they occasionally add to his statements. The earliest edition of the "Annales" is that of H. Canisius in his "Lectiones antiquæ", I, 307–358. An improved edition was published by Böhmer, "Fontes", II, 526–553, and another by Jaffé in "Mon. Germ. Hist., Scriptores", XVI, 592–605.

KEHR, *Hermann von Altaich und seine Fortsetzer* (Göttingen, 1883), 69–81; LORENZ, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im M.A.* (1886), I, 183 sq.

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

Ebionites.—By this name were designated one or more early Christian sects infected with Judaistic errors.

The word Ebionites, or rather, more correctly, Ebionæans, Ἐβιωναῖοι, is a transliteration of the Aramean אביונים, meaning "poor men". It first occurs in Irenæus, Adv. Hær., I., xxvi, 2, but without designation of meaning. Origen (C. Celsum, II, i; De Princ., IV, i, 22) and Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., III, xxvii) refer the name of these sectaries either to the poverty of their understanding, or to the poverty of the Law to which they clung, or to the poor opinions they held concerning Christ. This, however, is obviously not the historic origin of the name. Other writers, as Tertullian (De Præscr., xxxiii; De Carne Chr., xiv, 18), Hippolytus (cfr. Pseudo-Tert., Adv.

Hær., III, as reflecting Hippolytus's lost "Syntagma"), and Epiphanius (Hæres., xxx), derive the name of the sect from a certain Ebion, its supposed founder. Epiphanius even mentions the place of his birth, a hamlet called Cochabe in the district of Bashan, and relates that he travelled through Asia and even came to Rome. Of modern scholars Hilgenfeld has maintained the historical existence of this Ebion, mainly on the ground of some passages ascribed to Ebion by St. Jerome (Comm. in Gal., iii, 14) and by the author of a compilation of patristic texts against the Monothelites. But these passages are not likely to be genuine, and Ebion, otherwise unknown to history, is probably only an invention to account for the name Ebionites. The name may have been self-imposed by those who gladly claimed the beatitude of being poor in spirit, or who claimed to live after the pattern of the first Christians in Jerusalem, who laid their goods at the feet of the Apostles. Perhaps, however, it was first imposed by others and is to be connected with the notorious poverty of the Christians in Palestine (cf. Gal., ii, 10). Recent scholars have plausibly maintained that the term did not originally designate any heretical sect, but merely the orthodox Jewish Christians of Palestine who continued to observe the Mosaic Law. These, ceasing to be in touch with the bulk of the Christian world, would gradually have drifted away from the standard of orthodoxy and become formal heretics. A stage in this development is seen in St. Justin's "Dialogue with Trypho the Jew", chapter xlvii (about A.D. 140), where he speaks of two sects of Jewish Christians estranged from the Church: those who observe the Mosaic Law for themselves, but do not require observance thereof from others; and those who hold it of universal obligation. The latter are considered heretical by all; but with the former St. Justin would hold communion, though not all Christians would show them the same indulgence. St. Justin, however, does not use the term *Ebionites*, and when this term first occurs (about A.D. 175) it designates a distinctly heretical sect.

The doctrines of this sect are said by Irenæus to be like those of Cerinthus and Carpocrates. They denied the Divinity and the virginal birth of Christ; they clung to the observance of the Jewish Law; they regarded St. Paul as an apostate, and only used a Gospel according to St. Matthew (Adv. Hær., I, xxvi, 2; III, xxi, 2; IV, xxxiii, 4; V, i, 3). Their doctrines are similarly described by Hippolytus (Philos., VIII, xxii, X, xviii) and Tertullian (De carne Chr., xiv, 18), but their observance of the Law seems no longer so prominent a feature of their system as in the account given by Irenæus. Origen is the first (C. Cels., V, lxi) to mark a distinction between two classes of Ebionites, a distinction which Eusebius also gives (Hist. Eccl., III, xxvii). Some Ebionites accept, but others reject, the virginal birth of Christ, though all reject His pre-existence and His Divinity. Those who accepted the virginal birth seem to have had more exalted views concerning Christ and, besides observing the Sabbath, to have kept the Sunday as a memorial of His Resurrection. The milder sort of Ebionites were probably fewer and less important than their stricter brethren, because the denial of the virgin birth was commonly attributed to all. (Origen, Hom. in Luc., xvii.) St. Epiphanius calls the more heretical section Ebionites, and the more Catholic-minded, Nazarenes. But we do not know whence St. Epiphanius obtained his information or how far it is reliable. It is very hazardous, therefore, to maintain, as is sometimes done, that the distinction between Nazarenes and Ebionites goes back to the earliest days of Christianity.

Besides these merely Judaistic Ebionites, there existed a later Gnostic development of the same heresy. These Ebionite Gnostics differed widely from the main schools of Gnosticism, in that they absolutely rejected any distinction between Jehovah the Demiurge, and the Supreme Good God. Those who regard this distinction as essential to Gnosticism would even object to classing Ebionites as Gnostics. But on the other hand the general character of their teaching is unmistakably Gnostic. This can be gathered from the Pseudo-Clementines and may be summed up as follows: Matter is eternal, and an emanation of the Deity; nay it constitutes, as it were, God's body. Creation, therefore, is but the transformation of pre-existing material. God thus "creates" the Universe by the instrumentality of His wisdom which is described as a "demiurgic hand" (χεῖρ δημιουργοῦσα) producing the world. But this Logos, or Sophia, does not constitute a different person, as in Christian theology. Sophia produces the world by a successive evolution of syzygies, the female in each case preceding the male but being finally overcome by him. This universe is, moreover, divided into two realms, that of good and that of evil. The Son of God rules over the realm of the good, and to him is given the world to come, but the Prince of Evil is the prince of this world (cf. John, xiv, 30; Eph., i, 21; vi, 12). This Son of God is the Christ, a middle-being between God and creation, not a creature, yet not equal to, nor even to be compared with, the Father (αὐτογεννήτῳ οὐ συγκρίνεται—"Hom.", xvi, 16). Adam was the bearer of the first revelation, Moses of the second, Christ of the third and perfect one. The union of Christ with Jesus is involved in obscurity. Man is saved by knowledge (*gnosis*), by believing in God the Teacher, and by being baptized unto remission of sins. Thus he receives knowledge and strength to observe all the precepts of the law. Christ shall come again to triumph over Antichrist as light dispels darkness. The system is Pantheism, Persian Dualism, Judaism, and Christianity fused together, and here and there reminds one of Mandaistic literature. The "Recognitions", as given us in Rufinus's translation (revision?), come nearer to Catholic teaching than do the "Homilies".

Amongst the writings of the Ebionites must be mentioned (a) their Gospel. St. Irenæus only states that they used the Gospel of St. Matthew. Eusebius modifies this statement by speaking of the so-called Gospel according to the Hebrews, which was known to Hegesippus (Eus., Hist. Eccl., IV, xxii, 8), Origen (Jerome, De vir., ill., ii), and Clem. Alex. (Strom., II, ix, 45). This, probably, was the slightly modified Aramaic original of St. Matthew, written in Hebrew characters. But St. Epiphanius attributes this to the Nazarenes, while the Ebionites proper only possessed an incomplete, falsified, and truncated copy thereof (Adv. Hær., xxix, 9). It is possibly identical with the Gospel of the Twelve.

(b) Their Apocrypha: "The Circuits of Peter" (περίοδοι Πέτρου) and Acts of the Apostles, amongst which the "Ascents of James" (ἀναβαθμοὶ Ιακώβου). The first-named books are substantially contained in the Clementine Homilies under the title of Clement's "Compendium of Peter's itinerary sermons", and also in the "Recognitions" ascribed to the same. They form an early Christian didactic novel to propagate Ebionite views, i. e. their Gnostic doctrines, the supremacy of James, their connexion with Rome, and their antagonism to Simon Magus. (See Clementines.)

(c) The Works of Symmachus, i. e. his translation of the Old Testament (see Versions of the Bible; Symmachus the Ebionite), and his "Hypomnemata" against the canonical Gospel of St. Matthew. The latter work, which is totally lost (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., VI, xvii; Jerome, De vir. ill., liv), is probably identical with "De distinctione præceptorum", mentioned by Ebed Jesu (Assemani, Bibl. Or., III, 1).

(d) The book of Elchesai, or of "The Hidden Power" (חל כסי), purporting to have been written about A.D. 100

and brought to Rome about A. D. 217 by Alcibiades of Apamea. Those who accepted its doctrines and its new baptism were called Elchesaites. (Hipp., "Philos.", IX, xiv–xvii; Epiph., "Hær.", xix, 1; liii, 1.)

Of the history of this sect hardly anything is known. They exerted only the slightest influence in the East and none at all in the West, where they were known as Symmachiani. In St. Epiphanius's time small communities seem still to have existed in some hamlets of Syria and Palestine, but they were lost in obscurity. Farther east, in Babylonia and Persia, their influence is perhaps traceable amongst the Mandeans, and it is suggested by Uhlhorn and others that they may be brought into connexion with the origin of Mohammedanism.

UHLHORN in *Realencyk. f. prot. Theol.* (1898), s. vv. *Ebioniten, Elkesaiten, Klementinen;* ID., *Die Homilien und Recognitionen d. Clem. Rom.* (Göttingen, 1854); HILGENFELD, *Judenthum u. Christenthum* (Leipzig, 1886); ID., *Ketzergeschichte des Urchr.* (Leipzig, 1884); BARDENHEWER, *Geschichte der altkirch. Lit.* (Freiburg, 1902); QUARRY, *Notes on the Clementine Homilies* in *Hermathena* (Dublin, 1890–1), VII, VIII; BUSSEL, *The Purpose of the World-Process . . . in the Clementine . . . Writings* in *Studia Bibl.* (Oxford, 1896); MANSEL, *The Gnostic Heresies of the First and Second Cent.* (London, 1875).

J. P. ARENDZEN.

Ebner, the name of two German mystics, whom historical research has shown to have been in no wise related.

(1) CHRISTINA, b. of a patrician family on Good Friday, at Nuremberg, 1277; d. at Engelthal, 27 December, 1355. From her mother she inherited a deeply religious spirit, which early manifested itself in a fondness for prayer and mortification. Hardly had she made her First Communion when her parents acceded to a desire, which she had expressed since her seventh year, of entering the Dominican convent at Engelthal in the vicinity of Nuremberg. At the end of her year of novitiate she was stricken with a dangerous illness, which reappeared three times annually from her thirteenth to her twenty-third year. Each year, for the remainder of her life, she suffered a relapse of this mysterious sickness. Christina did not, however, on this account relax her penitential practices, nor fail in her duties as superior, to which she had been early elected. In her thirteenth year she began to enjoy frequent visits from the Master, from whose words she drew light and counsel for her own direction. As a result she was misunderstood by all save her confessor, Father Konrad of Füssen, O.P., at whose command, in the Advent of 1317, she began to write a diary of her spiritual experiences in chronological order. After an introduction in which she reviews in a simple, unaffected manner the whole history of her life till 1317, this touching piece of mystical literature is carried on till 1353. She speaks of herself in the third person as *von dem menschen.* Most of this diary was written by her own hand save when she dictated on account of illness. It is preserved, in a complete version of the fifteenth century, in a manuscript (cod. 90) at Nuremberg. Excerpts are to be found also at the same place (cod. 89, 91), at Stuttgart (cod. 90), and Medingen. We learn from this source that Christina played an important part by her prayers in the settlement of the difficulties arising from the riots at Nuremberg in 1348; from the earthquake of the same year; the Black Death; the Flagellants' processions of 1349; and the long quarrel between Louis the Bavarian and the Holy See. She also tells us of the absence of a director from the removal of Konrad to Freiburg in 1324 till 1351, when Henry of Nördlingen visited her and gave her advice sufficient for the remainder of her life. The treatise "Von der genaden überlast" which the Stuttgart Literary Society edited over her name in 1871 is probably not her work.

(2) MARGARETHA, b. of rich parents at Donauwörth, 1291; d. 20 June, 1351. She received a thorough classical education in her home, and later entered the Dominican convent at Maria-Medingen near Dillingen, where she was solemnly professed in 1306. In 1312 she was dangerously ill for three years, and subsequently for a period of nearly seven years she was most of the time at the point of death. Hence she could exercise her desire for penance only by abstinence from wine, fruit, and the bath. On her return from home, whither she had gone during the campaign of Louis the Bavarian, her nurse died, and Margaretha grieved inconsolably, until Henry of Nördlingen assumed her spiritual direction in 1332. The correspondence that passed between them is the first collection of this kind in the German language. At his command she wrote with her own hand a full account of all her revelations and intercourse with the Infant Christ, as also all answers which she received from Him even in her sleep. This diary is preserved in a manuscript of the year 1353 at Medingen. From her letters and diary we learn that she never abandoned her adhesion to Louis the Bavarian, whose soul she learned in a vision had been saved.

LOCHNER, *Das mystische Leben der hl. Margaretha von Cortona,* 141–322: *Bericht aus dem mystischen Leben der gottseligen Ordensjungfrauen Christina und Margaretha Ebner aus Nürnberg* (Ratisbon, 1862); PREGER, *Gesch. der deutschen Mystik,* II, 247–50, 269–74; STRAUCH, *Margaretha Ebner und Heinrich von Nördlingen, Ein Beitrag* (Freiburg, 1882); STEMPFLE, *Die gottselige Margaretha Ebner, Klosterfrau zu Maria-Medingen* (Augsburg, 1838); VILLERMONT, *Un groupe mystique allemand* (Paris, 1908); RAUSCHMEYER, *Margaretha Ebner und ihre Zeit* in *Jahrbuch des historischen Vereins zu Dillingen* (1894), 144–147; *The True Story of Margaret of Cortona* in *The Messenger,* XXXVI (New York, 1901), 1110–14.

THOS. M. SCHWERTNER.

Ecchelensis, ABRAHAM. See ABRAHAM ECCHELENSIS.

Ecclesiarch. See SACRISTAN.

Ecclesiastes (Sept. ἐκκλησιαστής, in St. Jerome also CONCIONATOR, "Preacher") is the name given to the book of Holy Scripture which usually follows the Proverbs; the Hebrew *Qoheleth* probably has the same meaning. The word *preacher,* however, is not meant to suggest a congregation nor a public speech, but only the solemn announcement of sublime truths [הקהיל, passive נקהל, Lat. *congregare,* I (III) K., viii, 1, 2; בקהל, *in publico, palam,* Prov., v, 14; xxvi, 26; קהלת to be taken either as a feminine participle, and would then be either a simple abstract noun, *præconium,* or in a poetic sense, *tuba clangens,* or must be taken as the name of a person, like the proper nouns of similar formation, Esd., ii, 55, 57; corresponding to its use, the word is always used as masculine, except vii, 27]. Solomon, as the herald of wisdom, proclaims the most serious truths. His teaching may be divided as follows.

Introduction.—Everything human is vain (i, 1–11); for man, during his life on earth, is more transient than all things in nature (i, 1–7), whose unchangeable course he admires, but does not comprehend (i, 8–11).

Part I.—Vanity in man's private life (i, 12–iii, 15): vain is human wisdom (i, 12–18); vain are pleasures and pomp (ii, 1–23). Then, rhetorically exaggerating, he draws the conclusion: "Is it not better to enjoy life's blessings which God has given, than to waste your strength uselessly?" (ii, 24–26). As epilogue to this part is added the proof that all things are immutably predestined and are not subject to the will of man (iii, 1–15). In this first part, the reference to the writer himself, the self-accusation, on account of the excessive luxury described in III Kings, x, is placed in the foreground. Afterwards, the author usually prefaces his meditations with an "I saw", and explains what he has learned either by personal observation or by other means, and on what he has meditated. Thus he saw:—

Part II.—Sheer vanity also in civil life (iii, 16–vi, 6). Vain and cheerless is life because of the iniquity which reigns in the halls of justice (iii, 16–22) as well as in the intercourse of men (iv, 1–3). The strong expressions

in iii, 18 sqq., and iv, 2 sq., must be explained by the writer's tragic vein, and this does credit to the writer, who, speaking as Solomon, deplores bitterly what has often enough happened in his kingdom also, whether through his fault or without his knowledge. The despotic rule of the kings was described in advance by Samuel, and Solomon cannot be cleared of all guilt (see below). But even the best prince will, to his grief, find by experience that countless wrongs cannot be prevented in a large empire. Qoheleth does not speak of the wrongs which he himself has suffered, but of those which others sustained. Another of life's vanities consists in the fact that mad competition leads many to fall into idleness (iv, 4–6); a third causes many a man through greed to shun society, or even to lose a throne because his unwisdom forbids him to seek the help of other men (iv, 7–16). Qoheleth then turns once more to the three classes of men named: to those who groan under the weight of injustice, in order to exhort them not to sin against God by murmuring against Providence, for this would be tantamount to dishonouring God in His temple, or to breaking a sacred vow, or to denying Providence (iv, 17–v, 8); in the same way he gives a few salutary counsels to the miser (v, 9–19) and describes the misery of the supposed foolish king (vi, 1–6). A long oratorical amplification closes the second part (vi, 7–vii, 30). The immutable predestination of all things by God must teach man contentment and modesty (vi, 7–vii, 1, Vulg.). A serious life, free from all frivolity, is best (vii, 2–7, Vulg.). Instead of passionate outbreaks (vii, 8–15), he recommends a golden mean (vii, 16–23). Finally, Qoheleth inquires into the deepest and last reason of "vanity" and finds it in the sinfulness of woman; he evidently thinks also of the sin of the first woman, through which, against the will of God (30), misery entered the world (vii, 24–30). In this part, also, Qoheleth returns to his admonition to enjoy in peace and modesty the blessings granted by God, instead of giving oneself up to anger on account of wrongs endured, or to avarice, or to other vices (iii, 22; v, 17 sq.; vii, 15).

Part III begins with the question: "Who is as the wise man?" (In the Vulg. these words have been wrongly placed in chap. vii.) Qoheleth here gives seven or eight important rules for life as the quintessence of true wisdom. Submit to God's ("the king's") will (viii, 1–8). If you observe that there is no justice on earth, contain yourself, "eat and drink" (viii, 9–15). Do not attempt to solve all the riddles of life by human wisdom; it is better to enjoy modestly the blessings of life and to work according to one's strength, but always within the narrow limits set by God (viii, 16–ix, 12.—In the Vulg. *ad aliud* must be dropped). In this "siege" of your city (by God) seek help in true wisdom (ix, 13–x, 3). It is always most important not to lose your temper because of wrongs done to you (x, 4–15). Then follows the repetition of the advice not to give oneself up to idleness; sloth destroys countries and nations, therefore work diligently, but leave the success to God without murmuring (x, 16–xi, 6). Even amid the pleasures of life do not forget the Lord, but think of death and judgment (xi, 7–xii, 8).

In the epilogue Qoheleth again lays stress upon his authority as the teacher of wisdom, and declares that the pith of his teachings is: Fear God and keep the Commandments; for that is the whole man.

In the above analysis, as must be expected, the writer of this article has been guided in some particulars by his conception of the difficult text before him, which he has set forth more completely in his commentary on the same. Many critics do not admit a close connexion of ideas at all. Zapletal regards the book as a collection of separate aphorisms which form a whole only exteriorly: Bickell thought that the arrangement of the parts had been totally destroyed at an early date; Siegfried supposes that the book had been supplemented and enlarged in strata; Luther assumed several authors. Most commentators do not expect that they can show a regular connexion of all the "sayings" and an orderly arrangement of the entire book. In the above analysis an attempt has been made to do this, and we have pointed out what means may lead to success. Several parts must be taken in the sense of parables, e. g. what is said in ix, 14 sqq., of the siege of a city by a king. And in viii, 2, and x, 20, "king" means God. It appears to me that iv, 17, is not to be taken literally; and the same is true of x, 8 sqq. Few will hesitate to take xi, 1 sqq., figuratively. Chap. xii must convince every one that bold allegories are quite in Qoheleth's style. Chap. iii would be very flat if the proposition, "There is a time for everything", carried no deeper meaning than the words disclose at first sight. The strongest guarantee of the unity and sequence of thoughts in the book is the theme, "Vanitas vanitatum", which emphatically opens it and is repeated again and again, and (xii, 8) with which it ends. Furthermore, the constant repetition of *vidi* or of similar expressions, which connect the arguments for the same truth; finally, the sameness of verbal and rhetorical turns and of the writer's tragic vein, with its hyperbolical language, from beginning to end.

In order to reconcile the apparently conflicting statements in the same book or what seem contradictions of manifest truths of the religious or moral order, ancient commentators assumed that Qoheleth expresses varying views in the form of a dialogue. Many modern commentators, on the other hand, have sought to remove these discrepancies by omitting parts of the text, in this way to obtain a harmonious collection of maxims, or even affirmed that the author had no clear ideas, and, e. g., was not convinced of the spirituality and immortality of the soul. But, apart from the fact that we cannot admit erroneous or varying views of life and faith in an inspired writer, we regard frequent alterations in the text or the proposed form of a dialogue as poor makeshifts. It suffices, in my opinion, to explain certain hyperbolical and somewhat paradoxical turns as results of the bold style and the tragic vein of the writer. If our explanation is correct, the chief reproach against Qoheleth—viz. that against his orthodoxy—falls to the ground. For if iii, 17; xi, 9; xii, 7, 14, point to another life as distinctly as can be desired, we cannot take iii, 18–21, as a denial of immortality. Besides, it is evident that in his whole book the author deplores only the vanity of the mortal or earthly life; but to this may be truly applied (if the hyperbolical language of the tragical mood is taken into consideration) whatever is said there by Qoheleth. We cannot find fault with his comparing the mortal life of man and his death to the life and death of the beast (in vv. 19 and 21 רוח must always be taken as "breath of life"). Again, iv, 2 sq., is only a hyperbolical expression; in like manner Job (iii, 3) curses in his grief the day of his birth. True, some allege that the doctrine of immortality was altogether unknown to early antiquity; but even the Saviour (Luke, xx, 37) adduced the testimony of Moses for the resurrection of the dead and was not contradicted by his adversaries. And ix, 5 sq. and 10, must be taken in a similar sense. Now, in dooming all things earthly to destruction, but attributing another life to the soul, Qoheleth admits the spirituality of the soul; this follows especially from xii, 7, where the body is returned to the earth, but the soul to God.

Sometimes Qoheleth also seems to be given to fatalism; for in his peculiar manner he lays great stress on the immutability of the laws of nature and of the universe. But he considers this immutability as dependent on God's will (iii, 14; vi, 2; vii, 14 sq.). Nor does he deny the freedom of man within the limits set by God; otherwise his admonitions to fear God, to work, etc. would be meaningless, and man would not have brought evil into the world through his own fault (vii,

29, Heb.). Just as little does he contest the freedom of God's decrees, for God is spoken of as the source of all wisdom (ii, 26; v, 5). His views of life do not lead Qoheleth to stoical indifference or to blind hatred; on the contrary he shows the deepest sympathy with the misery of the suffering and earnestly deprecates opposition against God. In contentment with one's lot, in the quiet enjoyment of the blessings given by God, he discerns the golden mean, by which man prevents the vagaries of passion. Neither does he thereby recommend a kind of epicurism. For the ever-recurring phrase, "Eat and drink, for that is the best in this life", evidently is only a typical formula by which he recalls man from all kinds of excesses. He recommends not idle, but moderate enjoyment, accompanied by incessant labour. Many persist in laying one charge at Qoheleth's door, viz., that of pessimism. He seems to call all man's efforts vain and empty, his life aimless and futile, and his lot deplorable. It is true that a sombre mood prevails in the book, that the author chose as his theme the description of the sad and serious sides of life: but is it pessimism to recognize the evils of life and to be impressed with them? Is it not rather the mark of a great and profound mind to deplore bitterly the imperfection of what is earthly, and, on the other hand, the peculiarity of the frivolous to ignore the truth? The colours with which Qoheleth paints these evils are indeed glaring, but they naturally flow from the poetical-oratorical style of his book and from his inward agitation, which likewise gives rise to the hyperbolical language in the Book of Job and in certain psalms. However, Qoheleth, unlike the pessimists, does not inveigh against God and the order of the universe, but only man. Chap. vii, in which he inquires into the last cause of evil, closes with the words, "Only this I have found, that God made man right, and he hath entangled himself with an infinity of questions [or phantasms]". His philosophy shows us also the way in which man can find a modest happiness. While severely condemning exceptional pleasures and luxury (chap. ii), it counsels the enjoyment of those pleasures which God prepares for every man (viii, 15; ix, 7 sqq.; xi, 9). It does not paralyze, but incites activity (ix, 10; x, 18 sq.; xi, 1 sq.). It stays him in his afflictions (v, 7 sqq.; viii, 5; x, 4); it consoles him in death (iii, 17; xii, 7); it discovers at every step how necessary is the fear of God. But Qoheleth's greatest trouble seems to be his inability to find a direct, smooth answer to life's riddles; hence he so frequently deplores the insufficiency of his wisdom; on the other hand, besides wisdom, commonly so called, i. e. the wisdom resulting from man's investigations, he knows another kind of wisdom which soothes, and which he therefore recommends again and again (vii, 12, 20; Heb. viii, 1; ix, 17; xii, 9–14). It is true, we feel how the author wrestles with the difficulties which beset his inquiries into the riddles of life; but he overcomes them and offers us an effective consolation even in extraordinary trials. Extraordinary also must have been the occasion which led him to compose the book. He introduces himself from the beginning and repeatedly as Solomon, and this forcibly recalls Solomon shortly before the downfall of the empire; but we know from the Scriptures that this had been prepared by various rebellions and had been foretold by the infallible word of the prophet (see below). We must picture to ourselves Solomon in these critical times, how he seeks to strengthen himself and his subjects in this sore trial by the true wisdom which is a relief at all times; submission to the immutable will of God, the true fear of the Lord, undoubtedly must now appear to him the essence of human wisdom.

As the inspired character of Ecclesiastes was not settled in the Fifth Œcumenical Council but only solemnly reaffirmed against Theodore of Mopsuestia, the faithful have always found edification and consolation in this book. Already in the third century, St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, in his metaphrase, then Gregory of Nyssa, in eight homilies, later Hugh of St. Victor, in nineteen homilies, set forth the wisdom of Qoheleth as truly celestial and Divine. Every age may learn from his teaching that man's true happiness must not be looked for on earth, not in human wisdom, not in luxury, not in royal splendour; that many afflictions await everybody, in consequence either of the iniquity of others, or of his own passions; that God has shut him up within narrow limits, lest he become overweening, but that He does not deny him a small measure of happiness if he does not "seek things that are above him" (vii, 1, Vulg.), if he enjoys what God has bestowed on him, in the fear of the Lord and in salutary labour. The hope of a better life to come grows all the stronger the less this life can satisfy man, especially the man of high endeavour. Now Qoheleth does not intend this doctrine for an individual or for one people, but for mankind, and he does not prove it from supernatural revelation, but from pure reason. This is his cosmopolitan standpoint, which Kuenen rightly recognized; unfortunately, this commentator wished to conclude from this that the book originated in Hellenistic times. Nowack refuted him, but the universal application of the meditations contained therein, to every man who is guided by reason, is unmistakable.

The Author of the Book.—Most modern commentators are of the opinion that Qoheleth's style points not to Solomon, but to a later writer. About this the following may be said:—

(1) As a matter of fact, the language of this book differs widely from the language of the Proverbs. Some think that they have discovered many Aramaisms in it. What can we say on this point?—It cannot be gainsaid that Solomon and a great, if not the greatest, part of his people understood Aramaic. (We take the word here as the common name of the dialects closely related to the Biblical Hebrew.) Abraham and Sara, as well as the wives of Isaac and Jacob, had come from Chaldea; it is therefore probable that the language of that country was preserved, beside the language of Palestine, in the family of the Patriarchs; at any rate, in Moses' time the people still use Aramaic expressions. They exclaim (Ex., xvi, 15) מן הוא, while Moses himself at once substitutes the Hebrew מה־הוא; the name of the miraculous food, however, remained מן. A large portion of David's and Solomon's empire was peopled by Arameans, so that Solomon reigned from the Euphrates to Gaza [I (III) K., v, 4, Heb.; II Sam. (K.), x, 19; cf. Gen., xv, 18]. He was conversant with the science of the "sons of the East" and exchanged with them his wisdom (I K., v, 10–14, Heb.). But, as Palestine lay along the commercial routes between the Euphrates and Phœnicia, the Israelites, at least in the north of the country, must have been well acquainted with Aramaic. At the time of King Ezechias even the officials of Jerusalem understood Aramaic (Is., xxxvi, 11; II K., xviii, 26, Heb.). Solomon could therefore assume, without hesitation, a somewhat Aramaic speech, if reason or mere inclination moved him. As a skilful writer, he may have intended, especially in his old age, and in a book whose style is partly oratorical, partly philosophical, partly poetical, to enrich the language by new turns. Goethe's language in the second part of "Faust" differs greatly from the first, and introduces many neologisms. Now Solomon seems to have had a more important reason for it. As it lay in his very character to remove the barriers between pagans and Israelites, he may have had the conscious intention to address in this book, one of his last, not only the Israelites but his whole people; the Aramaic colouring of his language, then, served as a means to introduce himself to Aramaic readers, who, in their turn, understood Hebrew sufficiently. It is remarkable that the name of God, *Jahveh*, never oc-

curs in Ecclesiastes, while *Elohim* is found thirty-seven times; it is more remarkable still that the name *Jahveh* has been omitted in a quotation (v, 3; cf. Deut., xxiii, 22). Besides, nothing is found in the book that could not be known through natural religion, without the aid of revelation.

(2) The Aramaisms may perhaps be explained in still another way. We probably possess the Old Testament, not in the original wording and orthography, but in a form which is slightly revised. We must unquestionably distinguish, it seems, between Biblical Hebrew as an unchanging literary language and the conversational Hebrew, which underwent constant changes. For there is no instance anywhere that a spoken language has been preserved for some nine hundred years so little changed in its grammar and vocabulary as the language of our extant canonical books. Let us, for an instance, compare the English, French, or German of nine hundred years ago with those languages in their present form. Hence it seems exceedingly daring to infer from the written Hebrew the character of the spoken language, and from the style of the book to infer the date of its composition. In the case of a literary language, on the other hand, which is a dead language and as such essentially unchangeable, it is reasonable to suppose that in the course of time its orthography, as well as single words and phrases, and, perhaps, here and there, some formal elements, have been subjected to change in order to be more intelligible to later readers. It is possible that Ecclesiastes was received into the canon in some such later edition. The Aramaisms, therefore, may also be explained in this manner; at any rate, the supposition that the time of the composition of a Biblical book may be deduced from its language is wholly questionable.

(3) This is a fact admitted by all those critics who ascribe Ecclesiastes, the Canticle of Canticles, portions of Isaias and of the Pentateuch, etc., to a later period, without troubling themselves about the difference of style in these books.

(4) The eagerness to find Aramaisms in Ecclesiastes is also excessive. Expressions which are commonly regarded as such are found now and then in many other books. Hirzel thinks that he has found ten Aramaisms in Genesis, eight in Exodus, five in Leviticus, four in Numbers, nine in Deuteronomy, two in Josue, nine in Judges, five in Ruth, sixteen in Samuel, sixteen in the Psalms, and several in Proverbs. For this there may be a twofold explanation: Either the descendants of Abraham, a Chaldean, and of Jacob, who dwelt twenty years in the Land of Laban, and whose sons were almost all born there, have retained numerous Aramaisms in the newly acquired Hebrew tongue, or the peculiarities pointed out by Hitzig and others are no Aramaisms. It is indeed astonishing how accurately certain critics claim to know the linguistic peculiarities of each of the numerous authors and of every period of a language of which but little literature is left to us. Zöckler affirms that almost every verse of Qoheleth contains some Aramaisms (Komm., p. 115); Grotius found only four in the whole book; Hengstenberg admits ten; the opinions on this point are so much at variance that one cannot help noticing how varying men's conception of an Aramaism is. Peculiar or strange expressions are at once called Aramaisms; but, according to Hävernick, the Book of Proverbs, also, contains forty words and phrases which are often repeated and which are found in no other book; the Canticle of Canticles has still more peculiarities. On the contrary the Prophecies of Aggeus, Zacharias, and Malachias are without any of those peculiarities which are supposed to indicate so late a period. There is much truth in Griesinger's words: "We have no history of the Hebrew language".

(5) Even prominent authorities adduce Aramaisms which are shown to be Hebraic by clear proofs or manifest analogies from other books. There are hardly any unquestionable Aramaisms which can neither be found in other books nor regarded as Hebraisms, which perchance have survived only in Ecclesiastes (for a detailed demonstration cf. the present writer's Commentary, pp. 23–31). We repeat here Welte's words: "Only the language remains as the principal argument that it was written after Solomon; but how fallacious in such cases is the merely linguistic proof, need not be mentioned after what has been said."

It is alleged that the conditions as described in Ecclesiastes do not agree with the time and person of Solomon. True, the author, who is supposed to be Solomon, speaks of the oppression of the weak by the stronger, or one official by another, of the denial of right in the courts of justice (iii, 16; iv, 1; v, 7 sqq.; viii, 9 sq.; x, 4 sqq.). Now many think that such things could not have happened in Solomon's realm. But it surely did not escape the wisdom of Solomon that oppression occurs at all times and with every people; the glaring colours, however, in which he describes them originate in the tragic tone of the whole book. Besides, Solomon himself was accused, after his death, of oppressing his people, and his son confirms the charge [I (III) K., xii, 4 and 14]; moreover, long before him, Samuel spoke of the despotism of the future kings [I Sam. (K.), viii, 11 sq.]. Many miss in the book an indication of the past sins and the subsequent repentance of the king, or, on the other hand, wonder that he discloses the mistakes of his life so openly. But if these readers considered vii, 27–29, they could not help sharing Solomon's disgust at women's intrigues and their consequences; if obedience towards God is inculcated in various ways, and if this (xii, 13) is regarded as man's sole destination, the readers saw that the converted king feared the Lord; in chap. ii sensuality and luxury are condemned so vigorously that we may regard this passage as a sufficient expression of repentance. The openness, however, with which Solomon accuses himself only heightens the impression. This impression has at all times been so strong, precisely because it is the experienced, rich, and wise Solomon who brands the sinful aspirations of man as "vanity of vanities". Again, what Qoheleth says of himself and his wisdom in xii, 9 sqq., cannot sound strange if it comes from Solomon, especially since in this passage he makes the fear of the Lord the essence of wisdom. The passages iv, 13; viii, 10; ix, 13; x, 4, are considered by some as referring to historical persons, which seems to me incorrect; at any rate, indications of so general a nature do not necessarily point to definite events and persons. Other commentators think they have discovered traces of Greek philosophy in the book; Qoheleth appears to be now a sceptic, now a stoic, now an epicurean; but these traces of Hellenism, if existing at all, are nothing more than remote resemblances too weak to serve as arguments. Cheyne (Job and Solomon) sufficiently refuted Tyler and Plumptre. That iii, 12, is a linguistic Græcism, has not been proved, because the common meaning of עשה טוב is retained by many commentators; moreover, in II Sam. (K.), xii, 18, עשה רעה means "to be sorry"; the verb, therefore, has about the same force as if we translated עשה טוב by *εὖ πράττειν*.

As all the other internal proofs against the authorship of Solomon are not more convincing, we must listen to the voice of tradition, which has always attributed Ecclesiastes to him. The Jews doubted not its composition by Solomon, but objected to the reception, or rather retention, of the book in the canon; Hillel's School decided definitely for its canonicity and inspiration. In the Christian Church Theodore of Mopsuestia and some others for a time obscured the tradition; all other witnesses previous to the sixteenth century favour the Solomonic authorship and the in-

spiration. The book itself bears testimony for Solomon, not only by the title, but by the whole tone of the discussion, as well as in i, 12; moreover, in xii, 9, Qoheleth is expressly called the author of many proverbs. The ancients never so much as suspected that here, as in the Book of Wisdom, Solomon only played a fictitious part. On the other hand, the attempt is made to prove that the details do not fit Solomon, and to contest his authorship with this single internal argument. The reasons adduced, however, are based upon textual explanations which are justly repudiated by others. Thus Hengstenberg sees (x, 16) in the king, "who is a child", an allusion to the King of Persia; Grätz, to Herod the Idumæan; Reusch rightly maintains that the writer speaks of human experiences in general. From ix, 13–15, Hitzig concludes that the author lived about the year 200; Bernstein thinks this ridiculous and opines that some other historical event is alluded to. Hengstenberg regards this passage as nothing more than a parable; on this last view, also, the translation of the Septuagint is based (it has the subjunctive; ἔλθῃ βασιλεύς, "there may come a king"). As a matter of fact, Qoheleth describes only what has happened or may happen somewhere "under the sun" or at some time; he does not speak of political situations, but of the experience of the individual; he has in view not his people alone, but mankind in general. If internal reasons are to decide the question of authorship, it seems to me that we might more justly prove this authorship of Solomon with more right from the remarkable passage about the snares of woman (vii, 27), a passage the bitterness of which is not surpassed by the warning of any ascetic; or from the insatiable thirst of Qoheleth for wisdom; or from his deep knowledge of men and the unusual force of his style. Considering everything we see no decisive reason to look for another author; on the contrary, the reasons which have been advanced against this view are for the greatest part so weak that in this question the influence of fashion is clearly discernible.

The time of the composition of our book is variously set down by the critics who deny the authorship of Solomon. Every period from Solomon to 200 has been suggested by them; there are even authorities for a later time; Grätz thinks that he has discovered clear proof that the book was written under King Herod (40–4 B. C.). This shows clearly how little likely the linguistic criterion and the other internal arguments are to lead to an agreement of opinion. If Solomon wrote Ecclesiastes towards the end of his life, the sombre tone of the book is easily explained; for the judgments of God (III Kings, xi) which then came upon him would naturally move him to sorrow and repentance, especially as the breaking up of his kingdom and the accompanying misery were then distinctly before his eyes (see vv. 29 sqq.; 40). Amid the sudden ruin of his power and splendour, he might well exclaim, "Vanity of vanities!" But as God had promised to correct him "in mercy" (II Kings, vii, 14 sq.), the supposition of many ancient writers that Solomon was converted to God becomes highly probable. Then we also understand why his last book, or one of his last, consists of three thoughts: the vanity of earthly things, self-accusation, and emphatic admonition to obey the immutable decrees of Providence. The last was well suited to save the Israelites from despair, who were soon to behold the downfall of their power.

There is an unmistakable similarity between Ecclesiastes and the Canticle of Canticles, not only in the pithy shortness of the composition, but also in the emphatic repetition of words and phrases, in the boldness of the language, in the obscure construction of the whole, and in certain linguistic peculiarities (e. g. the use of the relative שׁ). The loose succession of sententious thoughts, however, reminds us of the Book of Proverbs, whence the epilogue (xii, 9 sqq.) expressly refers to Qoheleth's skill in parables. In the old lists of Biblical books, the place of Ecclesiastes is between Proverbs and the Canticle of Canticles: Sept., Talmud (Baba Bathra xiv, 2), Orig., Mel., Concil. Laodic., etc., also in the Vulgate. Its position is different only in the Masoretic Bible, but, as is generally admitted, for liturgical reasons.

As to the contents, the critics attack the passages referring to the judgment and immortality: iii, 17; xi, 9; xii, 7; furthermore the epilogue, xii, 9 sqq., especially verses 13, 14; also some other passages. Bickell expressed the opinion that the folios of the original, while being stitched, were deranged and completely confused; his hypothesis found few advocates, and Euringer (Masorahtext des Qoheleth, Leipzig, 1890) maintains, in opposition to him, that books had not at that early date taken the place of rolls. There is not sufficient evidence to assume that the text was written in verse, as Zapletal does.

Owing to its literalism, the translation of the Septuagint is frequently unintelligible, and it seems that the translators used a corrupt Hebraic text. The Itala and the Coptic translation follow the Septuagint. The Peshito, though translated from the Hebrew, is evidently also dependent on the text of the Septuagint. This text, with the notes of Origen, partly forms the Greek and Syriac Hexapla. The Vulgate is a shilful translation made by Jerome from the Hebrew and far superior to his translation from the Greek (in his commentary). Sometimes we cannot accept his opinion (in vi, 9, he most likely wrote *quid cupias*, and in viii, 12, *ex eo quod peccator*). (See the remnants of the Hexapla of Origen in Field, Oxford, 1875; a paraphrase of the Greek text in St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, Migne, X, 987.) The Chaldean paraphrast is useful for controlling the Masoretic text; the Midrash Qoheleth is without value. The commentary of Olympiodorus is also serviceable (seventh century, M., XCIII, 477) and Œcumenius, "Catena" (Verona, 1532). A careful translation from the Hebrew was made about 1400 in the "Græca Veneta" (ed. Gebhardt, Leipzig, 1875).

In the Latin Church important commentaries were written, after the time of Jerome, on whom many depend, by BONAVENTURA, NICOL. LYRANUS, DENYS THE CARTHUSIAN, and above all by PINEDA (seventeenth cent.), by MALDONATUS, CORNELIUS A LAPIDE, and BOSSUET.

Modern Catholic commentaries: SCHÄFER (Freiburg im Br., 1870); MOTAIS (Paris, 1876); RAMBOUILLET (Paris, 1877); GIETMANN (Paris, 1890); ZAPLETAL (Fribourg, Switzerland, 1905).

Protestant commentaries: ZÖCKLER, tr. TAYLOR (Edinburgh, 1872); BULLOCK, in *Speaker's Comment.* (London, 1878); *Cambridge Bible* (1881); WRIGHT (London, 1883); LEIMDÖRFER (Hamburg, 1892); SIEGFRIED (Göttingen, 1898); WILDEBOER (Freiburg im Br., 1898).

G. GIETMANN.

Ecclesiastical Art.—Before speaking in detail of the developments of Christian art from the beginning down to the present day, it seems natural to say something in regard to the vexed question as to the source of its inspiration. It would not be possible here to treat adequately all the various theories which have been propounded, but the essentials of the controversy may be given in a few words. Afterwards there will be some mention of the principal works which Christian antiquity has left to us and a setting forth of the influence of the Catholic Church in stimulating and directing that artistic spirit which for so many centuries it alone was destined to keep alive.

ORIGIN OF CHRISTIAN ART.—There has been much discussion of late years as to the influences which were predominant in the development of early Christian art. Professor Wickhoff in a striking essay (Roman Art, tr., 1900) has contended that in the first century after Christ a distinctively Roman style was evolved both in painting and sculpture, the salient features of which he characterizes as impressionist or "illusionist". He marks several stages in the growth of this

style, and claims for it especially the creation of what he calls the "continuous" method of composition, i. e. a method by which several successive stages of the same history are depicted together in a single painting. Further, he contends that this Roman style was adopted by the first Christian artists and that, though obscured and weakened, it pervaded the Roman world and maintained its identity throughout the Middle Ages, until eventually it quickened again into fuller life under the stimulus of the Renaissance. This view, an exaggeration of the Romanist hypothesis which long held the field, has been severely criticized by many competent authorities and notably by Strzygowski ("Orient oder Rom", 1901, and "Kleinasien", 1903), who attributes the predominant influence in the development of Christian art to the recrudescence of purely Oriental feeling. This, as he maintains, had always survived at Byzantium, Antioch, and Alexandria, and it became operative once more when the Græco-Roman artistic tradition at Rome had exhausted itself after the effort of a few centuries. Though Strzygowski may go too far when he claims that even the art of the Romanized provinces like Gaul came from the East direct and not through Rome, it seems highly probable that his contention is in substance accurate enough. It is significant that Professor André Michel in the monumental "Histoire de l'Art" (1905—) distinctly lends his support to the theory that the Christian art of the Middle Ages was Byzantine rather than Roman in its origin. To Rome no doubt must be assigned the prevalence of the basilica type of church and the first effective conception of the possibilities of stone vaulting. But the transference of the seat of government by Honorius in 404 from Rome to Ravenna and the confusion that arose in the Western Roman Empire, had far-reaching consequences upon the development of art. If Rome was at all times the seat of the papacy, the vicars of Christ had not at this early date acquired any preponderating influence in the social and civil affairs of the Western world, while more than a hundred years after this, beginning with the seventh century, no less than thirteen pontiffs who occupied in succession the chair of St. Peter were of Greek or Syrian origin. But what is perhaps most important of all, the Latin stock who occupied what was once the great city, but what now became only a provincial town, were morally and intellectually effete. The motive power for a new development was to come from outside. The impetuous energy of the Teutonic tribes of the North was full of latent possibilities for the arts of peace, when that energy was once diverted from the strenuous occupations of a time of war. Once again "Græcia capta ferum victorem cepit"; but it was Greece enriched this time with the inheritance of Antioch, Ephesus, and Alexandria, while the culture that now travelled west and north found ultimately a more responsive soil than it had ever met with in Latium. In its adoption by Goths, Franks, and Saxons the art of Byzantium lost its rigidity, and something of its formalism. It was a living germ which soon developed an independent growth, and long before the Renaissance once more directed the minds of men to classic models, not only architecture and sculpture, but the arts of the painter, the iron-worker, the goldsmith, and the glass-founder were full of vigorous life and promise throughout all Western Europe.

The earliest specimens of decoration employed for a Christian purpose are found in the Roman catacombs. In the most ancient examples of all, the private chambers used for Christian interment in the first and second centuries, there is decoration indeed, but it is only in a negative sense that it can be called Christian art, for while the abundant frescoes seen in the cemetery of Domitilla and notably in the cubiculum of Ampliatus exclude such pagan elements as would be unseemly, the character of the painting is in every respect the counterpart of the ornamentation of the contemporary private houses buried at Pompeii. There is nothing distinctively Christian. Perhaps the frequent recurrence of the vine as a principal element in the scheme of decoration may have been meant to suggest the thought of Christ, the true vine, but even this is doubtful. Symbolism occurs early, but it can only be recognized with confidence in the more public cemeteries of the second century, e. g. that of St. Callistus; here, under the influence of the "Discipline of the Secret", it is hardly wrong to recognize the true beginnings of a distinctively Christian art. No doubt this art in a most marked degree was imitative of the more decent forms of pagan decoration familiar at the period. It seems constantly to be forgotten by those who discuss this subject that it was the deliberate object of the early Christians, during the ages of suspicion and persecution, to exclude from their places of sepulture all that would by its conspicuousness or strangeness attract the notice of the casual pagan intruder. No wonder that the theme of the Good Shepherd is introduced again and again in the fresco decorations of the early catacombs. This is no indication, as rationalist critics have sometimes pretended, of the survival of an idolatrous mythology, but the very likeness of the beardless Good Shepherd to the type of the pagan Hermes Kriophorus—a likeness, however, which is never so exact as to lead to real confusion—constituted its recommendation to those who wished to hide their distinctive practices from the prying eyes of the people around them. In the same way the Orante, or praying figure, symbolical of the Church or the individual soul, bore a general resemblance to the statues of Pietas, familiar enough to the ordinary Roman citizen, while the dove, which was to the Christian eloquent of the grace of the Holy Spirit, would not have been distinguished by his pagan neighbour from the birds consecrated to Venus. The deeper mysteries of the Eucharist and of the other sacroments were still more artfully veiled in the frescoes of those early centuries. No doubt the fish was an object familiar enough in all kinds of pagan decoration, but that very fact rendered it most suitable for the purpose of the Christian when he wished to symbolize the marvellous workings of Christ (Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ Υἱὸς Σωτήρ = ΙΧΘΥΣ, the fish) in the waters of baptism. What again was more common in decoration than some form of banqueting scene—a theme also often utilized by the worshippers of Mithra—but these feasts depicted upon the walls of a sepulchral chamber had a far other and deeper significance for the Christian, who by some minute sign, the little cross, it may be, impressed upon the loaves, or the fishes which decked the frugal board, was quick to discern the reference to the life-giving mystery of the Blessed Eucharist. There are also human figures and Biblical scenes, especially those connected with the liturgy for the departed—for example, the miraculous restorations of Jonah and Daniel and Lazarus—and in one or two isolated instances we may perhaps recognize a presentment of the Madonna; but the reference is always cryptic and only interpretable by the initiated. It was under these circumstances that the instinct of religious symbolism was developed when the art of the Church was yet in its infancy, but the tradition thus created has never departed from true religious art throughout the ages.

With the triumph of the Church under Constantine the necessity for the sedulous hiding of the mysteries of the Faith in large measure disappeared. From A. D. 313 to the end of the fifth century was a period of transformation and development in Christian art, and it may be conspicuously recognized upon the walls of the Roman catacombs. Biblical scenes abound, and the figure of Christ, no longer so frequently as the beardless Good Shepherd, but crowned with a nimbus and sitting or standing in the attitude of authority, is fearlessly introduced. The nimbus is also extended to

others beside Christ, for example to Our Lady and some of the saints. Sculpture again, though in the catacombs the traces it has left are relatively few, now for the first time becomes the helpmate of painting in the service of the Church. This is the age of the great Christian sarcophagi so wonderfully decorated with the figures of Christ and His Apostles and with biblical scenes still full of symbolic meaning. The old ways of the period of persecution had, it is plain, become not only familiar but dear to the body of the faithful. The allegorical method of representing the mysteries of the Faith did not disappear at once. But though with the triumph of Constantine the outline of the "chrisme", or the Greek monogram of Christ, ☧ was universally held in honour and introduced ✠ into all Christian monuments and even into the coinage, the crucifix as a Christian emblem was as yet practically unknown. For more than a century the memory of the Sacrifice of Calvary was recalled to the minds of the faithful only by some such device as that of a plain cross impressed with the figure of a lamb. The first representations of the figure of the Saviour nailed upon the Rood, as we see it upon the carved doors of Sta Sabina in Rome and in the British Museum ivory, belong probably to the fifth century, but for a long period after that this subject is very rarely found, and its occurrence in frescoes or mosaics is hardly recorded anywhere before the time of Justinian (527–565).

Mosaics and Other Early Christian Arts.—To find the beginning of the use of colour in the Roman Empire to anything like an important extent, we must look at the Roman pavements composed of myriads of tesseræ, and representing in a flat and somewhat uninteresting manner mystic beings, extraordinary animals, fruits, flowers, and designs. Between these Roman pavements and one branch of the earliest Christian art, that of mosaic, there is a very close connexion. It seems also possible that some of the early efforts of the art of the Christian Church are to be found in the decorations of gold on glass which have been discovered in the catacombs. Upon these glasses, dating from the third to the fifth century, are found representations of Christ and of the Apostles, as well as drawings in gold-leaf, partly symbolic and partly realistic, referring to the miracles of Christ, the emblems of the Seven Spirits, a future life, and the events narrated in the New Testament. Simple and archaic as these are, yet many of them show considerable beauty. The primitive Church included within itself, not only the poor and humble, but persons of distinction, rank, and attainment, and it is clear from an examination of these drawings that some were executed by those who were in possession of considerable artistic skill, and who had been trained in a knowledge of Greek and Roman art. Contemporaneous with these, and earlier, are frescoes painted upon the walls of the catacombs, including portraits of the Apostles and of Christ, representations of the martyrs, naive pictures of the scenes from Holy Writ, and simple illuminatory symbolism. Then, between the fourth and tenth centuries, there is a long series of mosaics, in which for the first time strong evidence appears of a sense of colour. A few specimens of these mosaics adorned the catacombs, afterwards they are found in the oratories and places of worship of the primitive Church. It was speedily recognized that mosaic decorations possessed certain strong claims to attention, such as other methods of decoration lacked. While the artist himself must be responsible for fresco work, very much of the labour in mosaic decoration could be left to persons of subordinate position, and once the artist had drawn out the pattern and scheme which was to cover, for instance, the apse of the church, the actual manual labour of fitting in the tesseræ could be done by workmen. Then, again, there was the quality of imperishability; the mosaic was permanent, an actual part of the structure which it decorated; it did not vary in colour by reason of light or atmosphere, and could be cleansed from time to time. It was also capable of strong, broad effects, rendering it peculiarly suitable to positions at the end of a building, somewhat above the line of sight, and its colour could be made so emphatic and so brilliant that the darkest of curves or hollows could be lit up by its luminous beauty. It is small wonder, therefore, that from the very earliest period the Church drew to itself the skilful workers in mosaic, and employed them, as can be seen by the wonderful remains at Ravenna, in Sicily, on Mount Athos, near Constantinople, and notably at Rome, to decorate the interiors of the basilicas, and to portray upon their walls the emblems of the Divine tragedy, of the sufferings of Christ and of His saints, or to represent in hieratic magnificence the figures of Christ in glory, or in benediction, so that the scenes might be well in sight of all the worshippers within the little churches.

From the representation of single figures at the end of the church, the work speedily spread to more elaborate adornment of the walls, and from the simplicity of a single emblem, a single figure, the artistic spirit grew until it represented in pictorial effect the parables and miracles of Christ, or spread long triumphant processions of virgins, Apostles, martyrs, along the walls of the aisles and transepts of the larger churches. There is no city in Europe in which this earliest Christian art can be so well studied as at Ravenna. The difficulty of approaching the place in its out-of-the-way position has enabled it to retain and preserve the monuments in which it is so rich, and which relate so exclusively to its early history. The baptistery dates back to the last years of the fourth century, and was later ornamented in mosaic. There is in it a representation of the Baptism of Christ, and a circle of the Twelve Apostles; the figures, of surpassing dignity, appear to move round the dome with a swing and grace very remarkable in effect. Another circle of mosaic decorations in the same building represents the four Books of the Gospels open upon four altars, and between them four thrones of dominion with crosses; these mosaics have never been restored, and are in the condition in which their makers left them. The huge font intended for baptism by immersion, which stands below them, is proof of their antiquity, but the actual inscription of dedication with its date still exists on the metal cross surmounting the building. In the chapel of the archbishop in the archiepiscopal palace are mosaics of the fifth century made during the reign of Archbishop St. Peter Chrysologus, while in the tomb of the Empress Galla Placidia are mosaic decorations of her period; unfortunately, many of these latter works have been restored. The very finest mosaics in Ravenna, however, relate to the great heresy of Arianism. In the time of Theodoric, the old heresy was beginning once more to make itself felt. Arius had long been dead, Athanasius had fought his courageous battle against the Arian heresy, the Councils of Nicæa and Constantinople had been held, and had pronounced against it, and the Nicene doctrine had been confirmed, so that within the Church the heresy could no longer exist, but outside the Catholic Church there were still those who accepted it. When Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths, came into power, Arianism became once more a force to be reckoned with, and the emperor erected a cathedral and a baptistery at Ravenna for his Arian bishops. It is in the church now called Sant' Apollinare Nuovo, which was new more than a thousand years ago, that the great rhythmic array of saints and virgins alluded to above exists, the greater part of it as it was when Theodoric erected the church fourteen centuries ago. In the baptistery of the Arians, near by, the mosaics upon the roof were put in place practically after the baptistery became Catholic, and therefore date from about 550.

It is not only, however, in mosaics, that Ravenna

illustrates the early art of the Church; one of its great treasures, the ivory chair of St. Maximianus (546–556), made in the first half of the sixth century, has been in the city since it was first carved, with the exception of a very short time when it was carried to Venice in 1001. It is perhaps the finest example in existence of such ivory carving, and was the work of Oriental craftsmen, who entered into the service of the Church and carved this chair with its delicate and beautiful illustrations of the miracles of Christ and the history of Joseph. The same city can illustrate other branches of applied art, for the orphreys and textile fabrics made for San Giovanni in the fifth century, the sixth-century altar-cross of the archbishop, St. Agnellus (556–569), his processional cross of silver, and portions of his cathedral chair, are still preserved in the cathedral, while the art of carving in marble of the same period is exceedingly well exemplified by the splendid stone sarcophagi existing in various churches of the city. Following the time of Theodoric came the rule of the Emperor Justinian (527–565), and the episcopate of St. Ecclesius (521–534), while the mosaic decoration in the church of San Vitale, done in the early and middle part of the sixth century, illustrate the change from Arian heresy to Catholic truth, and the exquisite beauty of the mosaic work the Church was able to make use of at that time. A little journey outside Ravenna to the church of Sant' Apollinare in Classe will enable the student to bring his study of early mosaic work and early sculpture down to a still later period, as in that church there is the great mosaic erected by Archbishop Reparatus c. 671, the carved throne of St. Damianus (688–705), and the sarcophagi of various archbishops, extending in date to the end of the seventh century, and bearing religious emblems of very considerable importance. Attention should also be drawn to the pictures on unprepared linen cloth, executed in a material similar to transparent water-colour, ascribed to a period antecedent to the third century. They chiefly purport to be representations of the features of Christ. The most notable of course is the one known as the Handkerchief of St. Veronica, preserved in the Vatican, and which none but an ecclesiastic of very high rank is allowed to examine closely. Although the most important, it is by no means the only example of such a picture. There is another in Genoa, a third in the church of San Silvestro in Rome, and others in various European shrines. The metal work executed during the Ostrogothic occupation of Italy was often work commissioned by the Church for use in the ceremonials of the service, and figures of Christ and of the saints, ornaments for copes, chasses in which to put relics, and vessels for use at the altar, belonging to this period of primitive art, are the direct result of the teaching of the Church. As, however, the religious feeling spread more and more, the desire arose among Christians to have artistic representations of the great events of the Faith in their houses, and it is possible that the beginnings of what we may term portable pictorial work arose in this way. The very early tempera paintings on wood of Eastern and Byzantine character, some of which are actually ascribed to the hand of the Apostle St. Luke himself, may very likely have been executed, not entirely as decorations for the Church, but that the wealthier members of the community, at least, might have in their homes, in the privacy of their own oratories, some cherished representation of the Man of Sorrows Himself, or of some Apostle or saint from whom the owner was named, or towards whom he had some particular affection. In this way may perhaps be traced the beginning of the history of the icons, which are so important a feature in the life of the Eastern Church, and which adorn every house, in many cases being found in all the rooms occupied by the various members of the family.

ECCLESIASTICAL ART IN THE MIDDLE AGES.—Leaving primitive times, the period of the Middle Ages is one of enormous artistic importance, and it is an era in which the influence of the Church is practically paramount. To this period there does not belong any very long series of artistic objects relating exclusively to domestic life. There were, of course, articles of domestic interest marked by artistic skill, there were objects of personal decoration, and appliances for use in the home; but the choicest talent and the efforts of the most supreme genius were almost invariably given to the work of the Church, and even where the commissions related to domestic ornamentation, there was generally a religious element in the decorations and the use of religious symbolisms. To this period belong the magnificent works in enamels, executed for church work. There are the tall pricket candlesticks, superb chasses and reliquaries, altar-crosses, crosiers, shrines, censers and incense boats, crucifixes, morses for copes, and medallions for sacred vessels, triptychs and polyptychs for use on the altar, plaques for book-covers, especially for the adornment of the Book of the Gospels, cruets, basins, chalices, and book-binding in metal encrusted with jewels. The very first British enamels were merely a kind of coarse decoration, applied to the adornment of shields and helmets, but later on to cups, vases, and drinking-vessels, but, when mention is made of the Ardagh Chalice and the Alfred Jewel, it will be realized that a period in enamel work has been reached when the Church laid its hand upon the craft. Concerning the use of the Alfred Jewel, it may be broadly stated that the most probable theory is that it was the ornament applied to the head of an ivory pointer used by the deacon when reading the Book of the Gospels, and that therefore this exquisite object now in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford is one of the earliest examples of ecclesiastical enamel work. The Ardagh Chalice, of translucent enamels on silver and gold, is only one of a group of Irish shrines, reliquaries, missal-covers, crosiers, and crosses, similarly decorated, and it would appear likely that these Irish or Celtic enamels, of which half a dozen adorn the altar of Sant' Ambrogio in Milan, are perhaps among the earliest existing examples of the art in connexion with ecclesiastical possessions. In the first part of the eleventh century, Byzantium appears to have been the head-quarters of the work of ecclesiastical enamelling, and the pectoral cross in the South Kensington Museum may be taken as an example of early Byzantine work. The art of the enameller was also in existence in Germany at an early date, and here also was applied exclusively to ecclesiastical objects. Towards the middle of the twelfth century the workers of Limoges came into prominence, and from that time down to the end of the thirteenth Limoges was the centre of production. In Italian enamelling, the wonderful translucent reliquary, dated 1338, the work of Ugolino of Siena, in which is preserved the great relic of the Holy Corporal at Orvieto, is a masterpiece of the craft. The altar-frontal at Pistoja belongs to about the same period, and a little later comes the reliquary made by the brothers Arezzo, while during the whole of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the enamellers were kept hard at work in Italy producing objects intended for Church work in two or three distinct processes, either that called champlevé, or another method, that of floating transparent enamels, known by the name of *bassetaille*, or still another process called encrusting. At the end of the fifteenth century, and the beginning of the sixteenth, in the era of the Renaissance, the art left Italy, and, taking a new form, that of painted enamels, or more strictly, painting in enamels, had a recrudescence in France, in the very same place, Limoges, in which the old enamels had been produced.

In another division of applied arts are the remarkable embroideries which adorned all the sacred vestments, representing, in the most wonderful pictorial

effect, groups of saints, sacred scenes, and religious symbols. On the chasubles, copes, albs, stoles, maniples, burses, veils, mitres, frontals, super-frontals, and altar-covers, palls, bags, and panels of that period, are to be seen triumphs of artistic excellence, worked with exceeding beauty, and with a glorious richness of colour, by the hands of the faithful women of the day and designed by the men of supreme genius whom the Church had attracted to her side. Some of the very finest of this embroidery work was English, and references are found to the dignity of English embroidery before the end of the seventh century, as, St. Aldhelm, Bishop of Sherborne, celebrated in verse the skilful work of the Anglo-Saxon embroideresses. Indeed, at one time, rather too much attention in the convents for women seems to have been given to this fascinating needlework, for a council held in 747 recommended that the reading of books and psalm-singing by the nuns should receive greater attention, and that not quite so many hours should be spent in needlework. As early as 855, the Anglo-Saxon King Ethelwulf when journeying to Rome took with him as presents silken vestments richly embroidered in gold, executed in his own country, and there are fragments of a stole and maniple, found in the tomb of St. Cuthbert (d. 687), which were produced under the auspices of the wife of Edward the Elder in 916 and placed in the saint's coffin. From that time down to the middle of the sixteenth century there was a constant demand for the work of the skilled embroideresses, and this section of art, so particularly suitable to ecclesiastical purposes, was one of perennial richness. It is well that some stress should be laid upon the question of embroidery, inasmuch as in the Middle Ages it was almost exclusively a branch of ecclesiastical art, and nearly everything that can be termed of importance in fine embroidery, especially in fine English embroidery previous to the fifteenth century, was executed for the Church. Enormous labour was given to the production of these beautiful vestments, and as an example it may be mentioned that a frontal presented to the Abbey of Westminster in 1271 took the whole labour of four women for three years and three-quarters. Lincoln Cathedral in the fourteenth century possessed over six hundred vestments in its sacristy, while the Abbey of Westminster had very nearly double as many, and even the English churches were far behind those of Spain in the sumptuous manner in which they were supplied with vestments. There was therefore every possible necessity for the work, and no branch of art has a greater importance between the twelfth and the fifteenth centuries than has this one of embroidery. Fortunately, a sufficient number of the old vestments have come down to the present day to give a satisfactory idea of their importance and beauty, and the records and inventories of church goods prior to the sixteenth century afford still further information concerning this branch of art. The spirit of devotion which has ever given the instinct to decorate the house of God with the very finest works of which man is capable led to this lavish display of artistic genius in the service of the Catholic Church, but it must also be borne in mind that there were other, subordinate causes to account for the work. The Church, following its Divine Master, has always inculcated the importance of good works, and it has ever encouraged the faithful to give to its service of their best. If their skill was in metal-work, in embroidery, in carving wooden figures or wonderful choir-stalls, in stained glass, in jewellery, in fresco or in mosaic, such skill was to be devoted to God's service, as the choicest gift the artist had to lay upon the altar, symbolic of his devotion to his faith. Even beyond that, there came the occasions in which the penance for sin took the form of the devotion of artistic gifts to the work of the Church, and the other and very numerous cases in which this artistic labour was the constant employment of those persons who had devoted their entire life to the religious career, in the various monastic houses belonging to the different orders. One further cause must not be overlooked, the fact that it was the Crown, the clergy, and the nobility who alone could command, by reason of their means, the splendid productions of the men of genius of the time, and that while the commissions given by the clergy would most certainly be for church purposes almost exclusively, those given by the Crown and the higher nobility were in almost all instances for exactly the same purposes, and this for a double reason. First, the desire to render the home beautiful had not yet arisen to any considerable extent, and secondly, there was every wish to make the private chapel or oratory, the public church or royal sanctuary, as beautiful as possible, both to carry out the instincts of the religious feeling and please those who held control of spiritual things, as well as to heap up a reward for good deeds which would have a corresponding equivalent in the future life and might serve as retribution for the deeds of violence that formed so integral a part of the life of these centuries.

The period under consideration was not so much one of portable pictures as of applied art, devoted to the interior decoration of the sacred buildings, and to every object having connexion with the service of the altar. One section of ecclesiastical art deserving special mention concerns almost exclusively the monastic orders, namely, that of illumination and transcription. All over Europe the monks of the pre-Renaissance time were engaged in preparing the books of the day, and these books were almost exclusively religious ones. The number of those concerning domestic matters, agriculture, or the classics, transcribed by these diligent students, is relatively small, but the series of religious works from their diligent pens is an exceedingly long one. Their time was fully occupied in preparing manuscripts for use within the cloisters and for the service of the altar, as well as for the great patrons of the monasteries who desired to have books of devotion for their own use, or for gifts to other sovereigns or noblemen. These manuscripts are of incomparable beauty, being transcribed with extraordinary skill upon the finest of vellum, and adorned with initial letters, calendars, and illustrations, that are triumphs of artistic skill, and marvels of ingenuity. The Books of Hours, Missals, Breviaries, and Psalters having their origin in the monastic houses of England, France, Germany, and Italy during the Middle Ages are now among the greatest artistic treasures of the world, and with regard to them there is one very striking fact which must never be overlooked. This does not relate exclusively to books of devotion, it belongs nearly as much to every work of art produced during this period, and it is the fact that these triumphs of skill are for the most part anonymous. In the period hardly any great names are recorded in connexion with such work. There is a wonderful series of artistic treasures, but signatures scarcely ever exist. Here and there the name of an enameller is known, or perchance the name of the place where he worked, occasionally the name of a wood-carver or a worker in stained glass has been preserved and there are just a few cases in which the name of the zealous monk who toiled over the manuscript is known, but the instances are exceedingly few, and they occur, one might say, by accident rather than by intention. With respect to illuminations in books of devotion, one monk took up the task where the other had left it. Death caused no cessation of the self-imposed labour. The orders could never die, and as in the present day great literary works are undertaken by the leading orders, in the full knowledge that to carry them out will extend far beyond the life of the writer who begins the undertaking, but that his successor will be equally able to continue the task, so in the earlier days the monks laboured in

their cloisters, each at his own work; each generation of monks in the footsteps of the former, hiding the individual identity in the name of the order and content, as the work was done for the greater glory of God, that while the work should remain, the monks themselves should be forgotten. Few things are more striking in considering this period than the singleness of aim and devotion to duty which characterized these artists and led them to have no desire to perpetuate their own names, but simply to carry out to the best of their ability the allotted task for the glory of God and His Church. Partly, of course, the reason was that the dignity of personal labour was not fully realized, but the reason for this anonymity lies mainly in the facts already stated, that the work was religious work, that the aim was a religious aim, and that the identity of the person did not matter, so long as the Church was properly served by her faithful. There is one other aspect of the artistic work of the pre-Renaissance time to be alluded to. It is by no means confined to the pre-Renaissance period, but extends through the succeeding centuries, and it should extend to all the artistic labour of the present day, but it is more especially a feature of the period under discussion. It is that determination which is never satisfied with the work which has been done, but which is always straining forward for finer and better work. It is that element of untiring energy and ever-quickening desire for perfection which has always characterized the greatest art-workers of the world, and it finds its earliest and perhaps its strongest development in this period.

The early Italian painters fall into two groups: the first, that which may be called the group of the miniaturists or illuminators, as, for example, Enrico, Berlinghieri, and Oderico; the second, the very primitive painters, such as Margaritone, Spinello, Uccello, Cimabue, Duccio, Memmi, Lorenzetti, and the various early masters of the schools of Siena, Padua, and Verona. The predecessors of these artists, for the most part, worked without any reference to nature, under Byzantine influence, copying slavishly the methods fixed by the Greek Church. Their pictures, whether they illustrated scenes from the Sacred Writings, the legends of the Church, or the lives of the saints, were designed and painted according to fixed rules. Their work was inferior to that of the Byzantine workers in mosaic, but followed the same conceptions of art; in every way, in attitudes, compositions, types of face, folds of drapery, and even as regards colour, it was guided by the definite rules of tradition, so that the painter was little more than a mechanic. Still, despite what may be termed the ugliness of this particular school, there was a strong spirit of devotion exercising the minds of the artists, and they were able to put a certain amount of sympathy into their hard, angular productions, thus showing that their works were painted with religious sentiment, and with a desire to evoke that sentiment in others. Margaritone was one of the first to break through the hard crust of rules, and although his work does not show any very striking advance upon that of his predecessors, yet in his pictures and in those of the earliest painters of Siena, we begin to find the desire to paint a Mother of God bearing some living semblance to a Mother of Man. There is a struggling towards tenderness and sweetness of countenance, a desire to represent raiment gently floating in easy curves, and a greater command of sentiment, together with a simplicity in story-telling, which mark this primitive school, and prepare the way for the forerunner of natural treatment, Giotto himself.

Period of the Renaissance.—The great era of transition from the Middle Ages to modern times which is called the Renaissance may be divided into the three periods of the Early Renaissance, Full Renaissance, and Late Renaissance. Here again the influence of the Church is found just as strong and as definite as in the past. The growing desire to have magnificent churches created the necessity for other workers in art. The first years of this period give in Italy the earliest workers known by name in fresco, and in portable pictures, Cimabue, Orcagna, Giotto, and others. In their "frescoed theology", decorating the churches of Assisi, Siena, Pisa, and other parts of Italy, is seen the beginning of the long list of painters whom the Church enlisted in her service. In bronze work Ghiberti produced the gates of the Baptistery of Florence, and with the appearance of Brunelleschi a new school of architecture for ecclesiastical buildings arose. In this period belongs also the introduction of printing, and here again, just as emphatically, the Church took the lead. The earliest printers were churchmen, belonging to a religious order, the earliest books those of religion—the first actual printed sheet being the Indulgence of Pope Nicholas V—followed by a long list of religious and liturgical works, Sacred Scriptures, and patristic literature. In the Low Countries the Van Eycks developed the methods of oil-painting and there arose a great school of artists, among whom were Van der Goes, Van der Weyden, Bouts, Cristus, Memling, and others, who formed the transition from the Gothic school. Their most important works were altar-pieces, and in some cases all their paintings were of a religious character, while in others the paintings not religious were portraits of the various patrons who had commissioned the altar-pieces, or who had had their own private chapels decorated by these artists; therefore the intimate connexion between art and the Church was just as close as ever.

Towards the close of the Early Renaissance period is found the work in sculpture of Donatello and those of his school, Desiderio da Settignano, the Rossellini, Duccio, Verrochio, and Mino da Fiesole; almost all the fine work of these men was for ecclesiastical purposes. Here and there are single detached statues, as for example the one of St. George by Donatello, but then it must be remembered that these were figures of saints, and intended for buildings more or less of a religious character, or for those erected by guilds distinctly religious, while some of the sculptors named, as for example Duccio of Perugia, were only known by the work they executed for the decoration of churches. During this period among the workers in Germany were Adam Kraft, Veit Stoss, and the Vischers, who are associated with the superb tabernacle, the series of Stations of the Cross and the great bronze shrine in Nuremberg, all objects intimately connected with religious work. In England, the tomb of Henry V, and that of Henry VII by Torrigiano, both at Westminster, must not be overlooked. Every branch of artistic craftsmanship was at this time employed for the benefit of the Church. Finiguerra, Ghiberti, and others were at work at the great silver altar of the Florentine baptistery. The jewellers, Ghirlandajo, Verrochio, and Francia were making jewels for altar vestments, medals for the great ecclesiastics, and pictures for the churches, Luca della Robbia was preparing his vitrified enamel medallions, that he might present the Blessed Virgin and her Child in attitudes of the most perfect tenderness on the exteriors of the churches, and on the corners of the streets, while other potters were marking the sacred emblems on their finest productions, or painting religious scenes upon their vases and majolica plates. The Arras tapestries of France, the English tapestries of Coventry, and the Van Eyck tapestries of Flanders, were being woven for the hangings of the churches, while Benedetto da Maiano was bringing his intarsia work to perfection that he might apply it to the decoration of the choir-stalls in the great churches of Italy. It was at this time that the great monastic painter Fra Angelico decorated the cells of San Marco with his perfect representations of the great events in the Divine Tragedy, while Gozzoli, Lippi, and Ghirlandajo adorned the churches, and Perugino, Pin-

turicchio, Francia, Albertinelli, and Fra Bartolomeo, almost exclusively religious painters, prepared those masterpieces of religious art to set upon the altars of the private chapels and great churches of the day, that are now among the treasured masterpieces of all time.

This era was also the period of Humanism, of the return to the love of the classics. It may be difficult in this complex period to mark the boundary line between religion and that strange paganism which was an emblem of the classical revival, but the Certosa of Pavia and the work of the early German painters, represented by such men as Schongauer and the elder Holbein, mark that side by side with the Humanistic movement there was a strong religious one. In this religious movement art had its full share, and engaged in its tasks, not perhaps with the austere simplicity and singleness of aim which belonged to an earlier period, but still with a definite determination that the best products of artistic craftsmanship should be devoted to the service of God. There was, however, a growing desire that the home should be more beautiful and more luxurious. The decoration of churches was ceasing to be the sole aim of the art-worker, and he was finding other fields, but the chief encouragement of art still came from the Church and for the Church, and even upon domestic work the Church set her hand and seal. The period of the Full Renaissance may be taken as lasting from 1450 to 1550, and here must be noticed the advent of a new movement in art, or at least a stronger development of what had undoubtedly begun to arise in the previous century. Hitherto, in pictorial art, notably in that of Italy, the aims had been form, drawing, composition, devotion, and the expression of spiritual conceptions rather than colour; but in the Venetian School, that took its rise in the earlier century with the first Bellini, Carpaccio, and Crivelli, and that was to see its development at this time in the later Bellini, Giorgione, Titian, Paolo Veronese, and Tintoretto, the claims of colour gain a supremacy over the kindred branches of pictorial art. The Venetian School is the one in which brilliant colour attains to its apotheosis, and everything else is subservient to it. The simplicity of aim which characterized such a man as Fra Angelico passed away, the devotional feeling that marked the works of Albertinelli and Fra Bartolomeo gave place to an overpowering desire for decoration as such, and in Venice, although the Church commissioned the great altar-pieces and the schemes of interior ornamentation for which these noble artists were responsible, it had to be content to accept Venetian tradition and to see religious scenes treated as gorgeous pieces of sumptuously coloured decoration. Although there might not be the simplicity of a past generation, yet there still existed in the artists the same desire to offer to the Church the greatest works of their genius. In this period of the Full Renaissance are found the work of Raphael and of Michelangelo; of Clouet, Mabuse, and Scorel; of Dürer, Holbein, and Cranach; of Leonardo da Vinci, and of Correggio, while in applied arts there was immense industry and great development. The German metal-workers and goldsmiths prepared church vessels innumerable; Cellini and Caradosso produced ornaments for church vestments; the screen and the woodwork for King's College Chapel, Cambridge, typified the ecclesiastical wood-carving of the time in England; while the stained-glass windows at King's College Chapel, in other chapels, and in great churches show what was attained in this branch of ecclesiastical art.

The fall of Florence marked the close of the period of great art in that city, while the paintings and tapestry executed for Francis I at Fontainebleau, for Louis XII at Tours, and some sculpture done by Michelangelo for the Medici Chapel, all point out the enhanced power of the Humanistic movement and the destruction of that devotion to faith which had been so marked a feature of the earlier centuries. The epoch of the Late Renaissance, extending from 1500 to 1600, and overlapping that of the Full Renaissance, was still, however, distinguished by a considerable amount of earnest religious fervour in art. The paintings of Luini, Gaudenzio Ferrari, Andrea del Sarto, Sodoma, Bronzino, and Peruzzi, are strongly religious, full of right feeling, and almost exclusively done for churches, religious houses, guild chapels, and private oratories, but outside of Italy the connexion between the Church and art is by no means so apparent. Spanish supremacy in Northern Europe had been destroyed, and 1576 was marked by the rapid decline of Spain. The Iberian goldsmiths and iron-workers still certainly produced their famous grilles, jewels, morses, chalices, and crucifixes, while in needlework the finest workers of Castile were elaborating some of the most perfect examples of church vestments that have ever been produced. In bronze, the smiths of Aragon were casting superb church candelabra, and some of the weavers in France and England were producing tapestry decoration for churches; but the greater part of the Gobelin, Brussels, and Mortlake tapestry-weaving was for domestic use, the greatest architects were working on domestic architecture, the potters on domestic pottery, and the printers and engravers upon work which cannot be termed religious. The names of certain men stand out, however, as representing persons of deep personal religion, who brought their own devotion to duty to bear upon the work they executed. Such men were Giulio Romano, Palladio, and the Behaims, but the period of that supreme hold which the Church had retained upon the art of the world, which she had initiated, developed, and encouraged, was passing away, never more to appear in its full fruition. Some reference should be made to the system under which during this time many of the great decorative schemes of Italian painting were executed. The encouragement which the Church gave to the Italian painters took various forms. It was permissible for an influential or a wealthy family to have allotted to it a small chapel in the large parish or town church, and the decoration of the chapel was left to the care of the family whose name it received. In some cases, these chapels were built onto the church, and in such instances an architect, a builder, a decorator, and an artist were all employed, and the Church gladly gave permission for such additions to the church structure, in order that the family might have a meeting-place and an opportunity to make an endowment for perpetual Masses for its deceased members. In cases where a new structure was not erected, a portion of the existing church was enclosed as a private chapel, perhaps in memory of a father, a mother, or some children, and a painter of repute was called in to devise a scheme of decoration for its walls, in which would be introduced the figures of saints to whom the deceased persons had been dedicated, or scenes from the lives of such saints; in many cases life-size figures of the saints were represented with their hands upon the kneeling figures of the donors of the chapel. There was no thought of an anachronism; it was considered perfectly right that representations of persons who had died but a few weeks or months before should be introduced into the scenes in which the saints of early church history were depicted. It then became the ambition of later members to add to the beauty of the family chapel as means allowed. The walls having been decorated, an altar-piece would be painted by another artist, while perhaps, following him, yet a third would ornament the front of the altar, or craftsmen would be called in to supply objects used in the sacred service, or vestments and books for the priests. In this way these little chapels became shrines for artistic work, the productions of many hands, representing the desires of many persons to place the best of work at the service of the Church, to act dutifully

towards the family itself, and to make a suitable offering in recompense for crimes committed. Another course sometimes adopted was to call in two painters, rivals in their profession, to decorate different walls of a church, or the two sides of an altar-piece, or again, when some great addition was made to the fabric, on account of an important event, such as the canonization of a local saint, or a marked interposition of Providence on behalf of the town, different influential persons in the place would undertake to be responsible for portions of the building, each calling in his own favourite painter, and in this way the work would be completed. Or it might be that an order desired to decorate a church dedicated to its patron saint, and the commission would be given to some notable artist, who perhaps was unable to complete the task, or who died before its completion. In such cases, others were called in to complete it, and in this way the fabric was beautified by various successive hands.

The number of definitely personal commissions which the sixteenth-century artist had was small, as even in the instances where a patron ordered a picture, it was generally an altar-piece for the family chapel, or else the decoration of some building belonging to the trade guild to which he was attached, and this trade guild being nearly always a religious association, the commission came under the category of religious work. It is all this which marks the great distinction between art and craftsmanship previous to the sixteenth century and after it. In the period from the triumph of Christianity to about 1260 in Italy, and about 1460 in Northern Europe, the dominant art is architecture, chiefly employed in the service of the Church, and the arts of painting and carving were only applied subordinately for its enrichment. During the Renaissance period the imitative arts, sculpture, painting, and the various art-crafts began to develop and detach themselves, to exist and strive after perfection on their own account, and while architecture still held an important position, it was no longer dominant; the arts which supplied the interior decoration of the building, and the objects needed in the service of the Church, ceased to be considered as subordinate, but were taking each its own high position under the guidance of workers of supreme genius. From the period, however, of the Full Renaissance, the great dignity of architecture begins to diminish, especially as regards ecclesiastical buildings, and architects devoted themselves almost exclusively to domestic and civic work. Architecture ceased to be personal, democratic, local, and became professional and more or less uniform throughout the whole of Europe, while it suffered severely because the designing of detail became in many cases the work of others than the executant workmen. The same sort of difficulty was befalling the pictorial art and the arts of the craftsmen. The personal element was no longer the main strength of an art. The ecclesiastical side of the work was almost non-existent, and the crafts suffered by reason of the fact that the commercial element had entered into art, and the adornment of the house, the palace, and the person was considered of far greater importance than the adornment of the church, and the sacrifice of the life of the worker for the greater glory of God.

Post-Renaissance Period.—There are certain political explanations of this great change between the art of the sixteenth and the art of the seventeenth century. There were several forces at work which were hostile or indifferent to artistic development, such as the religious, dynastic, and commercial wars, the difficulties of the Reformation, and constitutional problems, while the grouping together of small towns into larger provinces and countries was doing away with the rivalry of the craftsmen in the smaller places, and permitting a spirit of greater uniformity in style to spread throughout a large section of Europe. Add to all these colonial expansion, huge enterprise, and great commercial prosperity, constantly broken into by ravaging wars, and the causes for the decay of that spirit of religious activity in art characterizing earlier periods are apparent. Spain and Italy were, in the seventeenth century, almost the only two countries in which any close connexion between art and the Church was kept up. England was troubled with the religious question, and struggling with great constitutional problems, while it had given itself over to the faith of the Reformers, and such art as it was producing was the great architectural triumph of Sir Christopher Wren in the rebuilding of the churches of London, and the various sections of craftsmanship concerned with the adornment of the house and the person. In Spain there were still some great goldsmiths at work, and some even greater workers in wrought iron, preparing the *rejas* for the Spanish cathedrals, while pictorial art was at its very highest in that country, and its masterpieces, with the exception of those of the very greatest artist of all, Velazquez, were devoted to subjects suggested by the Church. Yet there had been no country in which the painter had been so trammelled by traditional restrictions as in Spain. The very manner in which each saint was to be represented, the method in which his or her clothing was to be painted, and the colouring which was to be applied to each garment, had been a matter of stern decree, it had needed the profound genius of a Velazquez to break through the traditional rules, and to open for his successors, and especially for Murillo, a period of greater freedom. Commencing with such painters as Pantoja della Cruz and Vicente Carducci, the great Spanish School had produced the Ribaltas and Ribera, and then the majestic Velazquez. In Spain the only great painter to follow Velazquez was Murillo, but there were many whose works were marked by distinction, excellence, and beauty, especially Zurbaran, Iriarte, Juan de Valdes, Alonso Cano, and Orrente. The seventeenth century was, in various countries of Europe, one of the important periods of artistic production, and although the Italian schools, the Realists, and the painters of the Second Revival were men whose productions at the present time are out of favour, yet they deserve more than a passing notice, while contemporary with them there are others who rank among the veritable giants of the artistic craft. The late Italian artists, the Carracci, Caravaggio, Sasso Ferrato, Carlo Dolci, Domenichino, Luca Giordano, Carlo Maratta, Guido Reni, Salvator Rosa, and others, show in their work melodramatic style, love of magnificent colouring, and intense shades. The draughtsmanship of these artists should cause their works to be more highly esteemed than they are at present, for they certainly represent an important epoch in the art history of the world, and one which must never be overlooked. Many of their works were altar-pieces painted for churches, or were intended for church decoration, but at the same time they were greatly influenced by the Humanistic movement, and by the eager desire to represent the stories of classical writers in pictorial effect. The commercial prosperity of Holland, at a time when other nations were lacking in material wealth, was one of the reasons for the existence of a veritable crowd of artists just at this time. The Church had ceased to commission pictures in Holland, and very seldom were stories, either from Holy Writ, or from the lives of the saints, represented by this school of artists.

In dealing with the arts and crafts of the eighteenth century, a new and destructive factor which had arisen must be taken into consideration. "The genius of handicraft", as has been well said, "passes now into invention", and the commencement of a system now appears that was eventually to strike at the very roots of the manner in which supreme works of genius had been produced in the preceding centuries. It must also be noticed that, in painting especially, the artistic centre of gravity had shifted from Italy to

England, and to a lesser extent to France, and that Italy, Germany, Spain, and the Netherlands took but a very small share in the artistic development of the eighteenth century, instead of, as in preceding periods, being the great centres of development themselves. The triumph of the home, however, in contradistinction to that of the Church, was now complete, and portraiture, whether concerning itself with the great decorative single figures or family groups of Reynolds and Gainsborough, or with the productions of the leading miniature painters, Cosway, Engleheart, Plimer, Smart, Hone, Wood, and their numerous followers, was exclusively applied to the multiplication of portraits of those persons who were able to afford to employ the artist, and who desired to possess and distribute to others such delightful representations as would adorn the home and the person. Ecclesiastical art, or art for the decoration of the church, had hardly any existence.

In England towards the middle of the nineteenth century a new movement having in it some of the instincts of earlier Italian art began to arise. The foremost artist of this new school was Sir Edward Burne-Jones. In the wonderful succession of poetic visions which he presented, marked by a play of fancy, a fertility of inventiveness, tender witchery of inspiration, exquisite colour, and grace and harmony of line and grouping, he was able to develop the spirit of religious emotion to a far fuller extent than he himself had intended, and to vivify the old legends of primitive times which had formed part of his inheritance from Celtic ancestors. His appearance on the horizon of art was to a great extent coincident with the blossoming forth of what has been termed the Oxford Movement in religion, a growing desire for a deeper and fuller devotion; an eager determination to return to earlier and purer lines of thought in religion, to set faith free from the regulations of statecraft, and to rise from the dreary monotony of a Genevan theology to something approaching closer to the fiery enthusiasm and the sumptuous ceremonial of the passionate faith of earlier days. The progress of this movement within the Protestant Church led to a considerable number of accessions to the Catholic Faith, but in the Church of its origin it worked a complete revolution. Once more there arose the determination that the house of God should be beautiful, and once again art, with all the various crafts closely connected therewith, entered into the service of religion, very much in the manner they had done in preceding centuries. Tapestry-workers, under the influence of William Morris and Burne-Jones, were set to work to prepare panels of glowing colour for the decoration of churches. The stained-glass painters, under the influence of these craftsmen, sought out old designs, originated new schemes of colour, and worked hard to discover old secrets of technic. The earlier schools of embroidery were studied, and all over the country women set to work to make vestments and to execute needlework of rare distinction and great beauty. A revival took place in the art of the metal-worker and in that of the stone-mason. Many fine wrought-iron grilles were made, and the claim of the artist to prepare the design and to superintend the carrying out of its execution was once more considered and gladly entertained. Quite apart from the religious aspect of the movement, there was in this Oxford revival the origin of the effort towards greater refinement, greater beauty, and more attention to handicraft, which, commencing in the middle of the nineteenth century, has by no means reached its culmination in the early years of the twentieth.

One of the first and most important of the movements which aimed to break away from the artistic traditions of the eighteenth century took place in the early part of the nineteenth century in Germany, and was led by Overbeck. The Academy of Vienna, at the time that he entered it, was under the direction of Füger, a talented miniature painter, but a follower of the pseudo-classical school of David, and a firm believer in the tenets of these opinions, too conservative to vary from them in the least degree. Overbeck felt that he was among commonplace painters, that every noble thought was suppressed within the academy, and that Christian art had been diverted and corrupted until nothing Christian remained in it. The differences between him and his followers and their fellow-students were so serious that the upholders of Overbeck and their leader were expelled from the academy; leaving Vienna, Overbeck journeyed to Rome, reaching it in 1810, and remaining there for fifty-nine years. Here he was joined by such men as Veit, Cornelius, Schadow, with others of less importance; together they formed a school which was known as the Nazarites, or the Church-Romantic painters. They built up a severe revival on simple nature and the serious art of the Umbrian and Bolognese painters, and although for a long time they laboured under great difficulties, yet, after a while, they were able to exert considerable influence, and their success led to memorable revivals throughout Europe. Overbeck was a Catholic, as were several of his friends. He was a man of high purity of motive, of deep insight, and abounding knowledge, a very saintly person, and a perfect treasury of art and poetry, insomuch that his influence helped very largely to purify the art of his time. The secessions from the conservative line adopted by the Royal Academy in England late in the nineteenth century were not marked by the particular element of religious fervour distinguishing Overbeck, but were the result of a similar determination to return to nature, and understand the art of painting in the open air, with not only a strict adherence to realism in choice and treatment of subject, but also the subordination of colour to tone gradation. These secessions in England were, however, very much the result of the movement in France which had preceded them, and which was connected with the name of Millet.

In Catholic countries there are arising some signs that the old practice of enlisting the services of art for the purposes of religion may be developed, but the signals of an approaching movement are not very strong as yet, and the Church has a good deal to learn with regard to decoration, to design, and to craftsmanship from the earlier periods of its history. Foremost among the signs of the new spirit must be placed the erection of the Westminster Cathedral at London, one of the most perfect buildings in England, erected after the truest and most careful study of the past and with every desire to give full play to the spirit of the present and to the original talent of its designer, while avoiding anything that could be called a slavish copying of the past. This building affords an example of the revived use of mosaic properly applied, in method following the work of Ravenna, and planned by a great artist, Bentley. It affords the most perfect scheme of interior decoration that could well be conceived. In other countries of Europe the signs of progress are not quite so clear, but the Church which has fostered and encouraged art from its very birth has so many glorious examples in its midst of the great achievements of profound genius that it can only be a matter of time before its ancient use of the fine arts is revived. A close study of the past would enable the Church to once more set about the task of employing the craftsmen of the world to produce their finest work in the domain of ecclesiastical art.

Illustrations explanatory of the different branches of ecclesiastical art will be found under the special articles: IVORIES; MANUSCRIPTS, ILLUMINATION OF; METAL-WORK; PAINTING; RELIQUARIES; SCULPTURE; WOOD-CARVING.

KRAUS, *Geschichte der christlichen Kunst* (Freiburg im Br., 1895–1900); MICHEL, *Histoire de l'art depuis les premiers temps*

chrétiens jusqu'à nos jours (Paris, 1895—); LOWRIE, *Christian Art and Archeology* (New York, 1901); GRADMANN, *Geschichte der christlichen Kunst* (Stuttgart, 1902); BÜRKNER, *Geschichte der christlichen Kunst* (Freiburg, 1903); PÉRATÉ, *L'archéologie chrétienne* (Paris, 1892); DE ROSSI, *Roma Sotterranea Cristiana* (Rome, 1864–1897); GARRUCCI, *Storia dell' arte cristiana* (Prato, 1873); SCHULTZE, *Archäologie der altchristlichen Kunst* (Munich, 1895); GRISAR, *Geschichte Roms und der Päpste* (Freiburg, 1901); STRZYGOWSKI, *Orient oder Rom* (Leipzig, 1901); IDEM, *Kleinasien ein Neuland der Kunstgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1903); VENTURI, *Storia dell' arte italiana* (Milan, 1901—); BERTAUX, *L'art dans l'Italie méridionale* (Paris, 1904); WICKHOFF, *Roman Art*, tr. (London, 1900); *Die Wiener Genesis* (Vienna, 1895); WILPERT, *Die Katacombengemälde* (Freiburg, 1892); FICKER, *Studien zum christlichen Altertum und Mittelalter* (Leipzig, 1895); LANCIANI, *Pagan and Christian Rome* (London, 1892); MARUCCHI, *Le catacombe romane* (Rome, 1903); IDEM, *Éléments d'archéologie chrétienne* (Paris, 1899–1902); SÉROUX D'AGINCOURT, *Histoire de l'art par les monuments* (Paris, 1823); COURAJOD, *Leçons professées à l'école du Louvre* (Paris, 1899); KONDAKOV, *Histoire de l'art byzantin* (Paris, 1886–1891); CLAUSSE, *Les monuments du christianisme au moyen-âge* (Paris, 1893); ROHAULT DE FLEURY, *La messe* (Paris, 1876); IDEM, *Les saints de la messe* (Paris, 1891); MILLET, *Le monastère de Daphni* (Paris, 1899); STOKES, *Early Christian Art in Ireland* (London, 1875); WEIS AND LIEBERSDORF, *Christus-und Apostelbilder* (Freiburg, 1902); LINDSAY, *The History of Christian Art* (1895); BROWN, *The Arts in Early England* (1903); LUNDY, *Monumental Christianity* (New York, 1892); BAYLIS, *Rex Regum* (London, 1902); HULME, *Symbolism in Christian Art* (London, 1899); JAMESON, *Sacred and Legendary Art* (London, 1890); BRINTON, *The Renaissance in Italian Art* (London, 1898); BURCKHARDT, *Le cicerone* (Paris, 1885); FRIZZONI, *Arte italiana del Renascimento* (Milan, 1891); SOLVAY, *L'art espagnol* (Paris, 1887); KUGLER, *Hand-Book of Painting* (London, 1900); MORELLI, *Italian Painters* (London, 1892); KINGSLEY, *History of French Art* (London, 1899); RIO, *De l'art chrétien* (Paris, 1874); CHURCH, *Some Minor Arts* (London, 1894); BELL, *The Saints in Christian Art* (1901); HORSIN-DÉON, *Histoire de l'art* (Paris, 1891); MUTHER, *The History of Modern Painting* (London, 1895); SCOTT, *The Renaissance of Art in Italy* (London, 1883); SPRINGER, *Kunsthandbuch für Deutschland* (Berlin, 1883).

The works of LANZI and VASARI may be studied either in Italian or English editions. Of the Italian edition of Lanzi there is a convenient one in six vols. (1809), and both Lanzi and Vasari are to be obtained in English in BOHN'S *Libraries*. BLASHFIELD prepared an annotated edition of VASARI'S *Lives* (New York, 1897); HAVARD, *Dict. de l'ameublement et de la décoration* (Paris, 1884). GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

ECCLESIASTICAL ARCHITECTURE.—The best definition of architecture that has ever been given is likewise the shortest. It is "the art of building" (Viollet-le-Duc, Dict., I, 116). The *art*, be it observed, and not merely the *act* of building. And when we say the *art* of building, the term must be held to imply the giving to buildings of whatever beauty is consistent with their primary purpose and with the resources that may be available. As a recent writer has said: "It can hardly be held that there is one art of making things well, and another of making them badly. . . . *Good* architecture is . . . the art of building beautifully and expressively; and *bad* architecture is the reverse. But architecture is the art of building in general" (Bond, Gothic Architecture in England, 1). Since, however, the word *building* is apt to suggest, primarily, "the actual putting together of . . . materials by manual labour and machinery", it may be desirable to amend or restrict the definition given above by saying that architecture is the art of planning, designing, and drawing buildings, and of directing the execution thereof (Bond, op. cit., 2). And in this art as in all others, including that of life itself, the fundamental principle should always be that of subordinating means to ends and secondary to primary ends. Where this principle is or has been abandoned or lost sight of, the result may indeed be, or may have been, a building which pleases the eye, but it must needs be also one which offends that sense of the fitness of things, which is the criterion of the highest kind of beauty. Now a church is, primarily, a building intended for the purpose of public worship; and in all sound ecclesiastical architecture this purpose should be altogether paramount. To build a church for the admiration of "the man in the street", who sees it from outside, or of the tourist who pays it a passing visit, or of the artist, or of anyone else whatsoever except that of the faithful who use the church for prayer, the hearing of Mass, and the reception of the sacraments, is to commit a solecism in the noblest of all the material arts. Even the needs of the liturgy itself are in a sense subsidiary to the needs of the faithful. *Sacramenta propter homines* is an old and sound saying. But, on the other hand, among the needs of the faithful must be reckoned, under normal circumstances, the adequate carrying out of the liturgy. It is, of course, perfectly true to say that a church is not only a building in which we worship God, but also itself the expression of an act of worshipful homage. This, however, it ceases to be, at least in the highest degree, unless, as has been said, the æsthetic qualities of the building have been entirely subordinated to its primary purpose. It only needs a little reflection to see that these preliminary remarks have a very practical bearing on modern church-building. There is always a danger lest we should be dominated by technical terms and conventional opinions about the merits of this or that style of architecture, derived from times and circumstances that have passed away; lest we should be led by sentiment or fashion, or mere lack of originality, to copy from the buildings of a bygone age without stopping to consider whether or how far the needs of our own day are those of the days when those buildings were raised. And the chief use of the study of the history of ecclesiastical architecture is not that it directs attention to a number of buildings more or less beautiful in themselves, but that it cannot fail to bring home to us that all true architectural development was inspired, primarily, by the desire to find a solution of some problem of practical utility.

Roughly speaking, all ecclesiastical architecture may be said to have been evolved from two distinct germ-cells, the oblong and the circular chamber. From the simple oblong chamber to the perfect Gothic cathedral the steps can be plainly indicated and admit of being abundantly illustrated from the actual course of architectural development in Western Europe (Brown, "From Schola to Cathedral", *passim*), while the links which connect the simple circular chamber with a gigantic cruciform domed church, like St. Peter's in Rome or St. Paul's in London, are still more obvious, though the actual course of development in the case of domed churches has been far less continuous and regular.

THE ORIGINS OF ECCLESIASTICAL ARCHITECTURE.—That the first places set apart for Christian worship were rooms in private dwellings is admitted on all hands; and, although it is at least doubtful whether all the texts from the New Testament which have been alleged in support of the statement will bear the interpretation that has been put upon them, the statement itself hardly needs proof (Messmer in "Zeitschr. f. christl. Arch.", 1859, 212 sqq.; corrected by Lange, "Haus u. Halle", 273 sqq.). It may be assumed, further, that such rooms would for the most part have a simple oblong form, with a door in one of the narrower sides. From the first, however, there must have been some kind of division between the portion of the room occupied by the officiating clergy (the θυσιαστήριον, sanctuary, or presbytery) and the space allotted to the faithful; and this division, we may feel sure, was from a very early date marked by at least a breast-high barrier, analogous to that which still survives in the ancient *cancelli* of S. Clemente, Rome, and also by a curtain which veiled the altar from view during certain portions of the Liturgy. And here we find the suggestion of a first step in the development of a distinctively ecclesiastical architecture. When the first churches or chapels were erected as independent structures, an obvious economy would suggest that, especially in the case of smaller edifices, the sanctuary need not be built so broad or so high as what may already be called the nave; and an equally obvious regard for stability would suggest that the division should be marked by an arch, supporting the gable wall at the further end of the nave (Scott, English Church Architecture, 3). Moreover, both structural and liturgical needs would

alike be served if the piers which support the dividing arch were projected inwards, somewhat beyond the side walls of the sanctuary; for the narrower the span the easier it would be to construct the arch, and to suspend a curtain from pier to pier. Thus, then, that rudimentary type of church or chapel would be reached of which archaic examples still survive in England and Ireland. Mr. Scott notes that in many of our oldest English churches there are clear indications that the opening from the nave into the sanctuary was originally much narrower than it is at present. He further notes that in the persistent adherence to the square-ended type of sanctuary which manifests itself throughout the history of English ecclesiastical architecture, may possibly be found a surviving indication of the very early introduction of Christianity into these islands (Scott, op. cit., 4).

The earliest improvement on the crude form of the oblong chamber with its rectangular annex, and one which may well have become usual even while the liturgy was confined to a single room in a private house, was to throw out a semicircular apse at the end of the chamber opposite the door, or to select for the purposes of worship a room thus built. And this would almost certainly be the form adopted, at least in Rome, as soon as the Christian communities began to possess separate buildings in which to hold their religious meetings. These buildings would be, in the eyes of the public and perhaps of the law, *scholæ* or guild-rooms; and for such buildings the form most commonly adopted appears to have been that of an oblong terminated by an apse (Brown, op. cit., 51 sqq.; cf. Lange, op. cit., 291 sqq.). In the apse, of course, was placed the seat of the bishop; round the walls on either side were the *subsellia* of the assistant clergy, while the altar stood beneath the arch formed by the opening of the apse, or slightly in advance of it. On the hither side of the altar would be a space reserved for the clerics of inferior rank, and for the *schola cantorum*, as soon as an organized body of singers, under whatever name, came into existence. Outside the boundary of this space, however it may have been marked, the general body of the faithful would have their place, and at the lower end of this chamber, or in some kind of ante-room or narthex, or possibly even in an outer court, would be placed the catechumens and—when ecclesiastical discipline was sufficiently developed—the penitents.

This particular form of the domestic church, removed by just one degree, architecturally speaking, from a quite primitive simplicity, deserves special attention. For there would seem to be good grounds for the assertion that it had become at least not uncommon, even within Apostolic times. In fact, as several writers on the subject have quite independently pointed out, the main feature of the arrangement would seem to be indicated in the New Testament itself. The visions recorded in the Apocalypse are, of course, Divine revelations; but, as the vision of Ezechiel was cast in the mould of the Jewish ritual, so also those of St. John may be reasonably thought to reflect the ritual of primitive Christianity (Scott, op. cit., 211 sq.; Weizsäcker in "Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.", xxi, 480 sq.; Lange, op. cit., 298 sqq.). There, then, in the midst, we see the throne, whereon there sits One enthroned, of whom the Christian bishop is the representative; and with Him are four and twenty presbyters, who are "priests" (ἱερεῖς), ranged in a semicircle (κυκλόθεν), twelve on either hand (Apoc., iv, 2, 4). Within the space bounded by these seats is a pavement of glass "like to crystal" (possibly of mosaic), and in the centre the altar (Apoc., iv, 6; vi, 9; viii, 3; ix, 13; xvi, 7). On the hither side of this are the one hundred and forty-four thousand "signed", or "sealed", who "sing a new canticle", and who incidentally bear witness to the very early origin of the *schola cantorum*, at least in some rudimentary form (Apoc., vii, 4; xiv, 1–3). Farther removed from the altar is that "great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and tribes, and peoples, and tongues", the heavenly counterpart of the *cœtus fidelium* (Apoc., vii, 9).

To lateral columns and aisles there is indeed no allusion, but it is at least possible that in the mention of the outer court which is "given unto the Gentiles" we may find the earliest traces of the atrium or *parvis*, which in later ages formed part of the precincts of a fully equipped basilica (Apoc., xi, 2; Scott, op. cit., 31). Moreover, in these same Apocalyptic visions certain details of internal arrangement, which might perhaps have been thought to have been of comparatively late development, appear to be clearly implied. Every one is aware that in the basilicas of the fourth and succeeding centuries the altar was surmounted by a baldachin, or civory; and it is hardly less certain that the civory was not merely a canopy, but a means of support for curtains which during certain portions of the Liturgy were drawn round the altar. Traces of these ancient curtains still survive in those which flank our modern altars, in our tabernacle veils, and in the very name *tabernacle*, i. e. "tent", and also, curiously enough, in "those imitations of silken vallances, cast in bronze, . . . which we see in the canopies of S. Maria Maggiore and St. Peter's" (Scott, op. cit., 29). In addition to these canopy veils, however, we hear of curtains which, when drawn close, concealed the entire sanctuary from view. In the East these have, of course, been replaced by the iconostasis, a screen formerly latticed but now usually solid; while in the West they are represented, not without some change of position, by our chancel screens, and may be thought to have found another modified survival in the Lenten veil of the Middle Ages.

Now, whatever may be the case as regards the civory with its veils, there are clear indications in the Apocalypse that the transverse curtains were in use from Apostolic times. For the seer thrice makes mention of a "voice" which he heard, and which proceeded either "from the four horns of the golden altar" (Apoc., ix, 13), or "from the temple of the tabernacle of the testimony" (Apoc., xv, 5), or "from the throne" (Apoc., xvi, 17). From the first of these expressions it is plain that the altar, at the moment when the voice was heard, must have been shrouded from view, and from the last it appears that the throne was likewise within the space enclosed within the veil. As regards other ritual indications in the Apocalypse, it must be sufficient barely to mention here the "souls of the martyrs" beneath the altar, the incense, the opening of the sealed book, and the garb, carefully distinguished, of the various classes of persons mentioned in the visions (Apoc., vi, 9; viii, 3; etc.).

THE BASILICA AND BASILICAN CHURCHES.—A great deal of conjecture has been expended on the question as to the genesis of the Roman basilica. (The question has been discussed at great length by Zestermann, Messmer, Kraus, Lange, Durm, Dehio and von Bezold, and others.) For present purposes it may be sufficient to observe that the addition of aisles to the nave was so manifest a convenience that it might not improbably have been thought of, even had models not been at hand in the civic buildings of the Empire. The most suitable example that can be chosen as typical of the Roman basilica of the age of Constantine is the church of S. Maria Maggiore. And this, not merely because, in spite of certain modern alterations, it has kept in the main its original features, but also because it departs, to a lesser extent than any other extant example, from the classical ideal. The lateral colonnade is immediately surmounted by a horizontal entablature, with architrave, frieze, and cornice all complete. The monolithic columns, with their capitals, are, moreover, homogeneous, and have been cut for their position, instead of being, like those

of so many early Christian churches, the more or less incongruous and heterogeneous spoils of older and non-Christian edifices. Of this church, in its original form, no one—however decidedly his tastes may incline to some more highly developed system or style of architecture—will call in question the stately and majestic beauty. The general effect is that of a vast perspective of lines of noble columns, carrying the eye forward to the altar, which, with its civory or canopy, forms so conspicuous an object, standing, framed, as it were, within the arch of the terminal apse, which forms its immediate and appropriate background.

S. Maria Maggiore is considerably smaller than were any of the other three chief basilicas of Rome (St. Peter's, St. Paul's, and the Lateran). Each of these, in addition to a nave of greater length and breadth, was furnished (as may still be seen in the restored St. Paul's) with a double aisle. This, however, was an advantage which was not unattended with a serious drawback from a purely æsthetic point of view. For a great space of blank wall intervening between the top of the lateral colonnade and the clerestory windows was of necessity required in order to give support to the pent-house roof of the double aisle. And it is curious, to say the least, that it should not have occurred to the builders of those three basilicas to utilize a portion of the space thus enclosed, and at the same time to lighten the burden of the wall above the colonnade, by constructing a gallery above the inner aisle. It is true, of course, that such a gallery is found in the church of S. Agnese, where the low level of the floor relatively to the surface of the ground outside may have suggested this method of construction; but whereas, in the East, the provision of a gallery (used as a gynæceum) was usual from very early times, it never became otherwise than exceptional in the West. Taking East and West together, we find among early and medieval basilican churches examples of all the combinations that are possible in the arrangement of aisles and galleries. They are (1) the single aisle without gallery, which is, of course, the commonest type of all; (2) the double aisle without gallery, as in the three great Roman basilicas; (3) the single aisle with gallery, as in S. Agnese; (4) the double aisle with single gallery, as in St. Demetrius at Thessalonica; and finally, as a crowning example, though of a later period, the double aisle surmounted by a double gallery, as in the Duomo at Pisa.

These, however, are modifications in the general design of the building. Others, not less important, though they are less obviously striking, concern the details of the construction. Of these the first was the substitution of the arch for the horizontal entablature, and the second that of the pillar of masonry for the monolithic column. The former change, which had already come into operation in the first basilica of St. Paul Without the Walls, was so obviously in the nature of an improvement in point of stability that it is no matter for surprise that it should have been almost universally adopted. Colonnaded and arcaded basilicas, as we may call them, for the most part older than the eleventh century, are to be found in the most widely distant regions, from Syria to Spain, and from Sicily to Saxony; and the lack of examples in Southern France is probably due to the destructive invasions of the Saracens and Northmen and to the building of new churches of a different type, in the eleventh and succeeding centuries, on the ruins of the old. The change from column to pillar, though in many cases it was no doubt necessitated by lack of suitable materials—for the supply of ready-made monoliths from pagan buildings was not inexhaustible—proved, in fact, the germ of future development; for from the plain square support to the recessed pillar, and from this again to the grouped shafts of the Gothic cathedrals of later times, the progress can be quite plainly traced.

Mention should here be made of a class of basilican churches, in which as in S. Miniato, outside Florence, and in S. Zenone, Verona, pillars or grouped shafts alternate, at fixed intervals, with simple columns, and serve the purpose of affording support to transverse arches spanning the whole width of the nave; a first step, it may be observed, to continuous vaulting.

Romanesque Types.—Something must now be said of the very important alterations which the eastern end of the basilican church underwent in the process of development from the Roman to what may conveniently be grouped together under the designation of "Romanesque" types. When, in studying the ground-plan of a Roman basilica, we pass from the nave and aisles to what lies beyond them, only two forms of design present themselves. In the great majority of instances the terminal apse opens immediately on the nave, with the necessary result, so far as internal arrangements are concerned, that the choir, as we should call it, was an enclosure, quite unconnected with the architecture of the building, protruding forwards into the body of the church, as may still be seen in the church of S. Clemente in Rome. In the four greater basilicas, however, as well as in a few other instances, a transept was interposed between the nave and the apse, affording adequate space for the choir in its central portion, while its arms (which did not project beyond the aisles) served the purpose implied in the terms *senatorium* and *matroneum*. Now it is noteworthy that the transept of a Roman basilica is, architecturally speaking, simply an oblong hall, crossing the nave at its upper extremity, and forming with it a T-shaped cross, or *crux immissa*, but having no organic structural relation with it. But it was only necessary to equalize the breadth of transept and nave, so that their crossing became a perfect square, in order to give to this crossing a definite structural character, by strengthening the pieces at the four angles of the crossing, and making them the basis of a more or less conspicuous tower. And this was one of the most characteristic innovations or improvements introduced by the Romanesque builders of Northern Europe. In fact, however, before this stage of development was reached, the older basilican design had undergone another modification. For the simple apse, opening immediately into the transept, church builders of all parts of Europe had already in the eighth century substituted a projecting chancel, forming a fourth limb of the cross, which now definitively assumed the form of the *crux commissa*, by contrast with the *crux immissa* of the Roman basilica. The earliest example of a perfectly quadrate crossing, with a somewhat rudimentary tower, appears to have been the minster of Fulda, built about A. D. 800. It was quickly followed by St. Gall (830), Hersfeld (831), and Werden (875); but nearly two centuries were to elapse before the cruciform arrangement, even in the case of more important churches, can be said to have gained general acceptance (Dehio and v. Bezold, Die kirchliche Baukunst des Abendlandes, I, 161).

The differences which have already been mentioned were, however, by no means the only ones which distinguished the Romanesque from the Roman transept. The transept of a Romanesque church, especially of those which were attached to monasteries, was usually provided with one or more apses, projecting from the east side of its northern and southern arms; and from this it appears, plainly enough, that the purpose, or at least a principal purpose, of the medieval transept, was to make provision for subsidiary altars and chapels. A pair of transept apses, projecting eastwards, already makes its appearance at Hersfeld and Werden. At Bernay, Boscherville (St-Georges), and Cerisy-la-Forêt (St-Vigor), each arm of the transept has two eastern apses, corresponding respectively to the aisle and to the projecting arm. The same arrangement is found also at Tarragona. At La Cha-

rité, a priory dependent on Cluny, each arm had three apses, so that there were seven in all, immediately contiguous to one another, and varying in depth from the central to the northern and southern members of the system. The plan of Cluny itself was that of a cross with two transverse beams. Of the western transept each arm had two apses; of the eastern each had three, two projecting eastwards and one terminal. Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire had likewise a double transept, furnished on the same principle with six subsidiary apses. Among English cathedrals—it may here be mentioned—both Canterbury and Norwich have a single chapel projecting from each arm of their respective transepts; and at Ely the "Galilee" porch, which has the form of a western transept, opens eastwards into two apsidal chapels, contiguous on either side to the main walls of the cathedral.

Far more important in their bearing on the later history of architecture than these developments of the transept were certain changes which gradually took place in connexion with the chancel. It is not unusual in Romanesque churches, to find the chancel flanked, like the nave, with aisles, terminating in apsidal or square-ended chapels. But in more considerable edifices, especially in France, the aisle is often carried round as an ambulatory behind the chancel apse; and when this is the case, the ambulatory most commonly opens into a series of radiating chapels. These are, in the earliest examples, entirely separate from one another, being sometimes two or four, but more usually three or five, in number. In later examples the number of chapels increases to seven or even nine; and they are then contiguous, forming a complete corona or chevet.

The first beginnings of this system go back to so early a date as the fifth century. De Rossi has argued, apparently on good grounds, that some early Roman, Italian, and African basilicas were furnished with an ambulatory round the apse. This form of design, however, was soon abandoned in Italy, and in the Romanesque pre-Gothic period it cannot be said to have been usual anywhere except in France, where it proved a seed rich with the promise of future developments. The earliest instance of its adoption there was almost certainly the ancient church of St. Martin of Tours, as rebuilt by Bishop Perpetuus in A. D. 470. This edifice, as Quicherat has shown, had a semicircular ambulatory at the back of the altar, in which, a few years later, was placed the tomb of Perpetuus himself. From Tours the type seems to have passed to Clermont-Ferrand (Sts. Vitalis and Agricola), and thence, many centuries later, to Orléans (St-Aignan, 1029). Meanwhile, in 997, the church of St. Martin had been rebuilt, and in the foundations of this edifice, which can still be traced, we find what is probably the earliest example of a chevet or corona of radiating chapels. It served, in its turn, in the course of the following century, as the model, in this respect, of Notre-Dame de la Couture at Le Mans (c. 1000), St-Remi at Reims (c. 1010), St-Savin at Saint-Savin (1020–30), the cathedral at Vannes (c. 1030), St-Hilaire at Poitiers (1049), and the abbey church at Cluny, as rebuilt in 1089. Shortly before 1100 the church of St. Martin was once more rebuilt, on a scale of greater splendour; and once more the new building became the model for other churches, chief among which were those of St-Sernin at Toulouse (1096), of Santiago at Compostela (c. 1105), and of the cathedral at Chartres (1112).

Romanesque Vaulting.—The history of ecclesiastical architecture in Western Europe during the relatively short period which alone deserves to be regarded as one of more or less continuous and steady advance, and which extends, roughly speaking, from 1000 to 1300, may be described as the history of successive and progressive attempts to solve the problem, how best to cover with stone vaulting a basilican or quasi-basilican church, that is to say, a building of which the leading feature is a nave flanked with aisles and lighted with clerestory windows (Dehio and v. Bezold, op. cit., I, 296; Bond, op. cit., 6). It was the conditions of this problem, and the failure, more or less complete, of all previous attempts to solve it satisfactorily, and by no means a mere æsthetic striving after beauty of architectural form, which led step by step to the development of the Gothic architecture of the thirteenth century in its unsurpassed and unsurpassable perfection.

The advantages of a vaulted, as compared with a timber, roof are so obvious that we are not surprised to find, dating from the tenth century or at latest from the beginning of the eleventh, examples of basilican churches with vaulted aisles (Viollet-le-Duc, Dict., I, 177). Indeed these first attempts at continuous vaulting would probably have been made much earlier but for the invasions of Saracens and Northmen, which delayed till that period the first beginnings of a steady development in ecclesiastical architecture, but which by their wholesale destruction of pre-existing buildings may be said to have prepared the way for that same development. The vaulting of the nave, however, in the case of any church of considerable size, was a very different matter; and it was not until the eleventh century was well advanced that the problem was seriously faced. And when at last it was definitely taken in hand, this was done under pressure of dire necessity. Everyone who is at all conversant with medieval chronicles, or with the history of the cathedrals of Western Europe, must be aware how extremely frequent were the disasters caused by conflagrations (Dehio and v. Bezold, op. cit., I, 296), and it was natural enough that the church-builders of the later Middle Ages should aim at making their buildings, at least relatively, fire-proof.

The simplest form which the vaulting of a rectangular chamber can take is, of course, the cylindrical barrel-vault; and this is, in fact, the form which was adopted in many of the earliest examples of vaulted roofs, especially in the south of France; a form, too, which was extensively used in Italy during the age of the Renaissance. But, though simplest alike in conception and in construction, the cylindrical barrel-vault is in fact the least satisfactory that could be devised for its purpose; and the objections which militate against its employment are equally valid against that of the barrel-vault whose cross section forms a pointed arch. Of these objections the chief is that the horizontal thrust of a barrel-vault is evenly distributed throughout its entire length. Theoretically, then, this thrust requires to be met, not by a series of buttresses, but by a continuous wall of sufficient thickness to resist the outward pressure at any and every point along the line. Moreover, the higher the wall, the greater is the thickness needed, assuming of course that the wall stands free, like the clerestory wall of an aisled church. Much, too, will depend on the cohesiveness of the vaulting itself; and as the Romanesque church-builders were either unacquainted with, or unable to use, the methods by which the Romans and the Byzantines respectively contrived to give an almost rigid solidity to their masonry, it is no matter for surprise that in two large classes of instances they should have been content to sacrifice either the clerestory or the aisles to the advantages of a vaulted roof and to the exigencies of stability. Of aisleless churches, indeed, we must forbear here to speak. But of an important group of buildings which German writers have designated *Hallenkirchen* (hall-churches) a word must be said, as they unquestionably played a part in preparing the way for the final solution of the problem of vaulting.

The most rudimentary form of hall-church is that in which the nave and aisles are roofed with three parallel barrel-vaults, those of the aisles springing from the same level as those of the nave. Examples

are found at Lyons (St-Martin d'Ainay), at Lesterps, Civray, and Carcassonne (St-Nazaire) (Dehio and v. Bezold, op. cit., Pl. 122, figs. 3–6). An improvement on this design, in view of the illumination of the nave, consists in giving to the vaulting of the aisles the form of a "rampant" arch, as at Silvacanne, and from this it was but a step to the arrangement by which the section took the form of a simple quadrant, as at Parthenay-le-Vieux, Preuilly, and Fontfroide. This method of quadrant vaulting, as Viollet-le-Duc and others have observed, provides a kind of continuous internal "flying buttress", though it is by no means certain that the idea of the flying buttress in the Gothic architecture of Northern France was actually suggested by these Southern buildings (Viollet-le-Duc, Dict., I, 173). In point of stability, the hall-churches of the eleventh century leave nothing to be desired. Their great defect is want of light (Viollet-le-Duc, Dict., I, 176). And this defect almost equally affects a class of buildings which may be described as two-storied hall-churches, and which are found principally, if not exclusively, in Auvergne and its neighbourhood. These are furnished, like a few of the Roman basilicas and certain Byzantine churches, with a gallery, which is not a mere triforium contrived in the thickness of the walls, but a chamber of equal dimensions with the aisle. This arrangement not only affords additional space, but also, by reason of the greater height of the edifice, might seem to facilitate the provision of a more liberal supply of light, unimpeded by neighbouring buildings. This last-mentioned advantage is, however, almost entirely negatived by the circumstance that, in this class of buildings, each bay of the gallery is subdivided by means of coupled or grouped arches, so that the additional obstructions offered to the passage of the light almost entirely counterbalance the possible gain through additional fenestration. We say "the possible gain" because, in fact, the galleries of these churches are but sparingly provided with windows. In these churches (which to the English reader should be of special interest by reason of their affinity in point of construction to the Westminster cathedral) the aisle is usually cross-vaulted, while the gallery has a quadrant vault abutting in the wall of the nave just below the springing of the transverse arches. The most noteworthy examples are found at Clermont-Ferrand (Notre-Dame du Port), Issoire (St-Paul), and Conques. To the same family belongs, moreover, the great church of St-Sernin at Toulouse, already mentioned, which is distinguished from those previously named by having a double aisle. At Nevers the church of St-Etienne resembles those at Clermont, Issoire, and Conques, except that it is provided with a range of upper windows which break through the barrel-vaulting, somewhat after the fashion which afterwards became so common in Italy in churches of the Renaissance period.

The inherent shortcomings of the barrel-vault, especially when used as a roof for the nave of an aisled church, have been sufficiently illustrated. These disadvantages, so far as structural stability and fenestration are concerned, might indeed be overcome by adopting the system of a succession of transverse barrel-vaults, such as are seen in the unique instance of the church of St-Philibert at Tournus. Such a construction is, however, "ponderous and inelegant, and never came into general use" (Moore, Gothic Architecture, 42). The system of cross-vaulting, which has now to be considered, may be regarded as a combination of longitudinal with transverse barrel-vaulting, inasmuch as it may be described as consisting of a central barrel which is penetrated or intersected by a series of transverse vaults, corresponding of course to the successive bays or compartments of the nave. The advantages of cross-vaulting are threefold. In the first place the total amount of the outward lateral thrust is very greatly diminished, since one-half of it is now replaced by longitudinal thrusts, which, being opposed in pairs, neutralize one another. Secondly, all that is left of the lateral thrust, as well as the longitudinal thrusts, and the whole of the vertical pressure, instead of being distributed throughout the whole length of the building, is now collected and delivered at definite points, namely the summits of the columns or pillars. Thirdly and lastly, a perfectly developed system of cross-vaulting makes it possible so to heighten the clerestory windows that their archivolts shall reach the utmost interior height of the building, and so to broaden them that their width between reveals may approximate very closely to the interval between column and column below. By these improvements (as ultimately realized in the perfected Gothic of the thirteenth century) the somewhat rudimentary design of the ancient Roman basilica may be said to have reached the highest development of which it is capable. The gradual development of cross-vaulting, it is to be observed, did not take place in those districts of Southern and Central France which had already become the home of the barrel-vault and to a less degree of the cupola, but first in Lombardy, then in Germany, and finally in Northern France and in England. In these countries the evolution of the Romanesque timber-roofed basilican church had—with local variations of course—reached a far more advanced stage than was ever attained in those regions in which the adoption of barrel-vaulting at a relatively early date had in a manner put a check on architectural progress. And it is noteworthy that in Lombardy and Germany, when cross-vaulting was first adopted, its development was far less complete than in Northern France, and that in like manner the advance towards perfection was both less rapid and less complete in Normandy than in Picardy and the Ile-de-France. These two districts were the last to adopt the system, but it was here that it was, within the brief space of less than fifty years (1170–1220), brought to its final perfection. The reason may probably have been, as Dehio and von Bezold suggest, that the architects of the Ile-de-France, in the days of Philip Augustus and St. Louis, were less trammelled than those of Normandy by the traditions of a school. The comparative lack of important architectural monuments of an earlier date left them, say these writers, a more open field for their inventive enterprise (op. cit., I, 418).

The simplest form of cross-vaulting is of course that which is formed by the intersection of two cylindrical barrel-vaults of equal span. And this, without the use of ribbed groining, was the method mostly adopted by the Roman builders in their civic edifices. In the case of a pillared or columned church, however, this method had its disadvantages. In particular, having regard to the dimensions of the aisle and its vaulting, the builders of Northern Europe had all but universally adopted the plan of so spacing the columns and pillars which flank the nave that the intervals between them should be one-half the width of the church. Now the only means by which an equal height could be given to vaults of unequal span was the use of the pointed arch; and so it came about that the pointed arch was adopted, not primarily for æsthetic reasons, but rather for constructive purposes. And the same is to be said of the use of ribbed groining. The mediæval builders, who, as has been said above, possessed neither a tenacious mortar nor the command of an abundant supply of rough labour, and who therefore could not—even had they wished it—have adopted the massive concrete masonry of the Romans, were driven by the very necessities of the case to aim at lightness in the construction of their vaults, and at the same time to depend for stability not on the cohesion of the materials, but on the reduction of thrusts to a minimum, and on their skilful transmission to points where they could be effectively resisted. It was, then,

plainly desirable to substitute for a vaulting of uniform thickness a framework of ribs on which a comparatively thin layer of stones (cut to the requisite curvature) could be laid, and as far as possible to lighten the whole construction by moulding the ribs and likewise the columns which supported the vaulting. The same principle of aiming at lightness of construction led to the elimination, as far as possible, of all masses of solid masonry above the columns and arches of the nave. This was done by the enlargement of the windows and the development of the triforium, till the entire building, with the exception of the buttresses, and of the spandrels below the triforium, became a graceful framework of grouped shafts and interlacing ribs (Moore, op. cit., 17). The final stage in the evolution of architecture of the pointed arch was not, however, reached, until, for the solid Romanesque buttresses, which rested on the vaulting of the aisles, and which were not only clumsy but often proved inadequate for their purpose, the genius of the Gothic builders hit upon the epoch-making device of the flying buttress. By means of this device the thrust of the main vaulting was not, indeed, as has been too often said, "met by a counter-thrust", but was *transmitted* to the solid buttresses, mostly weighted with pinnacles, which were now built outwards to a great distance from the aisles, and the spaces between which were sometimes utilized, and might with advantage have been more often utilized, for a range of lateral chapels. (Bond, op. cit., 754; cf. Moore, op. cit., 20.) The subject of Gothic architecture in its details is, however, one that needs separate treatment, and for present purposes this very inadequate indication of some of the general principles involved in its development must suffice.

The Circular Church and its Derivatives.—It was stated at the outset of this article that all ecclesiastical architecture may be said to have been developed from two primitive germs, the oblong and the circular chamber. Of those very numerous churches, principally, but by no means exclusively, Eastern or Italian, which may be regarded as the products of the second line of development, we shall speak very briefly. That a circular chamber without any kind of annex was unsuitable for the ordinary purposes of public worship is plain enough. And the most obvious modification of this rudimentary form was to throw out a projecting sanctuary on one side of the building, as in St. George's, Thessalonica, or in the little church of S. Tommaso in Limine, near Bergamo. It was hardly less obviously convenient to build a projecting porch or narthex on the opposite side, as in St. Elias's, also at Thessalonica, and to complete the cross by means of lateral projections, as in the sepulchral chapel of Galla Placidia at Ravenna. Thus it was that churches having the form of a Greek cross, as well as other varieties of what German writers call the *Centralbau*, may be said to owe their origin to a very simple process of evolution from the circular domed building. Among the almost endless varieties on the main theme may be here enumerated: (1) buildings in which a circular, or polygonal, or quadrilateral aisle, whether in one or more stories, surrounds the central space; (2) buildings in which, though the principal open space is cruciform, and the whole is dominated by a central cupola, the ground-plan shows a rectangular outline, the cross being, as it were, "boxed" within a square; and (3) buildings in which one of the arms of the cross is considerably elongated, as in the Duomo at Florence, St. Peter's in Rome, and St. Paul's in London. The last-named modification, it is to be observed, had the effect of assimilating the ground-plan of those great churches, and of many lesser examples of the same character, to that of the Romanesque and Gothic cruciform buildings whose genealogical descent from the columned rectangular basilica is incontestable. Among ecclesiastical edifices of historical importance or interest which are either circular or polygonal, or in which the circular or polygonal centre predominates over all subsidiary parts of the structure, may be mentioned the Pantheon in Rome, St. Sergius at Constantinople, S. Vitale at Ravenna, S. Lorenzo at Milan, the great baptisteries of Florence, Siena, and Pisa, and the churches of the Knights Templars in various parts of Europe. St. Luke's at Stiris in Phocis, besides being an excellent typical instance of true Byzantine architecture, affords a good example of the "boxing" of a cruciform building of the Greek type, by enclosing within the walls the square space between the adjacent limbs of the cross.

Practically, however, the full development of cruciform from circular buildings became possible only when the problem had been solved of roofing a square chamber with a circular dome. This has in some cases been done by first reducing the square to an octagon, by means of "squinches" or "trompettes", and then raising the dome on the octagon, by filling in the obtuse angles of the figure with rudimentary pendentives or faced corbelling. But already in the sixth century the architect and builder of Santa Sophia had showed for all time that it was possible, by means of "true" pendentives, to support a dome, even of immense size, on four arches (with their piers) forming a square. The use of pendentives being once understood, it became possible, not only to combine the advantages of a great central dome with those of a cruciform church, but also to substitute domical for barrel-vaulting over the limbs of the cross, as at S. Marco, Venice, St-Front, Périgueux, and S. Antonio, Padua, or even to employ domical vaulting for a nave divided into square bays, as in the cathedral at Angoulême and other eleventh-century churches in Périgord, in S. Salvatore at Venice, in the London Oratory, and (with the difference that saucer domes are here employed) in the Westminster Cathedral. Nor should it be forgotten that in the nave of St. Paul's, London, the architect had shown that domical vaulting is possible even when the bays of nave or aisles are not square, but pronouncedly oblong. Indeed, if account be taken of the manifold disadvantages of barrel-vaulting as a means of roofing the nave of a large church, it may safely be said that the employment of some form of the dome or cupola is as necessary to the logical and structural perfection of the architecture of the round arch as ribbed groining and the use of flying buttresses are necessary to the logical and structural perfection of the architecture of the pointed arch.

Systems and Styles of Architecture in Relation to Modern Needs.—A word must now be said, in conclusion, as to the merits of the several systems and styles of architecture, more especially in relation to the needs of our own day. Of systems, indeed, there are in truth only three, the trabeate or that of which the horizontal lintel may be regarded as the generating element, and which of necessity postulates a timber roof; that of the round arch, which by virtue of the law of economy postulates, as has been said, the use of domical rather than barrel-vaulting; and that of the pointed arch, which, if carried to perfection, postulates ribbed groining and the use of the flying buttress. The second system, however, admits of two methods of treatment which are sufficiently distinctive to be classed as two "styles", viz. the neo-classical, or Renaissance, and the Byzantine, and which shall be particularized presently.

Now the trabeate system, or that of the timber roof, may be very briefly dismissed. In the great majority of cases we must, indeed, of necessity be content with such a covering for our churches; but no one would choose a wooden roof who could afford a vaulted building. Again, the various types of Romanesque architecture, with their imperfect and tentative methods of vaulting, though historically of great interest, should

be regarded as finally out of court. On the other hand, of the Gothic architecture of the thirteenth century, as exemplified in the great cathedrals of Northern France and of Cologne, it may be quite fearlessly asserted: (1) that every single principle of construction employed therein was the outcome of centuries of practical experience, in the form of successive and progressive attempts to solve the problems of church vaulting; (2) that the great loftiness of these buildings was not primarily due (as has been sometimes suggested) to any mere *Emporstreben*, or "upward-soaring" propensity, but was simply the aggregate result of giving to the windows of the aisles and of the clerestory a height in suitable proportion to their width, and to the triforium a height sufficient to allow of the abutment of the aisle roof; and (3) that every subsequent attempt to modify, in any substantial particular, this perfected Gothic style, was of its nature retrogressive and decadent, as might be illustrated from the English Perpendicular and the Italian and Spanish varieties of Gothic architecture. Nevertheless it must be admitted that thirteenth-century Gothic, though perfect of its kind, has its limitations, the most serious of which—in relation to modern needs—is the necessarily restricted width of the nave. When the architect of the Milan cathedral attempted to improve on his French predecessors by exceeding their maximum width of fifty feet, and to construct a Gothic building with a nave measuring sixty feet across, it was found impossible, as the building proceeded, to carry out the original design without incurring the almost certain risk of a collapse, and hence it was necessary to depress the clerestory to its present stunted proportions. Now under modern conditions of life, especially in the case of a cathedral of first-class importance, a nave of far greater width is by all means desirable; and in order to secure this greater width it is necessary either to fall back on the unsatisfactory compromise of Italian or Spanish Gothic, as illustrated in the cathedrals of Milan, Florence, or Gerona, or else to adopt the principle of the round arch, combined, by preference, with domical vaulting. This, as everyone knows, is what Mr. Bentley has done, with altogether conspicuous success, in the case of the Westminster Cathedral. Of the design of this noble edifice it is impossible to speak here. But it may be worth while to indicate one main reason for the choice of the Byzantine rather than the neo-classic or Renaissance treatment of the round-arch system. The principal difference between the two is this: that, whereas the neo-classical style, by its use of pilasters, treats every pier as though it were a cluster of huge, flat-faced columns, the Byzantine boldly distinguishes between piers and columns, and employs the latter exclusively for the purposes which monolithic shafts are suited to fulfil, for instance the support of a gallery; while the piers in a Byzantine building make no pretence of being other than what they are, viz., the main supports of the vaulting. The Byzantine method of construction, as employed at Westminster, has the further advantage that it brings within the building the whole of the spaces between the buttresses, thereby at the same time increasing the interior dimensions and avoiding the awkward appearance of ponderous external supports. Nor is the Byzantine style of architecture suitable for a great cathedral alone; and one may venture to hope that the great experiment which has been tried at Westminster will be fruitful of results in the future development of ecclesiastical architecture.

Bond, *English Gothic Architecture* (London, 1905); G. B. Brown, *From Schola to Cathedral* (London, 1886); Burckhardt, *Gesch. der Renaissance in Italien* (Stuttgart, 1878); Cattaneo, *Architecture in Italy*, tr. (London, 1896); Choisy, *Histoire d'Architecture* (2 vols., Paris, 1899); Idem, *L'Art de bâtir chez les Romains* (Paris, 1873); Idem, *L'Art de bâtir chez les Byzantins* (Paris, 1883); Clausse, *Basiliques et mosaïques chrétiennes* (Paris, 1893); Crostarosa, *Le Basiliche di Roma* (Rome, 1892); Dartein, *L'Architecture Lombarde* (Paris, 1865–82); Dehio and von Bezold, *Die kirchliche Baukunst des Abendlandes* (Stuttgart, 1892–1901); Fergusson, *History of Architecture*, ed. A. Spiers (3rd ed., London, 1893), vols. I and II; von Geymüller, *Les projets primitifs pour la basilique de S. Pierre à Rome* (Paris and Vienna, 1875); Hübsch, *Die altchristl. Kirchen* (1858–63); Isabelle, *Les édifices circulaires et les dômes* (Paris, 1855); H. G. Knight, *The Ecclesiastical Architecture of Italy* (London, 1842–44); F. X. Kraus, *Gesch. der christl. Kunst* (Freiburg im Br., 1896—); S. Kreuser, *Christlicher Kirchenbau* (Ratisbon, 1880); S. Lange, *Haus u. Halle* (1885); Lethaby and Swainson, *Santa Sophia* (London, 1894); W. Longman, *St. Paul's Cathedral* (London, 1873); C. H. Moore, *Development and Character of Gothic Architecture* (2nd ed., New York, 1899); von Quast, *Die altchristl. Bauwerke v. Ravenna* (Berlin, 1842); Révoil, *L'Architecture romane du midi de la France* (Paris, 1866–74); W. Salzenberg, *Die altchristl. Baudenkmäler v. Konstantinopel* (Berlin, 1891); Schulz and Barnsley, *The Monastery of St. Luke at Stiris* (London, 1901); Sir G. G. Scott, *Mediæval Architecture* (London, 1879), 2 vols.; G. G. Scott, *English Church Architecture* (London, 1881); F. M. Simpson, *A History of Architectural Development* (London, 1906—); R. P. Spiers, *Architecture East and West* (London, 1905); Texier and Pullan, *Byzantine Architecture* (London, 1864); Verneilh, *L'Architecture Byzantine en France* (Paris, 1851); Viollet-le-Duc, *Dict. raisonné de l'architecture* (Paris, 1858–68); C.-J.-M. de Vogüé, *La Syrie Centrale* (Paris, 1865–77); Witting, *Die Anfänge christ. Architektur* (1902).

Herbert Lucas.

Ecclesiasticus (abbrev. Ecclus.), the longest of the deuterocanonical books of Holy Writ, and the last of the Sapiential writings in the Vulgate of the Old Testament.

I. Title.—The usual title of the book in Greek MSS. and Fathers is Σοφία Ἰησοῦ υἱοῦ Σειράχ, "the Wisdom of Jesus, the son of Sirach", or simply Σοφία Σειράχ "the Wisdom of Sirach". It is manifestly connected with, and possibly derived from, the following subscription which appears at the end of recently-discovered Hebrew fragments of Ecclesiasticus: "Wisdom [*Ḥókhmâ*] of Simeon, the son of Yeshûâ, the son of Eleazar, the son of Sîrâ". Indeed, its full form would naturally lead one to regard it as a direct rendering of the Hebrew heading: *Ḥókhmâth Yeshûa bén Sîrâ"*, were it not that St. Jerome, in his prologue to the Solomonic writings, states that the Hebrew title of Ecclesiasticus was "Míshlê" (*Parabolæ*) of Jesus of Sirach. Perhaps in the original Hebrew the book bore different titles at different times: in point of fact, the simple name *Ḥókhmâ*, "Wisdom", is applied to it in the Talmud, while Rabbinic writers commonly quote Ecclesiasticus as Bén Sîrâ. Among the other Greek names which are given to Ecclesiasticus in patristic literature, may be mentioned the simple title of Σοφία, "Wisdom", and the honorary designation ἡ πανάρετος σοφία, "all-virtuous Wisdom".

As might well be expected, Latin writers have applied to Ecclesiasticus titles which are derived from its Greek names, such as "Sapientia Sirach" (Rufinus); "Jesu, filii Sirach" (Junilius), "Sapientia Jesu" (Codex Claromontanus); "Liber Sapientiæ" (Roman Missal). It can hardly be doubted, however, that the heading "Parabolæ Salomonis", which is prefixed at times in the Roman Breviary to sections from Ecclesiasticus, is to be traced back to the Hebrew title spoken of by St. Jerome in his prologue to the Solomonic writings. Be this as it may, the book is most commonly designated in the Latin Church as "Ecclesiasticus", itself a Greek word with a Latin ending. This last title—not to be confounded with "Ecclesiastes" (Eccl.)—is the one used by the Council of Trent in its solemn decree concerning the books to be regarded as sacred and canonical. It points out the very special esteem in which this didactic work was formerly held for the purpose of general reading and instruction in church meetings: this book alone, of all the deuterocanonical writings, which are also called *Ecclesiastical* by Rufinus, has preserved by way of pre-eminence the name of Ecclesiasticus (Liber), that is "a church reading-book".

II. Contents.—The Book of Ecclesiasticus is preceded by a prologue which professes to be the work of the Greek translator of the original Hebrew and the genuineness of which is undoubted. In this preface to his translation, the writer describes, among other things,

his frame of mind in undertaking the hard task of rendering the Hebrew text into Greek. He was deeply impressed by the wisdom of the sayings contained in the book, and therefore wished, by means of a translation, to place those valuable teachings within the reach of anyone desiring to avail himself of them for living in more perfect accord with the law of God. This was a most worthy object, and there is no doubt that in setting it before himself the translator of Ecclesiasticus had well realized the general character of the contents of that sacred writing. The fundamental thought of the author of Ecclesiasticus is that of *wisdom* as understood and inculcated in inspired Hebrew literature; for the contents of this book, however varied they may appear in other respects, admit of being naturally grouped under the general heading of "Wisdom". Viewed from this standpoint, which is indeed universally regarded as the author's own standpoint, the contents of Ecclesiasticus may be divided into two great parts: chs. i-xlii, 14; and xlii, 15-l, 26. The sayings, which chiefly make up the first part, tend directly to inculcate the fear of God and the fulfilment of His commands, wherein consists true wisdom. This they do by pointing out, in a concrete manner, how the truly wise man shall conduct himself in the manifold relationships of practical life. They afford a most varied fund of thoughtful rules for self-guidance "in joy and sorrow, in prosperity and adversity, in sickness and health, in struggle and temptation, in social life, in intercourse with friends and enemies, with high and low, rich and poor, with the good and the wicked, the wise and the foolish, in trade, business, and one's ordinary calling, above all, in one's own house and family in connection with the training of children, the treatment of men-servants and maid-servants, and the way in which a man ought to behave towards his own wife and women generally" (Schürer). Together with these maxims, which resemble closely both in matter and form the Proverbs of Solomon, the first part of Ecclesiasticus includes several more or less long descriptions of the origin and excellence of wisdom (cf. i; iv, 12–22; vi, 18–37; xiv, 22-xv, 11; xxiv). The contents of the second part of the book are of a decidedly more uniform character, but contribute no less effectively to the setting forth of the general topic of Ecclesiasticus. They first describe at length the Divine wisdom so wonderfully displayed in the realm of nature (xlii, 15-xliii), and next illustrate the practice of wisdom in the various walks of life, as made known by the history of Israel's worthies, from Enoch down to the high priest Simon, the writer's holy contemporary (xliv-l, 26). At the close of the book (l, 27–29), there is first, a short conclusion containing the author's subscription and the express declaration of his general purpose; and next, an appendix (li) in which the writer returns thanks to God for His benefits, and especially for the gift of wisdom, and to which are subjoined in the Hebrew text recently discovered, a second subscription and the following pious ejaculation: "Blessed be the name of Yahweh from this time forth and for evermore."

III. Original Text.—Until quite recently the original language of the Book of Ecclesiasticus was a matter of considerable doubt among scholars. They, of course, knew that the Greek translator's prologue states that the work was originally written in "Hebrew", *ἑβραϊστί*, but they were in doubt as to the precise signification of this term, which might mean either Hebrew proper or Aramaic. They were likewise aware that St. Jerome, in his preface to the Solomonic writings, speaks of a Hebrew original as in existence in his day, but it still might be doubted whether it was truly a Hebrew text, or not rather a Syriac or Aramaic translation in Hebrew characters. Again, in their eyes, the citation of the book by rabbinical writers, sometimes in Hebrew, sometimes in Aramaic, did not appear decisive, since it was not certain that they came from a Hebrew original. And this was their view also with regard to the quotations, this time in classical Hebrew, by the Bagdad gaon Saadia of the tenth century of our era, that is of the period after which all documentary traces of a Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus practically disappear from the Christian world. Still, most critics were of the mind that the primitive language of the book was Hebrew, not Aramaic. Their chief argument for this was that the Greek version contains certain errors; for example, xxiv, 37 (in Gr., verse 27), "light" for Nile" (יאר); xxv, 22 (Gr., verse 15), "head" for "poison" (רֹשׁ); xlvi, 21 (Gr., verse 18), "Tyrians" for "enemies" (צרים); etc.; these are best accounted for by supposing that the translator misunderstood a Hebrew original before him. And so the matter stood until the year 1896, which marks the beginning of an entirely new period in the history of the original text of Ecclesiasticus. Since that time, much documentary evidence has come to light, and it tends to show that the book was originally written in Hebrew. The first fragments of a Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus (xxxix, 15-xl, 6) were brought from the East to Cambridge, England, by Mrs. A. S. Lewis; they were identified in May, 1896, and published in "The Expositor" (July, 1896) by S. Schechter, reader in Talmudic at Cambridge University. About the same time, in a box of fragments acquired from the Cairo *genizzah* through Professor Sayce for the Bodleian Library, Oxford, nine leaves apparently of the same MS. (now called B) and containing xl, 9-xlix, 11, were found by A. E. Cowley and Ad. Neubauer, who also soon published them (Oxford, 1897). Next followed the identification by Professor Schechter, first, of seven leaves of the same Codex (B), containing xxx, 11-xxxi, 11; xxxii, 1b-xxxiii, 3; xxxv, 11-xxxvi, 21; xxxvii, 30-xxxviii, 28b; xlix, 14c-li, 30; and next, of four leaves of a different MS. (called A), and presenting iii, 6e-vii, 31a; xi, 36d-xvi, 26. These eleven leaves had been discovered by Dr. Schechter in the fragments brought by him from the Cairo *genizzah;* and it is among matter obtained from the same source by the British Museum, that G. Margoliouth found and published, in 1899, four pages of the MS. B, containing xxxi, 12-xxxii, 1a; xxxvi, 21-xxxvii, 29. Early in 1900, I. Lévi published two pages from a third MS. (C), xxxvi, 29a-xxxviii, 1a, that is, a passage already contained in Codex B; and two from a fourth MS. (D), presenting in a defective manner, vi, 18-vii, 27b, that is, a section already found in Codex A. Early in 1900, too, E. N. Adler published four pages of MS. A, viz. vii, 29-xii, 1; and S. Schechter, four pages of MS. C, consisting of mere excerpts from iv, 28b-v, 15c; xxv, 11b-xxvi, 2a. Lastly, two pages of MS. D were discovered by Dr. M. S. Gaster, and contain a few verses of chaps. xviii, xix, xx, xxvii, some of which already appear in MSS. B and C. Thus by the middle of the year 1900, more than one-half of a Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus had been identified and published by scholars. (In the foregoing indications of the newly-discovered fragments of the Hebrew, the chapters and verses given are according to the numbering in the Latin Vulgate.)

As might naturally be anticipated, and indeed it was desirable that it should so happen, the publication of these various fragments gave rise to a controversy as to the originality of the text therein exhibited. At a very early stage in that publication, scholars easily noticed that although the Hebrew language of the fragments was apparently classical, it nevertheless contained readings which might lead one to suspect its actual dependence on the Greek and Syriac versions of Ecclesiasticus. Whence it manifestly imported to determine whether, and if so, to what extent, the Hebrew fragments reproduced an original text of the book, or on the contrary, simply presented a late retranslation of Ecclesiasticus into Hebrew by means of the versions just named. Both Dr. G. Bickell and

Professor D. S. Margoliouth, that is, the two men who but shortly before the discovery of the Hebrew fragments of Ecclesiasticus had attempted to retranslate small parts of the book into Hebrew, declared themselves openly against the originality of the newly found Hebrew text. It may indeed be admitted that the efforts naturally entailed by their own work of retranslation had especially fitted Margoliouth and Bickell for noticing and appreciating those features which even now appear to many scholars to tell in favour of a certain connexion of the Hebrew text with the Greek and Syriac versions. It remains true, however, that, with the exception of Israel Lévi and perhaps a few others, the most prominent Biblical and Talmudic scholars of the day are of the mind that the Hebrew fragments present an original text. They think that the arguments and inferences most vigorously urged by Professor D. S. Margoliouth in favour of his view have been disposed of through a comparison of the fragments published in 1899 and 1900 with those that had appeared at an earlier date, and through a close study of nearly all the facts now available. They readily admit in the MSS. thus far recovered, scribal faults, doublets, Arabisms, apparent traces of dependence on extant versions, etc. But to their minds all such defects do not disprove the originality of the Hebrew text, inasmuch as they can, and indeed in a large number of cases must, be accounted for by the very late character of the copies now in our possession. The Hebrew fragments of Ecclesiasticus belong, at the earliest, to the tenth, or even the eleventh, century of our era, and by that late date all kinds of errors could naturally be expected to have crept into the original language of the book, because the Jewish copyists of the work did not regard it as canonical. At the same time, these defects do not disfigure altogether the manner of Hebrew in which Ecclesiasticus was primitively written. The language of the fragments is manifestly not rabbinic, but classical Hebrew; and this conclusion is decidedly borne out by a comparison of their text with that of the quotations from Ecclesiasticus, both in the Talmud and in the Saadia, which have already been referred to. Again, the Hebrew of the newly found fragments, although classical, is yet one of a distinctly late type, and it supplies considerable material for lexicographic research. Finally, the comparatively large number of the Hebrew MSS. recently discovered in only one place (Cairo) points to the fact that the work in its primitive form was often transcribed in ancient times, and thus affords hope that other copies, more or less complete, of the original text may be discovered at some future date. To render their study convenient, all the extant fragments have been brought together in a splendid edition, "Facsimiles of the Fragments hitherto recovered of the Book of Ecclesiasticus in Hebrew" (Oxford and Cambridge, 1901). The metrical and strophic structure of parts of the newly discovered text has been particularly investigated by H. Grimme and N. Schlögl, whose success in the matter is, to say the least, indifferent; and by Jos. Knabenbauer, S.J., in a less venturesome way, and hence with more satisfactory results.

IV. Ancient Versions.—It was, of course, from a Hebrew text incomparably better than the one we now possess that the grandson of the author of Ecclesiasticus rendered the book into Greek. This translator was a Palestinian Jew, who came to Egypt at a certain time, and desired to make the work accessible in a Greek dress to the Jews of the Dispersion, and no doubt also to all lovers of wisdom. His name is unknown, although an ancient, but little reliable, tradition ("Synopsis Scripturæ Sacræ" in St. Athanasius's works) calls him Jesus, the son of Sirach. His literary qualifications for the task he undertook and carried out cannot be fully ascertained at the present day. He is commonly regarded, however, from the general character of his work, as a man of good general culture, with a fair command of both Hebrew and Greek. He was distinctly aware of the great difference which exists between the respective genius of these two languages, and of the consequent difficulty attending the efforts of one who aimed at giving a satisfactory Greek version of a Hebrew writing, and therefore begs expressly, in his prologue to the work, his readers' indulgence for whatever shortcomings they may notice in his translation. He claims to have spent much time and labour on his version of Ecclesiasticus, and it is only fair to suppose that his work was not only a conscientious, but also, on the whole, a successful, rendering of the original Hebrew. One can but speak in this guarded manner of the exact value of the Greek translation in its primitive form, for the simple reason that a comparison of its extant MSS.—all apparently derived from a single Greek exemplar—shows that the primitive translation has been very often, and in many cases seriously, tampered with. The great uncial codices, the Vatican, the Sinaitic, the Ephræmitic, and partly the Alexandrian, though comparatively free from glosses, contain an inferior text; the better form of the text seems to be preserved in the Venetus Codex and in certain cursive MSS., though these have many glosses. Undoubtedly, a fair number of these glosses may be referred safely to the translator himself, who, at times, added one word or even a few words to the original before him, to make the meaning clearer or to guard the text against possible misunderstanding. But the great bulk of the glosses resemble the Greek additions in the Book of Proverbs; they are expansions of the thought, or hellenizing interpretations, or additions from current collections of gnomic sayings. The following are the best-ascertained results which flow from a comparison of the Greek version with the text of our Hebrew fragments. Oftentimes, the corruptions of the Hebrew may be discovered by means of the Greek; and, conversely, the Greek text is proved to be defective, in the line of additions or omissions, by reference to parallel places in the Hebrew. At times, the Hebrew discloses considerable freedom of rendering on the part of the Greek translator; or enables one to perceive how the author of the version mistook one Hebrew letter for another; or, again, affords us a means to make sense out of an unintelligible expression in the Greek text. Lastly, the Hebrew text confirms the order of the contents in xxx–xxxvi which is presented by the Syriac, Latin, and Armenian versions, over against the unnatural order found in all existing Greek MSS. Like the Greek, the Syriac version of Ecclesiasticus was made directly from the original Hebrew. This is wellnigh universally admitted; and a comparison of its text with that of the newly found Hebrew fragments should settle the point forever: as just stated, the Syriac version gives the same order as the Hebrew text for the contents of xxx–xxxvi; in particular, it presents mistaken renderings, the origin of which, while inexplicable by supposing a Greek original as its basis, is easily accounted for by reference to the text of the Hebrew fragments. But the Hebrew text from which it was made must have been very defective, as is proved by the numerous and important lacunæ in the Syriac translation. It seems, likewise, that the Hebrew has been rendered by the translator himself in a careless, and at times even arbitrary, manner. The Syriac version has all the less critical value at the present day, because it was considerably revised at an unknown date, by means of the Greek translation.

Of the other ancient versions of Ecclesiasticus, the Old Latin is the most important. It was made before St. Jerome's time, although the precise date of its origin cannot now be ascertained; and the holy doctor apparently revised its text but little, previously to its adoption into the Latin Vulgate. The unity of the Old Latin version, which was formerly undoubted,

has been of late seriously questioned, and Ph. Thielmann, the most recent investigator of its text in this respect, thinks that chs. xliv-l are due to a translator other than that of the rest of the book, the former part being of European, the latter and chief part of African, origin. Conversely, the view formerly doubted by Cornelius a Lapide, P. Sabatier, E. G. Bengel, etc., namely that the Latin version was made directly from the Greek, is now considered as altogether certain. The version has retained many Greek words in a latinized form: *eremus* (vi, 3); *eucharis* (vi, 5); *basis* (vi, 30); *acharis* (xx, 21); *xenia* (xx, 31); *dioryx* (xxiv, 41); *poderes* (xxvii, 9); etc., etc., together with certain Græcisms of construction; so that the text rendered into Latin was unquestionably Greek, not the original Hebrew. It is indeed true that other features of the Old Latin—notably its order for xxx–xxxvi, which disagrees with the Greek translation, and agrees with the Hebrew text—seem to point to the conclusion that the Latin version was based immediately on the original Hebrew. But a very recent and critical examination of all such features in i–xliii has led H. Herkenne to a different conclusion; all things taken into consideration, he is of the mind that: "Nititur Vetus Latina textu vulgari græco ad textum hebraicum alterius recensionis græce castigato." (See also Jos. Knabenbauer, S.J., "In Ecclesiasticum", p. 34 sq.) Together with græcized forms, the Old Latin translation of Ecclesiasticus presents many barbarisms and solecisms (such as *defunctio*, i, 13; *religiositas*, i, 17, 18, 26; *compartior*, i, 24; *receptibilis*, ii, 5; *peries*, *periet*, viii, 18; xxxiii, 7; *obductio*, ii, 2; v, 1, 10; etc.), which, to the extent in which they can be actually traced back to the original form of the version, go to show that the translator had but a poor command of the Latin language. Again, from a fair number of expressions which are certainly due to the translator, it may be inferred that, at times, he did not catch the sense of the Greek, and that at other times he was too free in rendering the text before him. The Old Latin version abounds in additional lines or even verses foreign not only to the Greek, but also to the Hebrew text. Such important additions—which often appear clearly so from the fact that they interfere with the poetical parallelisms of the book—are either repetitions of preceding statements under a slightly different form, or glosses inserted by the translator or the copyists. Owing to the early origin of the Latin version (probably the second century of our era), and to its intimate connexion with both the Greek and Hebrew texts, a good edition of its primitive form, as far as this form can be ascertained, is one of the chief things to be desired for the textual criticism of Ecclesiasticus. Among the other ancient versions of the Book of Ecclesiasticus which are derived from the Greek, the Ethiopic, Arabic, and Coptic are worthy of special mention.

V. Author and Date.—The author of the Book of Ecclesiasticus is not King Solomon, to whom, as St. Augustine bears witness, the work was oftentimes ascribed "on account of some resemblance of style" with that of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticle of Canticles, but to whom, as the same holy doctor says, "the more learned" (apparently among the church writers of the time) "know full well that it should not be referred" (On the City of God, Bk. XVII, ch. xx). At the present day, the authorship of the book is universally and rightly assigned to a certain "Jesus", concerning whose person and character a great deal has indeed been surmised but very little is actually known. In the Greek prologue to the work, the author's proper name is given as Ἰησοῦς, and this information is corroborated by the subscriptions found in the original Hebrew: l, 27 (Vulg., l, 29); li, 30. His familiar surname was Bén Sîrâ, as the Hebrew text and the ancient versions agree to attest. He is described in the Greek and Latin versions as "a man of Jerusalem" (l, 29), and internal evidence (cf. xxiv, 13 sqq.; l) tends to confirm the statement, although it is not found in the Hebrew. His close acquaintance with "the Law, the Prophets, and the other books delivered from the fathers", that is, with the three classes of writings which make up the Hebrew Bible, is distinctly borne witness to by the prologue to the work; and the 367 idioms or phrases, which the study of the Hebrew fragments has shown to be derived from the sacred books of the Jews, are an ample proof that Jesus, the son of Sirach, was thoroughly acquainted with the Biblical text. He was a philosophical observer of life, as can be easily inferred from the nature of his thought, and he himself speaks of the wider knowledge which he acquired by travelling much, and of which he, of course, availed himself in writing his work (xxxiv, 12). The particular period in the author's life to which the composition of the book should be referred cannot be defined, whatever conjectures may have been put forth in that regard by some recent scholars. The data to which others have appealed (xxxi, 22 sqq.; xxxviii, 1–15; etc.) to prove that he was a physician are insufficient evidence; while the similarity of the names (Jason-Jesus) is no excuse for those who have identified Jesus, the son of Sirach, a man of manifestly pious and honourable character, with the ungodly and hellenizing high priest Jason (175–172 B. C.—concerning Jason's wicked deeds, see II Mach., iv, 7–26).

The time at which Jesus, the author of Ecclesiasticus, lived has been the matter of much discussion in the past. But at the present day, it admits of being given with tolerable precision. Two data are particularly helpful for this purpose. The first is supplied by the Greek prologue, where we read that the grandson of Jesus of Sirach came into Egypt ἐν τῷ ογδόῳ καὶ τριακοστῷ ἔτει επὶ τοῦ Εὐεργέτου Βασιλέως, not long after which he rendered into Greek his grandfather's work. The "thirty-eighth year" here spoken of by the translator does not mean that of his own age, for such a specification would be manifestly irrelevant. It naturally denotes the date of his arrival in Egypt with a reference to the years of rule of the then monarch, the Egyptian Ptolemy Euergetes; and in point of fact, the Greek grammatical construction of the passage in the prologue is that usually employed in the Septuagint version to give the year of rule of a prince (cf. Aggeus, i, 1; ii, 1, 10; Zach., i, 1, 7; vii, 1; I Mach., xiii, 42; xiv, 27; etc.). There were indeed two Ptolemys of the surname Euergetes (Benefactor): Ptolemy III and Ptolemy VII (Physcon). But to decide which is the one actually meant by the author of the prologue is an easy matter. As the first, Ptolemy III, reigned only twenty-five years (247–222 B. C.), it must be the second, Ptolemy VII, who is intended. This latter prince shared the throne along with his brother (from 170 B. C. onwards), and afterwards ruled alone (from 145 B. C. onwards). But he was wont to reckon the years of his reign from the earlier date. Hence "the thirty-eighth year of Ptolemy Euergetes", in which the grandson of Jesus, the son of Sirach, came to Egypt, is the year 132 B. C. This being the case, the translator's grandfather, the author of Ecclesiasticus, may be regarded as having lived and written his work between forty and sixty years before (between 190 and 170 B. C.), for there can be no doubt that in referring to Jesus by means of the term πάππος and of the definite phrase ὁ πάππος μοῦ Ἰησοῦς, the writer of the prologue designates his grandfather, and not a more remote ancestor. The second datum that is particularly available for determining the time at which the writer of Ecclesiasticus lived is supplied by the book itself. It has long been felt that since the son of Sirach celebrates with such a genuine glow of enthusiasm the deeds of "the high priest Simon, son of Onias", whom he praises as the last in the long line of Jewish worthies, he must himself have been an eyewitness of the glory which he depicts (cf. l, 1–16, 22, 23). This was, of course, but an inference,

and so long as it was based only on a more or less subjective appreciation of the passage, one can easily understand why many scholars questioned, or even rejected, its correctness. But with the recent discovery of the original Hebrew of the passage, there has come in a new, and distinctly objective, element, which places practically beyond doubt the correctness of the inference. In the Hebrew text, immediately after his eulogism of the high priest Simon, the writer subjoins the following fervent prayer: "May His [i. e. Yahweh's] mercy be continually with Simon, and may He establish with him the covenant of Phineas, that will endure with him and with his seed, as the days of heaven" (l, 24). Obviously, Simon was yet alive when this prayer was thus formulated; and its actual wording in the Hebrew implies this so manifestly, that when the author's grandson rendered it into Greek, at a date when Simon had been dead for some time, he felt it necessary to modify the text before him, and hence rendered it in the following general manner: "May His mercy be continually with *us*, and may He redeem *us* in His days." Besides thus allowing us to realize the fact that Jesus, the son of Sirach, was a contemporary of the high priest Simon, chap. l of Ecclesiasticus affords us certain details which enable us to decide which of the two Simons, both high priests and sons of Onias and known in Jewish history, is the one described by the writer of the book. On the one hand, the only known title of Simon I (who held the pontificate under Ptolemy Soter, about 300 B. C.) which would furnish a reason for the great encomium passed upon Simon in Ecclus., l, is the surname "the Just" (cf. Josephus, Antiq. of the Jews, Bk. XII, chap. ii, 5), whence it is inferred that he was a renowned high priest worthy of being celebrated among the Jewish heroes praised by the son of Sirach. On the other hand, such details given in Simon's panegyric, as the facts that he repaired and strengthened the Temple, fortified the city against siege, and protected the city against robbers (cf. Ecclus., l, 1–4), are in close agreement with what is known of the times of Simon II (about 200 B. C.). While in the days of Simon I, and immediately after, the people were undisturbed by foreign aggression, in those of Simon II the Jews were sorely harassed by hostile armies, and their territory was invaded by Antiochus, as we are informed by Josephus (Antiq. of the Jews, Bk. XII, chap. iii, 3). It was also in the later time of Simon II that Ptolemy Philopator was prevented only by the high priest's prayer to God, from desecrating the Most Holy Place; he then started a fearful persecution of the Jews at home and abroad (cf. III Mach., ii, iii). It appears from these facts—to which others, pointing in the same direction, could easily be added—that the author of Ecclesiasticus lived about the beginning of the second century B. C. As a matter of fact, recent Catholic scholars, in increasing number, prefer this position to that which identifies the high priest Simon, spoken of in Ecclus., l, with Simon I, and which, in consequence, refers the composition of the book to about a century earlier (about 280 B. C.).

VI. Method of Composition.—At the present day, there are two principal views concerning the manner in which the writer of Ecclesiasticus composed his work, and it is difficult to say which is the more probable. The first, held by many scholars, maintains that an impartial study of the topics treated and of their actual arrangement leads to the conclusion that the whole book is the work of a single mind. Its advocates claim that, throughout the book, one and the same general purpose can be easily made out, to wit: the purpose of teaching the practical value of Hebrew wisdom, and that one and the same method in handling the materials can be readily noticed, the writer always showing wide acquaintance with men and things, and never citing any exterior authority for what he says. They affirm that a careful examination of the contents discloses a distinct unity of mental attitude on the author's part towards the same leading topics, towards God, life, the Law, wisdom, etc. They do not deny the existence of differences of tone in the book, but think that they are found in various paragraphs relating to minor topics; that the diversities thus noticed do not go beyond the range of one man's experience; that the author very likely wrote at different intervals and under a variety of circumstances, so that it is not to be wondered at if pieces thus composed bear the manifest impress of a somewhat different frame of mind. Some of them actually go so far as to admit that the writer of Ecclesiasticus may at times have collected thoughts and maxims that were already in current and popular use, may even have drawn material from collections of wise sayings no longer extant or from unpublished discourses of sages; but they, each and all, are positive that the author of the book "was not a mere collector or compiler; his characteristic personality stands out too distinctly and prominently for that, and notwithstanding the diversified character of the apophthegms, they are all the outcome of one connected view of life and of the world" (Schürer).

The second view maintains that the Book of Ecclesiasticus was composed by a process of compilation. According to the defenders of this position, the compilatory character of the book does not necessarily conflict with a real unity of general purpose pervading and connecting the elements of the work: such a purpose proves, indeed, that one mind has bound those elements together for a common end, but it really leaves untouched the question at issue, viz. whether that one mind must be considered as the original author of the contents of the book, or, rather, as the combiner of pre-existing materials. Granting, then, the existence of one and the same general purpose in the work of the son of Sirach, and admitting likewise the fact that certain portions of Ecclesiasticus belong to him as the original author, they think that, on the whole, the book is a compilation. Briefly stated, the following are the grounds for their position. In the first place, from the very nature of his work, the author was like "a gleaner after the grape-gatherers"; and in thus speaking of himself (xxxiii, 16) he gives us to understand that he was a collector or compiler. In the second place, the structure of the work still betrays a compilatory process. The concluding chapter (li) is a real appendix to the book, and was added to it after the completion of the work, as is proved by the colophon in l, 29 sqq. The opening chapter reads like a general introduction to the book, and indeed as one different in tone from the chapters by which it is immediately followed, while it resembles some distinct sections which are embodied in further chapters of the work. In the body of the book, ch. xxxvi, 1–19, is a prayer for the Jews of the Dispersion, altogether unconnected with the sayings in verses 20 sqq. of the same chapter; ch. xliii, 15–l, 26, is a discourse clearly separate from the prudential maxims by which it is immediately preceded; chs. xvi, 24; xxiv, 1; xxxix, 16, are new starting-points, which, no less than the numerous passages marked by the address "my son" (ii, 1; iii, 19; iv, 1, 23; vi, 18, 24, 33; etc.), and the peculiar addition in l, 27, 28, tell against the literary unity of the work. Other marks of a compilatory process have also been appealed to. They consist in the significant repetition of several sayings in different places of the book (cf. xx, 32, 33, which is repeated in xli, 17b, 18; etc.); in apparent discrepancies of thought and doctrine (cf. the differences of tone in chs. xvi; xxv; xxix, 21–41; xl, 1–11; etc); in certain topical headings at the beginning of special sections (cf. xxxi, 12; xli, 16; xliv, 1, in the Hebrew); and in an additional psalm or canticle found in the newly discovered Hebrew text, between li, 12, and li, 13: all of which are best accounted for by the use of several

smaller collections containing each the same saying, or differing considerably in their general tenor, or supplied with their respective titles. Finally, there seems to be an historical trace of the compilatory character of Ecclesiasticus in a second, but unauthentic, prologue to the book, which is found in the "Synopsis Sacræ Scripturæ". In this document, which is printed in the works of St. Athanasius and also at the beginning of Ecclesiasticus in the Complutensian Polyglot, the actual redaction of the book is ascribed to the Greek translator as a regular process of compilation of detached hymns, sayings, prayers, etc., which had been left him by his grandfather, Jesus, the son of Sirach.

VII. Doctrinal and Ethical Teaching.—Before setting forth in a summary way the principal teachings, doctrinal and ethical, contained in the Book of Ecclesiasticus, it will not be amiss to premise two remarks which, however elementary, should be distinctly borne in mind by anyone who wishes to view the doctrines of the son of Sirach in their proper light. First, it would be obviously unfair to require that the contents of this Sapiential book should come fully up to the high moral standard of Christian ethics, or should equal in clearness and precision the dogmatic teachings embodied in the sacred writings of the New Testament or in the living tradition of the Church; all that can be reasonably expected of a book composed some time before the Christian Dispensation, is that it shall set forth substantially good, not perfect, doctrinal and ethical teaching. In the second place, both good logic and sound common sense demand that the silence of Ecclesiasticus concerning certain points of doctrine be not regarded as a positive denial of them, unless it can be clearly and conclusively shown that such a silence must be so construed. The work is mostly made up of unconnected sayings which bear on all kinds of topics, and on that account, hardly ever, if ever at all, will a sober critic be able to pronounce on the actual motive which prompted the author of the book either to mention or to omit a particular point of doctrine. Nay more, in presence of a writer manifestly wedded to the national and religious traditions of the Jewish race, as the general tone of his book proves the author of Ecclesiasticus to have been, every scholar worthy of the name will readily see that silence on Jesus' part regarding some important doctrine, such for instance as that of the Messias, is no proof whatever that the son of Sirach did not abide by the belief of the Jews concerning that doctrine, and, in reference to the special point just mentioned, did not share the Messianic expectations of his time. As can readily be seen, the two general remarks just made simply set forth elementary canons of historical criticism; and they would not have been dwelt on here were it not that they have been very often lost sight of by Protestant scholars, who, biased by their desire to disprove the Catholic doctrine of the inspired character of Ecclesiasticus, have done their utmost to depreciate the doctrinal and ethical teaching of this deutero-canonical book.

The following are the principal dogmatic doctrines of Jesus, the son of Sirach. According to him, as according to all the other inspired writers of the Old Testament, God is one and there is no God beside Him (xxxvi, 5). He is a living and eternal God (xviii, 1), and although His greatness and mercy exceed all human comprehension, yet He makes Himself known to man through His wonderful works (xvi, 18, 23; xviii, 4). He is the Creator of all things (xviii, 1; xxiv, 12), which He produced by His word of command, stamping them all with the marks of greatness and goodness (xlii, 15–xliii; etc.). Man is the choice handiwork of God, who made him for His glory, set him as king over all other creatures (xvii, 1–8), bestowed upon him the power of choosing between good and evil (xv, 14–22), and will hold him accountable for his own personal deeds (xvii, 9–16), for while tolerating moral evil He reproves it and enables man to avoid it (xv, 11–21). In dealing with man, God is no less merciful than righteous: "He is mighty to forgive" (xvi, 12), and: "How great is the mercy of the Lord, and His forgiveness to them that turn to Him" (xvii, 28); yet no one should presume on the Divine mercy and hence delay his conversion, "for His wrath shall come on a sudden, and in the time of vengeance He will destroy thee" (v, 6–9). From among the children of men, God selected for Himself a special nation, Israel, in the midst of which He wills that wisdom should reside (xxiv, 13–16), and in behalf of which the son of Sirach offers up a fervent prayer, replete with touching remembrances of God's mercies to the patriarchs and prophets of old, and with ardent wishes for the reunion and exaltation of the chosen people (xxxvi, 1–19). It is quite clear that the Jewish patriot who put forth this petition to God for future national quiet and prosperity, and who furthermore confidently expected that Elias's return would contribute to the glorious restoration of all Israel (cf. xlviii, 10), looked forward to the introduction of Messianic times. It remains true, however, that in whatever way his silence be accounted for, he does not speak anywhere of a special interposition of God in behalf of the Jewish people, or of the future coming of a personal Messias. He manifestly alludes to the narrative of the Fall, when he says: "From the woman came the beginning of sin, and by her we all die" (xxv, 33), and apparently connects with this original deviation from righteousness the miseries and passions that weigh so heavily on "the children of Adam" (xl, 1–11). He says very little concerning the next life. Earthly rewards occupy the most prominent, or perhaps even the sole, place, in the author's mind, as a sanction for present good or evil deeds (xiv, 22–xv, 6; xvi, 1–14); but this will not appear strange to anyone who is acquainted with the limitations of Jewish eschatology in the more ancient parts of the Old Testament. He depicts death in the light of a reward or of a punishment, only in so far as it is either a quiet demise for the just or a final deliverance from earthly ills (xli, 3, 4), or, on the contrary, a terrible end that overtakes the sinner when he least expects it (ix, 16, 17). As regards the underworld or Sheol, it appears to the writer nothing but a mournful place where the dead do not praise God (xvii, 26, 27).

The central, dogmatic, and moral idea of the book is that of wisdom. Bén Sîrâ describes it under several important aspects. When he speaks of it in relation to God, he almost invariably invests it with personal attributes. It is eternal (i, 1), unsearchable (i, 6, 7), universal (xxiv, 6 sqq.). It is the formative, creative power of the world (xxiv, 3 sqq.), yet is itself created (i, 9; also in Greek: xxiv, 9), and is nowhere treated as a distinct, subsisting Divine Person, in the Hebrew text. In relation to man, wisdom is depicted as a quality which comes from the Almighty and works most excellent effects in those who love Him (i, 10–13). It is identified with the "fear of God" (i, 16), which should of course prevail in a special manner in Israel, and promote among the Hebrews the perfect fulfilment of the Mosaic Law, which the author of Ecclesiasticus regards as the living embodiment of God's wisdom (xxiv, 11–20, 32, 33). It is a priceless treasure, to the acquisition of which one must devote all his efforts, and the imparting of which to others one should never grudge (vi, 18–20; xx, 32, 33). It is a disposition of the heart which prompts man to practise the virtues of faith, hope, and love of God (ii, 8–10), of trust and submission, etc. (ii, 18–23; x, 23–27; etc.); which also secures for him happiness and glory in this life (xxxiv, 14–20; xxxiii, 37, 38; etc.). It is a frame of mind which prevents the discharge of the ritual law, especially the offering of sacrifices, from becoming a heartless compliance with mere outward

observances, and it causes man to place inward righteousness far above the offering of rich gifts to God (xxxv). As can readily be seen, the author of Ecclesiasticus inculcated in all this a teaching far superior to that of the Pharisees of a somewhat later date, and in no way inferior to that of the prophets and of the other protocanonical writers before him. Highly commendable, too, are the numerous pithy sayings which the son of Sirach gives for the avoidance of sin, wherein the negative part of practical wisdom may be said to consist. His maxims against pride (iii, 30; vi, 2–4; x, 14–30; etc.), covetousness (iv, 36; v, 1; xi, 18–21), envy (xxx, 22–27; xxxvi, 22), impurity (ix, 1–13; xix, 1–3; etc.), anger (xviii, 1–14; x, 6), intemperance (xxxvii, 30–34), sloth (vii, 16; xxii, 1, 2), the sins of the tongue (iv, 30; vii, 13, 14; xi, 2, 3; i, 36–40; v, 16, 17; xxviii, 15–27; etc.), evil company (xi, 31–36; xxii, 14–18; etc), display a close observation of human nature, stigmatize vice in a forcible manner, and at times point out the remedy against the spiritual distemper. Indeed, it is probably no less because of the success which Bén Sîrâ attained to in branding vice than because of that which he obtained in directly inculcating virtue, that his work was so willingly used in the early days of Christianity for public reading at church, and bears, down to the present day, the pre-eminent title of "Ecclesiasticus".

Together with these maxims, which nearly all bear on what may be called individual morality, the Book of Ecclesiasticus contains valuable lessons relative to the various classes which make up human society. The natural basis of society is the family, and the son of Sirach supplies a number of pieces of advice especially appropriate to the domestic circle as it was then constituted. He would have the man who wishes to become the head of a family determined in the choice of a wife by her moral worth (xxxvi, 23–26; xl, 19–23). He repeatedly describes the precious advantages resulting from the possession of a good wife, and contrasts with them the misery entailed by the choice of an unworthy one (xxvi, 1–24; xxv, 17–36). The man, as the head of the family, he represents indeed as vested with more power than would be granted to him among us, but be does not neglect to point out his numerous responsibilities towards those under him: to his children, especially his daughter, whose welfare he might more particularly be tempted to neglect (vii, 25 sqq.), and his slaves, concerning whom he writes: "Let a wise servant be dear to thee as thy own soul" (vii, 23; xxxiii, 31), not meaning thereby, however, to encourage the servant's idleness or other vices (xxxiii, 25–30). The duties of children towards their parents are often and beautifully insisted upon (vii, 29, 30, etc.). The son of Sirach devotes a variety of sayings to the choice and the worth of a real friend (vi, 6–17; ix, 14, 15; xii, 8, 9), to the care with which such a one should be preserved (xxii, 25–32), and also to the worthlessness and dangers of the unfaithful friend (xxvii, 1–6, 17–24; xxxiii, 6). The author has no brief against those in power, but on the contrary considers it an expression of God's will that some should be in exalted, and others in humble, stations in life (xxxiii, 7–15). He conceives of the various classes of society, of the poor and the rich, the learned and the ignorant, as able to become endowed with wisdom (xxxvii, 21–29). He would have a prince bear in mind that he is in God's hand, and owes equal justice to all, rich and poor (v, 18; x, 1–13). He bids the rich give alms, and visit the poor and the afflicted (iv, 1–11; vii, 38, 39; xii, 1–7; etc.), for almsgiving is a means to obtain forgiveness of sin (iii, 33, 34; vii, 10, 36), whereas hardheartedness is in every way hurtful (xxxiv, 25–29). On the other hand, he directs the lower classes, as we might call them, to show themselves submissive to those in higher condition and to bear patiently with those who cannot be safely and directly resisted (viii, 1–13; ix, 18–21; xiii, 1–8). Nor is the author of Ecclesiasticus anything like a misanthrope that would set himself up resolutely against the legitimate pleasures and the received customs of social life (xxxi, 12–42; xxxii, 1 sqq.); while he directs severe but just rebukes against the parasite (xxix, 28–35; xl, 29–32). Finally, he has favourable sayings about the physician (xxviii, 1–15), and about the dead (vii, 37; xxxviii, 16–24); and strong words of caution against the dangers which one incurs in the pursuit of business (xxvi, 28; xxvii, 1–4; viii, 15, 16).

Catholic authors are marked with an asterisk (*).—*Commentaries:* CALMET* (Venice, 1751); FRITZSCHE (Leipzig, 1859); BISSELL (New York, 1880); LESÊTRE* (Paris, 1880); EDERSHEIM (London, 1888); ZÖCKLER (Munich, 1891); RYSSEL (Tübingen, 1900–1901); KNABENBAUER* (Paris, 1902).

Introductions to the Old Testament: RAULT* (Paris, 1882); VIGOUROUX* (Paris, 1886); CORNELY* (Paris, 1886); TROCHON-LESÊTRE* (Paris, 1890); KÖNIG (Bonn, 1893); CORNILL (Freiburg, 1895); STRACK (Munich, 1898); KAULEN* (Freiburg, 1899); GIGOT* (New York, 1906).

Monographs on Ancient Versions: PETERS* (Freiburg, 1898); HERKENNE* (Leipzig, 1899).

Literature on Hebrew Fragments: TOUZARD* (Paris, 1901); KNABENBAUER* (Paris, 1902).

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

Eccleston, SAMUEL, fifth Archbishop of Baltimore, U. S. A., b. near Chestertown, Maryland, 27 June, 1801; d. at Georgetown, D. C., 22 April, 1851. His father was Samuel Eccleston, an Episcopalian. After her husband's death, Mrs. Eccleston married a Catholic gentleman named Stenson. Samuel was thus brought under Catholic influences, and sent to St. Mary's College, Baltimore, where he was converted. Entering St. Mary's Seminary in 1819, he was ordained priest, 24 April, 1825. He went to Issy, France, for further theological studies, and, returning to Baltimore in July, 1827, was made vice-president, and two years later president, of St. Mary's College. On 14 Sept., 1834, he was consecrated titular Bishop of Thermia, and coadjutor with the right of succession for Baltimore, and, upon the death of Archbishop Whitfield, 19 October, 1834, succeeded to the metropolitan see. He became also administrator of Richmond, until Bishop Whelan's appointment in 1841.

During his term of office many new churches were erected. He contributed largely of his own means towards the building of the cathedral. To provide for German Catholics the Redemptorists were invited from Austria in 1841; the Brothers of the Christian Schools were introduced into the United States in 1846, establishing Calvert Hall School at Baltimore, and the same year the Brothers of St. Patrick took charge of a manual labour school (since discontinued) near that city. An important event was the opening, 1 November, 1849, of St. Charles's College, founded by the generosity of Charles Carroll of Carrollton. Five provincial councils, the third to the seventh inclusive, were held at Baltimore under Archbishop Eccleston. (See BALTIMORE, ARCHDIOCESE OF.)

SHEA, *Hist. of the Cath. Ch. in U. S.* (New York, 1892), I, 441, II, 1; SCARF, *Chronicles of Baltimore* (Baltimore, 1874), 497–501; CLARKE, *Lives of Deceased Bishops* (New York, 1872), I, 484; REUSS, *Biog. Encycl. Cath. Hierarchy of U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1898).

J. P. W. MCNEAL.

Eccleston, THOMAS OF, thirteenth-century Friar Minor and chronicler, dates of birth and death unknown. He styles himself simply "Brother Thomas", and Bale seems to have first given him the title "of Eccleston". He appears to have entered the order about 1232–3 and to have been a student at Oxford between 1230 and 1240. After the latter year he was stationed at the convent in London, but he does not appear to have ever held any office in the order. He is chiefly famous for his chronicle "De Adventu Fratrum Minorum in Angliam", which extends from the coming of the friars into England under Agnellus of Pisa, in 1224, up to about 1258, when the work was probably completed. Eccleston declares that he spent twenty-six years collecting material for his chronicle, most of the information it contains being derived from

personal knowledge or verbal communication, although he seems to have had access to certain written documents now lost. His "De Adventu" is a collection of notes rather than a finished work. He describes with extreme simplicity and vividness what has been called the heroic period of the Franciscan movement in England. In spite of the absence of dates and of any chronological sequence and of its tendency to extol the English province above all others, his chronicle is very valuable and is accurate and reliable in all that concerns the establishment and spread of the Friars Minor in England. Incidentally it throws some light on the trend of early Franciscan events and thought in general. Four MSS. of the "De Adventu", all of which go back to one lost archetype, are known to scholars. The chronicle has been often edited; in part by Brewer in the "Monumenta Franciscana" (Rolls Series, London, 1858); and by Howlett in the same series (1882); by the Friars Minor at Quaracchi (in Analecta Franciscana, I, 1885, 217–57); by Liebermann in the "Monumenta Germaniæ" (XXVIII, Hanover, 1885, 560–69). A critical edition of the complete text is much needed. There is an English translation of Eccleston's work by Father Cuthbert, O.S.F.C., "The Friars and how they came to England" (London, 1903).

WADDING-SBARALEA, *Script. ord. Min.*, ed. NARDECCHIA (Rome, 1907), 216; LITTLE, *Thomas of Eccleston on the Coming of the Friars Minor to England* (London, 1907).

PASCHAL ROBINSON.

Echard, JACQUES, historian of the Dominicans, b. at Rouen, France, 22 Sept., 1644; d. at Paris, 15 March, 1724. As the son of a wealthy official of the king he received a thorough classical and secular education. He entered the Dominican Order at Paris and distinguished himself for his assiduity in study. When Jacques Quétif, who had planned and gathered nearly one-fourth of the material for a literary history of the Dominican Order, died in 1698, Echard was commissioned to complete the work. After much labour and extensive research in most European libraries this monumental history appeared in two quarto volumes under the title "Scriptores ordinis prædicatorum recensiti, notisque historicis illustrati" etc. (Paris, 1721). Besides a sketch, based chiefly on Pignon and Salanac, and a list of each writer's works, with the dates and peculiarities of the various editions, Echard enumerates the unpublished, spurious, and doubtful works, with valuable indications as to their whereabouts. He displays throughout a keen, sane, and incisive criticism which has been highly praised by competent critics (Journal des Savants, LXIX, 574). A new and revised edition was prepared in 1908 by Rémi Coulon, O.P.

DENIFLE in *Archiv. für Litteratur und Kirchengeschichte* (1886), II, 165 sqq.; MORTET in *La Grande Encyclopédie*, s. v.

THOS. M. SCHWERTNER.

Echave, BALTASAR DE, painter, b. at Zumaya, Guipuzcoa, Spain, in the latter part of the sixteenth century; d. in Mexico about the middle of the seventeenth. As there was a painter of the same name, thought to be his son, he is known as Echave the Elder. He was one of the earliest Spanish artists to reach Mexico, arriving at about the same time, near the end of the sixteenth century, as Sebastian Arteaga and Alonzo Vasquez. He was then a young man, and there is a tradition that his wife, also a painter, was his instructor. Echave, whose subjects are chiefly religious, had especial skill in composition, and his best works, which have much charm of colour and tenderness of treatment, are thought to recall those of Guercino. In the galleries of the National Academy of San Carlos, in the City of Mexico, there are some of his best pictures, notably "The Adoration of the Magi", "Christ in the Garden", "The Martyrdom of San Aproniano", "The Holy Family", "The Visitation", "The Holy Sepulchre", "Saint Ann and the Virgin", "The Apparition of Christ and the Virgin to San Francisco", "The Martyrdom of San Ponciano", and "Saint Cecilia". In the church of San José el Real, generally known as the "Profesa", are several others, including "St. Isabel of Portugal", while he executed for the church of Santiago Tlaltelolco fifteen altar-panels. In the cathedral is his "Candelaria" and a "San Sebastian", believed to be by his wife. Among the smaller paintings of Echave is one of San Antonio Abad with St. Paul, the first hermit. The artist also had a reputation as an author, among his works being one on the Biscayan language.

AUGUSTUS VAN CLEEF.

Echinus, a titular see of Thessaly, Greece. Echinus (Ἐχῖνος, also Ἐχινοῦς) was situated on the northern shore of the Gulf of Lamia (*Maliacus Sinus*). To-day it is a small village, Akhinos (Ἀχινός), of 500 inhabitants, in the demos of Phalara and the eparchy of Phthiotis. On the conical hill which rises above the village are remains of the old walls. The city has been destroyed by earthquakes and rebuilt many times, particularly in 426 B. C. and A. D. 551. Philip II of Macedon left it to the Malians, and Philip V took it from the Ætolians. It was fortified by Justinian. The see, mentioned in "Notitiæ episcopatuum" as late as the twelfth or thirteenth century, was a suffragan of Larissa. Three bishops are known: Theodore in 431, Peter in 451, and Aristotle in 459 (Lequien, Oriens christianus, II, 115).

LEAKE, *Northern Greece* (London, 1835), II, 80; PAULY-WISSOWA, *Real-Encycl.*, s. v.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Echternach, ABBEY OF (also EPTERNACH, Lat. EPTERNACENSIS), a Benedictine monastery in the town of that name, in the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg and the Diocese of Trier. It was founded in 698 by St. Willibrord, an English monk of Ripon, who became the Apostle of Friesland and first Bishop of Utrecht. Although a bishop, he ruled the monastery as abbot until his death in 739. The abbey stood near Tier on land given him for the purpose by St. Irmine, Abbess of Oeren and daughter of Dagobert II. It had many royal and other benefactors, including Pepin and Charlemagne, who conferred upon it great privileges. In 859 the monks were displaced by secular canons, as was so often the case with the early monasteries, but in 971 Emperor Otho I restored the Benedictine life there, bringing forty monks thither from the great Abbey of St. Maximin at Trier, one of whom, Ravanger by name, was made abbot. The monastery became very celebrated and was, during the Middle Ages, one of the most important in Northern Europe. It continued to flourish until the French Revolution, when it was suppressed, and the monks dispersed. The buildings put up by St. Willibrord were burnt down in 1017, and a new abbey was then erected. The church was Romanesque in style, but Gothic additions and alterations were made in the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries. In 1797 it was sold and became a pottery manufactory, but in 1861 it was reacquired by the townspeople, through whose generosity and devotion it was restored and made a parish church. The reconsecration took place with great solemnity in 1868, and since that date the work of restoration and decoration has continued steadily. It is popularly called "the cathedral", though not the seat of a bishop. The conventual buildings, originally erected in 1017–31, have been frequently rebuilt and added to, and they were entirely modernized in 1732. At the suppression they became State property and have for many years served as barracks. The library was noted for a number of precious MSS. of very early date which it contained; some of them are now in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris.

The Dancing Procession.—The Abbey of Echternach owes much of its fame, especially in modern times,

to the curious "dancing procession" which takes place annually on Whit Tuesday, in honour of St. Willibrord. The cult of the saint may be traced back almost to the date of his death, and the stream of pilgrims to his tomb in the abbey church has never ceased. The Emperors Lothair I, Conrad, and Maximilian may be numbered amongst them. The tomb stands before the high altar, and has been recently entirely renewed. On it is a recumbent effigy of the saint, and amongst other relics preserved there are a mitre, crosier, and chasuble said to have been used by him. The origin of the procession cannot be stated with certainty. Authentic documents of the fifteenth century speak of it as a regular and recognized custom at that time, but for earlier evidence there is only tradition to depend upon. The legend is that in 1347, when a pestilence raged amongst the cattle of the neighbourhood, the symptoms of which were a kind of trembling or nervous shaking followed by speedy death, the people thought that by imitating these symptoms, more or less, whilst imploring the intercession of St. Willibrord, the evil might be stayed. The desired result was obtained, and so the dancing procession to the saint's tomb became an annual ceremony. Nowadays it is made an act of expiation and penance on behalf of afflicted relations and especially in order to avert epilepsy, St. Vitus's dance, convulsions, and all nervous diseases. The function commences at nine o'clock in the morning at the bridge over the Sure, with a sermon by the parish priest (formerly the abbot of the monastery); after this the procession moves towards the basilica, through the chief streets of the town, a distance of about 1½ kilometres. Three steps forward are taken, then two back, so that five steps are required in order to advance one pace. The result is that it is well after midday before the last of the dancers has reached the church. They go four or five abreast, holding each other by the hand or arm. Many bands accompany them, playing a traditional melody which has been handed down for centuries. A large number of priests and religious also accompany the procession and not infrequently there are several bishops as well. On arrival at the church, the dance is continued around the tomb of St. Willibrord, when litanies and prayers in his honour are recited, and the whole concludes with Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. Though curious and even somewhat ludicrous, the people perform it in all seriousness and as a true act of devotion. It usually attracts to Echternach a great concourse of tourists as well as pilgrims, and as many as ten thousand people generally take part in it. The procession took place annually without intermission until 1777. Then, on account of some abuses that had crept in, the music and dancing were forbidden by the Archbishop of Trier, and in 1786 Joseph II abolished the procession altogether. Attempts were made to revive it ten years later but the French Revolution effectually prevented it. It was recommenced, however, in 1802 and has continued ever since. In 1826 the Government tried to change the day to a Sunday, but since 1830 it has always taken place on Whit Tuesday, as formerly.

Ste-Marthe, *Gallia Christiana* (Paris, 1785), XIII; Martène and Durand, *Voyage littéraire de deux Bénédictins* (Paris, 1724), III; Migne, *Dict. des Abbayes* (Paris, 1856); Krier, *La Procession dansante à Echternach* (Luxemburg, 1888); Reiners, *Die St. Willibrords Stiftung Echternach* (Luxemburg, 1896); Taunton, *Echternach and the Dancing Pilgrims* in *Catholic World* (New York, 1891), LXV.

G. Cyprian Alston.

Echter von Mespelbrunn, Julius, Prince-Bishop of Würzburg, b. 18 March, 1545, in the Castle of Mespelbrunn, Spessart (Bavaria); d. 13 Sept., 1617, at Würzburg. Descended from an ancient family in the service of the archbishops of Mainz, he received a good education in the schools of that city, also at Louvain, Douai, Paris, Angers, Pavia, and Rome; it was in Rome that he became a licentiate of canon and civil law. In 1567 he entered on his duties as canon of Würzburg, an office to which he had been appointed in 1554; in 1570 he became dean of the cathedral chapter, and in 1573, at the age of twenty-eight, even before his ordination to the priesthood, was appointed Prince-Bishop of Würzburg. Various causes had combined to bring the diocese into a sad state. Deeply in debt and poorly administered, it had an almost entirely Protestant population. The clergy, in point of virtue and learning, were for the most part unequal to their task, and the cathedral chapter was adverse to any ecclesiastical reform. During the first ten years of Echter's government the attempt to unite the Abbey of Fulda and the Bishopric of Würzburg, after the deposition of the Prince-Abbot Balthasar von Dernbach, caused much confusion. This was due to the youthful ambition of Echter, and not, as some wish to interpret it, a sign of any anti-Catholic sentiments on his part. From the outset he endeavoured to carry out a thorough ecclesiastical restoration. For this reason he encouraged, as far as possible, the Jesuits and promoted their beneficent ministry. In the same spirit he conceived the plan of founding a university at Würzburg, and despite all difficulties it was solemnly opened (2 Jan., 1582) and became a model for all similar Counter-Reformation institutions. Under the Jesuits it flourished, grew rapidly, and furnished the see with the priests and officials needed to counterbalance the more or less irreligious temper of the population. The bishop was now able to take decisive steps against Protestantism. He banished all Lutheran preachers from his territory and removed all priests who were unwilling to observe the rules of their office. The public officials had to be Catholics, and none but Catholic teachers could be appointed. He began, moreover, courses of careful instruction for non-Catholics, and to some extent threatened them with penalties and even with banishment. Within three years about 100,000 returned to the Catholic Church. Public worship was also improved by the introduction of new devotions, processions, and the establishment of confraternities. Bishop Echter restored ruinous monasteries or devoted their revenues to the erection of new parishes and to the building of three hundred new churches. The tapering towers of these churches, called after the bishop "Julius towers", still preserve his memory. His most beneficial and lasting monument, after the university, is the Julius Hospital, which he founded with the endowment of the abandoned monastery of Heiligenthal. By skilful administration he improved the decadent economic conditions of his ecclesiastical states, reduced taxes, perfected the administration of justice, and established many primary schools. In a word, he proved himself one of the most capable rulers of his time. Not only in his own diocese did he display an extraordinary and varied activity, but as the founder and soul of the Catholic League, he exercised a decisive influence on the future of Germany.

Buchinger, *Julius Echter von Mespelbrunn* (Würzburg, 1843); Wegele in *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*, XIV, 671–84.

Patricius Schlager.

Eck (Eckius), Johann, theologian and principal adversary of Luther, b. 15 Nov., 1486, at Eck in Swabia; d. 10 Feb., 1543, at Ingolstadt. His family name was Maier, and his father, Michael Maier, was for many years magistrate in the town, the latinized name of which, *Eckius* or *Eccius*, was adopted after 1505 by Johann. His uncle, Martin Maier, pastor at Rothenburg on the Neckar, received Johann in his house (1495) and educated him. In 1498, when twelve years old, he was admitted to the Heidelberg University; thence he went in 1499 to Tübingen where he received the degree of Master of Arts in 1501; then to Cologne and in 1502 to Freiburg in the Breisgau. After his graduation in the faculty of arts

he began the study of philosophy and theology, took courses at the same time in jurisprudence, physics, mathematics, and geography, joined the Humanistic movement, and in addition to Latin, learned Hebrew and Greek. Among his instructors at the university were many distinguished scholars. His uncle now withdrew his allowance and Eck was obliged to earn his livelihood as a tutor while continuing his studies. In 1505 he was appointed rector of the *Artistenburse zum Pfau*, i. e. principal of the hall for students in arts at Freiburg, and received the degree of Bachelor of Theology; he lectured on the "Sentences" in 1506; was promoted to the licentiate in 1509; and in 1510, when twenty-four years old, he received the degree of Doctor of Theology. He had been ordained to the priesthood in 1508 with a papal dispensation from the age-requirement. Shortly after graduating as doctor, he was invited (1510) by the Dukes of Bavaria to the professorship of theology in Ingolstadt. He was appointed pro-chancellor of the university in 1512, and during his professorate of thirty-two years filled repeatedly the offices of dean, pro-rector, and rector; he also served as pastor and was appointed canon in Eichstätt. At Freiburg and during his earlier years at Ingolstadt, his literary activity was remarkable, not only in theology but also in other departments of science, as is evidenced by his writings which have been preserved partly in print and partly in MS. He engaged in geographical research and published a series of philosophical works, some of which were to serve as textbooks in the faculty of arts at Ingolstadt. In these writings he attempts to combine in a rational synthesis the advantages of the older philosophy with those of the new. His principal theological work during this period, entitled "Chrysopassus", treats of predestination with special reference to the dogmas of grace and free will which were so soon to become, in consequence of Luther's outbreak, the centre of sharp discussion. The tenor of this treatise, written when its author was only twenty-eight years old, evinces both confidence and modesty.

Luther's appearance, and especially the Disputation at Leipzig (1519), formed the turning-point in Eck's intellectual development and in his activity as a theologian. Thenceforth he is a prominent figure in the history of that period. With a clear insight into the meaning of Lutheranism, he was the first to champion the cause of Catholic teaching against Protestant error; and he became Luther's ablest opponent, skilful, untiring, and thoroughly equipped in theology. The rest of his life was spent in conflict with the Reformers in Germany and Switzerland. He defended the Catholic Church, its doctrines and its institutions, in his writings, in public debates, in his speeches at the diets, and in his diplomatic missions. For the betterment of ecclesiastical life and the spread of genuine reform he laboured earnestly by preaching to the people and by insisting on the scientific education of the clergy. As a reply to Luther's "theses" he wrote his "Obelisci", originally intended solely for the Bishop of Eichstätt. Both Luther and Karlstadt answered bitterly and then it was agreed to submit the points at issue to the test of a public debate, which was held in Leipzig, 27 June–15 July, 1519. Eck came off victorious, exposed Luther's heresy, and won over as a loyal adherent to the Catholic standard, George, Duke of Saxony. During the same year he published several essays attacking the tenets of Luther, and grew steadily in prominence as an authority on theological questions. In 1520 he visited Rome to report on the condition of affairs in Germany and to secure the condemnation of Luther's heresy. He submitted his essay on the Primacy of Peter to Leo X, was appointed prothonotary Apostolic, and was charged as papal legate, along with the two other legates, Aleander and Caracciolo, to carry out in Germany the provisions of the Bull "Exsurge Domine" which excommunicated Luther and condemned his 41 theses. The execution of this mandate was beset with difficulties on every side. Eck, through his "Epistola ad Carolum V" (1521), admonished Emperor Charles to enforce the papal bann. In the same year he went to Rome again, principally at the behest of the Bavarian dukes for whom he acted as counsellor in ecclesiastical affairs, and made a third visit to Rome in 1523. Meanwhile (1522) he had induced the Bavarian dukes to publish an edict in defence of the Catholic Faith. While in Rome he procured for the dukes, among other privileges, the power of enacting, independently of the bishops, decrees for the moral reformation of the clergy; and furthermore the right to appropriate, for use against heretics and Turks, a fifth part of all church revenues.

Eck in the meantime combated Lutheranism by his letters and essays. Between the years 1522 and 1526 he published eight voluminous treatises against Luther. Through his influence the University of Ingolstadt retained its strictly Catholic attitude and strenuously opposed the rising Protestant institutions. Eck had also a considerable share in organizing the "Catholic Federation", founded 5 June, 1524, by the leaders in Church and State for the purpose of safeguarding the ancient faith and enforcing the Edict of Worms. He also defended in numerous essays the traditional doctrines of the Church against Zwingli and his adherents, and participated in the religious discussion in Baden (1526). When the Protestants, at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530, promulgated the "Augsburg Confession", defining their religious views, Eck headed the Catholic champions upon whom the refutation of the articles in this confession devolved. Together with Wimpina and Cochlæus he represented the Catholic party at the conference (16 Aug.) between Catholic and Lutheran theologians relative to the "Confessio" and its "Confutatio"; and as theologian he served on the sub-committee which canvassed the results of the conference. Zwingli also had presented at Augsburg a Confession of Faith and this Eck alone refuted. Eck then drew up 404 heretical theses upon which he challenged the Protestant theologians to public debate. The challenge was not accepted; the only answer from the Protestant party was a torrent of abuse. In the negotiations relative to the Council of Trent, Eck was consulted by the emperor, Charles V, as well as by the pope, Paul III, and was charged by the latter with preliminary work for the council. At the religious disputation in Worms (1540), Eck again appeared as the chief Catholic representative and debated with Melanchthon on the issues involved in the "Augsburg Confession". This discussion was continued during the Diet of Ratisbon (1541) to which, besides Eck, the emperor delegated as spokesmen on the Catholic side, Julius Pflug and Gropper. Eck maintained clearly and decisively the Catholic position, and quite disapproved the "Ratisbon Interim". He also went on a mission to England and the Netherlands in the interest of the Catholic cause. In 1529 the bishops of Denmark invited Eck and Cochlæus to the discussion at Copenhagen; but neither appeared. Eck fully deserved the prominence gained by him during the struggle against Protestantism. He was the most distinguished theologian of the time in Germany, the most scholarly and courageous champion of the Catholic Faith. Frank and even in disposition, he was also inspired by a sincere love of truth; but he showed none the less an intense self-consciousness and the jovial bluntness of speech which characterized the men of that day. His adversaries, lampooning him publicly, taxed him with drunkenness and immorality; but the general tone of the writings published against Eck and the readiness of the Protestants to calumniate their victorious opponent, arouse strong suspicion as to the truth of these accusations and make them, so far as the evi-

dence goes, altogether improbable. In rebuttal it should be noted that Eck received the Last Sacraments with exemplary piety, and that his funeral in the Frauenkirche at Ingolstadt was marked by great solemnity.

As a writer Eck was prolific. His most important works are: "Loci communes adversus Lutherum et alios hostes ecclesiæ" (Arguments against Luther and Other Enemies of the Church), printed first in 1525, 45th edition in 1576; essays on the Primacy of Peter, Penance, the Sacrifice of the Mass, Purgatory, etc. He also published numerous polemical writings against Luther, Zwingli, Bucer, and other leaders of the new religious movements. He compiled the results of the numerous disputations in which he participated and the sermons he preached on various subjects. In 1539 he published a German version of the Scriptures, translating the Old Testament from the original and adopting Emser's translation of the New Testament. Eck, however, was abler as a theologian than as a stylist. He also published a collection of most of his writings prior to 1535 entitled "Opera Johannis Eckii contra Ludderum in 5 partes" (Ingolstadt, 1530–1535). In this edition parts I–II contain his polemical writings on the Primacy, Penance, etc. against Luther; parts III–IV, his reports of the debates and his polemics against Zwingli, Karlstadt, and Bucer; also the "Loci Communes", part V (4 vols.), his Latin sermons.

WIEDEMANN, *Dr. Johann Eck* (Ratisbon, 1865), with list of Eck's works; BRECHER in *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie* (Leipzig, 1877), V, 596–602; GÜNTHER, *Johann Eck als Geograph* in *Forschungen zur Kultur- und Literaturgesch. Bayerns* (Munich, 1894), II, 140–162; SCHNEID, *Dr. Johann Eck u. das kirchliche Zinsverbot* in *Historisch-politische Blätter* (1891), CVIII, 241 sq., 321 sq., 473 sq., 570 sq., 659 sq., 789 sq.; BAUCH, *Die Anfänge des Humanismus in Ingolstadt* (Munich, 1901); GREVING, *Johann Eck als junger Gelehrter* in *Reformationsgesch. Studien u. Texte* (Münster, 1906), I.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Eckart, ANSELM, missionary, b. at Bingen, Germany, 4 August, 1721; d. at the College of Polstok, Polish Russia, 29 June, 1809. Entering the Society of Jesus at nineteen, he was sent as a missionary to Brazil. Two years after his arrival in that country, he and his brethern were seized like felons and carried to Portugal, where they languished in prison till death released them or till the king, in whose name it was all done, was summoned by his own Judge. Father Eckart was confined for eighteen years in the underground dungeons of Almeida and St. Julian. He wrote the story of his own sufferings and those of his companions in prison. Upon the death of Joseph I of Portugal in 1777, Pombal fell into disgrace, and those of his victims who survived were released from their loathsome dungeons. The Society of Jesus, which had been suppressed four years earlier by the Brief of Clement XIV, had continued to exist in Russia. Father Eckart applied for readmission, and for thirty-two years following had the consolation of wearing the habit of the proscribed order. After filling the office of master of novices at Dünaburg, he was sent to the College of Polstok, where this venerable confessor of Jesus Christ, the last survivor, perhaps, of the cruelties of Pombal, preserved in extreme old age the same vigour of soul which had sustained him in the missions and in captivity. He died full of days and merits in the eighty-eighth year of his age and the sixty-ninth after his admission to the Society.

CARAYON, *Documents Inédits . . . . . Les Prisons du Marquis de Pombal*, XXIX, 113, 283, 327; SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la c. de J.*, III, 330; VON MURR, *Journal . . .*, VII, 295 sqq.; DE GUILHERMY, *Ménologe de la c. de J., Assistance de Germanie* (Paris, 1898), 556; WELD, *Suppression of the Society of Jesus in the Portuguese Dominions* (London, 1877), XI, XIII.

EDWARD P. SPILLANE.

Eckebert (EKBERT, EGBERT), Abbot of Schönau, b. in the early part of the twelfth century of a distinguished family along the Middle Rhine; d. 28 March, 1184, in the Abbey of Schönau. He was for a time canon in the collegiate church of Sts. Cassius and Florentius at Bonn. In 1155 he became a Benedictine at Schönau in the Diocese of Trier, and in 1166, after the death of the first abbot, Hildelin, he was placed at the head of the monastery. A man of great zeal, he preached and wrote much for the salvation of souls and the conversion of heretics. The Cathari, then numerous in the Rhineland, gave him especial concern. While a canon at Bonn he often had occasion to debate with heretics, and after his monastic profession, was invited by Archbishop Rainald of Cologne to debate publicly with the leaders of the sect in Cologne itself. His chief works are: "Sermones contra Catharos" with extracts on the Manichæans, from St. Augustine (P. L., CXCV); "De Laude Crucis" (ibid.); "Soliloquium seu Meditationes" (ibid.); "Ad Beatam Virginem Deiparam sermo panegyricus" (ibid., CLXXXIV); "De sanctâ Elizabethâ virgine", a biography of his sister, a Benedictine nun and a famous visionary and mystic (see ELIZABETH OF SCHÖNAU), a portion of which is in P. L., CXCV, also in "Acta SS.", June, IV, 501 sqq. (ed. Palmé, 1867). A complete edition of his works is found in Roth, "Die Visionen der hl. Elisabeth und die Schriften der Aebte Ekbert und Emecho von Schönau" (Brünn, 1884).

STREBER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Egbert;* HURTER, *Nomenclator* (Innsbruck, 1889), IV; CHEVALIER, *Bio-Bibl.* (Paris, 1905), s. v.

FRANCIS J. SCHAEFER.

Eckhart, JOHANN GEORG VON (called ECCARD before he was ennobled), German historian, b. at Duingen in the principality of Kalenberg, 7 Sept., 1664; d. at Würzburg, 9 Feb., 1730. After a good preparatory training at Schulpforta he went to Leipzig, where at first, at the desire of his mother, he studied theology, but soon turned his attention to philology and history. On completing his course he became secretary to Field-Marshal Count Flemming, the chief minister of the Elector of Saxony; after a short time, however, he went to Hanover to find a permanent position. Owing to his extensive learning he was soon useful to the famous historian Leibniz, who, in 1694, took Eckhart as assistant and was, until death, his large-hearted patron and generous friend. Through the efforts of Leibniz Eckhart was appointed professor of history at Helmstedt in 1706, and in 1714 councillor at Hanover. After the death of Leibniz he was made librarian and historiographer of the royal family of Hanover, and was soon after ennobled by Emperor Charles VI, to whom he had dedicated his work "Origines Austriacæ". For reasons which have never been clearly explained he gave up his position, in 1723, and fled from Hanover, perhaps on account of debt, to the Benedictine monastery of Corvey, and thence to the Jesuits at Cologne, where he became a Catholic. Not long after this the Prince-Bishop of Würzburg, Johann Philipp von Schönborn, appointed Eckhart his librarian and historiographer. In his work Eckhart was influenced by the new school of French historians, and gave careful attention to the so-called auxiliary sciences, above all to diplomatics; he also strove earnestly to follow a strictly scientific method in his treatment of historical materials. Together with Leibniz he may be considered as a founder of the critical school of historical writing. Besides the help he rendered Leibniz, of whom he prepared an affectionately respectful obituary (in Murr, "Journal für Kunstgeschichte", VII), he issued a number of independent works. His chief work, while professor at Helmstedt, is his "Historia studii etymologici linguæ germanicæ hactenus impensi" (Hanover, 1711), a literary and historical study of all works bearing on the investigation of the Teutonic languages. At Hanover he compiled a "Corpus historicum medii ævi" (Leipzig, 1723), in two volumes, at Würzburg he published the "Commentarii de reb-

Franciæ Orientalis et episcopatus Wirceburgensis" (1729), also in two volumes, an excellent work whose rich materials are treated with scientific exactness.

BÖNICKE, *Grundriss einer Geschichte von der Universität Würzburg* (Würzburg, 1782), II, 12–27; *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie* (Leipzig, 1877), V, 627–631.

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

Eckhart (ECKARD, ECCARD), JOHANN, MEISTER (the Master), Dominican preacher, theologian, and mystic, b. about 1260 at Hochheim, near Gotha; d. in 1327 at Cologne. He made his philosophical and theological studies in the Dominican Order. Although a profound mystic he was also an able man of affairs, admirably manifesting the spirit of his order by uniting throughout his career great activity with contemplation. After a period of teaching he was made, in 1298, prior of the Dominican convent at Erfurt and vicar-provincial of Thuringia. Two years later he began to lecture at Paris, where in 1302 his order gave him the degree of Master of Sacred Theology. In the following year he was elected provincial of the Province of Saxony, to which office he was re-elected in 1307, when he was also appointed vicar-general of Bohemia and charged to reform its convents. His term of office having expired in 1311, he again took a professorial chair at Paris, whence he went in 1314 to teach at Strasburg. After three years he was made prior at Frankfort. He finally returned to the schools in 1320, when he was made first professor of his order at Cologne, where he remained until his death.

Eckhart's activity was also displayed in the pulpit, of which he was an illustrious ornament, and by his writings in the form of treatises and sayings. As a preacher he disdained rhetorical flourish and avoided oratorical passion; but effectively employed the simple arts of oratory and gave remarkable expression to a hearty sympathy. Using pure language and a simple style, he has left us in his sermons specimens of the beautiful German prose of which he was a master. In these sermons, really short catecheses, we find frequent citations from such writers as Seneca and Avicenna, as well as from the theologians and Fathers. His discourses are directed to the intellect rather than to the will and are remarkable for their depth of mystical teaching, which only those who were advanced in the spiritual life could fully appreciate. His favourite themes are the Divine essence, the relations between God and man, the faculties, gifts, and operations of the human soul, the return of all created things to God. These and kindred subjects he develops more at length in his treatises, which partake of the catechetical character of his sermons. In his sayings he presents them in short and pithy form. Although the writings of Eckhart do not present a connected and studied system, they reveal the mind of the philosopher, the theologian, and the mystic. The studies of Henry Denifle, O.P., while showing Eckhart to have been less of a philosopher than he was supposed to be, show also that he was a Scholastic theologian of very superior merit, although not of the first order. He followed the teaching of Albert the Great and of St. Thomas Aquinas, but departed from their Scholastic method and form. Some opponents of Scholasticism, admiring his aphorisms and originality of method, have pronounced him to be the greatest thinker before Luther. And there have been Protestants who called him a Reformer. It was, however, as a mystic that Eckhart excelled. He is held by many to have been the greatest among the German mystics, and by all to have been the father of German mysticism. To Tauler and Suso he gave not only ideas but also a clear, simple style, possessing a heartiness like that of his own. Although he frequently quotes from the writings of the Pseudo-Areopagite and of John Scotus Eriugena, in his mysticism he follows more closely the teaching of Hugh of St. Victor.

The very nature of Eckhart's subjects and the untechnicality of his language were calculated to cause him to be misunderstood, not only by the ordinary hearers of his sermons, but also by the Schoolmen who listened to him or read his treatises. And it must be admitted that some of the sentences in his sermons and treatises were Beghardic, quietistic, or pantheistic. But although he occasionally allowed harmful sentences to proceed from his lips or his pen, he not unfrequently gave an antidote in the same sermons and treatises. And the general tenor of his teaching shows that he was not a Beghard, nor a quietist, nor a pantheist. While at Strasburg, although he had no relations with the Beghards (q. v.), he was suspected of holding their mystical pantheism. Later, at Frankfort suspicion was cast upon his moral conduct, but it was evidently groundless; for, after an investigation ordered by the Dominican general, he was appointed to a prominent position at Cologne. Finally the charge was made at a general chapter of his order, held at Venice in 1325, that some of the German brethren were disseminating dangerous doctrine. Father Nicholas, O.P., of Strasburg, having been ordered by Pope John XXII to make investigation, declared in the following year that the works of Eckhart were orthodox. In January, 1327, Archbishop Heinrich of Cologne undertook an independent inquiry, whereupon Eckhart and Father Nicholas appealed to Rome against his action and authority in the matter. But the next month, from the pulpit of the Dominican church in Cologne, Eckhart repudiated the unorthodox sense in which some of his utterances could be interpreted, retracted all possible errors, and submitted to the Holy See. His profession of faith, repudiation of error, and submission to the Holy See were declared by Pope John XXII in the Bull "Dolentes referimus" (27 March, 1329), by which the pontiff condemned seventeen of Eckhart's propositions as heretical, and eleven as ill-sounding, rash, and suspected of heresy (Denzinger, Enchiridion, no. 428 sqq.; Hartzheim, Conc. Germ., IV, 631).

The entire works of Eckhart have not been preserved. Pfeiffer in "Deutsche Mystiker des 14. Jahrhunderts" (1857), II, has given an incomplete edition of his sermons. Additions have been made by Sievers in "Zeitschrift für deutsche Alterthümer", XV, 373 sqq.; Wackernagel in "Altdeutsche Predigten" (1876), 156 sqq., 172 sqq.; Berlinger in "Alemannia", III, 15 sqq.; Bech in "Germania", VIII, 223 sqq.; X, 391 sqq.; Jundt in "Histoire du Panthéisme" (1875), 231 sqq. There is a translation in High German by Landauer, "Meister Eckharts mystische Schriften" (1903). Eckhart's Latin works bore the title "Opus Tripartitum". In the first part (Opus propositionum) there are over one thousand theses, which are explained in the second part (Opus quæstionum), and proved in the third part (Opus expositionum). Of these only the three prologues are known. Denifle discovered also a portion of the third part, part of an explanation of Genesis, a commentary on Exodus, Sirach, xxiv, Wisdom, and other fragments.

QUÉTIF AND ECHARD, *Script. Ord. Pr.*, I, 507–8; BACH, *Meister Eckhardt, der Vater der deutschen Speculation als Beitrag zu einer Gesch. der deutschen Theol. und Phil. der mittleren Zeit* (Vienna, 1864); DENIFLE in *Zeitschr. f. deutsche Alterth.* (1885), 259–66; IDEM, *Meister Eckharts lateinische Schriften und die Grundanschauung seiner Lehre* in *Archiv für Litteratur und Kircheng. des Mittelalters* (1886), II, 417–532, 672; HARTMANN, *Die Geheimlehre in der christlichen Religion nach den Erklärungen von Meister Eckhart* (Leipzig, 1895); GRABMANN, *Die Lehre des hl. Thomas von der "Scintilla animæ" in ihrer Bedeutung für die deutsche Mystik in Predigerorden* in *Jahrbuch für Phil. u. spek. Theol.* (1900), XIV, 413–27.

A. L. MCMAHON.

Eckhel, JOSEPH HILARIUS, German numismatist, b. 13 January, 1737, at Enzesfeld near Pottenstein, in Lower Austria, where his father, Johann Anton Eckhel, was steward to the Prince of Montecuculi; d. 16 May, 1798. In 1745 he was sent to study in Vienna,

in 1751 was admitted into the Society of Jesus, and thirteen years later was ordained priest. He had studied humanities in Leoben and philosophy in Graz, besides mathematics, Greek, and Hebrew. The first fruit of his literary labours, produced in his twenty-first year, was an "Exercitium grammaticum in prophetiam Obadiæ". This he published as an appendix to the "Institutiones linguæ sacræ" of P. J. Engstler. After his ordination, and probably for some time before, he was professor at the Jesuit gymnasia at Leoben and Steyer; probably also at Judenburg, and finally at the college of Vienna, where he taught poetry and rhetoric, and acquired a mastery of Latin, which he handled with ease and elegance. We still possess two rather comprehensive odes from his pen, "Plausus Urbis" and "Plausus Ruris". He left, besides, two German poems written for special occasions, in the style of that period, and a speech of the same nature delivered on the occasion of the journey of Emperor Joseph II to Italy.

How he became a numismatist, Eckhel himself has told us in the preface to his "Numi veteres anecdoti". Whilst teaching at the Academic Gymnasium he became interested in its cabinet of coins, which was under the supervision of his fellow-Jesuit, P. Khell. The collection, containing principally Greek coins, had attained considerable size, through the exertions of the learned Erasmus Fröhlich, who had edited a catalogue of most of the ancient coins; Eckhel set to work selecting the coins which were as yet unknown and unedited, and added thereto the unedited coins of the choice collections of Count Michael Viczay and Paul Festetics. Forced by ill-health to abandon teaching, he devoted himself entirely to numismatics and archæology. With the permission of his superior he went to Italy in 1772 for his further education. In Bologna and Rome he studied all the accessible coin collections, but found his richest treasures in Florence. Raimundo Cocchi, prefect of the Archducal Museum, received him most cordially and obtained for him the commission to arrange the coins which had been collected by Cardinal Leopoldo de' Medici, and which had afterwards been very considerably increased. Cocchi, who died shortly after this, recommended Eckhel to the Archduke Peter Leopold, who in turn introduced him to his mother, the Empress Maria Theresa. Meanwhile (1773) the Society of Jesus was suppressed, and Eckhel, like his brethren, was secularized. Returning to Vienna through the South of France in January, 1774, he was delighted to be entrusted by the empress with the task of transferring the collection which belonged to the university college of the Jesuits, to the court cabinet, where, however, it received a separate place. In March of the same year, having acquired an excellent reputation as a numismatist, he was named director of the cabinet of ancient coins, with Duval as his superior. After the latter's death (1775) he received sole charge. Eckhel was commissioned to deliver bi-weekly lectures on numismatics in the coin cabinet. In the fall of 1775 he was promoted to the chair of antiquities and of the historical auxiliary sciences in the university. In the same year his first numismatic publication appeared.

Joseph Hilarius Eckhel

J. von Bergmann writes of Eckhel's official work: "Eckhel, as is everywhere evident, was an expert administrator of the treasure committed to his charge. Without much ado, without ostentation, he wrote only what was needful and regarded merely that which was essential. Besides his very simple accounts and some reports written during the twenty-four years of his incumbency, only a very few documents concerning the collection of antique coins are in existence. He enriched the cabinet without advertising it." He obtained the means for these acquisitions from the proceeds of the sale of duplicates of gold and silver coins. The duplication of examples resulted from the amalgamation of the collection of Francis I with that of the imperial family. Moreover, the series of the Persian and Parthian kings were transferred from the Oriental to the ancient department. The collection of Duke Charles of Lorraine, that of the Count of Ariosti, and a selection of coins from the collections of suppressed monasteries were added. By means of embassies and lucky finds the coin cabinet acquired important additions (e. g. those of Osztropataka and Szilagy-Somlyo). As a professor in the university Eckhel lectured on ancient numismatics. His delivery is described as being simple, clear, instructive, inspiring, and often abounding in humour. He was highly respected by his pupils. That he also enjoyed high repute among his colleagues is attested by his appointment as dean of the philosophical faculty in 1789. However, he soon resigned this position.

The first numismatic work published by Eckhel was "Numi veteres anecdoti ex museis Cæsareo Vindobonensi, Florentino Magni Ducis Etruriæ, Granelliano nunc Cæsareo, Vitzaiano, Festeticsiano, Savorgnano Veneto aliisque" (Vienna, 1775, in two 4to sections with 17 copperplates). "Catalogus Musei Cæsariensis" (Vienna, in two large folio parts with numerous illustrations) followed four years later. Eckhel had given the collection entrusted to him an entirely new arrangement, discarding the time-honoured alphabetical order, and substituting quite a new system. He divided ancient numismatics into two departments: the first contained the coins minted by cities other than Rome, arranged according to the geographical situation of the countries as far as this was possible; the second comprised all the coins of the Roman Empire. First come the important but crude *asses*, then the unclassified pieces with the inscription *Roma*. They are followed by those of the various families, emperors, and empresses, all arranged as far as possible in chronological order. Those whose date could not be exactly obtained are placed after each emperor as unclassified in alphabetical succession. "By this method", says Eckhel, "the author was enabled to rectify countless errors which Mezzabarba had forced upon us in his General Catalogue" (Imperatorum Romanorum numismata, Milan, 1683). And to make these corrections principally led him to prepare this catalogue for print. In it he gives an account, not on outside authority, but from personal observation and after lengthy and painstaking research, of everything instructive which so numerous a collection presents. The work was written in Latin and, "contrary to the present ornamental style, in the simplest language". This catalogue was followed by "Sylloge II, numorum veterum anecdotorum Thesauri Cæsarei" and "Descriptio numorum Antiochiæ" (1786), then by the classical work "Doctrina numorum veterum", in eight volumes (1792–1798). Friedrich Kenner says of this: "Misguided dilettantism had produced most mischievous results in the field of numismatics. Lack of system, want of critical judgment, and the disorderly arrangement of the literature had begotten confusion and distrust, which prevented numismatics from taking the place among other sciences to which it was entitled. With his naturally critical eye, Eckhel mastered all the literature of his subject, eliminated errors and forgeries with the help of his profound learning, and then combined the results into an organic whole in his 'Doctrina numorum veterum'. . . . Eckhel has become the founder of the scientific numismatics of classical antiquity and taken his place alongside of his contemporaries, Heyne and Winckelmann. Numis-

matics, hitherto despised, he changed into a kind of encyclopedia of classical antiquities, which includes extensive and much-used sources for other branches of archæology." The addenda to this work which Eckhel entered in his manuscript copy were edited by his successor, Steinbüchel.

By command of Emperor Joseph II, Eckhel wrote an excellent manual, "Kurzgefasste Anfangsgründe zur alten Numismatik" (Vienna, 1787; 2nd ed., 1807). The work appeared in a Latin translation in 1799 and in a French revision in 1825. He edited, besides, "Choix des pierres gravées du Cabinet Impérial". Furthermore, a number of smaller treatises still exist in manuscript form. His "Inscriptiones veteres" was used by Theodore Mommsen. He also left an extensive correspondence with the most prominent representatives of his branch of learning (Abbé Barthélemy, R. Cocchi, Cousinéry, L. Lanzi, G. Marini, F. Séguier, and others).

Eckhel died shortly after the completion of his "Doctrina". He was, as Bergmann writes, "a man of firm and decided character, serious, but at the same time cheerful, indulging in sarcastic, and at times heated, attacks on cant and literary arrogance. He used his extensive learning to correct thousands of blunders committed by other writers, and was modest and not at all disputatious in his controversies. He spoke as he thought and acted as he spoke." Later scholars rank Eckhel's scientific importance equally high. On the first centenary of his birth a medal was struck (by Manfredini) with the inscription, SYSTEMATIS. REI. NVMARIÆ. ANTIQVÆ. CONDITORI. The distich which Michael Denis dedicated to his dead friend will vindicate its own truth:—

Eckhelium brevis hora tulit, sed diva Moneta
Scripta viri secum vivere secla jubet.

VON BERGMANN, *Dem Andenken des Abbé J. H. Eckhel* in *Sitzungsberichte der phil. Classe der kaiserl. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, XXIV (1857), 296–364; KENNER, *Eckhel, ein Vortrag* (Vienna, 1871); the same in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, V (1877), 633 sqq.

KARL DOMANIG.

Eclecticism (Gr. ἐκ, λέγειν; Lat. *eligere*, to select), a philosophical term meaning either a tendency of mind in a thinker to conciliate the different views or positions taken in regard to problems, or a system in philosophy which seeks the solution of its fundamental problems by selecting and uniting what it regards as true in the various philosophical schools. In the first sense, eclecticism is a characteristic of all the great philosophers, with special development in some, such as Leibniz; an element of the integral method of philosophy more or less emphasized in the divers schools. The term *eclectics*, however, is properly applied to those who accept Eclecticism as the true and fundamental system of philosophy. It is with Eclecticism in this strict sense that we are dealing here.

As a rule, in the history of philosophy, Eclecticism follows a period of scepticism. In presence of conflicting doctrines regarding nature, life, and God, the human mind despairs of attaining scientific and exact knowledge about these important subjects. Eclecticism then aims at constructing a system broad and vague enough to include, or not to exclude, the principles of the divers schools, though giving at times more importance to those of one school, and apparently sufficient to furnish a basis for the conduct of life. In the latter period of Greek philosophy, during the two centuries preceding the Christian Era and the three centuries following, Eclecticism is represented among the Epicureans by Asclepiades of Bithynia; among the Stoics by Boethus, Panetius of Rhodes, (about 180–110 B. C.), Posidonius (about 50 B. C.), and later on by the neo-Cynics, Demetrius and Demonax (about A. D. 150); in the New Academy by Philo of Larissa (about 80 B. C.) and Antiochus of Ascalon (d. 68 B. C.): in the Peripatetic School by Andronicus of Rhodes (about 70 B. C.), the editor and commentator of the works of Aristotle, and later on by Aristocles (about A. D. 180), Alexander of Aphrodisias (about A. D. 200), the physician Galen (A. D. 131–201), Porphyry in the third, and Simplicius in the sixth, century of our era. The eclectic system was, by its character, the one which was best suited to the practical mind of the Romans. With the exception of Lucretius's doctrine, their speculative philosophy was always and altogether eclectic, while Stoicism dominated in their ethical philosophy. Cicero is, in Rome, the best representative of this school. His philosophy is a mixture of the scepticism of the Middle Academy with Stoicism and Peripateticism. The School of the Sextians, with Quintus Sextius (80 B. C.), Sotion, and Celsus, was partly Stoic and Cynic, partly Pythagorean. Under the empire, Seneca, Epictetus the slave, and the Emperor Marcus Aurelius combined the principles of Stoicism with some doctrines taken from Platonism. The neo-Platonic School of Alexandria, in the second and third centuries after Christ, is considered by some as eclectic; but the designation is not exact. The school borrows, indeed, many of its principles from Pythagoreanism, Stoicism, Peripateticism, and especially from Platonism; but all these doctrines are dominated by and interpreted according to certain principles of religious mysticism which make this neo-Platonism an original though syncretic system. The same may be said of the Christian writers of this school who take some of their philosophical principles from the dominant systems, but who are guided in their choice as well as in their interpretation by the teaching of Christian revelation.

In modern times Eclecticism has been accepted in Germany by Wolff and his disciples. It has received its most characteristic form in France in the nineteenth century from Victor Cousin (1792–1867) and his school, which is sometimes called the Spiritualistic School. Drawn away from sensualism by the teaching of Royer Collard, Cousin seeks in the Scottish School a sufficient foundation for the chief metaphysical, moral, and religious truths. Failing in this attempt, he takes up the different doctrines then current; he is successively influenced by Maine de Biran whom he calls "the greatest metaphysician of our time", by the writings of Kant, and by personal intercourse with Schelling and Hegel; finally, he turns to the works of Plato, Plotinus, and Proclus, only to come back to Descartes and Leibniz. He then reaches the conclusion that the successive systems elaborated throughout the preceding ages contain the full development of human thought; that the complete truth is to be found in a system resulting from the happy fusion, under the guidance of common sense, of the fragmentary thoughts expressed by the different thinkers and schools of all ages. Four great systems, he says, express and summarize the whole development of human speculation: sensism, idealism, scepticism, and mysticism. Each contains a part of the truth; none possesses exclusively the whole truth. Human thought cannot invent any new system, nor can it neglect any of the old ones. Not the destruction of any of them, but the reduction of all to one, will put us in possession of the truth.

There is, indeed, something true in Eclecticism. It would be folly for each thinker to deliberately ignore all that has been said and taught before him; such a method would render progress impossible. The experience and knowledge acquired by past ages is a factor in the development of human thought. The history of philosophy is useful; it places at our disposal the truths already discovered, and by showing us the errors into which philosophy has fallen, it guards us against them and against the principles or methods which have caused them. This is the element of value contained in the system. But Eclecticism errs when it substitutes for personal reflection

as the primary source of philosophy a mere fusion of systems, or the history of philosophy for philosophy proper. Eclecticism does not furnish us with the ultimate principles of philosophy or the criterion of certitude. We cannot say that philosophy has reached the highest degree of precision either in its solution or in its presentation of every problem; nor that it knows all that can be known about nature, man, or God. But even if this were the case, the principles of Eclecticism cannot provide us with a firm, complete, and true system of philosophy. Cousin says that there is some truth in every system; supposing this to be exact, this partial truth has evidently to be acquired at first through principles and a rule of certitude which are independent of Eclecticism. When Cousin declares that there is a mingling of truth and error in every system, he evidently assumes a principle superior and antecedent to the very principle of Eclecticism. The eclectic must first separate error from truth before building into a system the results of his discrimination. But this is possible only on the condition of passing a judgment upon each of these systems and therefore of having, quite apart from history, some rational principle as an ultimate criterion. In a word, Eclecticism, considered as a study of the opinions and theories of others in order to find in them some help and enlightenment, has its place in philosophy; it is a part of philosophic method; but as a doctrine it is altogether inadequate.

SUIDAS, ed. BERNHARDY, *Lexikon* (2 vols., Halle, 1853); RITTER AND PRELLER, *Historia Philosophiæ Græcæ* (Gotha, 1888); ZELLER, *Die Philosophie der Griechen* (Leipzig, 1892); ALLEYNE, *Eclectics* (London, 1881); COUSIN, *Histoire générale de la philosophie* (Paris, 1884); LEROUX, *Réfutation de l'Eclectisme* (Paris, 1839); TAINE, *Les philosophes classiques du XIX^e siècle* (Paris, 1876), vi, xii; MERCIER, *Critériologie générale* (Louvain, 1900), III, i.

G. M. SAUVAGE.

Ecstasy.—Supernatural ecstasy may be defined as a state which, while it lasts, includes two elements: the one, interior and invisible, when the mind rivets its attention on a religious subject; the other, corporeal and visible, when the activity of the senses is suspended, so that not only are external sensations incapable of influencing the soul, but considerable difficulty is experienced in awakening such sensations, and this whether the ecstatic himself desires to do so, or others attempt to quicken the organs into action. That quite a large number of the saints have been granted ecstasies is attested by hagiology; and nowadays even free-thinkers are slow to deny historical facts that rest on so solid a basis. They no longer endeavour, as did their predecessors of the eighteenth century, to explain them away as grounded on fraud; several, indeed, abandoning the pathological theory, current in the nineteenth century, have advocated the psychological explanation, though they exaggerate its force.

FALSE VIEWS ON THE QUESTION OF ECSTASY.—The first three errors here mentioned are psychological in nature; they fail to estimate at its proper value the content of ecstasy; the other false theories spoken of identify this state with certain morbid physical or psychological conditions.

(1) Certain infidel philosophers maintain that during an ecstasy there is a lessening of intellectual power, that at a certain stage there is an utter loss of the ego, an annihilation of the faculties. This is the theory of Murisier and of Leuba. The arguments for this view are based upon an exaggerated interpretation of certain phrases used by the mystics. Their accounts, however (those, for instance, of Blessed Angela of Foligno), give the lie to such an explanation. The mystics state clearly that they experience, not only the fullness, but the superabundance of intelligence, an increase of activity of the highest faculties. Now, in a science that is based on observation, as is mysticism, we are not justified in brushing aside the numerous and consistent testimonies of those who have tested the facts, and putting in their place the creations of the imagination.

(2) The theory of unconsciousness distorts the facts so unscrupulously that some writers have preferred a theory less crude, i. e. the emotional explanation. The ecstatic, it is admitted, is not buried in a heavy sleep; rather, he experiences violent emotions, in consequence of which he loses the use of the senses; and as there is nothing new to occupy his attention, it follows that his mind is taken up by some trifling thought, so trifling, indeed, that these writers deem it unworthy of their notice. This theory clashes less with historical data than does the first, since it does not wholly eliminate the activity of the ecstatic; but it denies half the facts emphatically urged by the mystical writers.

(3) It has been said that ecstasy is perhaps a phenomenon wholly natural, such as might well be occasioned by a strong concentration of the mind on a religious subject. But if we are not to rest satisfied with arbitrary conjectures, we must show that similar facts have been observed in spheres of thought other than purely religious. The ancients attributed natural ecstasies to three or four sages, such as Archimedes and Socrates, but, as the present writer has proved elsewhere, these stories are founded either on inconclusive arguments or upon false interpretation of the facts (Des grâces d'oraison, c. xxxi).

(4) The rigid condition of the ecstatic's body has given rise to a fourth error. Ecstasy, we are told, is but another form of lethargy or catalepsy. The loss of consciousness, however, that accompanies these latter states points to a marked difference.

(5) In view of this, some have sought to identify ecstasy with the hypnotic state. Physically, there are usually some points of contrast. Ecstasy is always accompanied by noble attitudes of the body, whereas in hospitals one often marks motions of the body that are convulsive or repelling; barring, of course, any counter-command of the hypnotist. The chief difference, though, is to be found in the soul. The intellectual faculties, in the case of the saints, became keener. The sick in our hospitals, on the contrary, experience during their trances a lessening of their intelligences, while the gain is only a slight representation in the imagination. A single idea, let it be ever so trivial, e. g. that of a flower, or a bird, is strong enough to fasten upon it their profound and undivided attention. This is what is meant by the narrowing of the field of consciousness; and this is precisely the starting-point of all theories that have been advanced to explain hypnotic ecstasy. Moreover, the hallucination noticed in the case of these patients consists always of representations of the imagination. They are visual, auricular, or tactual; consequently they differ widely from the purely intellectual perceptions which the saints usually enjoy. It is no longer possible, then, to start with the extremely simple hypothesis that the two kinds of phenomena are one and the same.

A comparison of the effects that follow these states will bring out more clearly the essential difference between the two. (a) The neuropath, after an hypnotic trance, is dull, lifeless, and depressed. (b) His will is extremely weak. In this abnormal weakness is to be sought the reason why the subject can no longer resist suggestion. These poor creatures, distraught, listless, and helpless, pass their days in idle dreams. (c) The level of their morality is frequently almost as low as that of their intelligence. From a threefold point of view, then, there is a contrast between their case and that of the saints who have been granted ecstasies. (a) The latter possess strong intellects, conceiving projects lofty and difficult in the execution; in proof of this assertion we might appeal to the history of the founders of religious orders. (b) Their will-power is second to none in energy; so strong, indeed, as to enable them to break through all opposition, especially that which arises from their own na-

ture. (c) Lastly, the saints keep before them a moral ideal of a lofty character, the need of self-forgetfulness if they would give themselves to the glory of God and the temporal and spiritual welfare of their fellow-men. The hysterical subject of hypnotism, on the contrary, combines in himself none of these noble qualities.

(6) An attempt has been made to rank ecstasy with somnambulism, with which have also been classed, but with greater reason, the trances of spirit mediums. The case which most approaches, on the surface, the ecstasy of the saints is that of Helen Smith, of Geneva, whom Professor Flournoy studied carefully during the closing years of the nineteenth century. During the crises of spontaneous somnambulism she described her visions in word or in writing. At one time she saw the inhabitants of the planet Mars, at another she dwelt among the Arabs or the Hindus of the fourteenth century. In 1904 she had crises lasting a quarter of an hour, during which she painted in oil pictures of Christ and the Madonna, though she was quite unconscious of what she was doing. The ecstasies of the saints were, it was thought, of exactly the same nature. There are, however, some striking differences: (a) From the moral viewpoint the visions of the saints produce a remarkable change in their manner of life, and lead them to the exercise of the most difficult virtues. Helen experiences nothing of the kind. She is a good woman, that is all. (b) Unlike the saints, she remembers nothing of what she has seen. (c) While the vision lasts, the faculties at play are not the same. In the case of the saints, the activity of the imagination is arrested during the culminating periods, and throughout always holds a subsidiary place, while the intellect undergoes a marvellous expansion. In the case of Helen, the imagination alone was at work, and its objects were of the most commonplace character. Not a single elevated thought; simply descriptions of houses, animals, or plants—nothing but a mere copy of what we see on earth. Such descriptions serve only as stories to amuse children.

(7) A seventh theory would identify ecstasy with the wild reveries and disordered fancies occasioned by the use of alcohol, ether, chloroform, opium, morphine, or nitrous oxide. In the first place, the physical condition is quite different. No one, for instance, would mistake the exalted attitude of an ecstatic for that of a man under the influence of narcotics. Secondly, the mental perceptions are not the same in character. For if the slave of the drugs we have mentioned above does not lose all consciousness, if he still retains any ideas, they consist of extravagant, incoherent images, whereas the ideas and thoughts of the mystic are throughout coherent and elevated. Finally, the victims of alcohol and of opium, on recovering from their debauch, remain in a state of sottishness. Thought and action are simultaneously lessened; the moral and the social life have equally suffered. The use of narcotics has never enabled a man to lead a purer life or to better himself and others; experience points to the contrary.

These, then, are the false views that have been entertained on the question of ecstasy. Nor should it be a matter of surprise that free-thinkers should have ventured on these explanations. It is but the conclusion that follows logically from the principles with which they start, i. e., there is no such thing as the supernatural. They must, then, at any cost, seek the causes in natural phenomena. (See CONTEMPLATION.)

B. Angelæ de Fulgineo Visionum et Instructionum Liber (reprinted Cologne, 1601); *Acta SS.*, 4 Jan.; tr. CRUIKSHANK (Derby, 1872; New York, 1903); RUYSBROECK, *Opera omnia* (Cologne, 1652); LEONE ed., *Obras de Santa Teresa* (Salamanca, 1588); ALVAREZ DE PAZ, *De inquisitione pacis* (Lyons, 1617); JOSEPHUS A SPIRITU SANCTO, *Cursus theologiæ mysticæ*, 6 vols. (Seville, 1710–1740); POULAIN, *Des grâces d'oraison*, 6th ed. (Paris, 1909).

AUG. POULAIN.

Ecthesis. See HERACLIUS, EMPEROR; MONOTHELITES.

Ecuador, REPUBLIC OF (LA REPÚBLICA DEL ECUADOR), an independent state of South America, bounded on the north by Colombia, on the east by Brazil, on the south by Peru, and on the west by the Pacific Ocean. The north-western corner of the State is crossed by the Equator, hence its name. No part of America has been so prominent for scientific explorations, specially geographic and physiographic, carried out on a large scale in the eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth century. One, sent out in 1735 by the French Government for the purpose of measuring the meridian near the Equator, recalls the names of La Condamine and Bouguer. The other (1799–1804) forever associates Alexander von Humboldt with the history of the New World.

AREA, PHYSICAL FEATURES, ETC.—Ecuador is the third smallest of the South American republics. It forms, approximately, an isosceles triangle wedged in between Colombia and Peru. Indenting the south-west coast is the Gulf of Guayaquil within which lies the large Island of Puná. As in the case of other South American republics, the boundaries of Ecuador are ill-defined and subject to modification by treaty. Its area is variously given as from 80,300 to 152,000 sq. miles, to which must be added the Galapagos Islands in the Pacific, lying about 90°–92° west long., 10 degrees off the coast, and covering from 2490 to 3000 sq. miles. These islands are about ten in number, only one of which (Isabella or Albemarle) is inhabited by some two hundred people. The eastern half of Ecuador is low, wooded, and traversed by many rivers emptying into the Marañon or Upper Amazon; the western is very mountainous, the high Andes chain dividing the two sections. This mountain range runs nearly due south from the southern boundary of Colombia to the Peruvian frontier. It has a number of high peaks, all of volcanic origin, among them Chimborazo (20,500 ft.), and many volcanoes. Of the latter, Cotopaxi (19,613 ft.), Tunguragua (16,690 ft.), and Sangai (17,464 ft.) are still active; Antisana (19,335 ft.), Pichincha (15,918 ft.), etc. have been extinct for a century or more; while Altar, Cotocachi, etc. show traces only of activity in ages long past. The Ecuadorian table-land and higher mountain valleys are temperate, though the temperature is low in the greater altitudes. The year is divided into the dry and the wet season. Under the Equator, however, there is little difference between the seasons. The coast valleys and shores are very hot and the climate generally unhealthful. Ecuador has but one navigable river, the Guayas, which empties into the Gulf of Guayaquil. The other streams of Western Ecuador are of little importance. The flora is luxuriant except in high altitudes. Both lower slopes of the Andes are densely wooded. On the coast there is an arid zone of limited extent; the larger portion, however, is very fertile as far as the Peruvian boundary at Tumbez. The inland forests in the south are rich in cinchona bark, and extend easterly to a height of nearly 10,000 feet. Then follows a sub-Andean zone for the next 3500 feet, in which cereals thrive in an average temperature of from 53° to 59° Fahr. This is followed by what are called the *páramos*, cold and stormy wastes, treeless, and exposed to daily snows, which reach an altitude of 15,000 feet above sea-level, and where the tough puna-grass flourishes. On the eastern slope of the Andes dense forests are found again and the cinnamon tree. Animal life is tropical and is found in proportion to the vegetation. As far as known Ecuador is fairly rich in minerals. It is the only South American state, with the exception of Colombia, where emeralds have been found in any quantity (near the coast at Manta and Esmeraldas); their location, however, is uncertain.

The population is estimated at 1,272,000, of whom about 400,000 are supposed to be Indians. Exact statistics, however, do not exist. Of the 400,000, one-

half is allowed to the wild forest-tribes of the Eastern section and the other half to the remnants of the diverse sedentary tribes which formerly occupied the table-land and coast. The whole country is divided into fifteen provinces besides the Eastern territory and the Galapagos Islands.

History.—Of the pre-Columbian conditions and languages of the Indians of Ecuador little is known. The coast tribes have almost disappeared and those of the higher regions have adopted Spanish customs. That they differed from the Peruvian Quichua seems likely. The best-known were the Cañaris, the Carangas, and the Puruaes or Puruays; a tribe known as the Scyri is mentioned in the neighbourhood of Quito. They were all sedentary; knew how to work gold, silver, copper, and possibly bronze; and practised the fetichism common to primitive Americans. The coast tribes built their houses of wood and cane, while those of the interior used stone. They were skilful navigators, some of their vessels being estimated at thirty tons, and propelled by oars and cotton sails.

The Spaniards, led by Francisco Pizarro, first saw the coast of Ecuador in 1525. From Tacamez, or Atacames, where they touched, Pizarro dispatched Ruiz, his pilot, to the south. In the account of Pizarro we have the earliest description of the Ecuadorian coast people. He sailed south beyond the present limits of Peru, verifying his pilot's reports, and in 1528 returned to Spain to prepare for the conquest of Peru. He returned in 1531, landing at Coaque, and, marching south along the shore, established himself, despite the hostility of the natives, on the Island of Puná. The permanent Spanish occupation of Ecuador, however, began in 1534, from Piura in Peru under Sebastian de Belalcazar. He had a tedious campaign to Quito, in which he was assisted by the Cañaris. In 1534 three towns were established: San Francisco de Quito (15 Aug.) at Riobamba, thirteen days later transferred to its present site, Chimbo; and Guayaquil, also originally founded at a place distinct from the one it now occupies. Meanwhile Pedro de Alvarado had landed on the coast with a considerable force from Guatemala. Reaching the central plateau he was confronted by Belalcazar and Diego de Almagro the elder. An amicable agreement was reached, and Gonzalo Pizarro pushed into the cinnamon country, but made little headway and had to turn back. His lieutenant, Orellana, however, floated down the Amazon and landed on the Isle of Trinidad, whence he carried to Spain the first information about south-eastern Ecuador.

The second epoch of civil wars in Peru, the uprising of Gonzalo Pizarro against the viceroy Nuñez de la Vela, came to an end with the defeat and death of the viceroy near Quito, 16 Jan., 1546. Quito became the head-quarters of the Crown's representative, and with this as a basis the independence movement was put down. During the colonial period the Church founded institutions of learning such as the University of Quito and established a printing press at the same place in 1760. Political disturbances were few, but during the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries volcanic and seismic phenomena were frequent and often disastrous. An attempt was made in 1809 to overthrow the Spanish power, and Ecuador, Colombia, and Venezuela, together with the rest of Spanish South America, then engaged in efforts towards independence. In 1820 Guayaquil succeeded in throwing off Spanish control, and the battle of Pichincha (22 May, 1822) finally put an end to the domination of the mother country. Ecuador, with Colombia and Venezuela, next formed an independent confederacy until 1830, when the union was dissolved and the first Ecuadorian congress met. Since then Ecuador has been torn by internal dissensions and foreign complications, chiefly with Colombia. The opposing political parties are the Conservatives, or Clericals, and the Liberals. Since 1893 the latter have been in power and have to a great extent adopted a policy of secularization in church matters. From 1833 to 1908 Ecuador has had nineteen presidents.

Government, Education, etc.—Ecuador is a constitutional republic. From 1830 to 1883 it had no less than ten constitutions; the last was adopted in 1897. The executive head is the president, elected with the vice-president directly by the people for a term of four years. The senators (30) and the deputies (41) are also elected by direct vote, the former for four, the latter for two, years. Congress meets biennially at Quito, the capital, on 10 August, and is in session for sixty days. The principal cities are: Quito (80,000), Guayaquil (51,000), Cuenca (30,000), Riobamba (18,000), and five of 10,000 or more inhabitants. Guayaquil is the chief seaport. In 1904 Ecuador had 168 miles of railroad and 2565 miles of telegraph, both of which have since been added to. The monetary unit is the *sucre*, about equal to the *peso* of other Spanish-American countries, but subject to fluctuation in value. The chief exports are cacao, vegetable ivory, india-rubber, and straw hats.

Educational statistics are scanty. There is a university at Quito with thirty-two professors and two hundred and sixteen students (1905). Institutions for higher education are found at Guayaquil and Cuenca. The number of secondary schools is 35; primary schools 1088 with 1498 teachers and 68,380 pupils; and 9 high schools and colleges.

Religion.—Soon after the discovery of the country missionaries began their labours in Ecuador, and in 1545 the Bishopric of Quito was erected. Work among the different Indian tribes on the tributaries of the Amazon was difficult, and the Dominican missions were destroyed in 1599 by the savage Jivaros. Later, however, the Dominicans re-established themselves and were assisted by the Jesuits who had been in Quito since 1596. By the close of the seventeenth century Ecuador was well evangelized, but after the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1767, who on the Napo alone had thirty-three missions with 100,000 inhabitants, the Dominicans were unable to keep up the work and the natives fell back into paganism. The revolution destroyed all traces of two hundred years of untiring labours. Since 1848 Ecuador has formed an ecclesiastical province. The population is Catholic except for a small number of foreigners and a few pagan Indians in the East.

Up to 1861 the government was in the hands of the Liberal and largely anti-Catholic party. When Garcia Moreno (q. v.) was elected president (1861–65 and 1869–75), however, he reorganized civil and religious affairs. Under him a concordat (20 Nov., 1863) was concluded with Rome, new dioceses were erected, schools and missions given to the Jesuits (who had been recalled) and others, and in 1874, at the time of the spoliation of the Holy See, ten per cent of the State's income was guaranteed to the pope. Moreno was murdered 6 Aug., 1875, and his death not only put an end to the concordat, but under the new regime which succeeded him a series of persecutions occurred. In 1885, when Bishop Schumacher took charge, nearly all the native clergy were suspended and replaced by Europeans and practically a new hierarchy established. The religious and moral education of the people was likewise in bad condition. The revolution of Alfaro in 1895 was a severe blow to the Church. The orders, among them the Capuchins, Salesians, Missionaries of Steyl, and the various sisterhoods, were all banished and Bishop Schumacher obliged to flee.

The State religion is the Catholic, but other creeds are not interfered with. Since tithes were abolished the State has provided for the maintenance of Catholic worship; it also supports religious educational institutions, such as the three seminaries at Quito and six elsewhere, one in each of the six dioceses. Civil marriage was recognized in 1902, and two years later the

Church and its property were placed under State control. At the same time it was enacted that no new or foreign religious order would be permitted in the country. Suffragan to Quito, which became an archbishopric in 1848, are: Cuenca (1786), Guayaquil (1837), Ibarra (1862), Loja (1866), Puerto, or Porto, Viejo (1871), Riobamba (1863). There are also four vicariates Apostolic subject to the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs: Canelos and Macas, Mendez and Gualaquiza, Napo, Zamora.

The first known mention of the Ecuadorian coast is made by JUAN DE SAMANO, *Relación de los primeros descubrimientos de Francisco Pizarro y Diego de Almagro* (1525–26) in *Documentos para la Historia de España*, V.

Accounts of eyewitnesses on the Conquest: FRANCISCO DE XEREZ, *Verdadera relación della Conquista de la Perú y provincia del Cuzco llamada la nueva Castilla* (ed. 1534; Salamanca, 1547; and translations); *La Conquista del Perú llamada la nueva Castilla* (Seville, 1534); PEDRO PIZARRO, *Relación del descub. y conquista del Perú* (c. 1571) in *Doc. para la Hist. de España*, V.

Later sources are: CIEZA, *Primera Parte de la Crónica del Perú;* AUGUSTIN DE ZARATE, *Hist. del Descub. y Con. del Perú* (Antwerp, 1555); SANTA CLARA, *Hist. de las Guerras civiles del Perú* (Madrid, 1904); CIEZA, *La Guerra de Quito* in *Doc. para la Hist. de la España;* GARCILASSO DE LA VEGA, *Comentarios reales de los Incas* (Cordova, 1617); *Narratives of the Rites and Laws of the Incas*, ed. MARKHAM, (Hackluyt Soc., London, 1873), especially the first part, LOPEZ DE VELASCO, *Geogr. &ca. de Indias* (Madrid, 1892). Important documents are found in *Colección de Doc. de Indias* and in *Relaciones geog. de Indias* (Madrid), I, III. Cf. GOMARA, HERRERA, and, for beginning of Conquest, PETER MARTYR.—See also: JUAN DE VELASCO, *Hist. del Reyno de Quito* (Quito, 1841–42); ULLOA AND JORGE JUAN, *Relación hist. del viage á la América Meridional etc.* (Madrid, 1748); *Resumen hist. del orígen sucesión de los Incas etc.* (Caracas, 1830); LA CONDAMINE, *Journal du Voyage fait par ordre du roi à l'Equateur* (Paris, 1751); IDEM, *Hist. des pyramides de Quito* (Paris, 1751); HUMBOLDT, *Relación hist.* (Paris, 1816–31); *Vues des Cordillères etc.* (Paris, 1816); BENEDETTI, *Hist. de Colombia* (Lima, 1887); GONZALEZ SUÁREZ, *Hist. general de la Repúb. del Ecuador* (Quito, 1890); WOLF, *Geog. y geología del Ecuador* (Leipzig, 1892); STÜBEL, *Skizzen aus Ecuador* (Berlin, 1886); IDEM, *Die Vulkanberge von Ecuador* (Berlin, 1898); REISS AND STÜBEL, *Reisen in Süd-Amerika* (Berlin, 1890); KOLBERG, *Nach Ecuador* (Freiburg im Br., 1897); HASSAUREK, *Four Years Among Spanish Americans* (New York, 1876); WYMPER, *Travels Among the Great Andes of Ecuador* (London, 1892); see also publications of the Bureau of American Republics (Washington, D. C.) and *Dicc. Hisp.-Amer.* For history of printing in Ecuador see TORIBIO MEDINA, *La Imprenta en Quito* (Santiago, 1904).

AD. F. BANDELIER.

Ecumenical Council. See COUNCILS, GENERAL.

Edda, a title applied to two different collections of old Norse literature, the poetical or "Elder Edda" and the prose or "Younger Edda". Properly speaking the title belongs only to the latter work, having been given to the former through a misnomer.

I. "The Younger Edda", the work of the Icelandic historian and statesman Snorri Sturluson (1178–1241), is a treatise on poetics for the guidance of the skalds or Icelandic poets. The title "Edda" is given to this work in the most important manuscript which we possess of it, the "Upsala Codex", dating from about 1300. The meaning of the word *Edda* is not certain. The older explanation of "great-grandmother" is now generally discarded, the most commonly accepted rendering being "poetics" (from *óthr*, "spirit", "reason"). Some scholars derive the word from Oddi, the name of a place in southern Iceland, where Snorri received his earliest training. The work itself was intended to supply to the skald all the necessary information concerning mythology, poetic diction, and versification. Besides a *formáli* (preface) of later origin it contains three parts. (1) "Gylfaginning" (Gylfi's Deception), an abstract of old Scandinavian mythology in the form of a dialogue between King Gylfi and three gods. Appended to this are the "Bragaroedhur" (Bragi's Sayings), stories about Odhin and Thor, related by Bragi, the god of poetry, to the sea-god Aegir. (2) "Skaldskaparmál" (Diction of Poetry) is a collection of poetic paraphrases (*kenningar*) and synonyms (*ókend heiti*), interspersed with mythological and legendary stories. (3) "Háttatal", a panegyric on the Norwegian King Hákon Hákonarson and Jarl Skúli, containing one hundred and two strophes, each of which is composed in a different metre. This is followed by a prose commentary written, however, after Snorri's death by an unknown author. The work was unfinished when Snorri died and was subsequently revised and amplified by other writers. The best edition of the Snorra Edda is that published in three volumes by the Arna-Magnæan Society (Copenhagen, 1848–1887). Selections were edited by E. Wilken (Paderborn, 1877; glossary to this edition, Paderborn, 1883). Parts were translated into German by Gering (Leipzig, 1892), into English by Dasent (1842), by Blackwell in Mallet's "Northern Antiquities" (London, 1770), and R. B. Anderson (Chicago, 1880).

II. "The Elder Edda", a collection of mythological and heroic songs in the ancient Icelandic language. Altogether there are thirty-three such songs, twenty-nine of which are contained in the famous "Codex Regius", the most important of the Eddic manuscripts. This codex was found in Iceland in 1643 by Bishop Brynjólf Sveinsson. It had no title, and, since it contained poems, portions of which are cited in the Snorra Edda, the bishop concluded that this was Snorri's source and so he called the collection "Edda". He furthermore assumed that the priest Sæmund (1056–1133), whose reputation for learning had become proverbial, was the author, or at least the collector of these songs, and he therefore wrote on a copy which he caused to be made the title "Edda Sæmundi multiscii" (Edda of Sæmund the wise), and the title "Edda" has since then remained in general use to designate the kind of poems found in the "Codex Regius". Such poems differ both in content and form from the so-called skaldic poems. There is no doubt that these songs were collected and written down in Iceland from oral tradition; but nothing certain is known concerning their age, original home, and authorship. All this has to be inferred from internal evidence, and hence opinions differ widely. It is agreed, however, that these poems are not common Scandinavian, but purely Norwegian; they were composed either in Norway or in Norwegian settlements like Iceland and Greenland. As to their age, it is conceded that none dates earlier than the middle of the ninth, and that some were written as late as the thirteenth century. The subject-matter of the songs is taken either from mythology or heroic saga. Among the mythological poems the most famous is the "Völuspá" (the prophecy of the volva or sibyl), the most important source for our knowledge of Norse cosmogony. Important also in this respect are the "Vafthrúdhnismál" and "Grímnismál", where Odhin's superior wisdom is set forth.

Of the songs dealing with Thor the best known is the "Thrymskvidha" (the song of Thrym), relating Thor's quest of his hammer. The sententious wisdom of the Northmen is represented by the "Hávamál" (sayings of the High One, i. e., Odhin). Among the heroic poems the chief interest attaches to the lays of Sigurd and the Niflungs. Unfortunately this cycle of poems is incomplete, owing to a great gap of about eight leaves in the "Codex Regius"; but an idea of the contents of the lost poems may be gained from the prose version of the "Volsungasaga", the author of which still had before him the complete collection. The first complete edition of the "Elder Edda", with Latin translation, was issued by the Arna-Magnæan Society (Copenhagen, 1787–1828). The first critical edition, on which all subsequent ones were based, was given by Sophus Bugge (Christiania, 1867). A lithographic facsimile edition of the "Codex Regius", with a diplomatic text, was given by Wimmer and Jónsson (Copenhagen, 1891). Other editions are those of Sijmons and Gering (Halle, Vol. I, text, 1888–1901; Vol. II, glossary, 1903); F. Jónsson (Halle, 1888–90, 2 vols.); Hildebrand-Gering (Paderborn, 1904); F. Detter and R. Heinzel (Leipzig, 1903, 2 vols.). The

poems of this kind not found in the "Codex Regius" were edited by Heusler and Ranisch, "Eddica Minora" (Dortmund, 1903). The best translation into German is the metrical version of Hugo Gering (Leipzig, 1892). The first English version (of the mythological songs only) was made by A. S. Cottle (Bristol, 1797). A complete English version is that of Benj. Thorpe (London, 1865–66). The songs are also translated in Vigfusson and Powell's "Corpus poeticum boreale" (Oxford, 1883), and some songs are also rendered in Magnusson and Morris's "Translation of the Volsungasaga" (London, 1870). A new translation by W. H. Carpenter is in preparation (1908).

For the *Snorra Edda* consult JONSSON, *Den Oldnorske og Oldislandske Litteraturs Historie* (Copenhagen, 1894–1902), II, 77–90, 672 sq.; MOGK, *Geschichte der Norwegisch-isländischen Literatur* in PAUL'S *Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie* (Strasburg, 1904), pp. 698–703; 906–910.

For the *Elder Edda* consult JONSSON, op. cit., I, 9–321; MOGK, op. cit., 569–656; GOLTHER, *Nordische Litteraturgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1905), 10–57. See also the introduction to the edition of SIJMONS-GERING for full bibliographical and critical material.

ARTHUR F. J. REMY.

Eddius (AEDDI). See WILFRID OF YORK.

Edelinck, the family name of four engravers.—GERARD, b. in Antwerp c. 1640; d. in Paris, 2 April, 1707. Galle instructed him in the rudiments of his art, and from him, in Antwerp, the youth imbibed that vigour and energy characterizing Rubens' school of engravers, which was later to transform the art in France and impart to it Northern freshness and simplicity. In 1665 Gerard came to Paris, studied with de Poilly, quickly surpassed him, and almost immediately reached the height of his powers, which remained undiminished until his death. Le Brun and Colbert called Louis XIV's attention to Edelinck, who received commissions, a pension, the title of engraver to the king, apartments in the Gobelins, and the position of professor in the Gobelins Academy from the monarch whose features he depicted in fourteen engravings. In 1675 he was naturalized; in 1677 he became a Royal Academician; and soon thereafter the order of Chevalier of Saint-Michel was conferred upon him.

Edelinck was one of the greatest masters of pure engraving. He never used etching or dry-point on his plates, and of the four hundred that he produced there is not one that is poor or second-rate. Edelinck's work was epoch-making: he revolutionized engraving, abandoning lines that crossed to form squares for lozenge forms. Further, he massed his lines and changed their direction, thus avoiding the monotony that had marked all previous work in France. Edelinck had all the merits of his predecessors and, besides, rendered texture, colour, and light and shade as they never before had been rendered. His strokes were clear and bold, and the results beautifully finished, harmonious, and silvery. His proofs were the first to possess the quality called technically by engravers "colour". Sometimes they were slightly "metallic". Reproductions on steel by Edelinck frequently suggested more colour and quality in the originals than the latter possessed. He worked with marvellous facility and concealed his consummate science under an unobtrusive technic. While he did not confine his burin to portraits, it was these which gave him his great fame, for he so depicted all the notable men of his time, in the Church and the Court, and in literature and art, that we, to-day, gain an insight into their very character. The greater part of his work was reproductive, but he sometimes engraved from his own drawings, for he was a superb draughtsman. Edelinck was chosen to engrave Raphael's "Holy Family", Le Brun's "Magdalen", and "Alexander Visiting the Family of Darius", the first-named bringing him instant fame. Only two impressions before letters of the "Holy Family" exist. Edelinck's life was one of piety, contentment, and tireless labour; it was made up of teaching engraving to his son and his two brothers and working on his own plates. Death found him engraving the "Alexander Entering the Tent of Darius", a superb plate finished by Pierre Drevet. To his family he left a fortune. Plates wholly his own were signed "Gerard Edelinck", or "Edelinck eques"; but when his compatriot Pitau or Gaspard Edelinck assisted him the signature was "Edelinck". Among his pupils were Gaspard, Jean, and Nicolas Edelinck, Lombard, and Trouvain. His principal works are: "Portrait of Louis XIV", after Le Brun; "Portrait of Rigaud", after Rigaud; "Portrait of Mme. Hélyot with a Crucifix", after Galliot; "Portrait of Philippe de Champaigne", which the artist thought his best work, after Champaigne; "Combat of the Four Horsemen", after da Vinci.

GERARD EDELINCK

NICOLAS, son of the preceding, b. in Paris in 1680; d. there in 1730. He studied under his father, Gerard, and to perfect himself subsequently went to Italy. In Venice he produced many plates in the style of his father, whom, however, he never equalled in vigour or quality. He engraved several plates for the Crozat collection. His masterpiece is a "Virgin and Infant" after Correggio.

His works include a "Portrait of his Father", after Tortebat; "Portrait of Cardinal Giulio de' Medici", after Raphael; "Portrait of John Dryden", after Kneller.

JEAN, b. in Antwerp, c. 1643; d. in Paris, 1680. He was a younger brother and pupil of Gerard, with whom he worked and whose style he imitated. Plates wholly his own are much inferior to those of his celebrated brother, though they have considerable merit. "The Deluge", after A. Veronese, is his masterpiece. He made many engravings of the statues in the gardens of Versailles.

GASPARD-FRANÇOIS, b. in Antwerp, 1652; d. in Paris, 1722. Gaspard, the youngest brother of Gerard, who was his teacher and co-worker, was inferior in talent to the other members of the Edelinck family, and did not long follow the career of engraver. Because he used a signature similar to that of Gerard and because his master often helped him with his plates, much of his work is difficult to distinguish from Gerard's.

LIPPMAN, *Engraving and Etching* (New York, 1906); DUMESNIL, *Le peintre graveur français* (Paris, 1835–50), VII, 169–336; DUPLESSIS, *Hist. de la Gravure* (Paris, 1880); *Biographie générale des Belges;* SEUBERT, *Allgemeines Künstler-Lexicon* (3 vols., Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1882).

LEIGH HUNT.

Eden. See PARADISE, TERRESTRIAL.

Edesius and Frumentius, Tyrian Greeks of the fourth century, probably brothers, who introduced Christianity into Abyssinia; the latter a saint and first Bishop of Axum, styled the Apostle of Abyssinia, d. about 383. When still mere boys they accompanied their uncle Metropius on a voyage to Abyssinia. When their ship stopped at one of the harbours of the Red Sea, people of the neighbourhood massacred the whole crew, with the exception of Edesius

and Frumentius, who were taken as slaves to the King of Axum. This occurred about 316. The two boys soon gained the favour of the king, who raised them to positions of trust and shortly before his death gave them their liberty. The widowed queen, however, prevailed upon them to remain at the court and assist her in the education of the young prince Erazanes and in the administration of the kingdom during the prince's minority. They remained and (especially Frumentius) used their influence to spread Christianity. First they encouraged the Christian merchants, who were temporarily in the country, to practise their faith openly by meeting at places of public worship; later they also converted some of the natives. When the prince came of age Edesius returned to his friends and relatives at Tyre and was ordained priest, but did not return to Abyssinia. Frumentius, on the other hand, who was eager for the conversion of Abyssinia, accompanied Edesius as far as Alexandria, where he requested St. Athanasius to send a bishop and some priests to Abyssinia. St. Athanasius considered Frumentius himself the most suitable person for bishop and consecrated him in 328, according to others between 340–46. Frumentius returned to Abyssinia, erected his episcopal see at Axum, baptized King Aeizanas, who had meanwhile succeeded to the throne, built many churches, and spread the Christian Faith throughout Abyssinia. The people called him *Abuna* (Our Father) or *Abba Salama* (Father of Peace), titles still given to the head of the Abyssinian Church. In 365 Emperor Constantius addressed a letter to King Aeizanas and his brother Saizanas in which he vainly requested them to substitute the Arian bishop Theophilus for Frumentius (Athanasius, "Apol. ad Constantium" in P. G., XXV, 631). The Latins celebrate the feast of Frumentius on 27 October, the Greeks on 30 November, and the Copts on 18 December. Abyssinian tradition credits him with the first Ethiopian translation of the New Testament.

RUFINUS, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, lib. I, cap. ix, in *P. L.*, XXI, 478–80; *Acta SS.*, Oct., XII, 257–70; DUCHESNE, *Les missions chrétiennes au Sud de l'empire romain* in *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* (Rome, 1896), XVI, 79–122; THEBAUD, *The Church and the Gentile World* (New York, 1878), I, 231–40; BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, 27 Oct.; BARING-GOULD, *Lives of the Saints* (London, 1872), 27 Oct.

MICHAEL OTT.

Edessa, a titular archiepiscopal see in that part of Mesopotamia formerly known as Osrhoene. The name under which Edessa figures in cuneiform inscriptions is unknown; the native name was Osroe, after some local satrap, this being the Armenian form for Chosroes; it became in Syriac Ourhoï, in Armenian Ourhaï, in Arabic Er Roha, commonly Orfa or Urfa, its present name. Seleucus Nicator, when he rebuilt the town, 303 B. C., called it Edessa, in memory of the ancient capital of Macedonia of similar name (now Vodena). Under Antiochus IV (175–164 B. C.) the town was called Antiochia by colonists from Antioch who had settled there. On the foundation of the Kingdom of Osrhoene, Edessa became the capital under the Abgar dynasty. This kingdom was established by Nabatæan or Arabic tribes from North Arabia, and lasted nearly four centuries (132 B. C. to A. D. 244), under thirty-four kings. It was at first more or less under the protectorate of the Parthians, then of the Romans; the latter even occupied Edessa from 115 to 118 under Trajan, and from 216 to 244, when the kingdom was definitely suppressed to form a Roman province. The literary language of the tribes which had founded this kingdom, was Aramaic, whence came the Syriac.

The exact date of the introduction of Christianity into Edessa is not known. It is certain, however, that the Christian community was at first made up from the Jewish population of the city. According to an ancient legend, King Abgar V, Ushama, was converted by Addai, who was one of the seventy-two disciples. (For a full account see ABGAR.) In fact, however, the first King of Edessa to embrace the Christian Faith was Abgar IX (c. 206). Under him Christianity became the official religion of the kingdom. As for Addai, he was neither one of the seventy-two disciples as the legend asserts, nor was he the Apostle Thaddæus, as Eusebius says (Hist. Eccl., IV, xiii), but a missionary from Palestine who evangelized Mesopotamia about the middle of the second century, and became the first bishop of Edessa. (See DOCTRINE OF ADDAI.) He was succeeded by Aggai, then by Palout (Palut) who was ordained about 200 by Serapion of Antioch. Thenceforth the Church of Edessa, until then under that of Jerusalem, was subject to the metropolitan of Syria. The aforesaid relations with Jerusalem and Antioch caused an important Syriac literary movement at Edessa of which the city long remained the centre. Thence came to us in the second century the famous Peshitto, or Syriac translation of the Old Testament; also Tatian's Diatessaron, which was compiled about 172 and in common use until St. Rabbula (Rabulas), Bishop of Edessa (412–35), forbade its use. Among the illustrious disciples of the School of Edessa special mention is due to Bardesanes (154–222), a schoolfellow of Abgar IX, the originator of Christian religious poetry, whose teaching was continued by his son Harmonius and his disciples. (See BARDESANES AND BARDESANITES.)

A Christian council was held at Edessa as early as 197 (Euseb., Hist. Eccl., V, xxiii). In 201 the city was devastated by a great flood, and the Christian church was destroyed ("Chronicon Edessenum", *ad. an.* 201). In 232 the relics of the Apostle St. Thomas were brought from India, on which occasion his Syriac Acts were written. Under Roman domination many martyrs suffered at Edessa: Sts. Scharbîl and Barsamya, under Decius; Sts. Gûrja, Schâmôna, Habib, and others under Diocletian. In the meanwhile Christian priests from Edessa had evangelized Eastern Mesopotamia and Persia, and established the first Churches in the kingdom of the Sassanides. Aitillâtiâ, Bishop of Edessa, assisted at the Council of Nicæa (325). The "Peregrinatio Silviæ" (or Etheriæ) (ed. Gamurrini, Rome, 1887, 62 sqq.) gives an account of the many sanctuaries at Edessa about 388.

When Nisibis was ceded to the Persians in 363, St. Ephrem left his native town for Edessa, where he founded the celebrated School of the Persians. This school, largely attended by the Christian youth of Persia, and closely watched by St. Rabbula, the friend of St. Cyril of Alexandria, on account of its Nestorian tendencies, reached its highest development under Bishop Ibas, famous through the controversy of the Three Chapters (q.v.), was temporarily closed in 457, and finally in 489, by command of Emperor Zeno and Bishop Cyrus, when the teachers and students of the School of Edessa repaired to Nisibis and became the founders and chief writers of the Nestorian Church in Persia (Labourt, Le christianisme dans l'empire perse, Paris, 1904, 130–141). Monophysitism prospered at Edessa, even after the Arab conquest.

Suffice it to mention here among the later celebrities of Edessa Jacob Baradæus, the real chief of the Syrian Monophysites known after him as Jacobites (q. v.); Stephen Bar Sudaïli, monk and pantheist, to whom was owing, in Palestine, the last crisis of Origenism in the sixth century; Jacob, Bishop of Edessa, a fertile writer (d. 708); Theophilus the Maronite, an astronomer, who translated into Syriac verse Homer's Iliad and Odyssey; the anonymous author of the "Chronicon Edessenum" (Chronicle of Edessa), compiled in 540; the writer of the story of "The Man of God", in the fifth century, which gave rise to the legend of St. Alexius. The oldest known dated Syriac manuscripts (A. D. 411 and 462), containing Greek patristic texts, come from Edessa.

Rebuilt by Emperor Justin, and called after him Justinopolis (Evagrius, Hist. Eccl., IV, viii), Edessa was

taken in 609 by the Persians, soon retaken by Heraclius, but captured again by the Arabs in 640. Under Byzantine rule, as metropolis of Osrhoene, it had eleven suffragan sees (Echos d'Orient, 1907, 145). Lequien (Oriens christ., II, 953 sqq.) mentions thirty-five Bishops of Edessa; yet his list is incomplete. The Greek hierarchy seems to have disappeared after the eleventh century. Of its Jacobite bishops twenty-nine are mentioned by Lequien (II, 1429 sqq.), many others in the "Revue de l'Orient chrétien" (VI, 495), some in "Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft" (1899), 261 sqq. Moreover, Nestorian bishops are said to have resided at Edessa as early as the sixth century. The Byzantines often tried to retake Edessa, especially under Romanus Lacapenus, who obtained from the inhabitants the "Holy Mandylion", or ancient portrait of Christ, and solemnly transferred it to Constantinople, 16 August, 944 (Rambaud, Constantin Porphyrogénète, Paris, 1870, 105 sqq.). For an account of this venerable and famous image, which was certainly at Edessa in 544, and of which there is an ancient copy in the Vatican Library, brought to the West by the Venetians in 1207, see Weisliebersdorf, "Christus und Apostelbilder" (Freiburg, 1902), and Dobschütz, "Christusbilder" (Leipzig, 1899). (See also PORTRAITS OF CHRIST.) In 1031 Edessa was given up to the Greeks by its Arab governor. It was retaken by the Arabs, and then successively held by the Greeks, the Seljuk Turks (1087), the Crusaders (1099), who established there the "county" of Edessa and kept the city till 1144, when it was again captured by the Turk Zengui, and most of its inhabitants were slaughtered together with the Latin archbishop. These events are known to us chiefly through the Armenian historian Matthew, who had been born at Edessa. Since the twelfth century, the city has successively belonged to the Sultans of Aleppo, the Mongols, the Mamelukes, and finally (since 1517) to the Osmanlis.

Orfa is to-day the chief town of a sanjak in the vilayet of Aleppo, and has a trade in cotton stuffs, leather, and jewellery. Ruins of its walls and of an Arab castle are yet visible. One of its curiosities is the mosque of Abraham, this patriarch according to a Mussulman legend having been slain at Orfa. The population is about 55,000, of whom 15,000 are Christians (only 800 Catholics). There are 3 Catholic parishes, Syrian, Armenian, and Latin; the Latin parish is conducted by Capuchins, who have also a school. Franciscan nuns conduct a school for girls. This mission depends on the Apostolic mission of Mardin. There are also at Orfa a Jacobite and a Gregorian Armenian bishop.

CURETON, *Ancient Syriac Documents Relative to the Earliest Establishment of Christianity in Edessa* (London, 1863); BURKITT, *Early Eastern Christianity* (London, 1904); BAYER, *Historia Osrhoena et Edessena ex nummis illustrata* (St. Petersburg 1734); GUTSCHMID, *Untersuchungen über die Geschichte des Königsreichs Osrhoene* (St. Petersburg, 1887); TIXERONT, *Les origines de l'Eglise d'Edesse* (Paris, 1888); DUVAL, *La littérature syriaque* (Paris, 1899), passim; IDEM, *Histoire politique, religieuse et littéraire d'Edesse jusqu'à la première croisade* (Paris, 1891); LAVIGERIE, *Essai historique sur l'école chrétienne d'Edesse* (Lyons, 1850); DUCANGE, *Les familles d'outre-mer* (Paris, 1869), 294–314); TEXIER, *La ville et les monuments d'Edesse* in *Revue orientale-américaine* (1859), 326–54; CUINET, *La Turquie d'Asie* (Paris, 1892), II, 257–263.

S. VAILHÉ.

Edgeworth, HENRY ESSEX, better known as l'ABBÉ EDGEWORTH DE FIRMONT, confessor of Louis XVI, and vicar-general of the Diocese of Paris at the height of the French Revolution, b. at Edgeworthstown, County Longford, Ireland, in 1745; d. 22 May, 1807, at Mittau, Russia. His father, the Rev. Robert Edgeworth, Protestant rector of Edgeworthstown, or Mostrim, was a first cousin to Richard Lovell Edgeworth, the father of Maria Edgeworth, the novelist; and his mother was a granddaughter of the Protestant Archbishop Ussher. The Rev. Robert Edgeworth owned an estate at Firmount, or Fairymount, a few miles distant from Edgeworthstown, where the elder branch of the Edgeworth family resided. The Edgeworths were of English descent, and went to Ireland in the reign of Elizabeth. The title, "Edgeworth de Firmont", by which the abbé was universally known in France, was derived from Firmount, the ancestral patrimony of his family. The vicarage house at Edgeworthstown where he passed his childhood is believed to be the same in which Oliver Goldsmith went to school to the Rev. Patrick Hughes. The Rev. Robert Edgeworth through conscientious motives resigned his living, embraced the Catholic religion, and, finding life at home intolerable under the penal laws, with his family (all of whom became Catholics) removed to Toulouse in France, where Henry Essex, then four years of age, received his early training for the ecclesiastical state. Subsequently he went to the seminary of Trente-Trois, Paris, at the suggestion of Bishop Moylan of Cork (at one time a *curé* in Paris). After a course of theology at the Sorbonne, Henry Essex Edgeworth was ordained priest and the capital of France became the theatre of his apostolic labours. The Irish bishops offered him a mitre in Ireland, an honour which he declined with his usual humility. On the removal of her confessor, Madame Elisabeth, sister of the ill-fated Louis XVI, requested the superior of *Les Missions Etrangères*, where the abbé resided, to recommend her another and he unhesitatingly selected the Abbé Edgeworth. The Archbishop of Paris approved of the choice, and introduced him at court. Thus he became known to the royal family as a devoted friend. In their fallen fortunes he stood by them at the risk of his life, followed the survivors after the Revolution into exile, and died in their service.

EDGEWORTH DE FIRMONT

When the Archbishop of Paris was obliged to fly in 1792 in order to save his life, he vested the Abbé Edgeworth with all his powers, making him his *grand vicaire*, and committed the great diocese to his care. In answer to the urgent entreaties of his friends to seek safety in Ireland or England, at this time, the abbé replied: "Almighty God has baffled my measures, and ties me to this land of horrors by chains I have not the liberty to shake off. The case is this: The wretched master [the king] charges me not to quit this country, as I am the priest whom he intends to prepare him for death. And should the iniquity of the nation commit this last act of cruelty, I must also prepare myself for death, as I am convinced the popular rage will not allow me to survive an hour after the tragic scene; but I am resigned. Could my life save him I would willingly lay it down, and I should not die in vain" (Letter to Mr. Maffey, priest in London).

At last, on the 20th of January, 1793, he was summoned by the Executive Council to proceed to the Temple prison at the desire of "Louis Capet", who was condemned to die on the following day. The abbé, having remained in the Temple all night, said Mass in the king's apartment on the morning of the execution, sat beside him in the carriage on the way to the scaf-

fold, and, when the axe of the guillotine was about to fall, consoled his beloved master with the noble words: "Son of St. Louis, ascend to heaven." In his graphic and authoritative account of the last moments of Louis XVI (the original of which in French is preserved in the British Museum) the abbé is silent about this fine apostrophe, which everyone has heard of; but, when asked if he made use of the memorable expression, he replied that, having no recollection of anything that happened to himself at that awful moment, he neither affirmed nor denied having used the words. He was allowed to leave the scene of the execution unmolested, and so escaped; but soon after his head was demanded in several clubs, so that he was obliged to quit Paris and take refuge at Bayeux, whence at that time he might easily have escaped to England. Three chief considerations, however, bound him to the land of horrors. He had a great diocese committed to his care; he had promised Madame Elisabeth, then in prison, never to desert her, and he could not abandon his mother and sister, still living in Paris. Dressed as an ordinary citizen, and passing under the name now of Essex, now of Edgeworth, and again of Henry, he eluded capture and the guillotine, until finally in August, 1796, after the death of his mother, and the execution of Madame Elisabeth, he escaped to Portsmouth, and proceeded to London.

Mr. Pitt offered to settle a pension for life on him, but he respectfully declined it. During the three months he spent in London he was lionized by fashionable society. His brother, Ussher, who resided at Firmount, and his relatives at Edgeworthstown, proud of his fame and renown, were most anxious to see him in Ireland; and, in fact, he was on the point of revisiting the land of his birth when he was entrusted with confidential despatches for Louis XVIII, then at Blankenburg. This changed all his plans. At the earnest entreaty of the exiled king he resolved to remain with him as his chaplain, going afterwards with the royal family to Mittau in Russia, where he spent the remainder of his days, revered and honoured by all with whom he came in contact. The Emperor Paul settled a pension of 500 roubles per annum on him. When Napoleon invaded Russia in 1807 it happened that some French soldiers were taken prisoners, and sent to Mittau. A contagious fever broke out among them, and in attending to their spiritual wants Abbé Edgeworth, never of a robust constitution, fell a victim to the plague. The daughter of Louis XVI, despite the manifest danger of contagion, attended night and day at the sick bed of her "beloved and revered invalid, her more than friend, who had left kindred and country for her family", to use her own words. He was interred at Mittau. Louis XVIII wrote his epitaph, a copy of which, together with a letter of condolence, was sent by Louis' orders to Mr. Ussher Edgeworth, the abbé's brother, residing in Ireland.

C. S. Edgeworth, *Memoirs of the Abbé Edgeworth; containing his Narrative of the Last Hours of Louis XVI* (London, 1815); Thiers, *Histoire de la Révolution française* (1827); R. L. Edgeworth, *Memoirs* (London, 1820); Webb, *Compendium of Irish Biography* (Dublin, 1878); Gordon, *Five Unpublished Letters of l'Abbé Edgeworth de Firmont* in *The Tablet* (London, 28 April, 1900).

Joseph Guinan.

Edict of Milan. See Constantine the Great.

Edict of Nantes. See Huguenots.

Edict of Worms. See Luther.

Edinburgh, the capital of Scotland, though not its largest city, derives its name from the time (about A.D. 620) when the fortress of Edwin's burgh was raised on a lofty spur of the Pentland Hills, overlooking the Firth of Forth, and established the Anglian dominion in the northern part of the Northumbrian Kingdom. Edinburgh Castle was a royal residence in the reign of Malcolm Canmore, husband of St. Margaret, who died there in 1093. Round the castle the town grew up, and a little lower down the collegiate church of St. Giles, predecessor of the present church bearing that name, was erected in the twelfth century. St. Margaret's son, King David I, founded the Abbey of Holyrood, at the foot of the castle hill, 1128; but the town of Edinburgh for several centuries did not extend beyond the ridge sloping eastwards from the castle. In the middle of the fifteenth century Edinburgh became the real capital of Scotland, that is, the seat of the Parliament and the Government, as well as the residence of her kings, and the scene of many of the most important provincial councils which regulated the affairs of the Scottish Church. James II was the first king crowned at Edinburgh instead of in the Abbey of Scone, and he and his successors conferred many privileges on the capital, and did all in their power to develop it and increase its prosperity. The buildings of the city gradually spread outside the ancient walls, all along the sloping ridge which extends from the castle at the top to Holyrood at the bottom; and towards the end of the nineteenth century the New Town was built to the northward, beyond the extensive lake (since drained) which stretched under the castle hill.

During the past hundred years Edinburgh has steadily increased in population and wealth, if not so rapidly as other cities which are greater centres of manufactures and commerce. The unrivalled beauty of its situation, and the social and other advantages which it offers as the capital of the country, as well as the remarkable educative facilities afforded by its many splendidly equipped schools and colleges, have always made it exceptionally attractive as a place of residence. Literary taste and culture were long the special characteristic of Edinburgh society, and it still possesses some of the literary charm which won for the city the title of the Modern Athens in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, when Scott, Wilson, Jeffrey, Brougham, and others made it famous by their personality and their genius. Modern facilities of travel and of intercommunication have inevitably given to Edinburgh, as to every centre of population in the kingdom outside London, a certain note of provincialism; but it has not altogether lost the dignity and charm proper to a capital. The population of Edinburgh is now (1908) 317,000, an increase of more than 100,000 in the past thirty years; and its total area is nearly 11,000 acres. It returns four members to Parliament, and is governed by a town council of fifty members, presided over by the lord provost. Printing, brewing, and distilling have long been, and still are, the principal industries of the city. Edinburgh is the seat of the supreme court of Scottish law, which in its external forms as well as in many essential points differs greatly from the law of England. The presidents of the courts are the lord-justice-general and the lord-justice-clerk; and the judges, properly entitled "senators of the college of justice", enjoy the official title of lord. The supreme courts occupy the ancient Scottish Parliament house, a stately seventeenth-century building; and under the same roof is the Advocates' Library, one of the most extensive and valuable collections of books and manuscripts in the kingdom.

Edinburgh University, the only one of the four Scottish universities not founded in Catholic times, was established in 1582 by royal charter granted by James VI, and was speedily enriched by many benefactions from prominent citizens. Its buildings occupy the site of the ancient collegiate church of St. Mary-in-the-Fields, or the Kirk o' Field (well known as the scene of the mysterious murder of Lord Darnley), and have in recent years been greatly extended and embellished. The university comprises the usual faculties of divinity, law, medicine, and arts, and has pro-

duced many eminent men. The Edinburgh medical school has a world-wide reputation, and attracts students from all parts of the empire, as well as many foreigners. No religious tests prevent Catholics from enjoying the full benefit of university education in Edinburgh; but the number of Catholics frequenting the schools is remarkably small. The total number of students frequenting the university is between three and four thousand.

Ecclesiastical History.—Edinburgh is naturally much bound up in its ecclesiastical history with the country at large. In the earliest centuries of its existence, belonging as it did to the Kingdom of Northumbria, Edinburgh was included in the Diocese of Lindisfarne, as we find from the list of churches belonging to that see compiled by Simeon of Durham in

The Castle and Scott Monument, Edinburgh

854. The early connexion of the city with Lindisfarne is shown by the dedication to St. Cuthbert of its oldest church, founded probably in the ninth century. St. Cuthbert's church was presented to the newly established Abbey of Holyrood by King David; it was the richest church in Edinburgh, and possessed several outlying chapels, such as St. Ninian's, St. Roque's, and St. John Baptist's. When the diocesan system came to be fully established in Scotland, under Malcolm and Margaret and their sons, Edinburgh was included in the metropolitan Diocese of St. Andrews, and continued to be so until the suppression of the ancient hierarchy in the sixteenth century. The archbishop's see, as well as the episcopal residence, was of course in the primatial city of St. Andrews, beyond the Firth of Forth; and there was no building known as a cathedral in Edinburgh prior to 1634, when the new Anglican Diocese of Edinburgh was formed out of the ancient archdeaconry of Lothian, and Forbes became the first occupant of the see. The old collegiate church of St. Giles was at this time, and during the revival of Episcopalianism in Scotland, used as the cathedral of the Protestant bishop. As regards the Catholic Church, Edinburgh was the head-quarters of the vicars Apostolic of the Eastern District of Scotland from the time of the foundation of that vicariate in 1828, when the church now known as St. Mary's Catholic Cathedral had been in existence for some fifteen years. It has no architectural interest, but a spacious chancel was added, and other improvements carried out, in 1891. A cathedral for the Episcopalian body (whose bishop resides in Edinburgh) was erected about 1878, at a cost of over $500,000, from funds left by two charitable ladies. It is a Gothic building of much dignity, and by far the finest ecclesiastical building, either ancient or modern, now existing in Edinburgh. The Presbyterians have some handsome churches, but the grand old church of St. Giles, now in their hands, has been hopelessly vulgarized by the "restorer". A new church built by the Irvingites is adorned within by some fine mural paintings.

The seven Catholic churches which (besides the cathedral) supply the needs of the Catholic population of Edinburgh are of no particular merit architecturally, the most interesting being the latest erected, St. Peter's, which is in the earliest Byzantine style, and forms, with its presbytery, a little group of much originality and charm. The Catholic Archbishop of St. Andrews and Edinburgh (the fourth who has held that office in thirty years) resides in Edinburgh, and has his episcopal seat in St. Mary's Cathedral. St. Andrews (to which the title of Edinburgh was added at the restoration of the hierarchy in 1878) possesses a small Catholic church; but the Catholic population of the primatial city is—except for summer visitors—only a handful. In Edinburgh the Catholics are estimated to number about 20,000. In the reign of Queen Anne (1702–14) a list sent in to the privy council of "Popish parents and their children in various districts of Scotland" gives the number of Catholics in Edinburgh as 160, including the Duke and Duchess of Gordon with their family and household, and several other noble families. The majority of the Catholics of Edinburgh to-day are of the poorer classes, and of Irish origin; but the past decade or so has witnessed a considerable number of conversions among the more well-to-do inhabitants of the city. Since the great anti-Catholic tumults of 1779, when the chapels and houses belonging to the insignificant Catholic body were burned by the rioters, the spirit of tolerance has

made progress in the Scottish capital as elsewhere in the kingdom. Catholics are generally respected, and may and do rise to high positions of trust in the commercial, legal, and municipal world.

Something remains to be said of the religious houses which have flourished in Edinburgh in ancient and modern times. The principal and wealthiest monastery in former days was the Abbey of Holyrood, founded by David I for Augustinian canons, who were brought from St. Andrews. The Blackfriars or Dominican monastery was founded by Alexander II in 1230, on a site now occupied by a hospital. The Greyfriars or Franciscan church (of the Observant branch of the order) stood in the Grassmarket until it was destroyed by fire in 1845. The Whitefriars or Carmelites did not settle in Edinburgh until 1518. Their house of Greenside, near the Calton Hill, was transformed at the Dissolution into a lepers' hospital. Beyond the Carmelite house, nearer Leith, stood the preceptory of St. An-

Church of St. Giles (XIV Century)

thony, the only house of that order in Scotland. The collegiate churches in and about Edinburgh included those of St. Giles and St. Mary-in-the-Fields (already mentioned), Trinity Church, Restalrig, Corstorphine, Creighton, and Dalkeith. Trinity church, one of the most exquisite Gothic buildings in Scotland, was destroyed in the nineteenth century by a deplorable act of vandalism, to make room for new railway works. Neither the Benedictine nor Cistercian monks, who had numerous houses in Scotland, were established in Edinburgh. The Cistercian or Bernardine nuns, however, possessed the convent of St. Marie-in-the-wynd (or lane) near a hospital, where the sisters tended the sick. The Dominican nuns had also a convent (called *Sciennes* or *Shenes*, from St. Catherine of Siena) in the outskirts of the city. The numerous hospitals in Catholic Edinburgh comprised St. Mary Magdalen's in the Cowgate, founded in 1503 (the chapel remains, and is now used as a medical mission-hall); St. Leonard's, at the foot of Salisbury Crags; St. Mary's, in Leith Wynd, for twelve almsmen (converted into a workhouse by the Edinburgh magistrates in 1619); St. Thomas's, near the water-gate, founded in 1541 by Abbot Crichton of Holyrood for seven almsmen in red gowns; and Ballantyne's Hospital, founded by Robert Ballantyne or Bellenden, Abbot of Holyrood. The two religious orders of men now working in Edinburgh and its seaport of Leith are the Jesuits and the Oblates of Mary Immaculate. The former serve one of the largest churches in the city, and the latter have a house at Leith. There are eight convents of nuns, the oldest being St. Margaret's (Ursuline), founded in 1835, the first since the Reformation. The nuns keep a high-class school and attend several hospitals. St. Catherine's Convent of Mercy has a well-equipped training-college for teachers as well as a ladies' school. The other convents are those of the Sisters of Charity, Little Sisters of the Poor, Sisters of the Sacred Hearts, Poor Clares, Order of Marie Réparatrice, Helpers of the Holy Souls, and Sisters of the Immaculate Conception. The other Catholic institutions of the city include a children's refuge, orphanages for boys and girls, home for working boys, home for destitute children, dispensary, and home for penitents.

Maitland, *Hist. of Edinburgh* (Edinburgh, 1754); Anderson, *Hist. of Edinburgh* (Edinburgh, 1856); Chambers, *Traditions of Edinburgh* (Edinburgh, 1825); Wilson, *Memorials of Edinburgh* (Edinburgh, 1848); Lees, *St. Giles* (Edinburgh, 1887); Arnot, *Hist. of Edinburgh* (Edinburgh, 1779); *Lectures on the Antiquities of Edinburgh to the Guild of St. Joseph* (Edinburgh, 1845); Oliphant, *Royal Edinburgh* (Edinburgh, 1890).

D. O. Hunter-Blair.

Editions of the Bible.—In the present article we understand by editions of the Bible the printed reproductions of its original texts. We are not concerned with copies of the versions of the Bible, whether printed or written; nor do we purpose to consider the manuscript copies of the original text. The written reproductions are described under Codex Alexandrinus and similar articles. See also Criticism, Biblical, in the latter part of which article (Vol. IV, pp. 499, 500) will be found an explanation of the critical nomenclature of Bible codices and the symbols by which they are denoted. The translations of the Bible will be treated under the title Versions of the Bible. Since the original text of the Bible was written in Hebrew or Greek (the original Aramaic portions can for the present purpose be considered as coincident with the Hebrew), our study of its printed reproductions naturally considers first the editions of the Hebrew text, and secondly those of the Greek.

I. Editions of the Hebrew Text of the Bible.—Roughly speaking, there are three classes of editions of the Hebrew text: 1. The so-called *Incunabula* (Lat. *cunabula*, pl., "cradle"); 2. The common editions; 3. The critical editions. The reader will see that this division has an historical as well as a logical basis.

1. *The Incunabula.*—Technically speaking, the Incunabula are the editions issued before the year 1500. From our present critical standpoint, they are very defective; but since they represent manuscripts now lost, they are important even for critical purposes. The following publications constitute the main body of the Incunabula:—

(1) The quarto edition of the Hebrew Psalter with the commentary of Rabbi David Kimchi, printed in 1477, probably at Bologna. Vowels and accents are wanting, except in the first four psalms. The volume is noted for its omissions, abbreviations, and general lack of accuracy.

(2) The folio edition of the Pentateuch, with vowels and accents, containing the Targum of Onkelos and the commentary of Rabbi Samuel Jarchi, printed at Bologna, 1482. This publication is much more perfect and correct than the foregoing.

(3) The so-called Earlier Prophets, i. e. the Books of Josue, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, printed in 1488 at Soncino, near Cremona, in Italy.

(4) The folio edition of the Later Prophets, i. e. Isaias, Jeremias, Ezechiel, and the twelve Minor Prophets, printed soon after the preceding publication, without accents and vowels, but interlined with the text of Kimchi's commentary.

(5) The Psalter and the Megilloth, or "Rolls", i. e. the Canticle of Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther, printed in the same year as the preceding publication, at Soncino and Casale, in Italy, in a quarto volume.

(6) Three folio volumes containing the Hagiographa with several rabbinic commentaries, printed at Naples in 1487; the text is accompanied by the vowels, but not by the accents.

(7) A complete Hebrew Bible, in folio, printed in 1488 at Soncino, without any commentary. Its text, accompanied by both vowels and accents, is based partly on the previously printed portions of the Hebrew Bible, partly on Hebrew manuscripts, but it lacks accuracy.

(8) A folio containing the Hebrew and Chaldee Pentateuch with Rashi's commentary, printed in 1490 in Isola del Liri.

(9) A most accurate and highly esteemed quarto edition of the Pentateuch, printed at Lisbon in 1491.

(10) A second complete edition of the Hebrew text, in quarto, printed in 1494 at Brescia. The editor calls himself Gerson ben Mose of Soncino. The text, which is accompanied by its vowels and accents, exhibits many peculiar readings not found in any other edition. The type is small and indistinct, the proofreading most slovenly; in a word, the edition is utterly defective. Luther based his translation on it.

(11) The foregoing text is repeated in an octavo edition printed at Pisa in 1494.

(12) A folio edition of the Hebrew Bible, printed on parchment, bears no indication of its date or place of printing; it probably appeared in Constantinople about 1500.

(13) To these may be added Seb. Münster's Hebrew-Latin Bible, printed in folio at Basle, 1534 and 1546, since its text is based on that of the 1488 and 1494 editions. Here also belong, for the same reason, the "Biblia Rabbinica Bombergiana", first edition (see below), the editions of R. Stephanus (1539–44, 1546), and the manual editions of Bomberg.

2. *Common Editions.*—By these we understand editions of the Bible reproduced either from manuscripts or previous printed editions without the aid of critical apparatus and the application of critical principles. While the editions of the Hebrew text thus far enumerated owed their publication to Jewish enterprise, those that follow were, at least in part, due to Christian scholarship. For practical purposes we may divide the common editions into two classes: (1) those not depending on other printed editions (independent editions); (2) those depending, at least partly, on a previously printed text (dependent, or mixed, editions).

(1) Independent editions.—This class of editions comprises two principal ones: (a) the "Biblia Polyglotta Complutensia"; (b) the "Biblia Rabbinica Bombergiana", second edition. Here we can give only a summary of their principal features.

(a) "Biblia Polyglotta Complutensia".—In the year 1502, Cardinal Ximenes engaged several learned scholars to prepare the edition of a polyglot Bible called variously after the name of its ecclesiastical patron and the place of its publication (Alcalá, in Lat. Complutum). The editors of the Hebrew text were Jewish converts. Ancient manuscripts, estimated at the value of 4000 florins, and probably also the best extant printed copies of the Hebrew text, were placed at their disposal. Thus the cardinal's scholars produced a text quite different from the other printed texts of his time. They marked the vowels, but not the accents. The Polyglot was finished in 1517, but was published only in 1520 or 1522, according to Gregory (Canon and Text of the New Testament, New York, 1907). The pure form of its text was only once reprinted in the so-called "Biblia Polyglotta Vatabli", or "Polyglotta Sanctandreana", or again, "Bertram's Polyglot" (Heidelberg, 1586, 1599, 1616).

(b) "Biblia Rabbinica Bombergiana", second edition.—Daniel Bomberg, of Antwerp, who had established a printing-office for Hebrew and rabbinic literature in Venice, published, in 1518, two important editions of the Hebrew text: (α) an edition for Christian readers, in quarto, which was reprinted in 1521, 1525–28, 1533, 1544; (β) an edition for Jewish readers, edited by the Jewish convert Felix Pratensis. It contained the Targumim, the Massorah, and many Jewish commentaries, but did not satisfy the Jews. Hence Bomberg found it advisable to publish another edition under the editorship of R. Jacob ben Chayim, the most celebrated Jewish scholar of his time. He brought the text into closer agreement with the Massorah, and added several more Jewish commentaries. The work appeared in Venice, in four folio volumes, 1525–26, and was justly regarded as the first Massoretic Bible. It won the approbation of both Jewish and Christian scholars, so that it had to be republished in 1547–49, and 1568; the last edition was brought out under the direction of John de Gara. In spite of the great merits of the work, it is not wholly free from defects; Ben Chayim paid too much attention to the Massorah and too little to reliable old manuscripts. The principal codex he followed fell afterwards into the hands of de Rossi, who testifies that it is quite defective and has not been carefully edited. Chayim printed it without correcting its most glaring mistakes.

The subsequent editions were influenced principally by Ben Chayim's text, and only secondarily by the Complutensian Polyglot. Thus the former text was repeated by Bragadin (Venice, 1617), and, in a slightly modified form, by Justiniani (Venice, 1551, 1552, 1563, 1573), the editors of Geneva (1618), John de Gara (Venice, 1566, 1568, 1582), Plantin (Antwerp, 1566), Hartmann (Frankfort, 1595, 1598), the editors of Wittenberg (1586, 1587), and Tores (Amsterdam, 1705). Long before the last publication appeared, John Buxtorf edited first the Hebrew text in manual form (Basle, 1611), then Chayim's rabbinic Bible in four folio volumes (Basle, 1618, 1619). Though he corrected some of Ben Chayim's mistakes, he allowed others to remain and even introduced some new ones. He ought not to have regulated the vocalization of the Targumim according to the vowels in the Chaldee fragments of the Bible, and it was at least inconsistent to change the Massorah according to the Hebrew text, seeing that Ben Chayim, whose text he professed to follow, had modified the Hebrew text according to the Massorah.

(2) Dependent, or Mixed, Editions.—In the editions thus far mentioned the text of one or the other of the two principal forms of the Hebrew Bible was reproduced without any notable change. We have now to consider the attempts made to correct the text either according to the reading of other editions or according to that of ancient manuscripts.

(a) Texts Corrected according to Printed Texts.—The first mixed text of the Hebrew Bible appeared in the Antwerp Polyglot (1569–72); the same text was repeated in the Paris Polyglot (1629–45), in the London Polyglot (1657), in that of Reineccius (Leipzig, 1750–51), the smaller Plantin editions (Antwerp, 1580, 1582; Burgos, 1581; Leyden, 1613), the manual edition of Reineccius (Leipzig, 1725, 1739, 1756), and in the Vienna Bible (1743). The beautifully printed Bible of Hutter (Hamburg, 1588) presents a peculiarly mixed text. Here may be added the names of a few editors who published a Hebrew text without vowels and without pretence to critical accuracy: Plantin (Antwerp, 1573, 8vo and 12mo; Leyden, 1595, 16mo; 1610, 12mo; Hanau, 1610, 24mo); Menasse ben Israel (Amsterdam, 1630, 1639, 8vo); Leusden (1694, 8vo); Maresius (1701, 8vo); Jablonsky (Berlin, 1711, 24mo); Forster (Oxford, 1750, 4to).

(b) Texts Corrected according to Codices and Printed Texts.—The mixture of Chayim's text with the Complutensian could not give permanent satisfaction. Every comparison of the mixed text with that of any good manuscript brought to light many discrepancies and suggested the idea that a better Hebrew text might be obtained by the help of good codices. The first attempt to publish a Hebrew text thus corrected was made by John Leusden with the cooperation of the printer Jos. Athias (Amsterdam,

1661, 1667). The editor revised Chayim's text according to the readings of two codices, one of which was said to be about 900 years old. This edition, printed by Athias, was revised by George Nissel according to the readings of Hutter's Bible (Leyden, 1662). Nissel makes no pretence of having collated any codices, so that his work is noted for its scarcity rather than its critical value. Clodius, too, endeavoured to correct Athias's text according to earlier editions, but was not always successful (Frankfort, 1677, 1692, 1716). Jablonsky corrected the second edition of Athias according to the readings of several codices and of the better previous editions, paying special attention to the vowels and accents (Berlin, 1699, 1712); his first edition is commonly regarded as being one of the best. Van der Hooght corrected the second edition of Athias according to the Massorah and the previously printed editions (Amsterdam and Utrecht, 1705); his attention to the smallest details and the printer's care account for the general favour with which the edition was received. A still more perfect reprint of the edition was published by Props (Amsterdam, 1724). Simonis, too, published correct and cheap reprints of Van der Hooght's Bible. Opitz corrected the edition of Athias according to the readings of seventeen of the best previous editions and of several manuscripts (Kiel, 1709; Züllichau, 1741). He supervised the proof in person, and even the type was remarkable for its size and clearness, so that the edition was considered the most accurate extant. J. H. Michaelis edited the first Hebrew text with variants (Halle, 1720). He based it on the text of Jablonsky which he compared with twenty-four earlier editions and with five manuscripts preserved in Erfurt. The more important variants he added at the bottom of the page. It has been found that the comparison was made rather superficially as far as the printed editions were concerned, and there is no good reason for supposing that more care was taken in the comparison of the manuscript text. Still, the edition remains valuable, because it is the first of its kind, and some of its variants deserve attention even to-day. The Oratorian Father Houbigant tried to produce a text far superior to the commonly received one. Taking Van der Hooght's text for his basis, he added his own corrections and conjectures in critical notes. His apparatus consisted of a number of manuscripts, the ancient versions, and the Hebrew context. The precipitancy of his inferences and the rashness of his conjectures did much to create a prejudice against his method, though the merit of his work has been duly appreciated by scholars. His "Notæ Criticæ" were printed in separate form in Frankfort (1777), after the full edition had appeared in Paris (1753).

Here may be mentioned the work of the Italian Jew, Salomo Norzi. He began in the early years of the seventeenth century to compare Bomberg's text with the best of the printed editions, with a number of good manuscripts of both Bible and Massorah, with the Biblical citations found in the Talmud, the Midrashim, and in other rabbinic writings, and with the critical annotations of the more notable Jewish commentators; the results of his long study he summarized in a Massoretico-critical commentary intended to accompany the text of the Hebrew Bible, which had been rather scantily corrected. The title of the work was to be "Repairer of the Breach" (Is., lviii, 12), but the author died before he could publish his book. Nearly a century later, a Jewish physician named Raphael Chayim Italia had Norzi's work printed at his own expense under the title "Offering of the Gift" (Mantua, 1742–44). Among Christian scholars it appears to have remained unnoticed until Bruns and Dresde drew attention to it. In spite of his best intentions, Norzi at times rather corrupts than corrects the Hebrew text, because he prefers the readings of the Massorah to those of the manuscripts.

3. *Critical Editions.*—The editions thus far enumerated can hardly be called critical, since their editors either lacked the necessary apparatus or did not consider it prudent to correct the received Hebrew text according to the full light of their textual information. Later on, two classes of scholars published really critical editions of the Hebrew text; some endeavoured to restore critically the most correct Massoretic text obtainable; others tried to find the most accurate pre-Massoretic text.

(1) Critical Editions of the Massoretic Text.—In order to restore the correct Massoretic text it was necessary first to collect the apparatus. About the middle of the eighteenth century this need was felt very keenly by Benjamin Kennicott, a canon of Christ Church, Oxford, who determined to remedy the evil. Beginning in 1759, he collated either in person or through others as many as 615 Hebrew manuscripts, 52 printed editions, and the Talmud, continuing this preparation until the year 1773. Then he began the printing of the work (Vetus Testam. Hebr. cum var. lectionibus, 2 volumes, Oxford, 1776–80) based on Van der Hooght's Hebrew text as edited by Simonis. The variants, with their respective sources, were indicated below the text. In the introductory dissertation of the second volume the author gives the history of his enterprise and justifies its methods. He found this necessary because, after the appearance of the first volume, his critics had charged him with lack of care and discernment in the choice of the manuscripts used, of the variants noticed, and in the treatment of the Massorah.

Bernardo de Rossi, professor at Parma, tried to construct an apparatus that should not be open to the exceptions taken against Kennicott's work. The material on which de Rossi worked exceeded that of Kennicott by 731 manuscripts, 300 printed editions, and several ancient versions. In his work (Variæ lectiones Vet. Testam., 4 volumes, Parma, 1784–88) and its subsequent supplement (Supplementa ad varias s. text. lectiones, 1798) he noted the more important variants, gave a brief appreciation of their respective sources and their values, and paid due attention to the Massorah. He follows Van der Hooght's text as his basis, but considers it known, and so does not print it. All of de Rossi's critics are at one in admiring the laboriousness of his work, but they deny that its importance bears any proportion to the labour it implies. Perhaps the author himself, in his "Dissertatio præliminaris" to vol. IV, gives a fairer opinion of his work than his critics do. It can hardly be denied that de Rossi at least showed what can be done by a study of the manuscripts and of the old editions for the correction of the received Hebrew text.

The apparatus of the textual, or lower, criticism of the Old Testament text (see CRITICISM, BIBLICAL) is not limited to the works of Kennicott and de Rossi; it comprises also the above-mentioned work of Salomo Norzi, re-edited in Vienna, 1813; the writings of Wolf ben Simson Heidenhaim; Frensdorff's "Ochla W' Ochlah" (1864), and "Massora Magna" (Hanover, 1876); the prophetic "Codex of St. Petersburg", dating back to 916, phototyped by Strack in 1876; all the recently discovered or recently studied codices and fragments, together with the works of the ancient Jewish grammarians and lexicographers.

But even with these means at their command, the editors of the Hebrew text did not at once produce an edition that could be called satisfactory from a critical point of view. The editions of Döderlein-Meisner (Leipzig, 1793) and Jahn (Vienna, 1807) only popularized the variants of Kennicott and de Rossi without utilizing them properly. The edition published under the name of Hahn and prefaced by Rosenmüller (Leipzig, 1834) is anything but critical. The stereotype editions of Hahn (Leipzig, 1839) and Theile (Leipzig, 1849) remained for many years the best

Diuisiua beb.	Ter. Heb.	Deut. Ca. xxxii.	Trãsla. B. Hiero.	Trãsla. Exc. lxx. cũ interp. latina.
מוט	לְעֵת תָּמוּט רַגְלָם כִּי קְרוֹב יוֹם		[b]yltio: [i]& ego retribuã e	in tpe qñ labat pes eor. qñ iuxta dies p
אדם	אֵידָם וְחָשׁ עֲתִדֹת לָמוֹ: כִּי יָדִין		is [i]in tpe vt [i]labatur [m]pes	ἐν καιρῷ ὅταν σφαλῆ ὁ πους αὐτῶν. ὅτι ἐγγυς ἡμέρα ἀ=
חוש דין	יְהוָה עַמּוֹ וְעַל עֲבָדָיו יִתְנֶחָם כִּי		corũ. [l]Iuxta est [d]dies [q]p=	ditῶις eor. ▪ adsũt parata vob: qñ iudicabit dñs po
נחם	יִרְאֶה כִּי אָזְלַת יָד וְאֶפֶס עָצוּר		ditῶis [i]& adesse festinãt	πωλείας αὐτῶν, καὶ παρεσιν ἑτοιμα ὑμῖν, ὅτι κρινει κς τον λα
ראה עצר	וְעָזוּב: וְאָמַר אֵי אֱלֹהֵימוֹ צוּר		[q]tpa. [r]Iudicabit [i]dñs [s]po	pulũ suũ. τ in ſuis ſuis cõſolabit. ▪ vidit eñ
עזב	חָסָיוּ בוֹ: אֲשֶׁר חֶלֶב זְבָחֵימוֹ יֹאכֵלוּ		pulũ suũ: [t]& in [u]seruis ſu	ὀτι αὐτ. καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς δούλοις αὐτ παρακληθήσεται. ἰδὲ γαρ
חסה אכל	יִשְׁתּוּ יֵין נְסִיכָם יָקוּמוּ וְיַעְזְרֻכֶם		is [u]miſerebitur. [x]Videbit	eos diſſolutos τ deficiẽtes in captiuitate ▪
שתה נסך קום	יְהִי עֲלֵיכֶם סְתָרָה: רְאוּ עַתָּה		[x]ifirmata ſit [y]man? [i]&	αὐτ παρακαλυμμους καὶ ἐκλελοιπότας ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ καὶ
עתה היה ראה	כִּי אֲנִי אֲנִי הוּא וְאֵין אֱלֹהִים		[z]clauſi quoq; defecerũt:	remiſſoo. τ dixit dñs: vbi ſũt dij eor: qb cõ
עזר	עִמָּדִי אֲנִי אָמִית וַאֲחַיֶּה מָחַצְתִּי		[a]reſidui q; cõſumpti ſũt.	παφεν δους. καὶ ἐιπε κς, που εισιν οἱ θεοὶ αὐτῶν, ἐφ οἷς ἐπε
חיה מות	וַאֲנִי אֶרְפָּא וְאֵין מַיְדִי מַצִּיל: כִּי		[b]Et dicet. [c]V bi ſunt [d]dii	ποίθεισαν ἐπ αὐτοῖς. ὧν τα σταρ τῶν θυσιῶν αὐτῶν καθ ἱστε
נצל	אֶשָּׂא אֶל שָׁמַיִם יָדִי וְאָמַרְתִּי חַי		corũ in quibus [e]hẽbant	τ bibedatis vinũ libaminũ eor. ▪ surgãt τ
נשא	אָנֹכִי לְעֹלָם: אִם שַׁנּוֹתִי בָּרָק		fiduciã. De [f]quorũ [g]victi	καὶ ἐπίετε τον οἶνον τῶν σπονδῶν αὐτῶν. ἀναστήτωσαν καὶ
שנן	תָּחֵז שָׁפָט יָדִי אָשִׁיב		mis [g]comedebãt [h]adipes:	opitulẽtur vobis: τ fiãt vñ ptectores. videte
אחז שפט	נָקָם לְצָרָי וְלִמְשַׂנְאַי אֲשַׁלֵּם:		& [i]bibebãt [k]vinũ [l]libami	βοηθησάτωσαν ὑμῖν, καὶ γενηθήτωσαν ὑμῶν σκεπασαί. ἴδετε
שוב צור שנא	אַשְׁכִּיר חִצַּי מִדָּם וְחַרְבִּי תֹּאכַל		nũ. [m]Surgãt [n]& opitulen	videte φ ego ſũ: ▪ nõ eſt deus pter me. ego occi
שלם בשר	בְּשַׂר מִדַּם חָלָל וְשִׁבְיָה מֵרֹאשׁ		tur vobis: & in neceſſita	ἴδετε ὁτι ἐγώ εἰμι, καὶ ουκ ἐστι θεὸς πλὴν ἐμοῦ. ἐγὼ ἀποκτεί=
אכל	פַּרְעוֹת אוֹיֵב: הַרְנִינוּ גוֹיִם עַמּוֹ		te vos [o]ptegãt. [p]Videte	νω καὶ ζωοποιήσω. πατάξω, κἀγὼ ἰάσομαι. καὶ ουκ ἐστιν ὃς ἐξε
שבה	כִּי דַם עֲבָדָיו יִקּוֹם וְנָקָם יָשִׁיב		[p]ego [q]ſim ſolus: [r]& nõ	at de manibus meis. qñ leuabo in celũ manũ
נקם שוב	לְצָרָיו וְכִפֶּר אַדְמָתוֹ עַמּוֹ וַיָּבֹא		ſit [q]alius [r]deus [s]preter me.	meã: τ iurabo dexterã mea. τ dicã: viuo ego in eternũ.
צור בוא	מֹשֶׁה וַיְדַבֵּר אֶת כָּל דִּבְרֵי הַשִּׁירָה		[s]Ego [t]occidã: [u]& ego vi	μου, καὶ ὀμοῦμαι τῇ δεξιᾷ μου. καὶ ἐρῶ, ζῶ ἐγὼ εἰς τον αἰῶνα.
דבר שור	הַזֹּאת בְּאָזְנֵי הָעָם הוּא וְהוֹשֵׁעַ		uere faciã: [v]pcutiã [w]& ego	qñ acuã vt fulgur gladiũ meũ: τ arripiet
בן נון	בִּן נוּן: וַיְכַל מֹשֶׁה לְדַבֵּר אֶת כָּל		[v]ſanabo: [w]& nõ ē [x]qui de	ὅτι παροξυνῶ ὡς ἀσπραπὴν τὴν μάχαιράν μου, καὶ ἀνθέξεται
כלה	הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה אֶל כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל:		mãu mea [y]possit eruere.	iudiciũ manus mea. τ reddã vltiõς hoſtibus:
	וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם שִׂימוּ לְבַבְכֶם		[z]Leuabo [a]ad celũ manũ	κρίματος ἡ χείρ μου. καὶ ἀνταποδώσω δίκην τοῖς ἐχθροῖς,
אמר שום	לְכָל הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר אָנֹכִי מֵעִיד		meã [b]& dicã. [c]Viuo [d]ego	τ odiẽtib me retribuã. inebriabo ſagittas meas aſã
עוד	בָּכֶם הַיּוֹם אֲשֶׁר תְּצַוֵּם אֶת		[e]in eternum. [f]Si [g]m acuero	guine: τ gladi [h] meus deuo: abit carnes de cruore occi
צוה			vt [h]fulgur [i]gladiũ meum	αἱματος, καὶ ἡ μάχαιρά μου φαγεται κρέα ἀφ αἱματος τραυ=
			[k]& arripuerit [l]iudicium	ſor. ▪ captiuitate a capite [i]pncipũ inimicor. le
			[m]mãus mea: [n]Reddã [o]vl=	ματιῶν καὶ ἀιχμαλωσίας ἀπὸ κεφαλῆς ἀρχόντων ἐχθρῶν. ἐυ
			tionẽ [p]hoſtibus meis: [q]&	tamini celi ſimul cũ eo. τ adorẽt eũ vni
			his q oderũt [r]me retribu	φράνθητε ουρανοὶ ἅμα αὐτῶ. καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῶ πάν
			am. [s]Inebriabo [t]ſagittas	uerſi angeli dei. letamini gẽtes cũ pplo eius: τ robo
			meas [u]ſãguie: [v]& gladius	τες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ. ἐυφράνθητε ἔθνη μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτ. καὶ ἐνι=
			meus [w]deuorabit carnes	rẽtur in eo oẽs filij dei. qñ ſãguinẽ filioꝝ e=
			[x]de cruore [y]occiſorum [z]&	χυσάτωσαν αὐτῶ πάντες υἱοὶ θεοῦ. ὁτι τὸ αἷμα τῶν υἱῶν αὐ
			[a] de captiuitate [b]nudati [i]	ius vlciſcit. τ vlciſcet τ retribuet vindictã ini
			nimicorũ capitis. [c]Lau	τοῦ ἐκδικεῖται. καὶ ἐκδικήσει καὶ ἀνταποδώσει δίκην τοῖς ἐχ
			date [d]gẽtes [e]populũ eius	micis: τ odiẽtibus cũ retribuet. τ expurgabit
			[f]quia [g]ſãguinẽ [h]ſeruorũ	θροῖς, καὶ τοῖς μισοῦσιν αὐτον ἀνταποδώσει. καὶ ἐκκαθαριεῖ
			ſuoꝝ [i]vlciſcetur. [k]Et vidi	δῆς [k]τ populi ſui. τ ſcripſit moſes catiũ hoc
			cta [l]retribuet [i] hoſtes co	κς τὴν γῆν τ λαοῦ αὐτ. καὶ ἐγραψε μωυσῆς τὴν ὠδὴν ταύτην
			rum. [m]& ꝓpiti [n]erit [o]terre	in illa die. τ docuit illud filios iſrael. ▪
			[p]populi ſui. [q]Venit ergo	ἐν ἐκείνη τῇ ἡμέρα. καὶ ἐδίδαξεν αὐτὴν τοὺς υἱοὺς ἰσραήλ. καὶ
			[r]moyſes [s]& locut [t] oĩa	accellit moyſes τ locutus ẽ oĩa ⸗ba le
			[u]verba [v]cãtici hui [w]in au	προσῆλθε μωυσῆς καὶ ἐλάλησε πάντας τοὺς λόγους τ ῴ=
			rib [x]populi: [y]ipſe [z]& io	gis huius in aurib populi: ipe ▪ iohue filius nun.
			ſue [a]filij [b]nun. [c]Cõpleuit	μου τοῦ τους εἰς τὰ ὦτα τοῦ λαοῦ, αὐτὸς καὶ ἰησοῦς ὁ τ ναυή.
			q; [d]oẽs [e]ſermões [f]iſtos [g]lo	▪ cõpleuit moyſes loq̃ns ſermões iſtos vniuerſo
			qns [h]ad [i]vniuerſum [k]iſra	καὶ συνετέλεσε μωυσῆς λαλῶν τους λόγους τούτους πανti

Diuisiua chal.	Interp. chal.	Transla. Chal.
גלה דון	in tẽpore quo migrabit de terra ſua: qñ ꝓpe eſt dies	לְעִידָן דְּיִנְלוּן מִן אַרְעֲהוֹן אֲרֵי קָרִיב יוֹם תְּבָרָן וּמַבָּע דְּאָתֵיד לְהוֹן: אֲרֵי יְדִין יְיָ דִינָא
קרב יום	interitus eor: τ feſtinabit qõ futurũ eſt eis. ▪ Qñ iudi	דְּעַמֵּיהּ וּבְעַבְדּוֹהִי צַדִּיקַיָּא יִתְבָּרֵעַ אֲרֵי יְגֵלִי קֳדָמוֹהִי דְּהָתְקְפוּ עַל
פרע	cabit dñs iudiciũ populi ſui τ vltionẽ ſeruoꝝ ſuoꝝ tu	עַמְמַיָּא וּבְרוּרַת עַבְדּוֹהִי צַדִּיקַיָּא יִתְבָּרֵעַ אֲרֵי גְלֵי קֳדָמוֹהִי דְּהָתְקוֹף עַל
נחם	ſtozũ vlciſcet: qñ manifeſtũ eſt eorum eo q in tpe quo	עַמְמַיָּא סַגְיָא יְהוֹן מְמַלְּלִין וּשְׁבִירִין: יְרַיְמֵר אֲן חַלְתְּהוֹן תַּקִּיפָא דַּהֲוָא רְחִיצָ בֵּיהּ
עזב	ꝓpualebit ꝓtra eos plaga inimici: erũt inhabites τ dere	דִּיתְבֵי נְכַסְתְּהוֹן דְּהוֹן אַכְלִין שָׁתֵן חַמַר נִכְסֵיהוֹן יְקוּמוּן בְּעֵן וְיִסַּעֲדוּנְכוֹן יְהוֹן עֲלֵיכוֹן
חסה	licti. τ dicet vbi ẽ terribilis eor: τ fortis in quo habe	סַגְנֵן: חֲזוֹ כְּעַן אֲרֵי אֲנָא אֲנָא הוּא וְלֵית אֱלָהָא בַּר מִנִּי אֲנָא מְמִית וְאַחְיֵא מְסָיֵנָא
שתה נסך קום	bãt fiduciã: de quoꝝ victimis comedebãt adipẽ: τ bi	וְלֵית מִן יְדִי מְשֵׁיזִיבוּ: וַאֲרֵי אֶסְתַּקַּף בְּשָׁמַיָּא בֵּית שְׁכִנְתִּי וַאֲמַרִית קַיָּם אֲנָא לְעָלְמִין:
עתה היה ראה	bebãt vinũ libaminũ eor: surgãt nũc τ auxiliẽt vob:	אִם עַל חַד תְּרִין בְּחֵירוּ בְּרָקָא מְסוֹף שְׁמַיָּא וְעַד סוֹף שְׁמַיָּא תְּתְנַל חַרְבִּי וְתִתְקַף בְּדִינָא
עזר	et ſint ſup vos in protectionẽ. ▪ videte nũc qñ ego ego	יָדִי אָתֵיב נְקָמָא לְסַנָּאַי וְלִבְעָלֵי דְבָבַי אֲשַׁלֵּם: אֲרַוֵּי גָרֵי מִדְּמָא וְחַרְבִּי תְּתָקְטוֹל
חיה מות	ſum: τ nõ eſt deus preter me. Ego occido τ viuificо:	בְּעַמְמַיָּא מִדַּם קְטִילִין וְשִׁבְיָנָא לְאַנְעָאָה כְּתִרִין מֵרִישׁ סַנָּאֵה וְעַיִל דִּבְבָא: שַׁבַּח עַמְמַיָּא
נצל	percutio τ etiã ſano: τ nõ eſt qui de manu mea poſſit	דִּינָא דְּעַמֵּיהּ וְעַל עַבְדּוֹהִי צַדִּיקַיָּא יִתְפָּרַע מִתְבָּרַע וּפוּרְעָנוּתָא יְתֵב לְסַנָּאֵיהוֹן וְיִכַּפַּר
נשא	eruere. Qñ prepaui in celis domũ maieſtatis mee:	עַל אַרְעֵיהּ עַל עַמֵּיהּ: וַאֲתָא מֹשֶׁה וּמַלֵּיל יַת כָּל פִּתְגָמֵי תּוּשְׁבַּחְתָּא הָדָא קֳדָם עַמָּא
שנן	et dixi viuo ego in ſempiternũ. Si in duplũ pluſq; ful	הוּא וְהוֹשֵׁעַ בַּר נוּן: וְשֵׁיצִי מֹשֶׁה לְמַלָּלָא יַת כָּל פִּתְגָמַיָּא הָאֵילֵין עִם כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאָמַר
חזה שפט	gur apparet a ſummitate celi τ vſq; ad ſummitatẽ eius	לְהוֹן שַׁוּוֹ לִבְכוֹן לְכָל פִּתְגָמַיָּא דְּאַנָא סָהֵיד בְּכוֹן יוֹמָא דֵּין יַת בְּנֵיכוֹן דְּיִפְקְדוּנוּן יַת
שוה	reuelabit gladius meus: τ apprehẽdet iudiciũ manꝰ	
שלם רעה	mea: reddã vltionẽ hoſtibus meis: τ inimicis meis	
שוב	retribuã. Inebriabo ſagittas meas ſanguine: τ gladi	
שחה עדה	meꝰ occidet populos: de cruore occiſoꝝ τ captiuoꝝ:	
כפר	vt auferã corona de capite hoſtis τ inimici. Laudа	
תוב	te gẽtes populũ eius: qñ vidicтũ fer noꝝ ſuoꝝ iudicii	
שצא	vlciſcetur: τ vltionẽ reddet inimicis ſuis: τ propicius	
שוה	erit terre ſue τ populo ſuo. Et venit moyſes τ locutus	
סהד	eſt oĩa ⁘ba cantici huiꝰ coram populo: ipſe τ iohue filiꝰ	
	nun. Et cõſumauit moyſes loq̃ oĩa verba hec cũ omni	
	iſrael: τ dixit ad eos. ¶Ponite cor veſtrum ad omnia	
	verba que ego teſtificor vobis hodie: que precipietis	

UPPER PART: HEBREW, VULGATE, SEPTUAGINT (WITH INTERLINEAR LATIN TRANSLATION)
LOWER PART: CHALDAIC, WITH LATIN TRANSLATION. IN THE LEFT-HAND MARGIN ARE
GIVEN HEBREW AND CHALDAIC ROOTS. PHOTOGRAPHED FROM ONE OF TWO COPIES
OF ORIGINAL EDITION (600 COPIES) IN THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

manual texts extant. More recently the apparatus has been used to better advantage in the edition of Ginsburg (The New Massoretico-Critical Text of the Hebrew Bible, 1894) and in that of Baer and Delitzsch. The last-named appeared in single books, beginning with the year 1861. The Books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy are still wanting; both editors are dead, so that their work will have to be completed by other hands.

(2) Critical Editions of the Pre-Massoretic Text.—The editors whose work we have thus far noticed endeavoured to restore as far as possible the text of the Massorah. However valuable such an edition may be in itself, it cannot pretend to be the last word which textual criticism has to say concerning the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. After all, the Massoretic text attained to its fixed form in the early centuries of the Christian Era; before that period there were found many text-forms which differed considerably from the Massoretic, and which nevertheless may represent the original text with fair accuracy. The most ancient and reliable witness for the pre-Massoretic text-form of the Hebrew Bible is found in the Septuagint. But it is practically certain that, even at the time of the Septuagint, the original text had suffered considerable corruptions; these can be corrected only by comparing parallel passages of the context, or again by conjectural criticism; a critical edition of this kind presupposes, therefore, a critical edition of the Septuagint text.

Various attempts have been made to restore the pre-Massoretic text of single books of the Old Testament: thus Olshausen worked at the reconstruction of the Book of Genesis (Beiträge zur Kritik des überlieferten Textes im Buche Genesis, 1870); Wellhausen (Text der Bücher Samuelis, 1871), Driver (Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel, 1890), and Klostermann (Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige, 1887) at the correction of the Books of Samuel; Cornill at the correction of the Book of Ezechiel (Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel, 1886). To these might be added various other publications; e. g., several recent commentaries, some of the works published by Bickell, etc. But all these works concern only part of the Old Testament text. "The Sacred Books of the Old Testament", edited by Paul Haupt (see CRITICISM, BIBLICAL, s. v. *Textual*), is a series intended to embrace the whole Hebrew text, though the value of its criticism is in many instances questionable; Kittel's "Biblia Hebraica" (Leipzig, 1905), too, deserves a mention among the critical editions which attempt to restore the pre-Massoretic Hebrew text.

II. EDITIONS OF THE GREEK TEXT OF THE BIBLE.—Before speaking of the Greek text of the New Testament, we shall have to give a brief account of the editions of the Greek books of the Old Testament. They appear partly in separate editions, partly in conjunction with the Septuagint.

1. *Separate Editions.*—The principal separate editions of the deuterocanonical books appeared at Antwerp, 1566 (Plantin), 1584, and with Latin text taken from Ximenes' Polyglot, 1612; at Frankfort, 1694; Halle, 1749, 1766 (Kircher); Leipzig, 1757 (Reineccius), 1804 (Augusti), 1837 (Apel), 1871 (Fritzsche); Oxford, 1805; London, 1871 (Greek and English); Frankfort and Leipzig, 1691 (partial edition); Book of Tobias, Franeker, 1591 (Drusius), and Freiburg, 1870 (Reusch); Book of Judith, Würzburg, 1887 (Scholz, Commentar); Book of Wisdom, 1586 (Holkoth's "Prælectiones" edited by Ryterus); Coburg, 1601 (Faber); Venice, 1827 (Greek, Latin, and Armenian); Freiburg, 1858 (Reusch); Oxford, 1881 (Deane); Ecclesiasticus, 1551, '55, '68, '70, '89, '90 (Drusius), 1804 (Bretschneider); Books of Machabees, Franeker, 1600 (Drusius); I Mach., Helmstädt, 1784 (Bruns).

2. *Editions Joined to the Septuagint.*—The history of these editions of the deuterocanonical books of the Old Testament is connected with that of the Septuagint editions. The reader will find full information on this question in the article SEPTUAGINT.

SWETE, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge, 1902), 171 sqq.; *Urtext und Uebersetzungen der Bibel* (Leipzig, 1897), 64 sqq.; NESTLE in HAST., *Dictionary of the Bible* (New York, 1903), IV, 437 sqq.; KAULEN in *Kirchenlex.*, II, 596 sq.; MASCH, *Bibliotheca sacra* (Halle, 1778), I, 427–436.

The newly invented art of printing had flourished for more than half a century before an attempt was made to publish an edition of the Greek New Testament. The Canticles, Magnificat, and Benedictus were printed at Milan, 1481; at Venice, 1486 and 1496, as an appendix to the Greek Psalter; John, i, 1, to vi, 58, appeared in Venice, 1495 and 1504, together with the poems of St. Gregory Nazianzen; the beginning of the Fourth Gospel, John, i, 1–14, was published at Venice, 1495, and at Tübingen, 1511. Not that the reading public of that age did not feel interested in the other parts of the New Testament; but it did not show any desire for the Greek text of the Bible. After the beginning of the sixteenth century the world's attitude with regard to the Greek text of the New Testament changed considerably. Not counting the publication of codices, mere stereotype reprints, or the issue of parts of the Testament, the number of editions of the complete Greek text has been estimated at about 550; in other words, since the beginning of the sixteenth century, every year has witnessed the publication of, roughly speaking, two new editions of the complete Greek text. For our present purpose, we may consider the principal editions under the four headings of the Complutensian, the Erasmian, the Received, and the Critical text.

1. *The Complutensian Text.*—It was the Archbishop of Toledo, Cardinal Ximenes de Cisneros, who began at Alcalá, in 1502, the preparation of the edition of the Old Testament in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, and of the New Testament in Greek and Latin. It has been thus far impossible to ascertain what codices served as the basis of the work called the Complutensian Polyglot. Though Leo X sent from the Vatican Library some manuscripts *venerandæ vetustatis* for the use of the scholars engaged in the work at Alcalá, it is quite certain that the well-known Codex Vaticanus was not among them. It appears that the Greek New Testament text of the Polyglot rests on the readings of a few manuscripts only, belonging to the so-called Byzantine family (see CRITICISM, BIBLICAL, s. v. *Textual*). The charge that the Complutensian text was corrected according to the evidence of the Latin Vulgate, is now generally abandoned, excepting with regard to I John, v, 7. The New-Testament text is contained in the fifth or, according to other arrangements, in the last of the six folios of the Polyglot; it was finished 10 Jan., 1514, and though the rest of the work was ready 10 July, 1517, four months before the great cardinal's death (8 Nov., 1517), it was not published until Leo X had given his permission *proprio motu*, 22 March, 1520.

The Complutensian text, corrected according to certain readings of the Erasmian and of that of Stephanus, was repeated in the Antwerp Polyglot published, under the auspices of King Philip II, by the Spanish theologian Benedict Arias Montanus and his companions, and printed by the celebrated typographer, Christopher Plantin, of Antwerp, 1569–72. The Greek New Testament text occurs in the fifth and in the last of the eight folios which make up the Antwerp Polyglot; in the fifth it is accompanied by the Syriac text (both in Hebrew and Syriac letters), its Latin version, and the Latin Vulgate; in the eighth volume, the Greek text has been corrected in a few passages, and is accompanied by the interlinear Latin Vulgate text. The text of the fifth volume of the Antwerp Polyglot was repeated only in the fifth volume of the Paris Polyglot, 1630–33, while that of the

eighth volume reappears in a number of editions: Antwerp, 1573–84 (four editions, Christopher Plantin); Leyden, 1591–1613 (four editions, Rapheleng); Paris, 1584 (Syriac, Latin, and Greek text; Prevosteau); Heidelberg, 1599, 1602 (Commelin); Lyons, 1599 (Vincent); Geneva, 1599; Geneva, 1609–27 (eight very different editions; Pierre de la Rouière, Sam. Crispin, James Stoer); Leipzig, 1657 (with the interlinear version of Arias Montanus; Kirchner); Vienna, 1740 (edited by Debiel, published by Kaliwoda); Mainz, 1753 (edited by Goldhagen; published by Varrentrapp); Liège, 1839 (Kersten). To these editions, containing the Plantinian, or the modified Complutensian, text, the following may be added, which represent a mixture of the text of Plantin and that of Stephanus: Cologne, 1592 (Arnold Mylius; Greek and Latin text); Nuremberg, 1599–1600 (Hutter's Polyglot, twelve languages); 1602 (the same, four languages); Amsterdam, 1615 (the same, Welschaert); Geneva, 1628 (Jean de Tournes; one edition gives only the Greek text, another gives Beza's Latin version and a French translation).

2. *The Erasmian Text.*—On 17 April, 1515, the well-known humanist, Beatus Rhenanus, invited Desiderius Erasmus, who lived at the time in England, to edit the Greek New Testament which John Froben, a celebrated printer of Basle, was anxious to publish before Pope Leo X should give his permission to put forth the Complutensian text printed more than a year before. Erasmus hastened to Basle, and printed almost bodily the text of the manuscripts that happened to fall into his hands: the Gospels according to a manuscript of Basle (Evv. 2); the Book of Acts and the Epistles according to another manuscript of Basle (Act. 2); the Apocalypse according to a manuscript named after Reuchlin "Codex Reuchlini" (Apoc. 1). He made a few corrections after superficially collating some other Basle manuscripts, Evv. 1 among the rest. Since Reuchlin's manuscript did not contain the end of the Apocalypse, Erasmus translated Apoc., xxii, 16b–21, from the Vulgate. The printing began in Sept., 1515, and the whole New Testament text was finished in the beginning of March, 1516. Under these circumstances satisfactory work could hardly be expected; Erasmus himself, in a letter to Pirkheimer, confesses that the first New Testament edition is "præcipitatum verius quam editum". In 1519 appeared the second Erasmus edition, in which the text of the first was almost entirely repeated, though several hundred mistakes were corrected. Luther followed this edition in his German translation of the New Testament. Urged by the importunities of his critics, Erasmus admitted into his third edition (1522) the passage I John, v, 7, according to the reading of the Codex Montfort. (Evv. 61). In his fourth edition (1527) he changed his text, especially in Apoc., in several passages according to the readings of the Complutensian Polyglot; in the fifth edition (1535) he repeated the text of the fourth with very few changes.

The Erasmian text was frequently reprinted: Venice, 1518; Hagenau, 1521; Basle, 1524, 31, etc.; Strasburg, 1524; Antwerp, 1571, etc.; Paris, 1546 and 1549 (Robertus Stephanus introduced corrections from the Complutensian Polyglot); in his third edition, R. Stephanus repeats the fifth Erasmian with variants from fifteen manuscripts and the Complutensian Polyglot (Paris, 1550). This edition is called *Regia*, and is the basis of the English Authorized Version (1611). Stephanus's fourth edition (Geneva, 1551) adds the Latin to the Greek text, the latter of which is for the first time divided into verses, a contrivance which was introduced into the Latin Vulgate in 1555, and then became general. The last edition of R. Stephanus was reprinted with slight modifications a great number of times; its principal repetitions were those supervised by Theodore Beza (Geneva, 1565, 1582, 1589, 1598 in folio; 1565, 1567, 1580, 1590, 1604 in octavo) and the brothers Bonaventure and Abraham Elzevir (Leyden, 1624, 1633, 1641; Amsterdam, 1656, 1662, 1670, 1678). In the preface of the second Elzevir edition (Leyden, 1633) we read the words: "Textum ergo habes nunc ab omnibus receptum." Hence this Elzevir text became known as the *textus receptus*, or the Received Text.

3. *The Received Text.*—From what has been said it follows that the Received Text is that of the second Elzevir edition, which is practically identical with the text of Theodore Beza, or the fourth edition of Robertus Stephanus corrected in about one hundred and fifty passages according to the readings of the Codex Claromontanus, the Codex Cantabrigiensis, the Latin, Syriac, and Arabic versions, and certain critical notes of Henry Stephanus. In its turn, the fourth edition of Robertus Stephanus is almost identical with the fifth Erasmian edition which exhibits the text of five rather recent manuscripts corrected in about a hundred passages according to the reading of the Complutensian Polyglot. Still, it can hardly be denied that the readings peculiar to the text can be traced at least as far back as the fourth century. For about a century the Received Text held undisputed sway; its editions numbered about one hundred and seventy, some of the more important being the following: (1) The fifth volume of Brian Walton's "Biblia Polyglotta" (London, 1657) contains the New Testament in Greek, Latin, Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic; a learned apparatus is added in the sixth volume. (2) John Fell edited the text anonymously (Oxford, 1675) with variants collected "ex plus centum mss. codicibus et antiquis versionibus". (3) John Mill reprinted the text of Stephanus, 1550, together with valuable prolegomena and a critical apparatus (Oxford, 1707), and L. Kuster published an enlarged and corrected edition of Mill's work (Amsterdam, 1710). (4) Not to speak of Richard Bentley's "Proposals for Printing", published in 1720, we must mention Wetstein's edition, the prolegomena to which appeared anonymously in 1730, and were followed by the body of the work in two folios (Amsterdam, 1751–1752) with an apparatus collected from codices, versions, readings of the Fathers, printed editions, and works of Biblical scholars. He also laid down principles for the use of variants, but did not put them into practice consistently enough. (5) The principles advocated by Wetstein were more faithfully followed in W. Bowyer's edition of the Greek New Testament (London, 1763). (6) When the foregoing scholars had collected an almost unmanageable number of variants, John Albert Bengel endeavoured to simplify their use by dividing them into two families, an Asiatic and an African; besides, he constructed a Greek text based on the readings of previous editions, excepting that of the Apocalypse, which was based also on the readings of manuscripts (Tübingen, 1734). (7) This edition was enlarged and emended by Burck (Tübingen, 1763).

4. *The Critical Text.*—In the last paragraph we have enumerated a list of editions of the Greek New Testament which contain, besides the text, a more or less complete apparatus for the critical reconstruction of the true reading. We shall now mention a number of editions in which such a reconstruction was attempted.

(1) Griesbach developed Bengel's method of grouping the variants into a formal system. He admitted three textual recensions: the Occidental, the Alexandrian (or Oriental), and the Constantinopolitan (or Byzantine). The first two he derived from the middle of the second century, and the third he considered as a mixture of the two, belonging to the fourth century, though subsequently modified. After laying down his principles of textual criticism, he tried to reconstruct the text best known in the ancient Church of both East and West. In 1774 he published the text of the synoptic Gospels; in 1796–1806, the text of the

New Testament, called "Editio secunda"; in 1827 David Schulz added the first volume of a third edition. Griesbach is not always faithful to his principles, being too much under the sway of the Received Text; moreover, he did not sufficiently utilize the codices most important for his purpose. His text has been followed by Schott, Knapp, Tittmann, Hahn, and Theile.

(2) It suffices to mention the editions of Mace (London, 1729), Harwood (London, 1776), Matthaei (Riga, 1782–1788), Alter (Vienna, 1786), and Scholz (Leipzig, 1830–1836); the last named scholar (a Catholic, and professor of exegesis in the University of Bonn) reduced Griesbach's first two recensions to one, distinguishing it only from the Constantinopolitan text-form, which he derived from the more correct copies circulating in Asia Minor, Syria, and Greece during the first centuries. Scholz himself had industriously collected manuscripts in the East. The labours of Hug and Eichhorn may also be mentioned briefly. The former substituted his so-called Common Edition, and the latter the uncorrected text of Asia and Africa, for Griesbach's Occidental class. Both Hug and Eichhorn assign the Alexandrian text-form to Hesychius, and the Byzantine to Lucian; finally, Hug assigns to the labours of Origen in his old age a fourth text-form identical with a middle class favoured by Griesbach and Eichhorn. Rinck (1830) divided the Occidental manuscripts into African and Latin, both of which are surpassed in purity by the Oriental.

(3) Carl Lachmann was the first critic who tried to reconstruct a New Testament text independent of the Received. Believing that the autograph text could not be found, he endeavoured to restore the text-form most common in the Oriental Church during the course of the fourth century. He published his small stereotype edition in 1831 (Berlin), and his large Latin-Greek text in 1842–50 (Berlin); this latter is accompanied by P. Buttmann's list of authorities for the Greek readings. Though Lachmann's text is preferable to the Received, his apparatus and the use he made of it are hardly satisfactory in the light of our present-day methods.

(4) Among the editors of the New Testament text, Tischendorf deserves a place of honour. During the thirty years which he devoted exclusively to textual studies, he published twenty or twenty-one editions of the Greek Testament; the most noteworthy among them belong to one or another of the following five recensions: (a) In 1841 (Leipzig) he issued an edition in which he surpassed even Lachmann in his departure from the Received Text; the ancient manuscripts, the early versions, and the citations of the Fathers were regarded as the highest authorities in the selection of his reading. In 1842 Tischendorf published in Paris an edition destined for the French Protestants (Didot), and in the same year and place, at the instance of the Abbé I. M. Jager, another for the French Catholics, which he dedicated to Archbishop Affre. In this he received the Greek readings most in keeping with the Latin Vulgate. (b) The second recension consists of four stereotype editions (12mo, 1842–59) containing the Greek text brought into agreement with the Latin Vulgate. (c) Tischendorf's third recension is represented by his fourth (Lipsiensis secunda, 1849; Winter), his fifth (stereotype; Leipzig, 1850, Tauchnitz), and his sixth edition (with corrected Latin Vulgate and Luther's translation; Leipzig, 1854, Avenarius and Mendelssohn). A separate print of the Greek text of this last edition (1855) constitutes the first of Tischendorf's so-called "academic" editions. In the seventh reprint of the academic edition, as well as in the third of Tauchnitz's stereotype text, the readings were changed according to Tischendorf's fifth recension. (d) The fourth recension is found in Tischendorf's "Editio Septima Critica Maior" (Leipzig, 1856–59; Winter). The work contains valuable prolegomena and a detailed critical apparatus. (e) Tischendorf's fifth recension is found in his "Editio Octava Critica Maior" (Leipzig, 1864–72, Giesecke and Devrient). In his first recension Tischendorf is further removed than Lachmann from the Received Text; in his second he favours the Latin Vulgate; in the third, and still more in the fourth, he returns to the readings of the Received Text of Elzevir and Griesbach; but in the fifth he again follows the principles of Lachmann and favours the readings of his first recension rather than those of his third and fourth. Tischendorf will always occupy a high rank among the editors of the Greek text; but he is rather a student of the text than a textual critic. The "Prolegomena" to the eighth edition had to be supplied by C. R. Gregory on account of the great editor's untimely death (7 Dec., 1874). Gregory published these "Prolegomena" in three instalments (Leipzig, 1884, 1890, 1894), giving the reader a most satisfactory and complete summary of the information necessary or useful for the better understanding of the Greek text and its apparatus.

(5) The discrepancy between the text of Scholz's edition (Leipzig, 1830–36) and the readings of the early documents stimulated Tregelles to study the textual questions more thoroughly in order to relieve the existing uncertainty. The favourable reception of his "Book of Revelation in Greek . . . with a new English Version" published with a "Prospectus of a Critical Edition of the Greek New Testament, now in Preparation" encouraged him to continue the arduous course of studies he had begun. After collating all the more important manuscripts which were to be found in England, he visited the libraries of Rome, Florence, Modena, Venice, Munich, Basle, Paris, Hamburg, Dresden, Wolfenbüttel, and Utrecht for an accurate study of their respective codices. It has been noted that when the results of Tregelles differ from those of Tischendorf, the former are usually correct. He was enabled to publish the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark in 1857; those of St. Luke and St. John in 1861; the Acts and the Catholic Epistles in 1865; the Pauline Epistles in 1869–70. While engaged on the last chapters of the Apocalypse, he had a stroke of apoplexy, so that this part had to be finished by the hand of a friend (1872). Seven years later, Hort and Streane added "Prolegomena" to the work of Tregelles. A reprint of the text without its critical apparatus appeared in 1887. The character of the work is well described by its title, "The Greek New Testament, Edited from Ancient Authorities, with their Various Readings in full, and the Latin Version of Jerome" (London, 1857-79).

(6) The textual labours of Tregelles and Tischendorf were, to a certain extent, overshadowed by the work achieved by the two eminent Cambridge scholars, Brook Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort. Like their predecessors, they acknowledged and followed the principles of Lachmann; but they differed from Lachmann as well as from Tischendorf and Tregelles in utilizing and systematizing the genealogical grouping of the ancient readings, thus connecting their labours with the views of Bengel and Griesbach. They distinguished four branches of textual tradition. (a) The Western has a tendency to paraphrase the text and to interpolate it from parallel passages and other sources. It is found mainly in Codex D, the old Latin Version, and partly in Cureton's Syriac manuscript. (b) The Alexandrian is purer than the Western, but contains changes of a grammatical character. It is found in the oldest uncial codices, except in B (and part of ℵ), a number of cursive manuscripts, and the Egyptian versions. (c) The Syrian is a mixture of all the other texts, or at least it contains some of the characteristics of all the others. It is found in the later uncials, and in most of the cursive manuscripts and versions. (d) The neutral text comes nearest to the original text, being almost identical with it. Its

pure form is found nowhere, but the readings of ℵ and some of the oldest uncials, especially of B, give us the nearest approach to it. As to the value of the several classes of readings, Hort believes that most of the Western and Alexandrian, and all the Syrian must be rejected; these latter he finds nowhere before the middle of the third century. All the necessary explanations have been collected in a volume accompanying Westcott and Hort's "New Testament in the Original Greek" (Cambridge and London, 1881). The volume contains an introduction (324 pages) and an appendix (173 pages). The introduction treats of the necessity of Textual New-Testament Criticism (pp. 4–18), of its various methods (19–72), of the application of its principles to the restoration of the New-Testament text (73–287), and finally of the character, the aim, and the arrangement of the new edition (288–324). The appendix contains critical comments on difficult passages (pp. 1–140), notes on certain orthographic and grammatical discrepancies between the ancient codices (pp. 141–173), and finally a complete list of the Old-Testament passages employed in the New (pp. 174–188). The volume containing the text of Westcott and Hort's edition was printed also separately in the year of the first appearance. In 1885 (1887, etc.) the text appeared separately in a volume of smaller size, and in 1895–96 both volumes of the original work were published anew in their larger form.

(7) Westcott and Hort's Greek New Testament, though hailed with delight by a great number of textual critics, did not meet with unchallenged praise. Among the dissenters were Godet, Wunderlich, Dobschütz, Jülicher, Bousset, and Burgon (The Revision Revised; The Quarterly Review, 1881–82; 2nd edit., London, 1885). Of these, some object to Westcott and Hort's method, others to their appreciation of Codex B, others to their attitude towards the so-called Western readings, others, finally, uphold the claims of the Received Text. In the third and fourth editions of his "Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament", F. H. Scrivener writes against the views of Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott-Hort; he favours the readings of the later manuscripts in the reconstruction of the Greek New-Testament text, and advocates the return to a text-form similar to the Received Text. Among his various publications we may notice "The New Testament in the Original Greek, together with the Variations Adopted in the Revised Version" (New Edition, London, 1894) and his various collations of texts (Twenty Manuscripts of the Gospels, London, 1853; Collation of Codex Sinaiticus with the Received Text, Cambridge and London, 1863, 1867). Here may be mentioned also "The Greek Testament with a critically revised text, a digest of various readings, marginal references to verbal and idiomatic usage, prolegomena, and a critical and exegetical commentary" edited by Henry Alford, afterwards Dean of Canterbury (London, 1849–1857; sixth edition, 1871). Tischendorf was of opinion that Alford's revision of the text was not satisfactory. Again, "The New Testament in the Original Greek, with Notes and Introduction" (London, 1856–60; newly edited with index, 1867), by Christopher Wordsworth, Canon of Westminster, is a mixture of the texts of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Elzevir. Finally, in connexion with the Revised Edition, Professor C. Palmer, of Oxford, published "The Greek Testament, with the Readings adopted by the Revisers of the Authorised Version" (Oxford, 1881; Clarendon Press).

(8) Among the chief works dealing with the textual restoration of the Greek New Testament which have appeared in recent years, we must mention the edition of B. Weiss: Part I, Acts, Catholic Epistles, Apocalypse (Leipzig, 1894, Hinrichs); Part II, The Pauline Epistles together with Hebr. (1896); Part III, The Gospels (1900). A manual edition of this text appeared 1902–05, in three volumes; the mistakes of the first issue were corrected as far as possible. Richard Francis Weymouth edited in a handy form "The Resultant Greek Testament" (London, 1886, Elliot Stock; cheap edition, 1892 and 1896; third edition, 1905); in it he gives us the text on which the majority of modern editors are agreed, together with all the readings of Stephens (1550), Lachmann, Tregelles, Lightfoot, Ellicott, Alford, Weiss, the Bale Edition (1880), Westcott-Hort, and the Revision Committee, with an introduction by J. J. St. Perowne. The editor may not give the reader anything of his own, but he furnishes an amount of textual erudition which the Bible student can hardly afford to neglect. Dr. E. Nestle has edited a "Novum Testamentum Græce cum apparatu critico" (Stuttgart, 1898, 1899, 1901, 1903, 1904, 1906) based on the four most prominent of the recent texts: Tischendorf, Westcott-Hort, Weymouth, and Weiss. All the variants of the four editions, excepting as to minor details, are noted, so that the reader obtains at a glance the results of the foremost textual criticism on any given text. It would be difficult indeed to contrive a handier and more complete edition of the Greek text than this of Nestle's, which seems likely to become the Received Text of the twentieth century.

(9) It is, therefore, all the more to be regretted that Nestle's text cannot be recommended to the general Catholic reader. Not to mention other shortcomings, it places John, v, 4, and vii, 53–viii, 11, among the foot-notes, and represents Mark, xvi, 9–20, together with an alternative ending of the Second Gospel, as a "Western non-interpolation", suggesting that it is an ancient Eastern interpolation of the sacred text. The rules of the new Index enumerate with precision those classes of Catholics who may read texts like that of Nestle; others must content themselves with one or another of the following editions: P. A. Gratz re-edited the Complutensian text (Tübingen, 1821; Füs); L. Van Ess published a combination of the Complutensian and the Erasmian text (Tübingen, 1827; Füs); Jaumann adheres closely to the edition of Tittmann (Munich, 1832; Lindauer); we have already mentioned Tischendorf's text prepared for Catholic readers under the influence of I. M. Jager (Paris, 1847, 1851, 1859); Reithmayr produced a combination of this latter edition and that of Lachmann (Munich, 1847; Ratisbon, 1851); V. Loch derived his text, as far as possible, from the Codex Vaticanus (Ratisbon, 1862); Tauchnitz published, with the approbation of the proper ecclesiastical authority of Dresden, Theile's text almost without change, together with the text of the Latin Vulgate; Brandscheid edited the Greek text and the Latin Vulgate of the New Testament in such a way as to bring the former as much as possible into agreement with the latter (Freiburg, 1901, etc.); finally, M. Hetzenauer published his "Novum Testamentum Græce" (Innsbruck, 1904, Wagner), reproducing in separate form the Greek text of his Greek-Latin edition (1896–98). He is more independent of the Vulgate text than Brandscheid, and he adds the more important variants in the margin, or in foot-notes, or again in an *appendix critica*.

(10) It must not be imagined that the textual criticism of the New Testament has arrived at a state that can be regarded as final. Without doing injustice to the splendid results attained by the labours of the scholars enumerated in this article, it must be confessed that the condition of the textual criticism of the New Testament is more uncertain to-day than it was twenty years ago. The uncertainty springs mainly from the doubts of our critics as to the real value of the Western readings. Professor Blass may exaggerate the importance of these Western readings, at least with regard to the Book of Acts, when he considers them as the transcript of the inspired writer's first or rough copy, while he identifies the Eastern with the copy actually sent out to Antioch. Even if stu-

dents repudiate Blass's view, they will be influenced by the conservative work of H. von Soden, which is now (1908) in course of publication (Die Schriften des NT. in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte, Berlin, Duncker). The writer distinguishes three groups of readings: most manuscripts present the Antiochene text, which is probably the recension of Lucian, called K; about fifty witnesses represent the Egyptian text, probably the recension of Hesychius, denoted by H; the third group, denoted by I, is the Vulgate of Palestine. An investigation of the original form and the development of each of these recensions gives rise to a number of subdivisions. The problem for the textual critic is to discover the archetype which lies in each case at the bottom of the three recensions. If von Soden's method should eventually prove to be false, it may at least contribute to the improvement of our Greek New-Testament editions.

Several sources have been mentioned in the course of the article. We might refer the reader for a list of the other principal authors to KAULEN-WELTE-HUNDHAUSEN in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Bibelausgaben*, or to VON GEBHARDT in *Realencyclopädie;* LE LONG, *Bibliotheca sacra*, ed. MASCH (Halle, 1778), I, 187 sqq.; ROSENMÜLLER, *Handbuch für die Literatur der biblischen Kritik und Exegese* (Göttingen, 1797), I, 278 sqq.; HUG, *Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (4th ed., Stuttgart, 1847), I, 268 sqq.; TREGELLES, *An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament* (London, 1854); HORNE AND TREGELLES, *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (London, 1856), 116 sqq., 648 sqq.; O'CALLAGHAN, *A List of Editions of the Holy Scriptures and parts thereof printed in America previous to 1860* (Albany, 1861); REUSS, *Bibliotheca Novi Testamenti Græci* (Brunswick, 1872); HALL, *A Critical Bibliography of the Greek New Testament as Published in America* (Philadelphia, 1883); HUNDHAUSEN, *Editionen des neutestamentlichen Textes und Schriften zur neutestamentlichen Textkritik seit Lachmann* in *Literar. Handweiser* (1882), 321 sqq.; SCHAFF, *A Companion to the Greek Testament and the English Version* (3rd ed., New York, 1888), 497 sqq.; RÜGG, *Die neutestamentliche Textkritik seit Lachmann* (Zürich, 1892); LUCAS, *Textual Criticism and the Acts of the Apostles* in *Dublin Review* (1894), 30 sqq.; BLASS, *Acta Apostolorum* etc. (Göttingen, 1895); ID., *Acta Apostolorum*, etc. (Leipzig, 1896); Id., *Evangelium sec. Johannem* (Leipzig, 1902); GREGORY, *Textkritik des Neuen Testamentes* (Leipzig, 1902); GREGORY, *Canon and Text of the N. T.* (New York, 1907); VON SODEN, *Die Schriften des NT. in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt* etc. (Berlin, 1902, 1906).

A. J. MAAS.

Edmondsbury. See BURY ST. EDMONDS.

Edmund, CONGREGATION OF SAINT, founded in 1843, by Jean-Baptiste Muard, at Pontigny, France, for the work of popular missions. The members also devote themselves to parochial work, to the education of youth in seminaries and colleges, to the direction of pious associations, and to foreign missions. The mother-house is at Pontigny, but since the expulsion of the religious orders the superior general resides at Hitchin, England. In the United States, the congregation has two houses: a missionary house and apostolic school at Swanton, Vermont, for the training of young men who wish to study for the priesthood and the religious life; and a college at Winooski, Vermont, with 12 fathers, 8 scholastics, and 100 pupils.

E. M. SALMON.

Edmund Arrowsmith, VENERABLE, English martyr, b. in 1585 at Haddock; executed at Lancaster, 23 Aug., 1628. He is of great reputation for the numerous favours, spiritual and temporal, which are won through his "Holy Hand", still preserved as an object of veneration in the church of St. Oswald, Ashton, near the martyr's birthplace. His parents suffered much for their religion, and the future martyr was once, when a child, left shivering in his night-clothes by the pursuivants, who carried his parents off to Lancaster jail. He entered Douai College in 1605, but ill-health compelled him to interrupt his studies; he was, however, ordained priest in 1612. Lancashire was the scene of his missionary labours and he was eminent for "fervour, zeal and ready wit". Apprehended, probably in 1622, he was brought before Bridgeman, Protestant Bishop of Chester, and had a lively discussion with him and his ministers. Regaining his liberty he entered the Society of Jesus in 1623, and made his noviceship on the Mission, retiring to Essex for a spiritual retreat. He was eventually betrayed by false brethren, tried at Lancaster in 1628, and was found guilty of high treason for being a Jesuit priest and a seducer in religion. His fellow-prisoner, Father John Southworth, afterwards a martyr, absolved him as he went forth to undergo the usual butchery.

CHALLONER, *Missionary Priests* (1874), II, 68; FOLEY, *Records of the English Province, S. J.*, II, 24 sqq.; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, I, 62.

PATRICK RYAN.

Edmund Campion, BLESSED, English Jesuit and martyr; he was the son and namesake of a Catholic bookseller, and was b. in London, 25 Jan., 1540; executed at Tyburn, 1 Dec., 1581. A city company sent the promising child to a grammar school and to Christ Church Hospital. When Mary Tudor entered London in state as queen, he was the schoolboy chosen to give the Latin salutatory to her majesty. Sir Thomas White, lord mayor, who built and endowed St. John's College at Oxford, accepted Campion as one of his first scholars, appointed him junior fellow at seventeen, and, dying, gave him his last messages for his academic family. Campion shone at Oxford in 1560, when he delivered one oration at the reburial of Amy Robsart, and another at the funeral of the founder of his own college; and for twelve years he was to be followed and imitated as no man ever was in an English university except himself and Newman. He took both his degrees, and became a celebrated tutor, and, by 1568, junior proctor. Queen Elizabeth had visited Oxford two years before; she and Dudley, then chancellor, won by Campion's bearing, beauty, and wit, bade him ask for what he would. Successes, local responsibilities, and allurements, his natural ease of disposition, the representations, above all, of his friend Bishop Cheyney of Gloucester, blinded Campion in regard to his course as a Catholic: he took the Oath of Supremacy, and deacon's orders according to the new rite. Afterthoughts developing into scruples, scruples into anguish, he broke off his happy Oxford life when his proctorship ended, and betook himself to Ireland, to await the reopening of Dublin University, an ancient papal foundation temporarily extinct. Sir Henry Sidney, the lord deputy, was interested in Campion's future as well as in the revival which, however, fell through. With Philip Sidney, then a boy, Campion was to have a touching interview in 1577.

BLESSED EDMUND CAMPION

As too Catholic minded an Anglican, Campion was suspected, and exposed to danger. Hidden in friendly houses, he composed his treatise called "A History of Ireland". Written from an English standpoint it gave much offence to the native Irish, and was severely criticized, in the next century, by Geoffrey Keating in his Irish history of Ireland. Urged to further effort by the zeal of Gregory Martin, he crossed to England in disguise and under an assumed name, reaching

London in time to witness the trial of one of the earliest Oxonian martyrs, Dr. John Storey. Campion now recognized his vocation and hastened to the seminary at Douai. Cecil lamented to Richard Stanihurst the expatriation of "one of the diamonds of England". At Douai Campion remained for his theological course and its lesser degree, but then set out as a barefoot pilgrim to Rome, arriving there just before the death of St. Francis Borgia; "for I meant", as he said at his examination, "to enter into the Society of Jesus, thereof to vow and to be professed". This he accomplished promptly in April (1573), being the first novice received by Mercurianus, the fourth general. As the English province was as yet non-existent, he was allotted to that of Bohemia, entering on his noviceship at Prague and passing his probation year at Brünn in Moravia. Returning to Prague, he taught in the college and wrote a couple of sacred dramas; and there he was ordained in 1578. Meanwhile, Dr. Allen was organizing the apostolic work of the English Mission, and rejoiced to secure Fathers Robert Parsons and Edmund Campion as his first Jesuit helpers. In the garden at Brünn, Campion had had a vision, in which Our Lady foretold to him his martyrdom. Comrades at Prague were moved to make a scroll for *P. Edmundus Campianus Martyr*, and to paint a prophetic garland of roses within his cell. Parsons and Campion set out from Rome, had many adventures, and called upon St. Charles Borromeo in Milan, and upon Beza in Geneva. Campion was met in London, and fitly clothed, armed, and mounted by a devoted young convert friend. His office was chiefly to reclaim Catholics who were wavering or temporizing under the pressure of governmental tyranny; but his zeal to win Protestants, his preaching, his whole saintly and soldierly personality, made a general and profound impression. An alarm was raised and he fled to the North, where he fell again to writing and produced his famous tract, the "Decem Rationes". He returned to London, only to withdraw again, this time towards Norfolk. A spy, a former steward of the Roper family, one George Eliot, was hot upon his track, and ran him and others down at Lyford Grange near Wantage in Berkshire on 17 July, 1581.

Amid scenes of violent excitement, Campion was derisively paraded through the streets of his native city, bound hand and foot, riding backwards, with a paper stuck in his hat to denote the "seditious Jesuit". First thrown into Little Ease at the Tower, he was carried privately to the house of his old patron, the Earl of Leicester; there he encountered the queen herself, and received earnest proffers of liberty and preferments would he but forsake his papistry. Hopton having tried in vain the same blandishments, on Campion's return to the Tower, the priest was then examined under torture, and was reported to have betrayed those who had harboured him. Several arrests were made on the strength of the lie. He had asked for a public disputation. But when it came off in the Norman chapel of the Tower, before the Dean of St. Paul's and other divines, Campion had been denied opportunity to prepare his debate, and had been severely racked. Thus weakened, he stood through the four long conferences, without chair, table, or notes, and stood undefeated. Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, who was looking on in the flush of worldly pride, became thereby inspired to return to God's service. The privy council, at its wits' end over so purely spiritual a "traitor", hatched a plot to impeach Campion's loyalty, and called in the hirelings Eliot and Munday as accusers. A ridiculous trial ensued in Westminster Hall, 20 Nov., 1581. Campion, pleading not guilty, was quite unable to hold up his often-wrenched right arm, seeing which, a fellow-prisoner, first kissing it, raised it for him. He made a magnificent defence. But the sentence was death, by hanging, drawing, and quartering: a sentence received by the martyrs with a joyful shout of *Hæc dies* and *Te Deum*. Campion, with Sherwin and Briant, who were on a separate hurdle, was dragged to Tyburn on 1 December. Passing Newgate arch, he lifted himself as best he could to salute the statue of Our Lady still *in situ*. On the scaffold, when interrupted and taunted to express his mind concerning the Bull of Pius V excommunicating Elizabeth, he answered only by a prayer for her, "your Queen and my Queen". He was a Catholic Englishman with political opinions which were not Allen's, though he died, as much as ever Felton did, for the primacy of the Holy See. The people loudly lamented his fate; and another great harvest of conversions began. A wild, generous-hearted youth, Henry Walpole, standing by, got his white doublet stained with Campion's blood; the incident made him, too, in time, a Jesuit and a martyr.

Historians of all schools are agreed that the charges against Campion were wholesale sham. They praise his high intelligence, his beautiful gaiety, his fiery energy, his most chivalrous gentleness. He had renounced all opportunity for a dazzling career in a world of master men. Every tradition of Edmund Campion, every remnant of his written words, and not least his unstudied golden letters, show us that he was nothing less than a man of genius; truly one of the great Elizabethans, but holy as none other of them all. He was beatified by Pope Leo XIII on 9 Dec., 1886. Relics of him are preserved in Rome and Prague, in London, Oxford, Stonyhurst, and Roehampton. A not very convincing portrait was made soon after his death for the Gesù in Rome under the supervision of many who had known him. Of this there is a copy in oils at Stonyhurst, and a brilliantly engraved print in Hazart's "Kerckelycke Historie" (Antwerp, 1669), Vol. III (Enghelandt, etc.), though not in every copy of that now scarce work.

CAMPION'S *Historie of Ireland* was first published by STANIHURST in HOLINSHED, *Chronicles* (1587), then in WARE'S book under the same title (1633), and again by the Hibernia Press (Dublin, 1809); *Edmundi Campiani Decem Rationes et alia Opuscula*, carefully edited (Antwerp, 1631); this included *Orations, Letters*, and the *Narratio Divortii Henrici VIII, Regis Angliæ, ab Uxore et ab Ecclesiâ*, first printed by HARPESFIELD. There is no modern ed. or tr. The standard biography is SIMPSON, *Edmund Campion, Jesuit Protomartyr of England* (London, 1866; reissued, London, 1907). Accounts of Campion's life, labours, and death are in CHALLONER, *Memoirs of Missionary Priests;* FOLEY, *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*, and STANTON, *Menology of England and Wales*. The article on Campion by COOPER in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.* and that in GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.* are based, in phrase, as in fact, upon SIMPSON, *op. cit.* A much better account is contained in *Lives of the English Martyrs*, completed and ed. by CAMM (2 vols., London, 1905), II, 266–357. A sketch by GOLDIE appears in *The English Martyrs* (Catholic Truth Society, 2 vols., London, 1892). For minor points connected with Campion see *The Month* (August, 1893; September, 1897; January, 1905); and *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, XII, Series III, 1891, pp. 629, 725. Besides a bibliography in GILLOW, pp. 385–392, there is a more extensive one in SIMPSON, *Appendix*, itself founded on DE BACKER, *Bibl. des Ecriv. de la c. de J.* A small book devoted to him is *The Blessed Edmund Campion* in the *St. Nicholas Series* (London, 1908).

L. I. GUINEY.

Edmund Rich, SAINT, Archbishop of Canterbury, England, b. 20 November, c. 1180, at Abingdon, six miles from Oxford; d. 16 Nov., 1240, at Soissy, France. His early chronology is somewhat uncertain. His parents, Reinald (Reginald) and Mabel Rich, were remarkable for piety. It is said that his mother constantly wore hair-cloth, and attended almost every night at Matins in the abbey church. His father, even during the lifetime of his mother, entered the monastery of Eynsham in Oxfordshire. Edmund had two sisters and at least one brother. The two sisters became nuns at Catesby. From his earliest years he was taught by his mother to practise acts of penance, such as fasting on Saturdays on bread and water, and wearing a hair shirt. When old enough he was sent to study at Oxford. While there, the Child Christ appeared to him while he was walking

alone in the fields. In memory of what passed between him and Christ on that occasion, he used every night to sign his forehead with the words "Jesus of Nazareth", a custom he recommended to others. Anxious to preserve purity of mind and body, Edmund made a vow of chastity, and as a pledge thereof he procured two rings; one he placed on the finger of Our Lady's statue in St. Mary's, Oxford, the other he himself wore.

About 1195, in company with his brother Richard, he was sent to the schools of Paris. Thenceforward, for several years, his life was spent between Oxford and Paris. He taught with success in both universities. After having devoted himself to the study of theology, Edmund acquired fame as a preacher, and was commissioned to preach the Sixth Crusade in various parts of England. All this time his austerities were very great. Most of the night he spent in prayer, and the little sleep he allowed himself was taken without lying down. Though thus severe to himself, he was gentle and kind towards others, especially to the poor and sick, whom sometimes he personally attended. In 1222 Edmund became treasurer of Salisbury cathedral. Ten years later he was appointed to the Archbishopric of Canterbury by Gregory IX and consecrated 2 April, 1234.

Notwithstanding the gentleness of his disposition, he firmly defended the rights of Church and State against the exactions and usurpations of Henry III. He visited Rome in 1237 to plead his cause in person. This fearless policy brought him into conflict, not only with the king and his party, but also with the monks of Rochester and Canterbury. Determined opposition met him from all sides, and constant appeals were carried to Rome over his head. In consequence, a papal legate was sent to England, but Henry adroitly managed the legate's authority to nullify Edmund's power. Unable to force the king to give over the control of vacant benefices, and determined not to countenance evil and injustice, Edmund saw he could not longer remain in England. In 1240 he retired to the Cistercian Abbey of Pontigny. Here he lived like a simple religious till the summer heat drove him to Soissy, where he died. Within six years he was canonized by Innocent IV. His body was taken to Pontigny, and numerous miracles have been wrought at his shrine. Notwithstanding the devastation that from time to time has overtaken Pontigny, the body of St. Edmund is still venerated in its abbey church. Important relics of the saint are preserved at Westminster Cathedral; St. Edmund's College, Ware; Portsmouth Cathedral, and Erdington Abbey. The ancient proper Mass of St. Edmund, taken from the Sarum Missal, is used in the Diocese of Portsmouth, of which St. Edmund is patron. In September, 1874, 350 English pilgrims visited St. Edmund's shrine. The community, known as Fathers of St. Edmund, were forced to leave their home at Pontigny, by the Associations law. The "Speculum Ecclesiæ", an ascetical treatise, and the "Provincial Constitutions" are the most important of St. Edmund's writings.

Besides the three ancient lives of St. Edmund by MATTHEW PARIS, ROBERT BACON, and ROBERT RICH, there is a fourth ascribed to BERTRAND OF PONTIGNY in MARTÈNE AND DURAND, *Thesaurus Anecdotorum*. For a complete account of the MSS. records, the reader is referred to WALLACE, *St. Edmund of Canterbury* (London, 1893), 1–18, and to DE PARAVICINI, *St. Edmund of Abingdon* (London, 1898), xiii–xlii; BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, 16th Nov.; *S. Edmund Archbp. of Canterbury* (London, 1845) (Tractarian); WARD, *St. Edmund Archbp. of Canterbury* (London, 1903); ARCHER in *Dict. of Nat. Biog.*, s. v.

COLUMBA EDMONDS.

Edmund the Martyr, SAINT, King of East Anglia, b. about 840; d. at Hoxne, Suffolk, 20 November, 870. The earliest and most reliable accounts represent St. Edmund as descended from the preceding kings of East Anglia, though, according to later legends, he was born at Nuremberg (Germany), son to an otherwise unknown King Alcmund of Saxony. Though only about fifteen years old when crowned in 855, Edmund showed himself a model ruler from the first, anxious to treat all with equal justice, and closing his ears to flatterers and untrustworthy informers. In his eagerness for prayer he retired for a year to his royal tower at Hunstanton and learned the whole Psalter by heart, in order that he might afterwards recite it regularly. In 870 he bravely repulsed the two Danish chiefs Hinguar and Hubba who had invaded his dominions. They soon returned with overwhelming numbers, and pressed terms upon him which as a Christian he felt bound to refuse. In his desire to avert a fruitless massacre, he disbanded his troops and himself retired towards Framlingham; on the way he fell into the hands of the invaders. Having loaded him with chains, his captors conducted him to Hinguar, whose impious demands he again rejected, declaring his religion dearer to him than his life. His martyrdom took place in 870 at Hoxne in Suffolk. After beating him with cudgels, the Danes tied him to a tree, and cruelly tore his flesh with whips. Throughout these tortures Edmund continued to call upon the name of Jesus, until at last, exasperated by his constancy, his enemies began to discharge arrows at him. This cruel sport was continued until his body had the appearance of a porcupine, when Hinguar commanded his head to be struck off. From his first burial-place at Hoxne his relics were removed in the tenth century to Beodricsworth, since called St. Edmundsbury, where arose the famous abbey of that name. His feast is observed 20 Nov., and he is represented in Christian art with sword and arrow, the instruments of his torture.

THOMAS ARNOLD, *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey* in *R. S.* (London, 1890), containing ABBO OF FLEURY, *Passio S. Eadmundi* (985), and GAUFRIDUS DE FONTIBUS, *Infantia S. Eadmundi* (c. 1150); TYNEMOUTH AND CAPGRAVE, *Nova Legenda Angliæ*, ed. HORSTMAN (Oxford, 1901); BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints* (Dublin, 1872); MACKINLAY, *Saint Edmund King and Martyr* (London, 1893).

G. E. PHILLIPS.

Education.—IN GENERAL.—In the broadest sense, education includes all those experiences by which intelligence is developed, knowledge acquired, and character formed. In a narrower sense, it is the work done by certain agencies and institutions, the home and the school, for the express purpose of training immature minds. The child is born with latent capacities which must be developed so as to fit him for the activities and duties of life. The meaning of life, therefore, of its purposes and values as understood by the educator, primarily determines the nature of his work. Education aims at an *ideal*, and this in turn depends on the view that is taken of man and his destiny, of his relations to God, to his fellowmen, and to the physical world. The *content* of education is furnished by the previous acquisition of mankind in literature, art, and science, in moral, social, and religious principles. The inheritance, however, contains elements that differ greatly in value, both as mental possessions and as means of culture; hence a selection is necessary, and this must be guided largely by the educational ideal. It will also be influenced by the consideration of the educative *process*. Teaching must be adapted to the needs of the developing mind, and the endeavour to make the adaptation more thorough results in theories and methods which are, or should be, based on the findings of biology, physiology, and psychology.

The work of education begins normally in the home; but it is, for obvious reasons, continued in institutions where other teachers stand in place of the parents. To secure efficiency it is necessary that each school be properly organized, that the teachers be qualified, and that the subjects of instruction be wisely chosen. Since the school, moreover, is so largely responsible for the intellectual and moral formation of those who

will later, as members of society, be useful or harmful, there is evidently needed some higher direction than that of the individual teacher, in order that the purpose of education may be realized. Both the Church and the State, therefore, have interests to safeguard; each in its own sphere must exercise its authority, if education is to strive for the true ideal through the best content and by the soundest methods. It is thus obvious that education at any given time expresses the dominant ideas in philosophy, religion, and science, while, in its practical control, the existing relations between the temporal power and the spiritual assume concrete form. As, moreover, these ideas and relations have varied considerably in the course of time, it is quite intelligible that a solution of the central educational problems should be sought in history; and it is further beyond question that historical study, in this as in other departments, has a manifold utility. But a mere recital of facts is of little avail unless certain fundamental principles be kept in view, and unless the fact of Christian revelation be given its due importance. It is needful, then, to distinguish the constant elements in education from those that are variable; the former including man's nature, destiny, and relations to God, the latter all those changes in theory, practice, and organization which affect the actual conduct of educational work. It is with the first aspect of the subject that the present article is mainly concerned; and from this standpoint education may be defined as that form of social activity whereby, under the direction of mature minds and by the use of adequate means, the physical, intellectual, and moral powers of the immature human being are so developed as to prepare him for the accomplishment of his life-work here and for the attainment of his eternal destiny. Neither this nor any other definition was formulated from the beginning. In primitive times the helplessness and needs of the child were so obvious that his elders by a natural impulse gave him a training in the rude arts that enabled him to procure the necessaries of life, while they taught him to propitiate the hidden powers in each object of nature, and handed on to him the tribal customs and traditions. But of education properly so called the savage knows nothing, and much less does he busy himself with theory or plan. Even civilized peoples carry on the work of education for a long time before they begin to reflect upon its meaning, and such reflection is guided by philosophical speculation and by established social, religious, and political institutions. Often, too, their theorizing is the work of exceptional minds, and presents a higher ideal than might be inferred from their educational practice. Nevertheless, an account of what was done by the principal peoples of antiquity will prove useful by bringing out the profound modification which Christianity wrought.

Oriental Education.—The invention of writing was of the utmost importance for the development of language and the keeping of records. The earliest texts, chiefly of a religious nature, became the sources of knowledge and the means of education. Such were in China the writings of Confucius, in India the Vedas, in Egypt the Book of the Dead, in Persia the Avesta. The main purpose in having these books studied by youth was to secure uniformity of thought and custom, and unvarying conformity with the past. In this respect Chinese education is typical. The sacred writings contained minute prescriptions for conduct in every circumstance and station of life. These the pupil was obliged to memorize in a purely mechanical fashion; whether he understood the words as he repeated them was quite indifferent. He simply stored his memory with a multitude of established forms and phrases, which subsequently he employed in the preparation of essays and in passing the governmental examinations. That he should learn to think for himself was of course out of the question. With such a training, the development of free personality was impossible. In China, the family, with its sacred traditions and its ancestor-worship, was dominant; in Persia, education was controlled by the State; in Egypt by the priesthood; in India by the different castes. There was, doubtless, in the Oriental mind a consciousness of personality; but no effort was made to strengthen it and give it value. On the contrary, the Hindu philosophy, which regarded knowledge as the means of redemption from the miseries of life, placed that redemption itself in nirvana, the extinction of the individual through absorption into the being of the world. The position of woman was, in general, a degraded one. Though the early training of the child devolved upon the mother, her responsibility brought with it no dignity. But little provision was made for the education of girls; their only vocation was to marry, bear children, and render service to the head of the family.

In view of these facts, it cannot be said that education as the Western world conceives it owes any great debt to the East. It is true that some of the sciences, as mathematics, astronomy, and chronology, and some of the arts, as sculpture and architecture, were carried to a certain degree of perfection; but the very success of Oriental ability and skill in these lines only emphasizes by contrast the deficiencies of Oriental education. Even in the sphere of morality the same antagonism appears between precept and practice. It cannot and need not be denied that many of the sayings, e. g. of Confucius, evince a high ideal of virtue, while some of the Hindu proverbs, such as those of the "Pantschatantra", are full of practical wisdom. Yet these facts only make it more difficult to answer the question: Why was the actual living of these people so far removed from the formally accepted standards of virtue? Nevertheless, Oriental education has a peculiar significance; it shows quite plainly the consequences of sacrificing the individual to the interests of human institutions, and of reducing education to a machine-like process, the aim of which is to mould all minds upon one unchanging pattern; and it further shows how little can be accomplished for real education by despotic authority, which demands, and is satisfied with, an outward observance of custom and law. (See Davidson, "A History of Education", New York, 1901.)

The Greeks.—If the education of the Oriental peoples was stationary, that of the Greeks exhibits a progressive development which passes from one extreme to another through a variety of movements and reactions, of ideals and practice. What remains constant throughout is the idea that the purpose of education is to train youth for citizenship. This, however, was conceived, and its realization attempted, in different ways by the several City-States. In Sparta, the child, according to the Code of Lycurgus, was the property of the State. From his seventh year onward he received a public training whose one object was to make him a soldier, by developing physical strength, courage, self-control, and obedience to law. It was a hard training in gymnastic exercises, with little attention to the intellectual side and less to the æsthetic; even music and dancing took on a military character. Girls were subjected to the same severe discipline, not so much to emphasize the equality of the sexes as to train the sturdy mothers of a warrior race.

The ideal of Athenian education was the completely developed man. Beauty of mind and body, the cultivation of every inborn faculty and energy, harmony between thought and life, decorum, temperance, and regularity—such were the results aimed at in the home and in the school, in social intercourse, and in civic relations. "We are lovers of the beautiful", said Pericles, "yet simple in our tastes, and we cultivate the mind without loss of manliness" (Thucydides, II, 40). The means of culture were music and gymnas-

tics, the former including history, poetry, the drama, oratory, and science, along with music in the narrower sense; while the latter comprised games, athletic exercises, and the training for military duty. That music was no mere "accomplishment" and that gymnastics had a higher aim than bodily strength or skill is evident from what Plato tells us in the "Protagoras". The Greeks indeed laid stress on courage, temperance, and obedience to law; and if their theoretical disquisitions could be taken as fair accounts of their actual practice, it would be difficult to find, among the products of human thinking, a more exalted ideal. The essential weakness of their moral education was the failure to provide adequate sanction for the principles they formulated and for the counsels they gave to youth. The practice of religion, whether in public services or in household worship, exerted but little influence upon the formation of character. The Greek deities, after all, were no models for imitation; some of them could scarcely have been objects of reverence, since they were endowed with the weaknesses and passions of men. Religion itself was mechanical and external; it did not touch conscience nor awaken the sense of sin. As to the future life, the Greeks believed in the immortality of the soul; but this belief had little or no practical significance. Thus the motive for virtuous action was found, not in respect for Divine law nor in the hope of eternal reward, but simply in the desire to temper in due proportion the elements of human nature. Virtue is not self-repression for the sake of duty, but, as Plato says, "a kind of health and beauty and good habit of the soul"; while vice is "a disease and deformity and sickness of it". The just man "will so regulate his own character as to be on good terms with himself, and to set those three principles [reason, passion, and desire] in tune together, as if they were verily three chords of a harmony, a higher, and a lower, and a middle, and whatever may lie between these; and after he has bound all these together and reduced the many elements of his nature to a real unity as a temperate and duly harmonized man, he will then at length proceed to do whatever he may have to do" (Republic, IV, 443). This conception of virtue as a self-balancing was closely bound up with that idea of personal worth which has already been mentioned as the central element in Greek life and education. But the personality referred to was not that of man for the sake of his humanity, nor even that of the Greek for the sake of his nationality; it was the personality of the free citizen, and from citizenship the artisan and the slave were excluded. The mechanical arts were held in bad repute; and Aristotle declares that "they render the body and soul or intellect of free persons unfit for the exercise and practice of virtue" (Politics, V, 1337). A still more serious limitation, affecting not only their concept of human dignity, but their regard for human life as well, consisted in the exposure of children. This was practised at Sparta by the public authority, which destroyed the child that was unfit for the service of the State; while at Athens the fate of his offspring was committed to the father and might be decided in accordance with purely personal interests. The mother's position was not much better than it had been in the Orient. Women were generally regarded as inferior beings, "impotent for good, but clever contrivers of all evil" (Euripides, Medea, 406). At best she was a means to an end, the bearing of children and the care of the household; her education consequently was of the scantiest sort. The only exceptions were the *hetæræ*, i. e. the women who were outside the home circle and who with greater freedom of living combined higher culture than the legitimate wife could hope for. Under such circumstances marriage implied for woman a lowering of personal worth that was in marked contrast with the ideals set up for the education of men.

These ideals, again, underwent a decided change during the fifth century B. C. In one respect at least it was a change for the better; it extended the rights of citizenship. The constitution of Solon was set aside and that of Clisthenes adopted in its stead (509 B. C.). The democratic character of the latter, with the increase in prosperity at home and the widening of foreign relations, afforded new opportunities for individual ability and endeavour. This heightened activity, however, was not put forth in behalf of the common good, but rather for the advancement of personal interests. At the same time morality was deprived of even the outward support it had formerly drawn from religion; philosophy gave way to scepticism; and education, while it became more intellectual, laid emphasis on form rather than on content. The most influential teachers were the Sophists, who supplied the growing demand for instruction in the art of public discussion and offered information on every sort of subject. Developing in practical directions the principle that "man is the measure of all things", they carried individualism to the extreme of subjectivism alike in the sphere of speculative thought and in that of moral conduct. The purposes of education were correspondingly modified, and new problems arose. Now that the old standards and basis of morality had been rejected, the main question was to replace them by others in which due allowance would be made on the one hand for individuality and on the other for social needs. The answer of Socrates was: "Know thyself" and "Knowledge is virtue", i. e. a knowledge drawn from personal experience, yet possessing universal validity; and the means prescribed by him for obtaining such knowledge was his *maieutics*, i. e. the art of giving birth to ideas through the method of question and answer, by which he developed the power of thinking. As an intellectual discipline, this scheme had undoubted value; but it left unsolved the chief problem: how is knowledge, even of the highest kind, to be translated into action? Plato offered a twofold solution. In the "Republic", setting out from his general theory that the idea alone is real, and that the good of each thing consists in harmony with the idea whence it originated, he reaches the conclusion that knowledge consists in the perception of this harmony. The aim of education, therefore, is to develop knowledge of the good. So far, this scheme contains little more promise of practical results than that of Socrates. But Plato adds that society is to be ruled by those who attain to this knowledge, i. e. by the philosophers; the other two classes, soldiers and artisans, are subordinate, yet each individual, being assigned to the class for which his abilities fit him, reaches the highest self-development and contributes his share to the social weal. In the "Laws", Plato attempts to revise and combine certain elements of the Spartan and of the Athenian system; but this reactionary scheme met with no success.

This problem, finally, was taken up by Aristotle in the "Ethics" and the "Politics". As in his philosophy, so in his educational theory, he departs from Plato's teaching. The goal for the individual as well as for society is happiness: "What we have to aim at is the happiness of each citizen, and happiness consists in a complete activity and practice of virtue" (Politics, IV). More precisely, happiness is "the conscious activity of the highest part of man according to the law of his own excellence, not unaccompanied by adequate, external conditions". Merely to know the good does not constitute virtue; this knowledge must issue in practice, the goodness of the intellect (knowledge of universal truth) must be combined with goodness of action. The three things which make men good and virtuous—nature, habit, and reason—"must be in harmony with one another (for they do not always agree); men do many things against habit and nature, if reason persuades them that they ought.

We have already determined what natures are likely to be most easily moulded by the hands of the legislator. All else is the work of education; we learn some things by habit and some by instruction" (Politics, Bk. VII). Education, however, must always be adapted to the peculiar character of the State: "The citizen should be moulded to suit the form of government under which he lives" (ibid., VIII). And again, "It is right that the citizens should possess a capacity for affairs and for war, but still more for the enjoyment of peace or leisure; right that they should be capable of such actions as are indispensable and salutary, but still more of such as are moral *per se*. It is with a view to these objects, then, that they should be educated while they are still children, and at all other ages, till they pass beyond the need of education" (ibid., IV). "Neither must we suppose that any one of the citizens belongs to himself, for they all belong to the State, and are each of them a part of the State, and the care of each part is inseparable from the care of the whole" (ibid., VIII).

In the theories of Plato and Aristotle are found the highest reaches of Hellenic thought regarding the purpose and nature of education. Each of these great thinkers established schools of philosophy, and each has profoundly affected the thought of all subsequent time, yet neither succeeded in providing an education sound and permanent enough to avert the moral and political downfall of the nation. The diffusion of Greek thought and culture throughout the world by conquest and colonization was no remedy for the evils which sprang from an exaggerated individualism. Once the idea was accepted that each man is his own standard of conduct, neither brilliancy of literary production nor fineness of philosophic speculation could prevent the decay of patriotism, and of a virtue which had never looked higher than the State for its sanction. Aristotle himself, at the close of his "Ethics", points out the radical difficulty: "Now if arguments and theories were able by themselves to make people good, they would, in the words of Theognis, be entitled to receive high and great rewards, and it is with theories that we should have to provide ourselves. But the truth apparently is that, though they are strong enough to encourage and stimulate young men of liberal minds, though they are able to inspire with goodness a character that is naturally noble and sincerely loves the beautiful, they are incapable of converting the mass of men to goodness and beauty of character." No such "conversion" was aimed at by the Sophists. Appealing to the natural tendencies of the individual, they developed a spirit of selfishness which in turn broke out in discord, thus opening the way for the conquest of Greece by Roman arms.

THE ROMANS.—In striking contrast with the Greek character, that of the Romans was practical, utilitarian, grave, austere. Their religion was serious, and it permeated their whole life, hallowing all its relations. The family, especially, was far more sacred than in Sparta or Athens, and the position of woman as wife and mother more exalted and influential. Still, as with the Greeks, the power of the father over the life of his child—*patria potestas*—was absolute, and, in the earlier period at least, the exposure of children was a common practice. In fact the Laws of the Twelve Tables provided for the immediate destruction of deformed offspring and gave the father, during the whole life of his children, the right to imprison, sell, or slay them. Subsequently, however, a check was placed on such practices. The ideal at which the Roman aimed was neither harmony nor happiness, but the performance of duty and the maintenance of his rights. Yet this ideal was to be realized through service to the State. Deep as was the family feeling, it was always subordinate to devotion to the public weal. "Parents are dear", said Cicero, "and children and kindred, but all loves are bound up in the love of our common country" (De Officiis, I, 17). Education therefore was essentially a preparation for civic duty. "The children of the Romans are brought up that they may one day be able to be of service to the fatherland, and one must accordingly instruct them in the customs of the State and in the institutions of their ancestors. The fatherland has produced and brought us up that we may devote to its use the finest capacities of our mind, talent, and understanding. Therefore we must learn those arts whereby we may be of greater service to the State; for that I hold to be the highest wisdom and virtue."

These words express, at any rate, the spirit of the early Roman education. The home was the only school, and the parents the only teachers. Of scientific and æsthetic training there was little or none. To learn the Laws of the Twelve Tables, to become familiar with the lives of the men who had made Rome great, and to copy the virtues which he saw in his father were the chief endeavour of the boy and youth. Thus the moral element predominated, and virtues of a practical sort were inculcated: first of all *pietas*, obedience to parents and to the gods; then prudence, fair dealing, courage, reverence, firmness, and earnestness. These qualities were to be developed, not by abstract or philosophical reasoning, but through the imitation of worthy models and, as far as possible, of living concrete examples. *Vitæ discimus*, "We learn for life", said Seneca; and this phrase sums up the whole purpose of Roman education. In the course of time, elementary schools (*ludi*) were opened, but they were conducted by private teachers and were supplementary to the home instruction. About the middle of the third century B. C. foreign influences began to make themselves felt. The works of the Greeks were translated into Latin, Greek teachers were introduced, and schools established in which the educational characteristics of the Greeks reappeared. Under the direction of the *literatus* and the *grammaticus* education took on a literary character, while in the school of the *rhetor* the art of oratory was carefully cultivated. The importance which the Romans attached to eloquence is clearly shown by Cicero in his "De Oratore" and by Quintilian in his "Institutes"; to produce the orator became eventually the chief end of education. Quintilian's work, moreover, is the principal contribution to educational theory produced in Rome. The hellenizing process was a gradual one. The vigorous Roman character yielded but slowly to the intellectualism of the Greeks, and when the latter finally triumphed, far-reaching changes had come about in Roman society, government, and life. Whatever the causes of decline—political, economic, or moral—they could not be stayed by the imported refinement of Greek thought and practice. Nevertheless, pagan education as a whole, with its ideals, successes, and failures, has a profound significance. It was the product of the highest human wisdom, speculative and practical, that the world has known. It pursued in turn the ideals that appeal most strongly to the human mind. It engaged the thought of the greatest philosophers and the action of the wisest legislators. Art, science, and literature were placed at its service, and the mighty influence of the State was exerted in its behalf. In itself, therefore, and in its results, it shows how much and how little human reason can accomplish when it seeks no guidance higher than itself and strives for no purposes other than those which find, or may find, their realization in the present phase of existence.

THE JEWS.—Among the pre-Christian peoples the Jews occupy a unique position. As the recipients and custodians of Divine revelation, their conceptions of life and morality were far above those of the Gentiles. God manifested Himself to them directly as a Person, a Spirit, and an ethical Being, guiding them by His providence, making known to them His will, and pre-

scribing the minutest details of life and of religious practice. Throughout the Old Testament, God appears as the teacher of His chosen people. He sets before them a standard of righteousness which is none other than Himself: "You shall be holy, because I am holy" (Levit., xi, 46). Through Moses and the Prophets He gives them His Commandments and the promise of a Messiah to come. But He also placed upon them the duty of instructing their children. "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole strength. And these words which I command thee this day, shall be in thy heart: and thou shalt tell them to thy children, and thou shalt meditate upon them sitting in thy house, and walking on thy journey, sleeping and rising" (Deut., vi, 4–7). In accordance with this injunction, education, at least in the earlier period, was given chiefly in the home. Jewish family life, indeed, far surpassed that of the Gentiles in the purity of its relations, in the position it secured to woman, and in the care which it bestowed on children, who were regarded as a blessing vouchsafed by God and destined for His service by fidelity to the Divine law. An important function of the synagogue also was the instruction of youth, which was committed to the scribes and the doctors. Schools, as such, came into existence only in the later period, and even then the teaching was permeated by religion. Though the Old Testament contains no theory of education in the stricter sense, it abounds in maxims and principles which are all the more weighty because they are inspired by Divine wisdom and because they have a practical bearing upon life. God Himself showed the dignity of the teacher's office when He declared: "They that are learned shall shine as the brightness of the firmament: and they that instruct many to justice, as stars for all eternity" (Dan., xii, 3). In the light, however, of a more perfect revelation, it is clear that God's dealings with Israel had an ultimate purpose which was to be realized "in the fulness of time". Not only the utterances of the Prophets, but many signal events in the history of the Jews and many of their ritual observances were types of the Messiah; as St. Paul says, "All these things happened to them in figure" (I Cor., x, 11), and "The law was our pedagogue in Christ" (Gal., iii, 24). As the Supreme Teacher of mankind, God, while imparting to them the truth which they presently needed, also prepared the way for the greater truths of the Gospel.

Christian Education.—As in many other respects, so for the work of education, the advent of Christianity is the most important epoch in the history of mankind. Not only does the Christian conception of life differ radically from the pagan view, not only does the Christian teaching impart a new sort of knowledge and lay down a new principle of action, but Christianity, moreover, supplies the effectual means of making its ideals actual and of carrying its precepts into practice. Through all vicissitudes of conflict and adjustment, of changing civilizations and varying opinions, in spite even of the shortcomings of its own adherents, Christianity has steadfastly held up before men the life and the lessons of its Divine Founder.

Jesus Christ as Teacher.—"God, who, at sundry times and in divers manners, spoke in times past to the fathers by the prophets, last of all, in these days hath spoken to us by his Son" (Heb., i, 1–2). This communication through the God-Man was to reveal the true way of living: "The grace of God our Saviour hath appeared to all men; instructing us, that, denying ungodliness and worldly desires, we should live soberly, and justly, and godly in this world, looking for the blessed hope and coming of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ" (Titus, ii, 11, 12). Of Himself and His mission Christ declared, "I am come a light into the world; that whosoever believeth in me, may not remain in darkness" (John, xii, 46); and again, "For this was I born, and for this came I into the world; that I should give testimony to the truth" (John, xviii, 37). The knowledge which He came to impart was no mere intellectual possession or theory: "I am come that they may have life, and may have it more abundantly" (John, x, 10). He taught, therefore, as one "having authority"; He insisted that His hearers should believe the truths which He taught, even though these might seem to be "hard sayings". His doctrines, indeed, made no appeal either to pride of intellect or to selfishness or to passion. For the most part, as in the Sermon on the Mount, they were diametrically opposed to the maxims that had obtained in the pagan world. They were, in the highest sense, supernatural, not only in proposing eternal life as the ultimate goal of man's existence and action, but also in enjoining the denial of self as the chief requisite for attaining that destiny. Service to the neighbour was insisted upon, but this was to be rendered in the spirit of love, the new commandment which Christ gave (John, xiii, 34). Faithfulness also to civic duty was required, but the sanction which imparted force to such obligations was man's elevation to a higher citizenship in the Kingdom of God. To strive after this and to realize it in one's earthly life, so far as possible, was the ideal to which every other good was subordinate; "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his justice, and all these things shall be added unto you" (Matt., vi, 33).

Truths of this kind, so far removed from the natural tendencies of human thought and desire, could be imparted only by one who embodied in himself all the qualifications of a perfect teacher. The philosophers no doubt might, and did, formulate beautiful theories regarding knowledge and virtue; but Christ alone could say to His disciples: "I am the way, the truth, and the life" (John, xiv, 6). And whatever worth they attached in theory to personality was of far less significance than the actual realization of the highest ideal in Christ's own Person. He could thus rightfully appeal to that imitative tendency which is so deeply rooted in man's nature and from which so much is expected in modern education. The axiom, also, that we learn by doing, and that knowledge gets its full value only when it issues in action, finds its best exemplification in Christ's dealings with His disciples. He "began to do and to teach" (Acts, i, 1). In His miracles He gave evidence of His power over all nature and therefore of His authority to require faith in His words: "The works themselves which I do give testimony of me, that the Father hath sent me" (John, v, 36). To His disciples, when they hesitated or were slow to realize that the Father abided in Him, the answer was given: "Otherwise believe for the very works' sake" (xiv, 12). What He demanded in turn was no mere outward profession of faith or loyalty: "Not every one that saith to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven: but he that doth the will of my Father" (Matt., vii, 21).

The necessity of manifesting belief through action is constantly pointed out both in the literal teaching of Christ and in His parables. These, again, illustrate His practical wisdom as a teacher. They were drawn from objects and circumstances with which His hearers were familiar. In each instance they were adapted to the manner of thinking suggested by the local surroundings and the customs of the people; and they were often called forth by an incident that seemed unimportant or by a question which was asked now by His followers and again by His tireless enemies. Thus the simplest things of nature—the vine, the lily, the fig-tree, the birds of the air, and the grass of the field—were made to yield lessons of the deepest moral significance. His aim was not to adorn His own discourse, but rather to bring its content into the minds of his hearers more vividly, and to secure for it greater permanence by associating in their thought some supernat-

ural truth with the facts of daily experience. Sensory perception, memory, and imagination were thus developed to form a mental setting for the great truths of the Kingdom. The same principle found its application in the institution of the sacraments whereby natural elements are made the outward signs of inward grace. As St. John Chrysostom aptly says, "Wert thou incorporeal, He would have bestowed on thee incorporeal gifts in their bare reality; but because the soul is bound up with the body, He gives thee intelligible things under sensible forms" (Homilia lx, ad populum Antioch.). In fact the whole teaching of Christ is the clearest proof of the principle that education must adapt itself in method and practice to the needs of those who are to be taught. In accordance with this principle He prepared the minds of His followers beforehand for the institution of the Holy Eucharist, for His own death, and for the coming of the Holy Ghost (John, vi, xiv, xv); and He even reserved certain truths to be made known by the Paraclete: "I have yet many things to say to you: but you cannot bear them now. But when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will teach you all truth" (xvi, 12, 13). Thus the completion of His work as a teacher is left not to human conjecture or speculation, nor to the theories of philosophical schools, but to the Spirit of God Himself. This of course was best realized by those who were nearest to Him; yet even those of the Jews who were not among the Apostles, but were, like Nicodemus, disposed to judge fairly, confessed His superiority: "We know that thou art come a teacher from God; for no man can do these signs which thou dost, unless God be with him" (John, iii, 2).

The Aim of Christian Education.—Had Christ's mission ended when He quitted the earth, He would still have been in word and work the ideal teacher, and would have influenced for all time the education of mankind so far as its ultimate aims and basic principles are concerned. But as a matter of fact, He made ample provision for the perpetuation of His work by training a select body of men who for three years were constantly under His direction and were thoroughly imbued with His spirit. To these Apostles, moreover, He gave the command: "Going therefore, teach ye all nations . . . . . and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world" (Matt., xxviii, 19, 20). These words are the charter of the Christian Church as a teaching institution. While they refer directly to the doctrine of salvation, and therefore to the imparting of religious truth, they nevertheless, or rather by the very nature of that truth and its consequences for life, carry with them the obligation of insisting on certain principles and maintaining certain characteristics which have a decisive bearing on all educational problems.

1. The truth of Christianity is to be made known to all men. It is not confined to any one race or nation or class, nor is it to be the exclusive possession of highly gifted minds. This characteristic of *universality* is in plain contrast with the highest conceptions of the pagan world. The cultured Greek had only contempt for the barbarian, and the Roman looked upon outside nations as subjects to be governed rather than as people to be taught. But at Athens also and at Rome there was the distinction between free citizens and slaves, in consequence of which the latter were excluded from the benefits of education. As against these narrow limitations Christ charged His Apostles to "teach all men"; and St. Paul, in the same spirit, professes himself a debtor to all men, Greeks and barbarians, the wise and the unwise alike. All, in fact, were to be dealt with as children of the same Heavenly Father and heirs of the Kingdom of God. In respect of these supernatural prerogatives, the distinctions which had hitherto prevailed were set aside: Christianity appeared as one vast school with mankind at large for its disciples.

2. The commission given to the Apostles was not to expire with them; it was to remain in force "all days, even to the consummation of the world". *Perpetuity*, therefore, is an essential feature in the educational work of Christianity. The institutions of paganism had indeed flourished and advanced from phase to phase of development, but they did not contain the element of enduring vitality. In the higher departments of learning, as in philosophy, school had followed school into vigour and into decay. And in education itself, one ideal after another had been put forward only to be displaced. Christianity, on the contrary, while it could never become a rigid system, held up to mankind certain unchangeable truths which should serve as criteria for determining the value of every fundamental theory of life and of education. By insisting, especially, that man's destiny was to be attained, not in any form of temporal service or success, but in union with God, it proposed an ideal which should be valid for all time and amid all the variations of human thought and endeavour. That such changes would inevitably come to pass, Christ, without doubt, foresaw. In view of these, a merely human teacher would have provided for the stability of his work by devices which would, if successful, have attested his foresight, or shrewdness, or knowledge of human nature. But Christ's guarantee to the Apostles is at once simpler and surer: "Behold I am with you all days". The task of instructing the world in Christian truth would have been impossible but for this permanent abiding of Christ with His appointed teachers. On the other hand, once the force of His promise is realized, the significance of Christianity as a perpetual institution becomes evident: it means that Christ Himself through a visible agency was to continue for all time the work He began during His earthly life as Teacher of the human race.

3. It has already been pointed out that some of the pagan peoples, and notably the Greeks, had attained a very high conception of *personality;* and it has also been shown that this conception was by no means perfect. The teaching of Christianity in this respect is so far superior to any other that if a single element could be designated as fundamental in Christian education it would be the emphasis which it lays on the worth of the individual. In the first place, Christianity had its origin, not in any abstract speculation as to goodness or virtue, but in the actual, concrete life of a Person who was absolutely perfect. It was not, then, obliged to cast about for the ideal man, or to present a theory as to what that ideal might possibly be: it could and it did point to a realization which far surpassed the most exalted ideas of human wisdom. In Christ first appeared the full dignity of human nature through its elevation to personal union with the Word of God; and in Him, as never before or since, were manifest those traits which furnish the noblest models for imitation.

Christianity, furthermore, elevated human personality by the value it set upon each human soul as created by God and destined for eternal life. The State is no longer the supreme arbiter, nor is service to the public weal the ultimate standard. These, it is true, within their legitimate sphere have just claims upon the individual. Christianity by no means teaches that such claims can be disregarded or the corresponding duties neglected, but rather that the discharge of all social and civic obligations will be more thorough when subordinated to, and inspired by, fidelity in the duties that man owes to God. While the value of personality is thus enhanced, the sense of responsibility is correspondingly increased; so that the freer development of the person is not allowed to culminate in selfishness nor in that extreme individualism which is a threat to social organization.

4. From these principles Christianity drew consequences which were totally at variance with the

thought and practice of paganism. The position of woman was lifted at once to a higher plane; she ceased to be a chattel, or a mere instrument of passion, and became the equal of man, with the same personal worth and the same eternal destiny. Marriage was no longer a union entered into through caprice or convention, but an indissoluble bond involving mutual rights and duties. Moreover, it was raised to the dignity of a sacrament, which not only sanctified the marital relation and its purposes, but also conferred the graces needful for the due fulfilment of its obligations. The whole meaning of the family was thus transformed. Parental authority was indeed maintained, but such an exercise of the *patria potestas* as the destruction or the exposure of children could not have been tolerated once it was realized that the child's personality also is sacred, and that parents are responsible not simply to the State, but also to God, for the proper education of their offspring. Christianity, moreover, laid upon the child the duty of respecting and obeying his parents, not out of servile fear or hard necessity, but through a spirit of reverence and filial love. The ties of home-life were thereby strengthened, and the whole work of education took on a new character because it was consecrated in its very source by religion.

5. In respect of its content Christianity opened up to the human mind wide realms of truth which unaided reason could not possibly have attained, and which nevertheless are of far deeper import for life than the most learned speculations of pagan thought. Upon those truths, also, which the philosophers had but vaguely discerned, or about which they had remained in doubt, it shed a new light. There could be no further questioning, for the Christian, as to the existence of a personal God, the reality of His providence, the immortality of the soul, the freedom of the will, and the resulting accountability of man to Divine Justice. Above all, the nature of the moral order was set forth in unmistakable terms. Christianity insisted that morality was not mere outward conformity to custom or law, but the inner rectitude of the will, that æsthetic refinement was of far less consequence than purity of heart, and that love of the neighbour as proven in deeds, not personal gain or advantage, was the true norm of human relationships. That such a conception of life, with its emphasis on really spiritual aims, must lead to the formation of educational ideals unknown to the pagan world, is obvious. But on the other hand it would be wrong to infer that Christianity, in its "otherworldliness", reduces or neglects the values of the present life. What it consistently maintains is, that life here gets its highest value by serving as a preparation for the life to come. The question is not whether one should live now without any regard to the future or look forward to the future with no concern for the present; but rather how one should profit by the opportunities of this life in such wise as to secure the other. The problem, then, is one of establishing proportions, i. e. of determining values according to the standard of man's eternal destiny. When education is defined as "preparation for complete living" (Herbert Spencer), the Christian can take no objection to the words as they stand; but he will insist that no living can be "complete" which leaves out of consideration the ultimate purpose of life, and hence that no education really "prepares" which thwarts that purpose or sets it aside. It is just this completeness—in teaching all men, in harmonizing all truths, in elevating all relationships, and in leading the individual soul back to the Creator—that forms the essential characteristic of Christianity as an educational influence.

THE EDUCATIONAL WORK OF THE CHURCH.—Next in importance to Christ's personal teaching was the establishment of a teaching body whose mission was identical with His own; "As the Father hath sent me, I also send you" (John, xx, 21); and "He that heareth you, heareth me" (Luke, x, 16). He was not content with proclaiming once for all the truth of the Gospel, nor did He leave its wider dissemination to individual enthusiasm or initiative; He founded a Church to carry on His work. The spread of His doctrine was entrusted, not to books, nor to schools of philosophy, nor to the governments of the world, but to an organization that spoke in His name and with His authority. No other body of teachers ever undertook so vast a work, and no other ever accomplished so much for education in the highest sense. Apart from the preaching of the Apostles, the earliest form of Christian instruction was that given to the catechumens (q. v.) in preparation for baptism. Its object was twofold: to impart a knowledge of Christian truth, and to train the candidate in the practice of religion. It was conducted by the bishop and, as the number of catechumens increased, by priests, deacons, and other clerics. Until the third century this mode of instruction was an important adjunct to the Apostolate; but in the fifth and sixth centuries it was gradually replaced by private instruction of the converts, who were then less numerous, and by the training given in other schools to those who had been baptized in infancy. The catechumenal schools, however, gave expression to the spirit which was to animate all subsequent Christian education: they were open to every one who accepted the Faith, and they united religious instruction with moral discipline. The "catechetical" schools, also under the bishop's supervision, prepared young clerics for the priesthood. The courses of study included philosophy and theology, and naturally took on an apologetic character in defense of Christian truth against the attacks of pagan learning. One of the oldest of these schools was at the Lateran in Rome; the most famous was that of Alexandria (see DOCTRINE, CHRISTIAN).

In addition to this formal instruction, the Church from the beginning carried on through her worship an educational work embodying the deepest and soundest psychological principles. The ritual at first was of necessity simple; but as the Church was allowed a larger freedom, and her worship passed from the catacomb to the basilica, statelier forms were introduced; yet their essential purpose was the same. The Mass, which has always been the central liturgical function, appeals to the mind through the medium of sense. It combines light and colour and sound, the action of the priest, and the dramatic movement that fills the sanctuary, especially in the more solemn service. Beneath these outward forms lies the inner meaning. The altar itself, in every detail, is full of a symbolism that brings vividly to mind the life and personality of Christ, the work of redemption, and the enduring sacrifice of the Cross. In due proportion, each item of the liturgy conveys a lesson through eye and ear to the highest faculties of the soul. Sense, memory, imagination, and feeling are thus aroused, not simply as æsthetic activities, but as a support of intellect and will which thereupon issue in adoration and thanksgiving for the "mystery of faith". On the other hand, the liturgy has always included in its purpose the participation of the faithful, and hence it prescribes the response of the people to the prayers at the altar, the chanting of certain portions of the service, bodily postures and movements in keeping with the various phases of the sacred rite. The faithful are not merely bystanders or onlookers; they are not to maintain a passive, receptive attitude, but rather to give active expression to the religious thought and feeling aroused in them. This is especially evident in the sacramental system. While each of the sacraments is a sign to be perceived, it is also a source of grace to be received; and the reception involves in each case a series of actions which manifest the faith and disposition of the recipient. Moreover, each sacrament is

adapted to some particular need, and the whole system of sacraments, from baptism to extreme unction, builds up the spiritual life by processes of cleansing, strengthening, nourishing, and healing, which parallel the stages and requirements of organic growth.

In a larger way, also, the liturgical year, as it commemorates the principal events in the life of Christ, brings into Christian worship a variety which affects to some extent both the details of the liturgy itself and the religious feelings which it inspires—from the joy of Christmas to the triumph of Easter and Pentecost. For the due observance of the greater festivals the Church provides, as in Advent and Lent, by seasons of preparation. The Old Law with its types foreshadowed the New; the Baptist announced the Messiah; Christ himself prepared His disciples beforehand for the mystery of the Eucharist, for His death, and for the coming of the Holy Ghost. The Church, following the same practice, arouses in the mind of the faithful those thoughts and feelings which form an apperceptive preparation for the central mysteries of faith and their proper observance at appointed times. Along with these greater solemnities come year by year the commemorations of the Christian heroes, the men and women who have walked in the footsteps of Christ, laboured for the spread of His kingdom, or even shed their blood for His sake. These are held up as models to be imitated, as realizations more or less perfect of the sublime ideal which is Christ Himself. And among the saints the foremost place is given to Mary the Mother of Christ, the ideal of Christian womanhood, to whom the Son of God was "subject" in the home at Nazareth. Each festival in her honour is at once an exhortation to copy her virtues and an evidence of the high station to which woman was raised by Christianity. The liturgy, then, is an application on a large scale of those principles which underlie all real teaching—appeal to the senses, association, apperception, expression, and imitation. The Church did not begin by theorizing about these, nor did she wait for a psychological analysis to determine their value. Instructed by her Founder, she simply incorporated in her liturgy those elements which were best fitted to teach men the truth and lead them to act in conformity with the Gospel. It is none the less significant that modern education is adopting for its own purposes, i. e. the teaching of secular subjects, the psychological principles which the Church from the beginning has put into practice.

While the Church, in her interior life and in the execution of her mission, gave proof of her vitality and of her ability to teach mankind, she necessarily came into contact with influences and practices which were the legacy of paganism. In point of religious belief there was, of course, a clean breach between the polytheism of Athens and Rome and the doctrines of Christianity. But philosophy and literature were factors which had to be counted with as well as the educational system, which was still largely under pagan control. Schools had been opened by converts who were imbued with the ideas of Greek philosophy—by Justin at Rome, and Aristides at Athens; while, at Alexandria, Clement and Origen enjoyed the highest repute. These men regarded philosophy as a means of guiding reason to faith, and of defending that faith against the attacks of paganism. Others again, like Tertullian, condemned philosophy outright as something with which the Christian could have nothing to do. In regard to the pagan classics the conflict of opinion was even sharper. Some of the greatest theologians and Fathers, like St. Basil, St. Gregory Nazianzen, and St. Gregory of Nyssa, had studied the classics under pagan masters and were therefore in favour of sending Christian youths to non-Christian schools on the ground that literary studies would enable them the better to defend their religion. At the same time these Fathers would not permit a Christian to teach in such schools lest he should be obliged to take part in idolatrous practices. Tertullian (de Idololatriâ, c. x) insists on the same distinction: the teacher, he says, by reason of his authority, becomes in a way the "catechist of demons"; the pupil, imbued with Christian faith, profits by the letter of classical instruction, but rejects its false doctrine and holds aloof from the superstitious practices which the teacher can hardly avoid. Such a distinction was naturally the source of difficulties and gave rise to much discussion. The situation was not remedied by the edict of Julian the Apostate, forbidding the Christians to teach; though this called forth some protests and suggested the creation of a Christian literature based on classical models of style, nothing decisive resulted. On the other hand, fear of the corrupting influence of pagan literature had more and more alienated Christians from such studies; and it is not surprising to find among the opponents of the classics such men as St. John Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine. Though they had received a thorough classical education, and though they appreciated fully the worth of the pagan authors, their final attitude was adverse to the study of pagan literature. Apart from many controverted points in this subject, it is clear that the Fathers, at a time when the environment of the Church was still pagan, were far more anxious for the purity of faith and morals than for the cultivation of literature. In later ages, as the danger of contamination grew less, classical studies were revived and encouraged by the Church; but their value has more than once been questioned (see Lalanne, Influence des Pères de l'Eglise sur l'éducation publique, Paris, 1850).

Meanwhile the work of education was not neglected. If the Empire gave way before barbarian invasion, the Church found a new field of activity among the vigorous races of the North. To these she brought not only Christianity and civilization, but also the best elements of classical culture. Through her missionaries she became the teacher of Germany and France, of England and Ireland. The task was a difficult one, and its accomplishment was marked by many vicissitudes of temporary failure and hard-won success. At times, indeed, it would seem that the desire for learning had quite disappeared even among those for whom the acquisition of knowledge was a sacred obligation. Yet these drawbacks only served to stimulate the zeal of ecclesiastical and civil rulers in behalf of a more thorough and systematic education. Thus the salient feature of the Middle Ages is the co-operation of Church and State for the development of schools. Theodoric in Italy, Alfred in England, and Charlemagne in the Frankish Kingdom are illustrious examples of princes who joined their authority with that of bishops and councils to secure adequate instruction for clergy and people. Among churchmen it suffices to mention Chrodegang of Metz, Alcuin, St. Bede, Boethius, and Cassiodorus (see the several articles). As a result of their efforts, education was provided for the clergy in the cathedral schools under the direct supervision of the bishop and for the laity in parochial schools to which all had access. In the curriculum, religion held the first place; other subjects were few and elementary, comprising at best the *trivium* and *quadrivium* (see Arts, The Seven Liberal). But the significance of this education lies not so much in its content as in the fact that it was the means of arousing a love of learning among peoples that had just emerged from barbarism, and of laying the foundations of Western culture and science. The history of education records no greater undertaking; for the task was not one of improving or perfecting, but of creating, and had not the Church gone vigorously about her work, modern civilization would have been retarded for centuries. (See Schools; Middle Ages.)

One of the chief factors in this progress was monas-

ticism (q. v.). The Benedictine monasteries especially were homes of study and depositories of the ancient learning. Not only sympathetic writers, like Montalembert, but those also who are more critical, acknowledge the service which the monks rendered to education. "In those restless ages of rude culture, of constant warfare, of perpetual lawlessness and the rule of might, monasticism offered the one opportunity for a life of repose, of contemplation, and of that leisure and relief from the ordinary vulgar but necessary duties of life essential to the student. . . . Thus it happened that the monasteries were the sole schools for teaching; they offered the only professional training; they were the only universities of research; they alone served as publishing houses for the multiplication of books; they were the only libraries for the preservation of learning; they produced the only scholars; they were the sole educational institutions of this period" (Paul Monroe, A Text-Book in the History of Education, New York, 1907, p. 255). In addition to their prescribed studies, the monks were constantly occupied in copying the classic texts. "While the Greek classics owed their safe preservation to the libraries of Constantinople and to the monasteries of the East, it is primarily to the monasteries of the West that we are indebted for the survival of the Latin classics" (Sandys, A History of Classical Scholarship, 2nd ed. Cambridge, 1906, p. 617). The specific work of education was carried on in the monastery school and was intended primarily for the novices. In some cases, however, a *schola exterior*, or outer school, was added for lay students and for aspirants to the secular priesthood. The course of study included, besides the seven liberal arts, the reading of Latin authors and the music of the Church. Finally, through their annals and chronicles, the monks provided a rich store of information concerning medieval life, which is invaluable to the historian of that period. The chief importance, however, of the monastic schools is found in the fact that they were conducted by an organized body of teachers who had withdrawn from the world and devoted their lives, under the guidance of religion, to literary pursuits and educational work. The same Christianity that had sanctified the family now gave to the profession of teacher a sacredness and a dignity which made teaching itself a noble vocation.

Two other movements form the climax of the Church's activity during the Middle Ages. The development of Scholasticism (q. v.) meant the revival of Greek philosophy, and in particular of Aristotle; but it also meant that philosophy was now to serve the cause of Christian truth. Men of faith and learning like Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas, far from dreading or scorning the products of Greek thought, sought to make them the rational basis of belief. A synthesis was thus effected between the highest speculation of the pagan world and the teachings of theology. Scholasticism, moreover, was a distinct advance in the work of education; it was an intellectual training in method, in systematic thought, in severe logical reasoning, and in accuracy of statement. But taken as a whole, it furnished a great object-lesson, the purport of which was that, for the keenest intellect, the findings of reason and the truths of Revelation could be harmonized. Having used the subtilties of Greek thought to sharpen the student's mind, the Church thereupon presented to him her dogmas without the least fear of contradiction. She thus united in a consistent whole whatever was best in pagan science and culture with the doctrine entrusted to her by Christ. If education be rightly defined as "the transmission of our intellectual and spiritual inheritance" (Butler), this definition is fully exemplified in the work of the Church during the Middle Ages.

The same synthetic spirit took concrete form in the universities (q. v.). In founding these the popes and the secular rulers co-operated; in university teaching all the then known branches of science were represented; the student body comprised all classes, laymen and clerics, seculars and religious; and the diploma conferred was an authorization to teach everywhere. The university was thus, in the educational sphere, the highest expression of that completeness which had all along characterized the teaching of the Church; and the spirit of inquiry which animated the medieval university remains, in spite of other modifications, the essential element in the university of modern times. The changes which have since taken place have for the most part resulted in separating those elements which the Church had built into a harmonious unity. As Protestantism by rejecting the principle of authority brought about innumerable divisions in belief, so it led the way to rupture between Church and State in the work of education. The Renaissance in its extreme forms ranked pagan culture above everything else; and the Reformation in its fundamental tenet went beyond the individualism which led to the decline of Greek education. Once the schools were secularized, they fell readily under influences which transformed ideals, systems, and methods. Philosophy detached from theology formulated new theories of life and its values, that moved, at first slowly then more rapidly, away from the positive teachings of Christianity. Science in turn cast off its allegiance to philosophy and finally proclaimed itself the only sort of knowledge worth seeking. The most serious practical result was the separation of moral and religious from purely intellectual education—a result which was due in part to religious differences and political changes, but also in large part to erroneous views concerning the nature and need of moral training. Such views again are in general derived from the denial, explicit or implicit, of the supernatural order, and of its meaning for human life in its relations to God; so that, during three centuries past, the main endeavour outside the Catholic Church has been to establish education on a purely naturalistic basis, whether this be æsthetic culture or scientific knowledge, individual perfection or social service. In its earlier stages Protestantism, which laid so much stress on faith, could not consistently have sanctioned an education from which religious ideals were eliminated. But according as its principles worked out to their legitimate consequences, it became less and less capable of opposing the naturalistic movement. The Catholic Church has thus been obliged to carry on, with little or no help from other Christian bodies, the struggle in behalf of those truths on which Christianity is founded; and her educational work during the modern period may be described in general terms as the steadfast maintenance of the union between the natural and the supernatural.

From a human point of view the Church was under many disadvantages. The loss of the universities, the confiscation of monastic and other ecclesiastical property, and the opposition of various governments seemed to make her task hopeless. Yet these difficulties only served to call forth new manifestations of her vitality. The Council of Trent gave the impulse by decreeing that a more thorough education of the clergy should be secured through the seminaries (q. v.) and by urging upon bishops and priests the duty of building up the parochial schools. Similar measures were adopted by provincial and diocesan synods throughout Europe. Then came the religious orders founded for the express purpose of educating Catholic youth. (See especially INSTITUTE OF THE BROTHERS OF THE CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS; SOCIETY OF JESUS; ORATORIANS.) And to these finally must be added the numerous congregations of women who devoted their lives to the Christian training of girls. However different in organization and method, these institutions had for their common purpose the spread of religious truth along with secular knowledge among all classes. Thus

there arose, by force of circumstances, a distinctly Catholic system of education, including parish schools, academies, colleges, and a certain number of universities which had remained under the control of the Church or were founded anew by the Holy See. It is especially the parochial school that has served in recent times as an essential factor in the work of religion. In some countries, e. g. Canada, it has received support from the Government; in others, as in the United States, it is maintained by voluntary contributions. As Catholics have also to pay their share of taxes for the public school system, they are under a double burden; but this very hardship has only served to place in clearer light their practical loyalty to the principles on which Catholic education is based. In fact, the whole parochial school movement during the nineteenth century forms one of the most remarkable chapters in the history of education. It proves on one side that neither loss of the State's co-operation nor lack of material resources can weaken the determination of the Church to carry on her educational work; and on the other side it shows what faith and devotion on the part of parents, clergy, and teachers can accomplish where the interests of religion are at stake. (See SCHOOLS.) As this attitude and this action of Catholics place them in a position which is not always rightly understood, it may be useful to present here a statement of the principles on which the Church has based her course in the past, and to which she adheres unswervingly at the present time when the problems of education are the subject of so much discussion and the cause of agitation in various directions. The Catholic position may be outlined as follows:—

1. Intellectual education must not be separated from moral and religious education. To impart knowledge or to develop mental efficiency without building up moral character is not only contrary to psychological law, which requires that all the faculties should be trained, but is also fatal both to the individual and to society. No amount of intellectual attainment or culture can serve as a substitute for virtue; on the contrary, the more thorough intellectual education becomes, the greater is the need for sound moral training.

2. Religion should be an essential part of education; it should form not merely an adjunct to instruction in other subjects, but the centre about which these are grouped and the spirit by which they are permeated. The study of nature without any reference to God, or of human ideals with no mention of Jesus Christ, or of human legislation without Divine law is at best a one-sided education. The fact that religious truth finds no place in the curriculum is, of itself, and apart from any open negation of that truth, sufficient to warp the pupil's mind in such a way and to such an extent that he will feel little concern in his school-days or later for religion in any form; and this result is the more likely to ensue when the curriculum is made to include everything that is worth knowing except the one subject which is of chief importance.

3. Sound moral instruction is impossible apart from religious education. The child may be drilled in certain desirable habits, such as neatness, courtesy, and punctuality; he may be imbued with a spirit of honour, industry, and truthfulness—and none of this should be neglected; but if these duties towards self and neighbour are sacred, the duty towards God is immeasurably more sacred. When it is faithfully performed, it includes and raises to a higher plane the discharge of every other obligation. Training in religion, moreover, furnishes the best motives for conduct and the noblest ideals for imitation, while it sets before the mind an adequate sanction in the holiness and justice of God. Religious education, it should be noted, is more than instruction in the dogmas of faith or the precepts of the Divine law; it is essentially a practical training in the exercises of religion, such as prayer, attendance at Divine worship, and reception of the sacraments. By these means conscience is purified, the will to do right is strengthened, and the mind is fortified to resist those temptations which, especially in the period of adolescence, threaten the gravest danger to the moral life.

4. An education which unites the intellectual, moral, and religious elements is the best safeguard for the home, since it places on a secure basis the various relations which the family implies. It also ensures the performance of social duties by inculcating a spirit of self-sacrifice, of obedience to law, and of Christian love for the fellow-man. The most effectual preparation for citizenship is that schooling in virtue which habituates a man to decide, to act, to oppose a movement or to further it, not with a view to personal gain nor simply in deference to public opinion, but in accordance with the standards of right that are fixed by the law of God. The welfare of the State, therefore, demands that the child be trained in the practice of virtue and religion no less than in the pursuit of knowledge.

5. Far from lessening the need of moral and religious training, the advance in educational methods rather emphasizes that need. Many of the so-called improvements in teaching are of passing importance, and some are at variance with the laws of the mind. Upon their relative worth the Church does not pronounce, nor does she commit herself to any particular method. Provided the essentials of Christian education are secured, the Church welcomes whatever the sciences may contribute toward rendering the work of the school more efficient.

6. Catholic parents are bound in conscience to provide for the education of their children, either at home or in schools of the right sort. As the bodily life of the child must be cared for, so, for still graver reasons, must the mental and moral faculties be developed. Parents, therefore, cannot take an attitude of indifference toward this essential duty nor transfer it wholly to others. They are responsible for those earliest impressions which the child receives passively, before he exercises any conscious selective imitation; and as the intellectual powers develop, the parents' example is the lesson that sinks most deeply into the child's mind. They are also obliged to instruct the child, according to his capacity, in the truths of religion and in the practice of religious duties, thus co-operating with the work of the Church and the school. The virtues, especially of obedience, self-control, and purity, can nowhere be inculcated so thoroughly as in the home; and without such moral education by the parents, the task of forming upright men and women and worthy citizens is difficult, if not impossible.

That the need of moral and religious education has impressed the minds of non-Catholics also, is evident from the movement inaugurated in 1903 by the Religious Education Association in the United States, which meets annually and publishes its proceedings at Chicago. An international inquiry into the problem of moral training was started in London in 1906, and the report has been edited by Professor Sadler under the title, "Moral Instruction and Training in Schools" (London, 1908).

For the respective rights and duties of the Church and the civil authority, see SCHOOLS; STATE.

GENERAL: MONROE, *Bibl. of Education* (New York, 1897); HALL AND MANSFIELD, *Bibl. of Education* (Boston, 1893); CUBBERLEY, *Syllabus of Lectures on the Hist. of Ed.* (New York, 1902).

CATHOLIC WRITERS: STÖCKL, *Gesch. d. Pädagogik* (Mainz, 1876); KRIEG, *Lehrb. d. Pädagogik* (Paderborn, 1900); DRANE, *Christian Schools and Scholars*, 2d ed. (London, 1881); KUNZ, ed., *Bibliothek d. katholischen Pädagogik*, a series of monographs, biographical and expository (Freiburg, 1888—); NEWMAN, *The Idea of a University* (London, 1873); BROTHER AZARIAS, *Essays Educational* (Chicago, 1896); WILLMANN, *Didaktik als Bildungslehre*, 2d ed. (Brunswick, 1894); SPALDING, *Education and the Higher Life* (Chicago, 1890); IDEM, *Means and Ends of Education* (Chicago, 1895); IDEM, *Religion, Agnosticism and*

Education (Chicago, 1902); DUPANLOUP, *De l'éducation* (Paris, 1850); IDEM, *De la haute éducation intellectuelle* (Paris, 1855–57); GAUME, *Du Catholicisme dans l'éducation* (Paris, 1835); IDEM, *Lettres sur le paganisme dans l'éducation* (Paris, 1852); KLEUTGEN, *Ueber die alten und die neuen Schulen* (Münster, 1869).

NON-CATHOLIC WRITERS: K. A. SCHMID, *Gesch. d. Erziehung* (Stuttgart, 1884–96); K. SCHMIDT, *Gesch. d. Pädagogik* (Köthen, 1891); MONROE, *Source Book of the Hist. of Ed.* (New York, 1891); LAURIE, *Historical Survey of Pre-Christian Ed.* (New York, 1900); HARRIS, ed., *International Educational Series* (New York, 1887—); ROSENKRANZ, tr. BRACKETT, *The Philosophy of Education* (New York, 1905); BUTLER, *The Meaning of Education* (New York, 1905); SPENCER, *Education* (New York, 1895); BAIN, *Education as a Science* (New York, 1883); HORNE, *The Philosophy of Education* (New York, 1904).

E. A. PACE.

Educational Association, THE CATHOLIC, a voluntary organization composed of Catholic educators and other persons who have an interest in the welfare of Catholic education in the United States of America. It includes several associations established to secure closer union and more active co-operation in special lines of work. The movement for unification began with an effort to establish a conference of seminary presidents and professors. A meeting called by the Right Rev. T. J. Conaty, Rector of the Catholic University of America, was held at St. Joseph's Seminary, New York, in May, 1898. A second meeting was held in Philadelphia, September, 1899, but nothing further was done until April, 1904, when, at the instance of the Right Rev. D. J. O'Connell, representatives of several seminaries met and decided to revive the conference, and to hold a meeting at St. Louis in July, 1904.

The first meeting of the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities of the United States was called by the Right Rev. T. J. Conaty, and was held in Chicago in April, 1899. Annual meetings have been held since that time. The Parish School Conference was organized in Chicago in July, 1902, and it was then decided to meet at Philadelphia with the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities in 1903. At the Philadelphia meeting the Parish School Conference passed a resolution empowering a committee on organization to confer with the standing committee of the Association of Catholic Colleges and to draw up a plan of union. These three conferences met in St. Louis 12–14 July, 1904; and a committee including representatives of each proposed a constitution to be tried for one year. The report of the committee was unanimously adopted at a joint meeting of all three and the Catholic Educational Association was formed 14 July, 1904, the Right Rev. D. J. O'Connell being unanimously elected President General of the Association.

This Association held its second meeting in New York and a leading feature of the meeting was the remarkable public demonstration in Carnegie Hall at the close. The third meeting was held in Cleveland, and the fourth at Milwaukee; both were notable for the increasing attendance and for the cordial approbation of the movement given by members of the hierarchy. At the meeting in Milwaukee, July, 1907, the constitution, which had been amended each year, was finally adopted, and the executive board was authorized to take steps to incorporate the association. The fifth annual meeting was held at Cincinnati in July, 1908. There was a registration of 769 names at this convention; all sections of the country were represented, and a number of religious communities sent official delegates.

An idea of the general scope of these gatherings may be had from the subjects treated in the papers and the addresses at this meeting. Among the former were contributions on "The Present Condition of Latin Studies in the Catholic Institutions of the United States"; "The Method of Teaching Religion"; "Necessity and Means of Promoting Vocations to Teaching Orders"; "School Library and the Child's Reading", and on the study of social questions and problems in the seminary, the present state of education and the curriculum. At the public meeting the topics were "Religious Instruction, the Basis of Morality", "The Catholic School and Social Morality", and "The Necessity of an Enlightened Conscience for the Proper Performance of Civic Duties".

The convention was the largest and most representative gathering of Catholic educators that had up to that date been held in the country. The usefulness of these meetings is now generally recognized. They give an understanding of the strength and weakness of the Catholic educational position that can be obtained in no other way. A great deal of earnest and serious work is done at them; they foster a spirit of unity and co-operation in all departments of educational work; and they inspire the educators with a greater love and devotion to their calling. The whole system of Catholic educational activity has been strengthened, unified and developed by the annual conventions of the association, and more especially was this the result of the meeting in Cincinnati.

As the understanding of the Catholic educational situation, with its difficulties and possibilities, becomes clearer, the work of the association becomes every year more definite and more practical. The slow and gradual growth of the association has given it a form of organization well suited to the development of the work. Catholic educators have a good understanding of the problems they must solve, among which are the problem of secondary education, and the problem of curriculum. Of more importance, even, than the thoroughness of educational work is the defence of the general interests of Catholic education, and the vindication of the principles on which it is based. The secular system of education is based largely on the theory that man is born for the State and that he derives his rights from the State. The socialist would have the State absorb all authority in the domain of learning and of industry, and there are many secular educators who would fain see the monopoly of education lodged in the power of the State. The Catholic system is based on the right of the parent, the right of the child, and a reasonable individualism. The resolutions of the Cincinnati convention insisted on the right of the parent in the matter of education, and the association exists for the purpose of maintaining the right of the parent and the principle of liberty of education. The Catholic Educational Association is an expression of the unity of principle that unites all Catholic educators.

The officers of the association are a president general, several vice-presidents general, a secretary general, treasurer general, and an executive board. The association includes the college, school, and seminary departments. The affairs of the association are managed by the executive board. Each department is represented in this board by its president and two other members elected by the department. Each department regulates its own affairs, and each may organize sections for the more special work in which its members are interested. In the Parish School Department, there is a Superintendents' Section and a Deaf Mute Section. A local meeting for the teachers is organized at every convention through the Parish School Department.

In the constitution the aims of the association are stated as follows: "The object of this association shall be to keep in the minds of the people the necessity of religious instruction and training as the basis of morality and sound education; and to promote the principles and safeguard the interests of Catholic education in all its departments; to advance the general interests of Catholic education, to encourage the spirit of co-operation and mutual helpfulness among Catholic educators, to promote by study, conference, and discussion the thoroughness of Catholic educational work in the United States; to help the cause of Catholic education by the publication and circulation of such matter as shall further these ends."

According to the report of the secretary general

there were on 1 July, 1908, three hundred and sixty-four members of the Parish School Department, fifty-two colleges in the College Department, and fourteen seminaries in the Seminary Department. The association publishes an annual report giving all the papers and discussions of the association and its departments. It also publishes "The Catholic Educational Association Bulletin" quarterly, which contains matters of interest to the members of the association and articles that have an important bearing on Catholic educational work. The association has issued to 1908 five annual reports from the secretary's office, Columbus, Ohio.

FRANCIS W. HOWARD.

Education of the Blind.—Although the education of the blind as a class dates back no further than the year 1784, historians and statisticians generally admit that the affliction which it tends to relieve was no less prevalent before than it has been since that date. Indeed, so far from having increased, blindness appears to have in a marked degree decreased during the last hundred years.

GENERAL STATISTICS OF BLINDNESS.—An exact statement of the number of blind persons in all parts of the inhabited earth is of course impossible. The estimates which publicists have formed upon the basis of census returns, as also those derived from the observation of travellers, give the ratio of blind persons to the whole population in Asia 1 to 500; in Africa 1 to 300; in Europe 1 to 1094 (the ratios for seventeen countries of the last-named division being, approximately: England, 1 to 1235; Scotland, 1 to 1118; Ireland, 1 to 870; France, 1 to 1194; Germany, 1 to 1136; European Russia, 1 to 534; Austria, 1 to 1234; Hungary, 1 to 952; Italy, 1 to 1074; Spain, 1 to 835; Denmark, 1 to 1248; Sweden, 1 to 1262; Norway, 1 to 795; Finland, 1 to 689; Belgium, 1 to 1229; Switzerland, 1 to 1325; Bulgaria, 1 to 321). For the other great geographical divisions no data are available for even a fairly satisfactory approximation. (See below *Blindness in the United States.*) Consistently with the foregoing ratios, and with such conjectures as may be hazarded for America, Australasia, etc., it may be estimated that the number of blind persons now living in all parts of the world is not far short of 2,500,000. A careful study of the figures shows that blindness prevails most in tropical, and least in temperate, regions; more in the Eastern than in the Western Hemisphere. In the temperate climates of the North the blind are comparatively few; nearer the Arctic Circle, the glittering snows, the alternation from the brilliant nights of the Arctic summer to the prolonged darkness of the winter, and other conditions affect the visual organs unfavourably, while in the torrid zones the glare from desert sands and the intense heat of the sun occasion many diseases, resulting in either total or partial loss of sight.

Blindness in the United States.—In the Western Hemisphere a different ratio seems to obtain. The data, however, for an accurate comparison are wanting, except in the United States (lying between the 24th and 49th parallels of north latitude), where, according to the census of 1900, the ratio of the blind to the entire population is 1 to 1178. In 1890, the ratio was 1 to 1242. The number of blind persons in the United States originally returned by the enumerators of the Federal Census Bureau, 1900, was 101,123; by subsequent correspondence with individuals, this number was reduced to 64,763; but the special report on "The Blind and the Deaf" states that this should be considered only as a minimum, the correct figure being probably 80,000 and possibly over 100,000. Of the minimum 64,763 reported in the Census, 57·2 per cent were males, 42·8 per cent females; about 13 per cent were under, and about 87 per cent over, twenty years of age. Of the juvenile 13 per cent (8308), those entirely or partially blind before the age of two years numbered 8166.

Causes and Effects.—In a careful study of the causes of blindness Cohn of Breslau estimates that among 1000 blind there are only 220 absolutely unavoidable cases, 449 possibly avoidable, and 326 (or nearly one-third) absolutely avoidable. Blindness may result from accident or from disease. The diseases most often productive of blindness are: *ophthalmia neonatorum*, or inflammation of the eyes of the new-born; *trachoma*, often called "granular lids", and *glaucoma*, and atrophy of the optic nerve. Blindness from ophthalmia of the new-born is so widespread that, according to Magnus, out of 2528 cases of total blindness in Germany, 10·88 per cent were due to this cause. Among the blind under the age of twenty the proportion is as high as 30 per cent. In the United States, between 6000 and 7000 persons have thus become blind. Thanks to improved sanitary conditions in homes, to more intelligent care on the part of midwives and nurses, and more skilful medical treatment, ophthalmia in certain countries appears as a cause of blindness in only seven per cent of the total number of cases, as against the 41 per cent recorded fifty years ago.

The function of sight can, to a certain extent, be replaced by the use of the other senses. Stimulated by necessity and trained by education, touch, hearing, and smell take the place of vision. Having no sight to distract them, moreover, the blind cultivate their remaining senses all the more effectually. As for the exercise of their mental faculties, although wanting some of the means by which various impressions are received, and attention is aroused, the blind are as capable of reflection and reason as other human beings, while, owing to their condition, they are more frequently forced to close mental application. That blindness does not necessarily render its subjects intellectually inferior, may also be inferred from the number of famous persons who were blind from childhood or early youth. A list of such examples might with little difficulty be produced, long enough and important enough to show how erroneous is the idea that the physical darkness of the blind is necessarily associated with intellectual darkness.

HISTORY OF EDUCATION OF THE BLIND.—That no attempt was made in ancient times to instruct the blind, or in any way to cultivate their intelligences, was mainly due to the prevalent error as to their mental capacities. The same error, generally speaking, produced the same unfortunate results in Christian civilization until as late as the end of the eighteenth century. On the other hand, the Church, from the earliest ages, at least made provision for their corporal needs, while here and there attempts were made to teach them various handicrafts. Among the most noted of the hospices for the poor and afflicted which began to appear in all parts of Christendom almost as soon as persecution ceased, was that established in the fourth century by Saint Basil at Cæsarea, where special provision was made for the blind, and guides were supplied for them. In the fifth century, Limnæus, a hermit of Syria, received, in cottages especially built for them, the blind of the surrounding country, whom he taught, among other things, to sing the praises of God. Two centuries later, towards the year 630, a refuge exclusively for the blind, such as was called in the Middle Ages a *typhlocomium*, was founded at Jerusalem.

In the West, the Church was animated with similar charity. Early in the seventh century, St. Bertrand, Bishop of Le Mans, founded a hospice for the blind at Pontlieu, in the north-west of France. In the eleventh century, William the Conqueror, in expiation of his sins, founded a number of institutions; among them four hospices for the blind and other infirm persons at Cherbourg, Rouen, Bayeux, and Caen respectively. Towards 1260, St. Louis, King of France, established at Paris the Hospice des Quinze-Vingts, where he housed and instructed three hundred blind

persons. The inmates of the hospice, after the example of the students and the craftsmen of the day, formed among themselves a distinct brotherhood, to whom the saintly king gave special statutes and privileges. It is noteworthy that, in spite of the changes of government, the "Hospice des Quinze-Vingts" has survived to this day. A similar institution, though less extensive, was established and endowed at Chartres by King John the Good in 1350. Provision was made for 120 blind persons. For various reasons, however, the number of inmates dwindled till, in 1837, according to Dufau, there were but ten. A hospice for the blind is said to have been erected (1305) at Bruges, in Flanders, by Robert de Béthune, in gratitude for the courage displayed by the inhabitants in repelling (1300) an invasion of Philip the Fair. A similar foundation was made at Ghent by Peter Van der Leyen about 1370. Brotherhoods of the blind were formed, particularly at Chartres, Caen, Châlons, Meaux, Padua, Memming, Frankfort, and Hull. That the inmates of these institutions received other suitable instruction besides that in the Catechism and in trades there can be no doubt. So desultory, however, were these attempts to give the blind a modicum of education, and so inadequate were the means employed, that the problem of their special education remained unsolved. No one had as yet suggested the idea of providing a permanent literature for them. As early as the sixteenth century attempts were made to devise special processes, but these attempts, so far as we know, met with very little success.

Among others, Girolamo Cardano (1501-1576), an Italian mathematician, had pointed out a way of teaching the blind to read and write by the sense of touch. They were to trace with a steel bodkin or stylus the outline of each of the letters of the alphabet, engraved on metal, until they could distinguish the letters by the sense of touch and reproduce them on paper. Cardano, however, failed to suggest how to write on a straight line with uniformity of space between the lines. In 1575 Rampazetto produced at Rome prints in intaglio from letters carved in wood. His invention was dedicated to St. Charles Borromeo. In 1580, under Philip II, to whom he dedicated his invention, Francesco Lucas, at Madrid, engraved letters in wood for the instruction of the blind; but the letters being sunk in the wood, the outlines could not as readily be followed with the finger-tips. In 1640, Pierre Moreau, a notary at Paris, had movable letters cast for the use of the blind, but for lack of means was unable to follow up his undertaking. In his work, "Deliciæ mathematicæ et physicæ", published at Nuremberg in 1651, George Harsdörffer describes how the blind can recognize, and be taught to name and imitate, letters engraved in wax. Padre Francesco Lana-Terzi, the same Italian Jesuit who anticipated by more than a century the system of lip-reading for deaf mutes, also suggested, as an improvement on Cardano's invention for the blind, a guide consisting of a series of wires and strings arranged in parallel lines at equal distances from one another, to secure straight writing and uniformity of space between the lines. Besides this, Lana-Terzi describes, in his "Prodromo", an invention of his own, by which the blind may be taught to correspond with each other by a secret code. We have looked in vain in works of reference for any description of this cryptographic device. It is so simple that it can be learned in a few hours. Instead of compelling a blind person to learn how to form all the letters of the alphabet, the three methods pointed out by Lana-Terzi demand only a tactual knowledge of the letters, familiarity with their positions in their respective sections, and a little skill; (1) to insert one, two, or three dots within a square or parts of a square or right angles turned in four different directions; or (2) to prefix to either a comma, colon, semicolon, period, or interrogation mark any one of the first four numerals; or (3) merely to form these numerals. The letters of the alphabet with the lines enclosing them, Lana-Terzi suggests, should be in relief rather than in intaglio, raised letters being far more distinguishable to the sense of touch than letters sunk in a plane surface. The following diagrams will make the matter clear.

First (Lana-Terzi) Method.—Suppose the blind correspondent wishes to send the cipher message, *Son prigione* (I am a prisoner), he will turn to his tablet,

a o	g u	b t v
f i	m n	e s p
c l	h r	d 2 z

and ascertain by touch that the letter *s* is the second of those enclosed within the lines forming the figure. He will trace this figure with a pencil, and, to indicate that it is the second letter in the above figure, he will write, either above, or below, or within it, two dots, thus The message in full is as follows:—

S O N P R I G I O N E

Second Method.—The letters of the alphabet are embossed on a wooden or metallic tablet and distributed in any order whatever into five or more sections, which are indicated by lines in relief. Each section is distinguished from the others by one of the five principal punctuation marks, formed, like the letters, in relief.

a b c d ,	e f g h ;	i l m n :	o p q r .	s t u z ?

The position of each letter in its own section is indicated by one of the first four numerals according to the order in the section. Thus, the message, *Il re è morto* (the king is dead), would be written as follows:—

1: 2: 4·1; 1; 3: 1. 4. 2? 1.

I L R E È M O R T O

Third Method.—Instead of designating by punctuation marks the different sections into which the letters are distributed, they may be indicated by numerals, thus:—

a b c d 1	e f g h 2	i l m n 3	o p q r 4	s t u z 5

By this method the blind person would have to learn how to form only the first five numerals. Thus the above message, *Il re è morto*, according to this method, would be written as follows:—

1-3 2-3 4-4 1-2 1-2 3-3 1-4 4-4 2-5 1-4

I L R E È M O R T ■

the first numeral indicating the position of the letter in the section, and the second numeral the section itself.

To enable the correspondent to make out for himself the answer to his message or communication, Lana-Terzi proposes the following plan: Let each of the correspondents have a table or long strip of wood

on which are engraved or embossed the letters of the alphabet arranged in serial order at equal distances from each other, as in the diagram here given.



LANA-TERZI CONTRIVANCE FOR CORRESPONDING BY KNOTS

Suppose now that a person who is not blind should wish to send to his blind friend this message: *Il nemico ti trama insidie* (the enemy is trying to ensnare you). Let him take a piece of thread or twine, apply the end of it to the extreme point of the tablet, extend the thread over the space from *a* to the first letter *i* of the message and make a knot at that point; for the second letter, apply this first knot to point *a*, extend the thread over the space from *a* to the letter *l*, make, as before, a knot at that point, and so on for the rest of the letters. It will readily be understood how the blind person, to whom the roll of knotted thread or twine is sent, can make out the communication by applying the various thread lengths over the distances indicated by the knots, and thus discover each letter of the message. The blind correspondent, in his turn, can easily send by this same method whatever communication he wishes.

A few years after the publication of Lana-Terzi's "Prodromo", Jacques Bernouilli, being at Geneva in 1676, taught Elizabeth Waldkirch to read by a method not unlike that of Cardano. The young lady made such progress that after four years she was able to correspond with her friends in German, French, and Latin, all of which she spoke fluently at the age of fifteen. She knew almost all the Bible by heart, was familiar with philosophy, and was an accomplished musician.

About the year 1711 the first known attempt was made to construct a tactile ciphering-tablet or apparatus by which all the operations of arithmetic might be performed and recorded. This was the work of Nicholas Saunderson, who became blind when one year old. So distinguished was this blind mathematician that he was appointed Lucasian Professor of Mathematics in the University of Cambridge. The Abbé Claude-François Deschamps (1745-91), in his treatise on the education of the deaf and dumb, is said to have also sketched the outlines of the art of teaching the blind to read and write. Diderot in his "Lettre sur les aveugles", which appeared in London in 1749, and for which he was condemned to prison, mentions his interview with Lenôtre, better known as "The Blind Man of Puisaux". Among other remarkable things related of him is the teaching of his son, though not blind, to read by means of raised letters. Between 1772 and 1784 we read of the earliest attempt to make maps in relief for the blind. This invention is ascribed to R. Weissenburg, of Mannheim, who was partially blind at five years of age, and totally at fifteen. Whether any of the credit is due to Weissenburg's teacher, Christian Niesen, cannot be ascertained. Though Diderot was among the first to call special attention to the condition and wants of the blind, and to make them generally known through his famous letter, yet neither he, nor Leibniz, nor Reid, nor Condillac, nor any of the Encyclopedists went beyond abstract psychological speculation. None of them proposed any measure of practical utility or relief nor devised any plans for the instruction and training of sightless persons.

The modern era in the history of education of the blind opened in 1784—nearly three centuries after the desultory and apparently ineffectual attempts of Cardano and others—when Valentin Haüy (1745–1822) set himself to do for the blind what the Abbé de l'Epée had done for deaf mutes. It was in June, 1784, that Haüy met, in one of the churches of Paris, a young mendicant named Lesueur, who had been blind from his birth. Having already spent many years in studying the theory, Haüy took this young waif to be the subject of his first practical essays in teaching the blind. Lesueur was promised a regular daily allowance in place of the income which he was supposed to earn by begging. Before long the number of Haüy's pupils increased to twelve, then to double that number, and finally to fifty. His school was at first a day-school, to which children of both sexes were admitted. When Haüy, in 1786, exhibited the attainments of twenty-four of his best pupils at Versailles, Louis XVI and his court were in raptures at the wonderful novelty of children without sight reading, writing, ciphering, doing handicraft work, and playing orchestral music. So great was the interest which this and similar exhibitions aroused, and so generous the patronage of the king and the public which they secured for his school, that Haüy soon had sufficient means to board his pupils. From the very beginning the institution had the triple character of a school, a workshop, and an academy of music; and to this day these three departments have been maintained with such a record for efficiency that the institution founded by Haüy has served as the model for most of the many others in both hemispheres. But true intellectual culture for the blind dates only from the day when reading by touch was made possible. To Haüy is due the credit of having provided a system of tactual printing and a permanent literature for the blind. In the light of a century's progress and of better systems of printing and writing invented since his day, the shortcomings of Haüy's print in relief may lessen the value of his invention, but, in fairness to his memory, it must be remembered that Haüy alone succeeded in making practical for the blind as a class what others before him had merely foreshadowed, or had successfully applied only in individual instances. In spite, therefore, of the derogatory claims made by two or three writers, and notwithstanding that he himself admitted having seen a letter printed by Theresa von Paradis from type made for her by von Kempelen, the fact remains that no one before Haüy had ever tried seriously to make printing available for the blind; to no one before him had the idea occurred of printing books for the blind, or of establishing libraries of literature printed in relief. The movement originated by him has resulted in the establishment in all civilized countries of institutions of learning and industrial training schools for the blind. Before the close of the eighteenth century, a period of only sixteen years, four such institutions had sprung up in Great Britain, viz., in Liverpool (1791), in Edinburgh (1793), in Bristol (1793), and in London (1799). Other countries were not slow in following the example. The following table shows what the leading countries of Europe and America have done for their blind during the nineteenth century:—

	First Inst. founded in the year	No. of Blind	No. of Educat. Inst.	No. of Trade Schools and Asylums
France	1784	32,340	24	10
England	1791	26,330	24	54
Scotland	1793	4,000	5	2
Austria-Hungary	1804	41,400	11	17
Germany	1806	49,570	34	48
European Russia	1807	221,208	37	6
Sweden	1808	4,100	3	5
Switzerland	1809	2,500	4	5
Ireland	1810	5,120	6	7
Denmark	1811	1,961	2	2
Spain	1820	21,000	11	5
United States	1831	64,763	44	24
Belgium	1836	4,935	8	4
Italy	1838	30,210	19	5
Norway	1861	2,816	2	1

Contemporary Education of the Blind.—*General Aspects.*—In nearly all the countries referred to in the foregoing table, most of the schools for the blind maintain three distinct departments: a literary department, a department of music, and an industrial department. The rank of these institutions is higher or lower from an educational point of view according as more or less prominence is given to literature and music as compared with industrial or manual training. In the leading schools the literary department embraces kindergarten, primary, secondary, and, in a few instances, collegiate education; the department of music embraces primary, secondary, and collegiate education; while the industrial department embraces the teaching of handicrafts, varying in kind according to age, sex, and country. The courses of study in the literary department are generally the same as those pursued in the public high schools of the respective countries. The work in the department of music varies from instruction in the mere elements of music to thoroughly organized courses of study and highly specialized instruction in the science and art of music. In the industrial department the chief trades are: in the male department, piano-tuning, wood-carving, the making of baskets, mats, matting, brooms, and mattresses, chair-caning, hammock-work, and upholstery; in the female department, basket-making, knitting, hand- and machine-sewing, crocheting, fancy work of various kinds.

In the experimental stages of education, there was a tendency in almost all the schools for the blind to make the industrial department the most prominent feature. The lack of books, of adequate educational appliances, and of definite methods, the comparative ease in teaching some one or other of the simpler trades, the want of technical experience on the part of instructors, the dependence upon manual occupations and mechanical arts for self-support, the readiness to be swayed by the utilitarian principle of training the blind for the active duties and occupations opening the way to self-maintenance and independence—these and other similar considerations were strong arguments in favour of industrial training, to the neglect and detriment of the prime and essential work of education. Of late years, however, a marked change has been wrought in the ideals pursued in the education of the blind. Owing to the increase of general intelligence, on the one hand, and the steady decrease in value of manual labour, on the other hand, educators of the blind have come to realize that it is not technical skill, or ability to work successfully at one or more of the usual trades, but only a broad and liberal scheme of education that will release the blind from the bondage of dependence, uplift them as a class, and raise them to a level of usefulness and independence. In consequence of the extensive employment of machinery in almost every department of human activity, there has sprung up among educators of the blind a growing conviction that the only field in which the sightless can hope in the future to compete successfully with the seeing is a field of thought where the intellect can have free play and where blindness will be no hindrance to advancement and success. The blind need, therefore, at least as good an education as the seeing. The question as to whether they are capable and entitled to such an education has not been settled in the same manner in all countries. In many of the European institutions the prevailing idea is that, as a class, the blind must necessarily remain at the foot of the social scale, forever dependent upon the more fortunate classes, and that what is done for them is rather in the spirit of favour and charity than as of strict obligation. In the United States the education of the blind rests on a different basis. As modern methods of instruction have proved the possibility of imparting to the normal blind child practically the same education as to other children, it is generally acknowledged that the blind, as a class, have an equal right with the seeing to share in all the educational benefits which are provided for every child in the commonwealth; and since this education cannot for obvious reasons be given them in the common schools, special provision should be made for their education in distinct institutions, public or private.

Systems of Embossed Print.—Three centuries and a half elapsed after the invention of printing before any attempt to make printing available for the blind as a class was successful. Whatever information and inspiration may have been drawn by the ingenious inventor from special processes devised before his day, the credit of having first made reading by finger-touch possible must be accorded to Valentin Haüy (see above). The first book embossed by Haüy for the use of the blind was, according to Guadet, his "Essai sur l'éducation des aveugles" (1786). This book was translated into German by Michel, and into English, in 1795, by the blind poet Blacklock. The style of type adopted by Haüy was the French script, resembling the legal manuscripts of the time. The capital and small letters were respectively fourteen and seven and a half millimetres high. The book was a quarto of 111 pages, printed on one side only, two pages being gummed together back to back, to preserve the relief. The pages were embossed from metal type by the blind children of Haüy's school under the direction of Clousier, the court printer. While this invention won unstinted praise for Haüy, he himself, when he heard his achievements compared to those of the Abbé de l'Epée, modestly protested, "I only fit spectacles, while he bestows a soul." From 1806, the time of Haüy's departure for St. Petersburg, to 1854, when line-print was superseded by point-print, the type used at the Institution des Jeunes Aveugles at Paris, varied between the French script, the Italic, and Roman capitals.

Embossed Printing in England.—Printing for the blind had been used in France for forty-three years, in Austria for eighteen, in Prussia for twenty-six, before it was used in England; Haüy's system of printing, it is claimed, was introduced into England by Sir Charles Lowther, to whom it was suggested by a copy of one of the books printed at the Institution des Jeunes Aveugles, and purchased for him by his mother, he being himself blind. In 1826, James Gall, of Edinburgh, who had seen specimens of books embossed at the Paris institution, set himself to improve the alphabet, by making it more perceptible to the touch. In 1827 he printed a small book in an angular modification of the common English alphabet. It is said to have been the first English book printed for the blind in England, and naturally great interest was excited when it was found that the blind could read it easily with their finger-tips. Between 1828 and 1838 no fewer than 20 styles of embossed printing were brought out in Great Britain. Of these, however, only six obtained recognition: those of Haüy, Gall, Fry-Alston, Lucas, Frere, and Moon. Haüy's script was adopted by Sir Charles Lowther in his publication, in 1834, of the Gospel of St. Matthew. Though Gall modified the common characters of the alphabet to make them more easily distinguishable by touch, he did not believe that arbitrary characters would ever be universally adopted, maintaining that these books should be legible to both blind and seeing. Besides two or three booklets previously embossed, Gall printed, in 1832, the Gospel of St. John. The Fry-Alston system of embossed printing is the plain upper-case Roman without ceriphs or the lighter strokes, and was devised by Dr. Edmund Fry and adopted by Alston at the Glasgow Institution for the Blind, of which he was principal. In 1832 the Scottish Society of Arts offered a gold medal for the best system to produce cheapness and tangibility in connexion with an alphabet suited alike to the fingers of the blind and to the eyes of the seeing. Nineteen

different alphabets, seventeen of which were of a purely arbitrary character, were submitted to the society between 9 January, 1832, and 24 October, 1833. After much deliberation and a series of rigid tests, the medal was awarded (after Dr. Fry's death) to Alston, 31 May, 1837. From the award made to Dr. Fry's alphabet, the Scottish Society of Arts evidently shared the idea of Haüy and of other advocates of the Roman letter that in the education of the blind everything should be done to establish a bond of vital unity between them and the seeing and to lessen the isolation which arbitrary systems of print would only increase. As Alston's type was rather small and not very legible, his system did not stand the test of time. Lucas invented a stenographic system formed of arbitrary characters and of numerous contractions. In this system the Gospel of St. John and the Acts of the Apostles were printed in 1837 and 1838 respectively. Frere devised a phonetic system which he himself describes as a "scientific representation of speech". It consists of 34 characters indicating each of the simple sounds in speech. Frere was the first to introduce (1839) the "return lines", in which the reading is alternately from left to right and from right to left, and the letters themselves are reversed in the lines from right to left. He also devised an ingenious system of embossing from stereotype plates; which in-



Six Principal Systems of Embossed Type

vention was, at the time, the greatest improvement in embossing since the days of Haüy. The larger part of the Old and portions of the New Testament were printed in Frere's system. Dr. Moon of Brighton, whose system is used more than any other by the adult blind, at least in England, devised, towards 1845, an alphabet formed of more or less arbitrary characters, which either resemble or suggest a resemblance to the Roman letters which they represent. He also adopted, with a number of slight alterations, Frere's "return lines" and his method of stereotyping. The first book in Moon's system appeared in 1847. The printing of the Bible was begun in 1848 and completed in 1858. Moon's books, though easy to read owing to their large type, are very bulky and expensive; 56 volumes are required for the Protestant edition of the Bible, which omits a number of books contained in the Catholic edition. The chief defects of the Moon system are that it is not a writable system and that it lacks a musical notation. It is useful chiefly for adults whose finger-touch has been dulled by age or manual labour.

Embossed Printing in Continental Europe.—Between 1809, when embossed printing, of which he claimed to be the inventor, was begun by Klein, the founder of the first school for the blind at Vienna, and 1841, when Knie, principal of the institution for the blind at Breslau, introduced the Braille system into Germany, three styles of embossed printing, known as the Stachel-, Press-, and Punktierte Typendruck (the needle-, line-, and punctured print) had been used in Germany, Austria, Holland, Switzerland, and Denmark. These systems were different forms of the upper or lower case or of both upper and lower case, of the Roman letters. Owing to the size of the letters, the books embossed in other parts of Europe were much bulkier than those of like content in France or in England. For a long time after the introduction of the Braille system into Germany, line-print was retained, even where Braille was adopted. It was not until 1876 that interest began to be aroused in regard to uniformity of embossed printing, in consequence, no doubt, of the movement inaugurated in England by the British and Foreign Blind Association in favour of Braille.

Embossed Printing in the United States.—From 1832, when the first school for the blind was opened in the United States, to 1860, when Dr. Pollack introduced Braille in the Missouri school (there being then as many as twenty-one institutions for the blind in this country), two systems of printing were in vogue. The first was that of Dr. Howe, the head of the Boston school for the blind, and the second that of Mr. Friedlander, the principal of the Philadelphia school. Dr. Howe's system was the angular lower case Roman and Mr. Friedlander's system the Roman capitals of the Fry-Alston type. In 1835 Dr. Howe published several books in the Boston letter; Mr. Friedlander's Roman capital was not adopted in Philadelphia until 1837. From an educational as well as from an economical point of view, it is a matter of regret that, for the lack of concerted action between the principals of the Boston and the Philadelphia schools, two systems of print should have been imposed at the very outset on the country. From 1837 to 1853 the two systems flourished in their respective spheres without any agitation regarding uniformity of type. In 1851 the Boston line-print was given the preference over all other embossed systems at the London exhibition of industries of all nations. This award, made twenty-six years after the appearance of Braille in France and one year after the adoption of the new system by the Paris institution for the blind, shows how deeply rooted was the theory prevailing since Haüy, that the adoption of any system not resembling in form and appearance the letters in common use would be prejudicial to the best interests of the blind by furthering their segregation from the seeing. A comparison between the leading systems of line-letter print which obtained recognition in France, England, and the United States shows that Haüy's system gave 365 letters on 50 square inches of surface; Gall's, 526; Alston's, 891; Friedlander's (from 1833 to 1834), 290, and 826 after 1836; Howe's, 702 and by a further improvement, it is claimed, 1067 letters.

Braille.—In spite of the perfection to which some of the line-letter systems had been brought as regards compactness, a careful study of the functions and limitations of the sense of touch showed that the Roman systems, which lacked the quality of strong appeal to that sense (known as *tangibility*), could be of no edu-

cational value. Besides this, they were practically unwritable, and they provided no adequate means of musical notation. Fortunately, when the various line-types were found deficient, and a strong protest by the intelligent blind in Europe and in the United States was raised against them, a new system was discovered, which possessed all the requisites which were lacking in the line-letter prints. This new system is known as Braille. Its invention by Louis Braille, a blind pupil of the Institution des Jeunes Aveugles of Paris, marked a new epoch in the history of the education of the blind. The original idea of a point-print was derived by Louis Braille from Barbier, who suggested a combination of points arranged in a rectangle —twelve points in two vertical columns of six each. The most conspicuous, though not most radical, defect was the large and unwieldy size of the signs, which could not be covered with the finger. Another drawback was the great waste of space. As the "cell", or rectangle, was of fixed size, if a letter was represented by a point in one corner, all the rest of the space was left blank. This was observed by Braille, who reduced Barbier's rectangle one-half; thus he limited the number of the points to six instead of twelve. The six points in Braille are arranged in two vertical rows of three each. By the omission of one or more of the points sixty-three distinct signs are formed, to represent the entire alphabet, accents, Arabic numerals, marks of punctuation, word- and part-word signs, as well as a system of algebraic and musical notation. Of these sixty-three characters, ten are called fundamental signs, and form the basis of all the rest by the addition of one point in some part or other of the "cell" either to the fundamental signs or to the series formed from them. The chief advantages of the Braille system are: (1) its simplicity and easy acquisition; (2) its "tangibility", or efficiency in impressing the sense of touch, enabling the blind not only to read but also to write; (3) its adaptability to both the writing and printing of a system of musical notation.

In spite, however, of its evident advantages, many years went by before the new system obtained recognition, even in countries where, for lack of "tangibility" in the existing systems, the use of books in the class-room had been almost unknown. It is quite possible that the slowness and reluctance in the adoption of Braille were due to the fact that institutions for the blind had been so widely separated in dates of origin and in locality that the need of unity of action and community of interest was but slowly realized. In many cases prejudice, petty jealousy, and obstinate attachment to theories long since proved false, account for the unyielding attitude towards improved methods, which has often stood in the way of true and uniform progress in the education of the blind. From the day when the system was finally adopted in the schools of France, England, Germany, the United States, and other countries, the Braille has undergone various modifications; hence a variety of Braille systems, which have caused even greater confusion than the diversity of the earlier Roman styles of embossed literature. As late as 22 April, 1902, in an address made at the conference held at Westminster on matters relating to the blind, Mr. William H. Illingworth, headmaster of the Royal Blind Asylum and School, West Craigmillar, Edinburgh, spoke as follows regarding the diversity of Braille alphabets and the desirability of a uniform system: "Out of a chaos, born of conflicting opinions and petty jealousies, combined with an almost incredible amount of apathy, indifference and indecision such as exists in the Braille world, it would be impossible by any means short of a miracle to create or to formulate such a scheme. . . . We hear often and are treated to examples of 'English as she is spoke', but I venture to think that for variety and specimens of the grotesque, this pales into insignificance before 'Braille as she is wrote'. Though the time may be quite ripe for a serious attempt being made to improve the existing state of matters, it will require years of patient thought and interchange of opinion, absolute singleness of purpose and charitable, sympathetic self-abnegation to devise a perfectly uniform and practical system, and make the Braille—if that system be the very best system—as perfect and simple as possible and as worthy to be the tangible exponent of the most powerful and universally spoken language of modern times."


NEW YORK POINT ALPHABET.
a b c d e f g h i j k
l m n o p q r s t u v
w x y z Number sign Numerals 1 2
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 Word and Part
Word Signs the and of that ing ch
ou sh th wh ph gh Explanation of
Punctuation Marks Comma Semi-colon Colon Interrogation Dash Period Exclamation Parenthesis Quotation Apostrophe Hyphen

New York Point (see cut).—The claim to being, in the words of the writer quoted above, a system "as perfect and simple as possible and as worthy to be the tangible exponent" of the English language can justly be made for the punctographic system known as New York Point, or the Wait system, unquestionably the most perfect form which the idea suggested by Barbier and rescued from oblivion by Louis Braille has as yet attained. This system is a genuine American product, the outcome of years of patient thought, of indefatigable labour, and of absolute singleness of purpose. To Mr. William B. Wait, for upwards of forty-three years at the head of the leading institution for the blind in the United States, is due the credit of the origination, development, construction, and application of the literary, musical, and mathematical codes of the New York Point System. The genesis of this new punctographic system is the result of a desire on the part of Mr. Wait to improve the Braille by remodelling it, on principles of compactness and economy of time and space. Careful study, however, of the structure and application of Braille led to the conclusion

that the vertical position of Braille signs, allotting a fixed and unvarying space to all signs alike, was defective in more than one important respect. Owing to its limited number of only sixty-three possible single signs, it was inadequate to the requirements of music, if not to those of literature and mathematics as well; it was also found to be much more bulky, and hence more costly, than the Boston-Line, which, in the absence of any other system, was then taken as a standard. To remedy these structural defects, by increasing the number of signs, and reducing the bulk and cost of books to the lowest possible minimum, only one course was left open. A different mode of sign structure was devised, employing two points instead of three vertically and extending the base forms to three, four, or five points horizontally. By this method the new sign-structure of New York Point yields 120 single, and 20 compound, signs against the 63 single signs to which the Braille is limited, and thus answers all the requirements of literature, music, and mathematics Besides, even apart from the application of the principle of recurrence in the structure of the New York Point—a principle that was not applied in the original Braille—all the advantages of simplicity, economy of space and (in writing) of time, as well as of cost, are on the side of the Wait or New York Point system, as has been demonstrated by the most rigid tests. Thus, in printing a font of 520 letters in each system on a perfectly uniform scale, the letter-, word-, and line-spaces being the same in each system, any Braille code (where the alphabet only is used, and no contractions or punctuation marks) requires 51·75 per cent more space than the New York Point. The space required by punctuation marks in Braille is 20 per cent greater than in the New York Point. The excess of labour in the writing of Braille is twenty-seven per cent greater than in New York Point. In the writing of punctuation marks there is a slight excess of labour on the side of New York Point. However, the use of punctuation marks does not materially affect the question, as they form only about ·04 of the whole bulk of composition. Another advantage of the New York Point over Braille is its having true capitals. In Braille the practice is to place before words requiring capitals a sign identical with the period, and to begin the word with the usual small letter. This requires two full "cells", or sixty per cent more area than the New York capitals, which are four points wide. Although up to the sixth or seventh century no distinction was made in Europe, and none is made to this day in the Oriental alphabets, between capitals and small letters (the latter, in fact, were evolved from the former), yet, for those who are over-exacting regarding "good use", the advantage of possessing true capitals, instead of sham ones, is not inconsiderable. Furthermore, the gliding of the finger over the point-signs in but one direction, the lateral, is, on physiological grounds, an important advantage which the New York Point has over the Braille system, where the finger has to move first in the longitudinal and then in the lateral direction.

Methods of Writing.—The invention of the New York Point marked an epoch in the history of the education of the blind; yet, had facilities not been supplied for writing and printing it, the new system would have failed to make its mark as an educational force. Fortunately, however, such appliances were provided by Mr. Wm. Wait in 1894, and consist of a desk-tablet, a pocket-tablet, the kleidograph for paper writing, and the stereograph for embossing the metal plates used in printing. The kleidograph and stereograph have done wonders in facilitating the education of the blind. The former, designed for the purpose of writing literature, music, and mathematics in tactile form, is invaluable for speed and efficiency, and for the reason that what is written by it can at once be read by the blind writer without removing or reversing the paper, as must be done when the tablet is used. At least eighty per cent of the time required for writing music is saved, and sixty per cent for literary work. The stereograph is a development from the kleidograph, designed to emboss both sides of zinc or brass plates ready for use in printing. By its means a compositor can prepare twice or thrice as much matter in a given time as by the movable type; besides, the matter comes from the compositor's hands stereotyped and ready for the press. The cost of the complete plate is reduced by more than one-half. The further application of the interlining process, and of printing on both sides of the sheet at one impression from the plates embossed by Mr. Wait's stereograph, will reduce the cost of books still further, and effect a saving, in metal, in paper, and in binding, of nearly 50 per cent.

The many appliances devised since the days of Valentin Haüy, particularly in France, England, and Germany, to enable the blind to write, may be grouped under three classes. First, the "hand-guides" are designed merely to help the blind to write in straight lines and at equal distances. For correspondence with the seeing, an ordinary pen or, more generally, a lead pencil is used, and the letters are written from left to right. For correspondence with the blind the ordinary letters have to be formed with a blunt stylus from right to left and reversed on paper which is underlaid with some soft material, as felt or blotting-paper, to bring out the written matter in relief on the reverse side of the page and reading from left to right. Valentin Haüy devised a simple method of pencil-writing by placing the paper upon a frame in the interior of which were stretched parallel cords of catgut; between these cords it was an easy matter to write in straight lines and to make the letters of uniform size. Another ingenious way of producing tactile writing was, at the suggestion and request of Haüy, devised by Adet and Hassenfratz in 1783. It was to trace the letters in a bold hand with a glutinous ink, over which sand was spread, so as to form, when it adhered to the letters, a rough sort of relief, or "tangible", writing. Various other fluids were devised for embossed writing, by Challan and Rousseau in 1821, by C. L. Müller in 1823, by Freissauff in 1836, by Riesmer in 1867, and finally by the Abbé Vitali of Milan, in 1893. The use of these various coloured fluids produces a writing which is at once "tangible" to the blind and visible to the seeing.

Among the more elaborate appliances for writing in straight, parallel, equidistant lines, may be mentioned the tablets of Généresse (1807) and of Bruno, the typhlograph of Passard, Dr. Nord's skotograph, Dr. Woizechowsky's amaurograph, Count de Beaufort's stylograph, Wedgewood's noctograph, and the writing-frames of the Elliot brothers, of Thursfield, Dooley, and Levitte. The second class of apparatus are those designed not only to enable the blind to write in straight lines and to make the letters of uniform size, but also to mechanically assist the hand in the formation of the letters and in tracing them at the same distance from each other. These appliances may be divided into line-cell and point-cell frames, according as the ordinary line-letter alphabet or the point system is used in writing. Of the line-cell frames or tablets, the best known are those devised by the Rev. Joseph Engelmann of Linz (1825), James Gall of Edinburgh, Mercier-Capette, Hebold, Dr. Llorens of Barcelona, by C. E. Guldberg of Copenhagen (1858), Galimberti of Milan, Martuscelli of Naples, Moon of Brighton, England, Kemps of Grave, Holland, Ballu, Brother Isidore of Woluwe-Saint-Lambert, Belgium, and Mlle Mulot of Angers, France. Mlle Mulot's stylographic frame enables the blind to correspond not only with the sightless, but also with the seeing just as readily and satisfactorily. Of the numerous print-cell writing-frames or tablets de-

signed for writing Braille, the best known are those of Louis Braille, Ballu, Laas-d'Aguen, Krüger, Kull, Pablasek, Signora della Casa, T. R. Armitage; and for writing New York Point, Mr. Wait's desk and pocket-tablet already mentioned. Essentially, all point-cell tablets consist of a board bearing a movable metal plate indented with pits and having connected with it, and over it, a metal guide with two rows of either oblong or square holes. The paper is placed between the pitted plate and the metal guide. The writing is done with a blunt awl or bodkin, which forces the paper into pits, thereby producing the dots which represent the letters. When the paper is taken out and turned over, the writing which was from right to left appears in relief and is read from left to right. The metal guide has from four to five rows of openings, allowing for the writing of four or five lines; when these are written the guide is shifted downwards and held fast to the frame by two little pins, when four or five more lines are written, and the operation is repeated until the end of the page is reached. The third class of apparatus are those designed for increase of speed in writing, not by hand, however, but by mechanical means. Among the principal writing machines for the ordinary line-letter alphabet, are those of Braille-Foucault (1842), Thurber (1847), Hughes of Manchester (1850), Larivière of Nancy, Saintard (1847), Hirzel of Lausanne, Oehlwein of Weimar, Marchesi, Colard Viennot, Gastaldon of Turin, Ballu (1861), the Hammond, Simplex, Yost, Blickensderfer, Caligraph, etc. Without any doubt, the most rapid and most satisfactory way for the blind to correspond with the seeing is by means of typewriters. All methods of writing, however, which are not tangible to the fingers are liable to the objection that the written matter cannot be revised and corrected by the blind writer. Of machines constructed for embossing Braille and New York Point, those chiefly in use in the United States are Hall's writer, for Braille, and Wait's kleidograph, for New York Point. In France, England, and Germany, a number of Braille machines have been designed on the lines of Hall's Braille-writer.

Geography.—The blind are fond of the study of geography, and with proper teaching are as capable of forming correct geographical notions as the seeing. Most of the detailed teaching of geography, however, must be from raised maps. In the elementary course, rough maps made by the pupils themselves on cushions by means of pins and string are very helpful. The first maps used by the blind were on embroidered cloth or canvas, the needle-work representing the land and the plain cloth the water; boundaries were marked by coarse corded stitches, and towns and cities by points made with the same coarse material. Various attempts were subsequently made to construct relief maps on paper or cardboard, the boundary lines, river courses, lakes, bays, positions of towns and cities, etc., being represented in a variety of ways. The best thus far made are the wooden dissected maps, in which the divisions of a country are represented by a movable section, bodies of water by a depression in the wood, hills and mountains by a slight elevation, towns and cities by brass-headed nails. When all the movable sections are fitted together they form a complete map. The main objection to the dissected maps is that they are very expensive and better suited to individual than to class teaching.

The Teaching of Arithmetic.—Records are not wanting to show that, from the very beginning, arithmetic and other branches of mathematics held an important place in the education provided by institutions for the blind. It was soon observed that the blind displayed great fondness for arithmetical calculations. While mental arithmetic was particularly encouraged, it became evident that in the more advanced branches of the science, the blind needed special apparatus, and various appliances were devised to meet this want. Among the earliest attempts to construct a tangible device for the more abstruse calculations of arithmetic and algebra is that of the great mathematician, Nicholas Saunderson. Since his day a great many different ciphering boards, or tablets, have been constructed. One of the best is Taylor's octagonal board with square pins and octagonal holes. On one end of the pin one of the edges is raised into a prominent ridge, and on the other end there is a similar ridge divided in the middle by a deep notch. The holes in the board are star-shaped, with eight points. The pin can be placed in eight different positions, and on reversing it, with the notched end uppermost, in eight more; this gives ten signs for the Arabic numerals and six for the ordinary algebraic signs. For pure algebra another pin is needed, differing from that used in arithmetic. This gives sixteen additional signs, which are quite sufficient. It is essential for a good arithmetic board that the same pin should represent every character; otherwise time is lost in selecting the required character and in distributing the type at the end of each operation. In the United States a board is used with square holes, and two kinds of type are required to give even the Arabic numbers.



TAYLOR'S CIPHERING-TABLET

Music.—Since the days of Haüy, music has always been considered as one of the most potent factors in the education of the blind, offering them advantages which they can derive from no other source. Though a fair percentage of the blind attain to a high degree of musical skill, and find for themselves positions of responsibility and importance, yet, contrary to the general belief, no larger proportion of persons with exceptional musical talent is found among the blind than in any other class. The common idea that the blind are taught music by ear is erroneous; it arises partly from the assumption that those who are sightless must of course possess an abnormally acute sense of hearing, and partly from the fact that so many persons are unaware that a tactile musical notation exists. Since 1784 there have, in fact, been almost as many such systems as systems of embossed reading. Besides the common musical notation in relief, used by Valentin Haüy, by W. Taylor of York, and Alston of Glasgow, special systems were devised by Frere, Lucas, and Moon in England; by Guadet, Rousseau, and the Abbé Goupil, in France; by Klein, Krähmer, Oehlwein, and Warschauer, in Germany; by Petzelt in Austria; by D. Pedro Llorens in Spain; and by M. Mahony in the United States. In most of these systems the common letters in relief were used to express the notes and their values, the octave, finger, repeat, and time signs, etc. All of the above systems, however, with the exception of the common musical notation in relief, have long since been entirely superseded by the Braille and the New York Point systems of musical notation. Soon after Louis Braille had devised the literary code he adapted his punctographic system to musical notation. An outline of the New York Point musical notation was first presented in 1872, and the first edition of the notation was printed in the same year. In 1878 it received the unanimous approbation of the American Association of Instructors of the Blind, and it was adopted a few years later

in most of the institutions for the blind in the United States. As to the comparative merits of the two systems, it is claimed that the Braille notation is inferior in completeness and clearness of expression. The notation of music requires not less than 140 signs. The New York system, extending to four or five points horizontally, yields 120 single and 20 compound signs, while the Braille system admits of but 63 single signs


Al-le-lú-ia, al-le-lú-ia al-le-lú-ia!
O sons and daughters, let us sing: The King of heav'n the glo-rious
King, To-day is tri-umphing. Al-le-lú-ia!

Example of Tactile Musical Notation

and requires a uniform space for each. Ambiguity is the consequence of this inadequate number of signs, the same sign being made to represent two different things of the same species, as, for example, a whole note and a sixteenth, a half-note and a thirty-second.

Industrial Training.—From the very beginning of systematic education of the blind down to the last decade, industrial training has always occupied a decidedly prominent place in the curriculum. Too often, particularly in the earlier days, the essential work of education was subordinated to conditions created and demands made by the industries. Instead of being used as a means of education, the teaching of trades was made the chief aim and end. The success of certain pupils in careers from which they seemed necessarily excluded naturally gave rise to somewhat extravagant hopes of the possibilities of industrial education. Hence, perhaps, arose the prevalent notion and expectation that schools for the blind should graduate young men and women so equipped that each and all would be self-supporting and able to earn as much, or nearly as much, as persons of equal natural ability with the sense of sight. The fact, however, is that only a small proportion of the blind in Europe and America are wholly self-supporting. According to the United States Census of 1900, of 62,456 blind persons, ten years of age and upwards, only 12,506, or about 20 per cent, were reported as regularly engaged in remunerative occupations. The percentage of the general population so employed was upwards of 50. As most institutions for the blind, particularly in the United States, are open to all blind children of average intelligence, the heterogeneous character of the membership of such schools must lower the standard of efficiency. Another factor which has too often been lost sight of is that blindness is a disabling infirmity. Education is much slower and more difficult with only four senses than with five; it would, therefore, be unreasonable to expect better results of the schools for the blind than are expected of the public schools for normal children, in which schools neither trades nor music are taught. The teaching of skilled trades, it must also be remembered, properly belongs to a stage of education later than the primary, and it should not be allowed to trespass upon the legitimate work of the schools. As soon as adults are admitted to the school with minors, the industrial feature tends to become dominant and unavoidably imparts an element of commercialism to the school. Both adults and younger pupils become disposed to lay more stress on shop work than on mental exercises and discipline. In consequence, the finished pupils lack those general qualifications which are necessary to begin business in the trades they have learned, and still more to successfully compete against sight and machinery. The long, trying, and costly experience of the leading schools in the United States has, moreover, proved that the teaching of trades or industries during the school period confers no lasting good upon the pupils and is void of even such results as the sense of self-reliance and desire to become self-supporting which, it was believed, were being promoted. For these reasons the industrial experiment is gradually being abandoned in order to save the institutions for that strictly educational work for which they were established. If trades, then, are to be taught the blind, and industries to be carried on by them, the technical training should, as in the case of seeing pupils, be taken up only after the completion of the primary or secondary course of studies and in a location altogether removed from the school proper.

Manual Training.—Instead of the teaching of the ordinary trades, which, owing to the radical change in industrial conditions, can no longer be carried on by the blind at a financial profit, a system of regular and thorough training of the hands, the senses, and the muscles has been generally introduced in the leading American institutions for the blind. The various forms of solid work, of work in clay, paper, and cardboard, as well as sewing, cooking, weaving, basketry, simple wood-carving, etc., are the processes of manual training most commonly employed in the general education of the blind.

Physical Training.—Educators of both blind and seeing pupils are in entire accord as to the great importance of physical training. The blind, for obvious reasons, are peculiarly in need of healthful, systematic exercise. Observation and statistics show that their health and strength are far below the normal standard. Hence, before there is any hope of obtaining satisfactory educational results, all physical and physiological defects, such as deformities in the muscular system, unsightly movements, natural timidity, awkwardness in walking, etc., must be corrected as far as possible. In view of these facts, physical training forms an integral part of the regular curriculum of the schools for the blind.

Libraries for the Blind.—It is almost impossible for those who enjoy the use of sight to realize what a boon reading is for those who live in perpetual darkness. Outside of their early education, for those who have been blessed with it, there is nothing in the life of the blind so stimulating, so broadening, and so comforting as good books. In no country have more efforts been made to supply the blind with books and to solve the problem of their circulation than in the United States. In no country has such a liberal government provision been made for the education of the blind through the

publication of books as was made by the United States Government, when by an act of Congress (3 March, 1879) the sum of $250,000 was set apart as a perpetual fund, the interest of which ($10,000) is expended each year in printing and distributing suitable books among the institutions for the blind in the United States. Mainly as a result of this provision, the number of volumes distributed among the thirty-nine school libraries amounts, according to the Annual Report of the Department of the Interior for 1902, to 105,804 volumes, an average of 2713 volumes per school. In France and in England, it must be admitted, there is far greater individual co-operation and a more generous interest displayed in furthering the extension of libraries for the blind than in the United States. Thus the "Association Valentin Haüy" of Paris had, in 1905, on its list of voluntary writers of books for the blind the names of 1150 persons who embossed in Braille and donated in that year to the "Bibliothèque Braille", for its forty-nine travelling libraries, 1533 volumes. In the same year the British and Foreign Blind Association of London was indebted to 574 generous persons who gave valuable time in writing Braille books for the blind.

Catholic Literature for the Blind in the United States.—Before 1900, with the exception of a small catechism and Cardinal Gibbons' "Faith of Our Fathers", there were no Catholic books for the blind to be had in this country. To supply this long-felt want, which, with the dearth of Catholic schools for the blind, has resulted in the loss to the Church of thousands among the Catholic blind, the writer of this article founded, in January, 1900, a society whose aim it is to place gratuitously within the reach of the blind throughout the United States Catholic literature embossed in the Wait, or New York Point, print. With the assistance of a few devoted ladies, who helped to raise the necessary funds, a printing plant was equipped and has been in operation ever since. The society was incorporated in March, 1904, under the name of "The Xavier Free Publication Society for the Blind of the City of New York". Although from its inception the society has been dependent for the maintenance of its work upon donations and annual subscriptions, still, with the encouragement and blessing of the Catholic hierarchy, the deep appreciation and gratitude of thousands of Catholic blind throughout the country, and the generous help of its benefactors, it has been enabled to pursue its beneficent object for the moral and intellectual elevation of the blind. Since its foundation, thousands of volumes of Catholic literature, embracing ascetical, Biblical, biographical, doctrinal, and historical works, as well as works of general literature, of fiction, and of poetry, have been placed in upwards of thirty-seven state, city, or institute libraries for general and free circulation among the blind. The publications of the society are also circulated throughout the country from its own central library. "The Catholic Transcript for the Blind", a monthly magazine, published by the Xavier Free Publication Society for the Blind since 1900, is so far (1909) the only Catholic periodical embossed in the English language.

Catholic Literature in England.—It is only within the last five years that, through the initiative of the Hon. Mrs. G. M. Fraser, who taught Braille to most of the writers, upwards of four hundred books have been hand-typed by voluntary workers and placed at the disposal of the Catholic Truth Society of London for circulation among the Catholic blind in Great Britain. This work would not have been undertaken had it been possible to get Catholic books at the great English libraries for the blind.

The Blind-Deaf.—According to the special reports of the United States Census Office for 1900, of the 64,763 persons reported as blind, 2772, or nearly 43 per 1000, were found to be also deaf. The age of the occurrence of these two defects cannot be stated exactly, except for those blind and deaf from birth, of whom there are 76. Between birth and five years of age are 64; between five and nine, 54; between ten and fourteen, 37; between fifteen and nineteen, 24. That the public, and even professional educators, entertain incorrect views on the education of this class of sufferers has been shown by Mr. William Wade in his interesting monograph, "The Blind-Deaf". For this excellent publication, and still more for his widespread and munificent charity to the blind-deaf, and particularly to the deaf and dumb and blind of this country, Mr. Wade's name deserves to be forever enshrined in the hearts of this doubly and trebly afflicted class. The knowledge by the public that the education of the blind-deaf is by no means the difficult task commonly believed, and the further knowledge of the number of those who have been educated and of their advanced position in mental attainments, will do much, it is contended by the author of the monograph, to advance the interests and the happiness of the blind-deaf. "In the early education of the blind-deaf", we are told by Dora Donald, "there are three distinct periods. In the first the pupil receives impressions from the material world. The mind of a blind-deaf child does not differ from that of a normal child; given the same opportunity, it will develop in the same way. Whilst the normal child discovers the world through the five senses, the world must be brought to the blind-deaf child and imparted by the teacher through the sense of touch. During the second period the child is taught to give utterance to his conceptions. This may be done either through the sign language, the manual alphabet of the deaf, or through one of the systems of raised print for the blind, if articulated speech cannot be taught the child. The third and by far the most difficult step is that of procuring mental images from the printed page. If the child has been thoroughly trained in the habit of personal investigation, if he has been taught to express freely the results of such investigation by means of the manual alphabet and to record them in print, he will eventually be able to reverse the process and to build about him an imaginary existence that will cause the printed page to teem with life and to glow with the charm of actual existence. At this stage of the child's education, he may enter either a school for the deaf, a school for the blind, or the common school for normal children. Supplied with the necessary apparatus and accompanied by a teacher who will faithfully translate all that he might obtain through sight and hearing, he may be taught by the same methods used for normal children, ever keeping in mind this one point of difference—touch must take the place of sight and hearing; the manual alphabet or embossed page being substituted for speech."

NEOVIN, *Cœcus de Colore Judicans* (Jena, 1682); TRINKHUSIUS, *Dissertatiuncula de Cœcis* (Genoa, 1672); GUILBEAU, *Histoire de l'Institution Nationale des Jeunes Aveugles* (Paris, 1907); ARNOULD, *Une âme en prison* (Paris, 1904); DE LA SIZERANNE, *Les sœurs aveugles* (Paris, 1901), tr. by LEGGATT, *The Blind Sisters of St. Paul* (New York, 1907); ID., *Les aveugles par un aveugle* (Paris, 1889); BUISSON, *Dictionnaire de pédagogie* (Paris, 1887); MELL, *Encyklopädisches Handbuch des Blindenwesens* (Vienna, 1900); MERLE, *Das Blinden Bildungs-Wesen* (Norden, 1887); HELLER, *Studien zur Blindenpsychologie* (Leipzig, 1904); VIGNALI, *La Educazione dei Ciechi* (Florence, 1903); LANA-TERZI, *Prodromo all'Arte Maestra* (Brescia, 1670); ILLINGSWORTH, *Past and Present Methods of Educating the Blind;* LEVY, *Blindness and the Blind* (London, 1872); GALL, *Literature for the Blind* (Edinburgh, 1834); *Report of the Conference on Matters Relating to the Blind* (Westminster, 1902); ARMITAGE, *The Education and Employment of the Blind* (London, 1886); *Annual Reports of American Institutions for the Blind; Report of the New York State Commission to Investigate the Condition of the Blind* (Albany, 1906); ANAGNOS, *Education of the Blind* (Boston, 1882); WADE, *The Blind-Deaf* (2nd ed., Indianapolis, 1904).

JOSEPH M. STADELMAN.

Education of the Deaf and Dumb.—Education essentially includes the process of encouraging, strengthening, and guiding the faculties, whether of mind or body, so as to make them fit and ready instruments for the work they have to do; and, where the

need exists, it must include, moreover, the awakening for the first time into activity and usefulness of some faculty which, but for the awakening, might remain forever dormant. As regards intellectual development, the deaf individual is the most handicapped of the afflicted class. The term "deaf and dumb", so frequently applied to that class of individuals who neither hear nor speak, is becoming obsolete among the educators of the deaf, as it implies a radical defect in both the auditory and the vocal organism. Persons who are born deaf, or who lose their hearing at a very early age, are unable to speak, although their vocal organs may be unimpaired. They become dumb because, being deprived of hearing, they are unable to imitate the sounds which constitute speech. To correct the error involved in the term *dumb*, it is customary to speak of human beings who do not hear and speak as deaf-mutes, a term which implies that they are silent, but not necessarily incapable of speaking. Brute animals that are deaf, are deaf and dumb; the little child, before it has learned to speak, is mute, but not dumb. There are found individuals who can hear, but cannot speak. To such may be applied the term *dumb*, inasmuch as they are either destitute of the power of speech or are unwilling to speak and are lacking in intelligence. Such children are generally found to be more or less idiotic. On account of the great progress made, especially during the last century, in the education of deaf-mutes, by which a large percentage are taught to speak, the term *mute* is also omitted when speaking of matters pertaining to that class formerly designated as "deaf and dumb". Institutions for them are named preferably "Schools for the Deaf", and in the literature of the subject they are spoken of simply as the "deaf", e. g. "The Annals of the Deaf", etc. Here it is well to remark, that there is a strong and growing objection among the deaf and their educators to calling their institutions asylums—a term which classifies them with unfortunates needing relief and protection, like the insane. In fact, Webster, under the word "Asylum", classes the deaf and dumb with the insane. Efforts are consequently being made to place such institutions under the control of educational rather than of charity boards.

HISTORY.—That there were deaf persons in the remote past is evident from the fact that the causes of deafness, such as disease, were as prevalent then as now. Before the Christian Era, their condition was deplorable. By many they were considered as under the curse of heaven; they were called monsters and even put to death as soon as their deafness was satisfactorily ascertained. Lucretius voices the received opinion that they could not be educated:—

To instruct the deaf, no art can ever reach,
No care improve them, and no wisdom teach.

Greek and Roman poets and philosophers classified them with defectives, and the Justinian Code abridged their civil rights. In the family they were considered a disgrace, or were looked upon as a useless burden and kept in isolation. It is a bright page in the New Testament which narrates the kindness of our Divine Lord, who, doing good to all, did not forget the deaf and dumb. After His example, the Church has extended its charity to this afflicted class, and has led the way in opening up for them other channels of thought in place of the hearing faculty. The statement met with in literature connected with the education of the deaf, that the real history of deaf-mute instruction must be considered as dating from the Reformation, is the old fallacy of *post hoc ergo propter hoc*. The fact is, that not a few of the more famous educators of the deaf received their first lessons from those who preceded the Reformation or were not influenced by its errors, but undertook the instruction of deaf-mutes for the sole purpose of imparting religious instruction. No Catholic theologian maintained that the adult deaf and dumb from birth are beyond the pale of salvation, because "Faith cometh by hearing" (Rom., x, 17). The assertion is often made, without references being given, that St. Augustine held such an opinion. Although the great doctor may have held the opinion of his time, that the deaf could not be educated, he certainly did not exclude them from the possibility of salvation any more than he excluded pagans to whom the Gospel had not yet been preached.

That the deaf are very much handicapped, even in our time, as regards religious instruction, so necessary for the preservation of faith and morals, must be admitted. Many deaf-mutes born of Catholic parents have lost the Faith, owing to a lack of Catholic educational facilities. Moreover, they are deprived of the usual Sunday instructions and sermons. There are in the United States few priests engaged in ministering to their spiritual welfare, and such as have taken up this apostolate are not at leisure to devote their whole energy to the work. On the other hand, Protestant ministers travel through the length and breadth of the land and in their monthly itineraries assemble the deaf for religious services. There can be no doubt that from the dawn of Christianity the deaf enlisted the sympathy and zeal of many priests and missionaries who, by various ingenious devices suited to the occasion, taught them the essential truths of faith; but history has left meagre records of their good work. According to Venerable Bede, St. John of Beverley (721) caused a deaf and dumb youth to speak by making the sign of the cross over him; and Bede himself, in his "De Loquelâ per gestum digitorum", describes a manual alphabet. Rudolph Agricola, the distinguished humanist (1443–1485), states that he saw a deaf and dumb man who was able to converse with others by writing (De inventione dialecticâ, III, xvi). Ponce de Leon (1520–1584), a Spanish Benedictine monk, undertook the education of several deaf-mutes, as is related in the accounts of his work discovered among the archives at Oña. He relates that he taught pupils who were deaf and dumb from birth to speak, to read, to write, and to keep accounts, to repeat prayers and to confess orally. He first taught his pupils to write the names of objects and then to articulate. A contemporary writer, Francesco Valles, says that Ponce de Leon's method proved that, although we learn first to speak and then to write, the reverse order answers the same purpose for the deaf. It is highly probable that he was led to undertake the instruction of the deaf and dumb by the principle announced by Girolamo Cardano (1501–1576), a friend of St. Charles Borromeo, that "writing is associated with speech, and speech with thought, but written characters may be connected together without the intervention of sounds. The deaf can hear by reading, and speak by writing." About fifty years later, Juan Pablo Bonet, a Spanish priest, published a treatise entitled, "Reduccion de las Letras y arte para Enseñar a hablar los Mudos" (Madrid, 1620). He made use of a manual alphabet, invented a system of visible signs representing to the sight the sounds of words, and gave a description of the position of the vocal organs in the pronunciation of each letter. His work contains many valuable suggestions useful to modern teachers of articulation and lip-reading.

St. Francis de Sales, having on his missionary journeys met a deaf-mute, took him into his service and succeeded in establishing communication with him by signs, and prepared him for confession and Holy Communion. The celebrated Jesuit naturalist and physician, Lana Terzi (1631–1687), in his "Prodromo dell' Arte Maestra", considers the education of the deaf, which, according to him, consists in their "first learning to perceive the dispositions of the organs of speech in the formation of sounds, and then imitating them; and recognizing speech in others by lip-reading. To that end they should first utter each sound separately, read it on the lips of another, then join them in words;

next they should be taught the meaning of these words by being shown the objects signified, and gradually be made acquainted with the meaning of those which relate to the functions of the senses, the arts, the understanding and the will" (Arnold). Lorenza Hervas y Panduro (1735–1809), a celebrated Spanish philologist and missionary in America, took an active interest in the education of the deaf in Rome and published a learned work in two volumes entitled "Escuela Española de Sordo-mudos, o Arte Para Enseñarles a Escribir y Hablar el Idioma Español" (Madrid, 1795). The work consists of five parts, "the first dealing with the deaf in the political, physical, philosophical, and theological aspects of the subject and the linguistic questions it gives rise to; the second is a history of their education up to that time, which is the first complete account written; the third explains the practical method of teaching idiomatic language by writing; the fourth that of teaching speech; and the fifth is on the instruction of the deaf in metaphysical ideas and in moral and religious knowledge" (Arnold).

Among other writers in the interest of the education of the deaf and dumb must be mentioned John Bulwer (1645); Deusing (d. 1666), who in his writings recommends writing, signs, and, on occasion, lip-reading as the helpful instruments in the education of the deaf; William Holder (1616–1698), and his contemporary, John Wallis (1616–1703); George Dalgarno (1626–1687), of Aberdeen, Scotland, who published, in 1661, "Ars Signorum" and, in 1680, "Didascalocophus" (or "Deaf and Dumb Man's Tutor"), and devised a double-handed alphabet; Baron Von Helmont (1618–1699); John Conrad Amman (1669–1724), a native of Schaffhausen, Switzerland, who published (1700) "Dissertatio de Loquelâ", in which are described the means by which the deaf and dumb from birth may acquire speech.

Although Germany cannot claim originality in the field of the education of the deaf and dumb, several works published in other countries were translated into German, and their teachings put in practice. Among the earliest to take up this work were Kerger (1704), Raphel (1673–1740), Lasius (1775), and Arnoldi (1777). The first public institution for the deaf in Germany was established by Samuel Heinicke (1729–1790), the great advocate of the oral method of instruction, which has generally been followed in German schools for the deaf. To Friedrich Moritz Hill (1805–1874), regarded as one of the greatest teachers of the deaf, is due what is distinctively called the "German System", which has found an able critic in J. Heidsiek, of the Breslau Institution for the Deaf, in a work entitled "Der Taubstumme und seine Sprache". Jacob Rodriguez Pereire (1715–1780), a Portuguese Jew, gave an exhibition of his skill in teaching the deaf before the Academy of Science in Paris. "His efforts were confined to a privileged few, and, from this circumstance, as well as his keeping his methods secret, his work, unlike de l'Epée's, had no lasting effect upon the deaf as a class" (Arnold). Abbé Deschamps, of Orléans, devoted his life and fortune to the education of the deaf-mutes and, in his instructions, relied chiefly on reading and writing together with speech and lip-reading.

Up to the middle of the eighteenth century, it was believed that speech was indispensable to thought. The practical utility of pantomime had not been fully shown before the days of Abbé Charles-Michel de l'Epée (1712–1789), the father of the sign-language and founder of the first school for the deaf. The deplorable condition of the two deaf-mutes whom he chanced to meet on one of his missionary errands excited his compassion and awakened in him zeal for their religious instruction. He discovered others of the same class, especially among the poor, and to these he devoted his time and fortune. In his first attempt to teach his silent pupils he tried the method of pictures used by Père Vanin before him; but, finding this method unsatisfactory, he tried the articulation method, which he found discouragingly slow. Noticing, as every instructor of the deaf has noticed, that deaf-mute children, even before having received instruction from anyone, will, at play and at other times, communicate with each other in pantomime and make use of certain natural gestures indicative of objects, their quality and action, he came upon the idea of using a sign-language as the means of instruction. Since words are conventional signs of our ideas, why could not conventional gestures be signs of ideas? He concluded that the natural language of signs, which the deaf-mutes themselves invent, would be of great service in their instruction. He accordingly made himself familiar with the few signs already in use and added others more or less arbitrary. He opened a school for deaf-mutes in Paris, about 1760, which soon won international fame. De l'Epée died in 1789, leaving as his successor the Abbé Sicard, who made important improvements in the system of de l'Epée. At about the same time a school for the deaf was opened by Samuel Heinicke at Dresden, which was afterwards removed to Leipzig, and another by Thomas Braidwood, at Edinburgh. The successful results obtained in these schools prompted other cities and countries to establish similar ones under the direction of persons trained by de l'Epée, Heinicke, or their disciples.

In Italy the first school for the deaf was established in 1784 at Rome, by the Abbate Silvestri, a disciple of Abbé de l'Epée. Among other Italian educators must be mentioned Tommaso Pendola (1800–1883) and his brilliant associate, Enrico Marchio; Abbate Balestra and Abbate Giulio Tarra (1832–1889), who acted as president at the Milan International Congress in 1880 and saw his most cherished ideas regarding oral teaching practically approved by the resolutions that were adopted, and which hastened the progress of oral teaching, especially in France.

Francis Green, a native of Boston, 1742, whose son was a deaf-mute, was the earliest advocate of deaf-mute education in America. In his "Vox Oculis Subjecta", published in London, 1783, he describes the method by which the deaf-mute may be taught to speak. In about 1812, John Braidwood, Jr., a grandson of the founder of the Edinburgh school, attempted to establish schools in Virginia, New York, and Baltimore, but failed. "The immediate effects", says the "History of American Schools for the Deaf" (I, 10), "was to hinder and delay the opening of the first permanent school; for the members of his family in Great Britain, who controlled the monopoly of deaf-mute instruction in America, placed obstacles in the way of Dr. Gallaudet, when he sought to acquire the art of instruction in the mother country." An exceptionally large number of deaf-mutes having been found in the State of Connecticut by Dr. M. F. Cogswell, whose daughter was deaf, a corporation of several gentlemen was enlisted for the purpose of establishing a school at Hartford, under the care of Dr. Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet. For the purpose of mastering the art of instructing the deaf, Dr. Gallaudet sailed for England; but the exorbitant and humiliating terms imposed by the Braidwood-Watson family, which held the monopoly of the art, repelled him. Happening to meet Abbé Sicard, who with his pupils was visiting London, he accepted an invitation to visit the school in Paris. Here he received every assistance. The abbé gave him several hours of instruction every week and generously allowed Laurent Clerc, one of his distinguished pupils and valuable associates, to accompany him on his return to America. In the contract drawn up between Dr. Gallaudet and Laurent Clerc, it is stipulated (article 11): "He [Laurent Clerc] is not to be called upon to teach anything contrary to the Roman Catholic religion", and in his letter to Bishop Cheve-

rus of Boston, Abbé Sicard writes: "The extreme desire to procure for the unfortunate deaf-mutes of the country in which you dwell, and fulfill so well the mission of the Holy Apostles, the happiness of knowing our holy religion, leads me to a sacrifice which would exceed human strength. I send to the United States the best taught of my pupils, a deaf-mute whom my art has restored to society and religion. He goes fully resolved to live and be faithful to the principles of the Catholic religion which I have taught him." Notwithstanding the kind solicitude of his beloved master, Laurent Clerc, like so many other deaf-mutes deprived of constant religious instruction, in his surroundings weakened in the Faith and apostatized. The kindness of Abbé Sicard only served to lay the foundation of a Protestant propaganda which, ever since the opening of the Hartford School founded by Dr. Gallaudet, has controlled the education of the deaf in America. This Hartford School, then known as the American Asylum, was opened 15 April, 1817, under the superintendency of the Rev. Dr. Gallaudet, whose two sons, the Rev. T. Gallaudet and E. M. Gallaudet, have been active in the cause of deaf-mute education. The latter was the founder of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf and Dumb at Washington, D. C., which was opened 13 June, 1857. Later on, in 1864, it developed into a school for the higher education of the deaf under the name of the National Deaf-Mute College. Connected with the college is a normal department for the training of teachers for the deaf. A course of studies leading up to entrance into the National Deaf-Mute College may be found in the "American Annals of the Deaf" for November, 1907. As regards higher education and normal-school practice, opportunities are also afforded by the Catholic deaf-mute schools in the State of New York.

When the Abbé de l'Epée originated the method of signs, many of his contemporaries, such as the Abbé Deschamps, refused to be associated with the new school, and between him and Samuel Heinicke of Leipzig, the great upholder of the speech method, there was carried on a spirited controversy, which has continued ever since, among the educators of the deaf. Professor E. A. Fay, in the "American Annals of the Deaf", gives the following classification and definition of the methods used in the schools for the deaf:—

"(1) The Manual Method:—Signs, the manual alphabet, and writing are the chief means used in the instruction of the pupils, and the principal objects aimed at are mental development, and facility in the comprehension and use of written language. The degree of relative importance given to these three means varies in different schools; but it is a difference only in degree, and the end aimed at is the same in all.

"(2) The Manual Alphabet Method:—The manual alphabet method and writing are the chief means used in the instruction of the pupils, and the principal objects aimed at are mental development, and facility in the comprehension and use of written language. Speech and speech-reading are taught to all of the pupils in one of the schools (the Western New York Institution) recorded as following this method.

"(3) The Oral Method:—Speech and speech-reading, together with writing, are made the chief means of instruction, and facility in speech and speech-reading, as well as mental development and written language, is aimed at. There is a difference in different schools in the extent to which the use of natural signs is allowed in the early part of the course, and also in the prominence given to writing as an auxiliary to speech and speech-reading in the course of instruction; but they are differences only in degree, and the end aimed at is the same in all.

"(4) The Auricular Method:—The hearing of semi-deaf pupils is utilized and developed to the greatest possible extent, and, with or without the aid of artificial appliances, their education is carried on chiefly through the use of speech and hearing, together with writing. The aim of the method is to graduate its pupils as hard-of-hearing speaking people instead of deaf-mutes.

"(5) The Combined System:—Speech and speech-reading are regarded as very important, but mental development and the acquisition of language are regarded as still more important. It is believed that, in many cases, mental development and the acquisition of language can be best promoted by the manual or the manual-alphabet method, and so far as circumstances permit, such method is chosen for each pupil as seems best adapted for his individual case. Speech and speech-reading are taught where the measure of success seems likely to justify the labor expended, and, in most of the schools, some of the pupils are taught wholly or chiefly by the oral method or by the auricular method."

Some educators of the deaf employ the method of visible speech, which is a species of phonetic writing symbolizing the movements of the vocal organs in the production of speech. There is also a phonetic manual in which the several positions of the hand not only represent various speech sounds, but also indicate concisely the way in which the represented sound is physiologically or mechanically produced (see Lyon, "Phonetic Manual", Rochester, New York, 1891). Whipple, in his "Phonetic Manual", endeavours to depict the positions taken by the visible organs, the teeth, lips, tongue, and palate, in the production of sound.

It is beyond the scope of this article to discuss the merits of the various methods in use. A teacher of the deaf cannot lose sight of the fact that in the term *deaf*, or *deaf-mute*, there are included at least four subclasses, namely, the semi-mutes, who have lost their hearing after they had acquired more or less perfectly the use of language; the semi-deaf, who retain some power of hearing, but yet cannot attend with profit schools for hearing children; the congenitally deaf, possessing some ability to perceive sound; and the totally deaf from birth, who are unable to perceive sound. A teacher of hearing children may take for granted, if the class is properly graded, that all his pupils are on the same plane; but a teacher of the deaf, whose pupils may be only four in number, may have before him, even in the lowest grade, as many different kinds of deaf children as there are pupils in the class. These he must instruct and educate. Considering that the deaf child is very much handicapped, and that the period of its school-days are limited, it is reasonable to suppose that a good teacher will take advantage of every latent power possessed by the child for educational development. In a word, the teacher will suit the method to the child and not endeavour to adapt the child to the method. It would certainly be a mistake to use the purely oral method for all deaf-mutes without discrimination and without considering the capacity, eyesight, etc. of the pupil.

AIDS TO EDUCATION OF THE DEAF.—For the purpose of diffusing knowledge relative to the education of the deaf, there has been established, through the benefactions of Dr. Alexander Graham Bell, the Volta Bureau, Washington, D. C. Here are collected items of interest in the educational work for the deaf. Under John Hitz, its first superintendent, it received international development. In this way it has been possible to compile and diffuse international statistical information concerning institutions and work for the deaf throughout the world. Its publications are distributed gratuitously or by exchange. Among the publications of the Volta Bureau is an historical account of all the schools for the deaf in the United States, in three volumes, edited by Dr. E. A. Fay. As an incentive to the educational work for the deaf, and as a means of collating the opinions of those interested, there are about thirty-two periodical publications in

Europe and more than sixty in America dealing with questions concerning the deaf. The oldest among the latter, "The American Annals of the Deaf", edited by Dr. Fay, is eclectic in its character and as such is the organ of the combined system of instruction. For the diffusion of the oral method there was founded, in 1899, at Philadelphia, a special periodical, "The Association Review", published by the "American Association to Promote the Teaching of Speech to the Deaf". Among the efficient agencies for the promotion of educational work for the deaf must be numbered the meetings, congresses, and conferences of superintendents and teachers of the deaf, and of the deaf themselves. The oldest organization of the kind is the "Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf", which met for the first time in New York in 1850, and for the sixteenth time in 1901, at the Le Couteulx, St. Mary's Institution for the Improved Instruction of Deaf Mutes, Buffalo, as the guests of the Sisters of St. Joseph.

There are also annual meetings of the "Association to Promote the Teaching of Speech to the Deaf"; meetings of principals and of the Department of Special Education of the National Association of American Teachers. At the invitation of the Right Rev. D. J. O'Connell, Rector of the Catholic University of America, all persons interested in the education of Catholic deaf-mutes met in July, 1907, at Milwaukee, simultaneously with the Catholic Educational Association, and organized the Catholic Deaf-Mute Conference. The conference is a powerful factor in enlisting the co-operation of bishops, priests, and laymen in ameliorating the educational condition of the Catholic deaf. The deaf themselves, also, at stated times, hold State and national conventions. Such meetings are carried on in the sign language, which, because visible to a large audience, is best adapted for public addresses, sermons, etc. Whenever at these meetings the deaf touch upon educational topics, they take occasion to manifest their strong protest against pure oralism in the schools, and their unequivocal adherence to the sign-language and the combined system of education. In the United States deaf-mutes are entitled to a share in the school fund, and special boarding and day schools are provided for them. Most of the institutions are controlled by trustees appointed by the State. The term of instruction is from seven to twelve years.

Actual Conditions—According to the subjoined statistics, compiled from the "American Annals of the Deaf" for 1907, there are 60 public State schools, 60 public day-schools, and 17 denominational and private schools, making in all 139 schools for the deaf in the United States, having an attendance of 11,648 pupils — 6317 boys and 5331 girls—1552 instructors—471 men and 1081 women. Out of the total number of 139 schools for the deaf, there are 13 Catholic schools with the following enrolment: St. Joseph's School for the Deaf, Oakland, California, 39; Ephpheta School for the Deaf, Chicago, Illinois, 72; Institute of the Holy Rosary, Chincuba, Louisiana, 37; St. Francis Xavier's School, Baltimore, Maryland, 35; Boston School for the Deaf, Randolph, Massachusetts, 93; Mater Boni Consilii School, St. Louis, Missouri, 40; St. Joseph's School, Longwood, Missouri, 20; Notre Dame School, Cincinnati, Ohio, 12; St. John's Institute, St. Francis, Wisconsin, 71; St. Joseph's Schools, 3, NewYork City, 417; Le Couteulx, St. Mary's School, Buffalo, New York, 176—making in all 1002 deaf pupils in Catholic schools. It will be noticed that, in the four Catholic schools for the deaf in the State of New York, which has a deaf population of about 10,000, there are 593 children cared for; and that, in nine schools scattered throughout the remaining portion of the United States, where there is a deaf population eight times as great as that of the State of New York, only 409 are provided for. If all the States were as generous as New York in caring for its deaf children, there should be, if adequate facilities were provided, 4744 children in Catholic schools for the deaf outside of the State of New York.

With the exception of the New York institutions for the deaf, the other Catholic institutions are almost entirely dependent upon the charity of religious sisterhoods. Pupils of all denominations are admitted, the only requirements for admission being a sound mind and good morals. Good work has been done by these devoted sisters for Church and State, and their graduates are respected and self-supporting citizens; but, as they carry on their schools with little support from without, the number of pupils is necessarily small. The pupils are for the most part girls, and, because there is no male community in the United States, as there is in Canada and Europe, to take charge of the deaf-mute boys, these are obliged, with very few exceptions, to attend State or public day-schools.

The celebrated school for the deaf at Cabra, near Dublin, Ireland, has two departments. The St. Joseph's School for boys is under the care of Christian Brothers, and the St. Mary's School for girls is in charge of Dominican nuns. It was established in the year 1846 by Archbishop Murray of Dublin. The patrons of the institution are the archbishops and bishops of Ireland, the president of the management being the Archbishop of Dublin. Without government grant, the school has attained a foremost rank among educational institutions for the deaf. According to the report for May, 1900, there were 518 pupils under instruction,—260 boys and 258 girls. Industrial training suited to the age and capacity of the children, and so necessary for the deaf, forms an important part in the educational system of the school.

The institutions for the deaf in the United States, during the last decade, show a marked increase in the number of day-schools. This is due to the strong influence of the defenders of the oral method, who, for their purpose, consider such schools superior to boarding-schools. The conscientious duty of Catholic parents to withdraw their afflicted children from State boarding-schools that have proved so dangerous to faith, has also influenced the establishment of day-schools. Until boarding-schools are provided, the day-school, notwithstanding its many inconveniences, is preferable for the Catholic deaf-mute child, so that it may not be deprived of religious home influence. Until 1870, the schools for the deaf established in the United States were almost entirely boarding-schools.

Deaf-Blind.—There are some individuals who are not only deaf but also blind, and not a few who are deaf, mute, and blind. Wonderful results have been produced in the education of this afflicted class during the last half-century, as is evidenced in the case of Laura Bridgeman, taught by Dr. Howe; Helen A. Keller, educated by Miss Annie Sullivan; Clarence Selby, poet and author, taught by Sister Dosithea of the Le Couteulx, St. Mary's Institution, Buffalo, New York, and Lottie Sullivan, educated by Mrs. G. W. Veditz of the Colorado School, and instructed for her first Holy Communion by the Sisters of St. Joseph in St. Louis. About forty more remarkable cases are known in the United States and Canada (see "American Annals of the Deaf", June, 1900). It is evident that a teacher of this class must be strong in the power of inventing means for the attaining of results, and of utilizing the unimpaired faculties as indirect ways of communication between the imprisoned soul and the outer world. Usually they are taught the manual alphabet, and made to understand that objects have names, and that by these names, recognized in raised print or by spelling on the fingers, objects can be designated. So delicate is their sense of touch that, like Helen Keller, they can, by feeling the movements of the vocal organs in the production of speech, be taught to speak and even to read the speech of others.

Manual Alphabets.—Venerable Bede (op. cit.) describes finger alphabets. Monks under rigid rules of silence often made use of them. Rosellius, a Florentine monk, in his "Thesaurus Artificiosæ Memoriæ" (1579), figures three one-hand alphabets which, with minor differences, were used by Bonet and Hervas y Panduro. The first alphabet used in teaching spoken and written language to the deaf was the Spanish one-hand alphabet of Rosellius. "The happy thought of this adaptation", says J. C. Gordon, "is attributed to the pious and learned monk, Pedro Ponce de Leon" (1520–1584). The two-handed alphabet, used in Great Britain, was in use centuries ago among the school-boys of Spain, France, and England. Manual alphabets have nothing to do with "signs" or the "sign-language". They constitute a manner of writing language by spelling words on the fingers. As a means of intercourse with the deaf, they are preferable to writing on paper, being more convenient and rapid.

Two-handed Alphabet



One-handed Alphabet

For the sake of promoting the welfare of thousands of deaf persons, it is recommended to hearing persons to master this art, which is easily acquired.

Statistics.—According to the United States Special Census Report for 1900, there are in Continental United States 89,287 persons with seriously impaired powers of hearing. Of these 2772 are blind-deaf, 37,426 are totally and 51,861 partially deaf; 51,871 became deaf under the age of 20 and 37,416 in adult life; 46,915 are males and 42,372 females; 84,361 are white, and 4926 coloured.

There are on an average 1175 deaf to the 1,000,000 population in Continental United States. Considering that there are in this territory probably 15,000,000 Catholics, it follows that, if conditions and causes are uniform, there are 17,625 Catholic deaf—10,272 under the age of 20 and 7353 adults. Since deaf-mutism is common among the poor, it is probable that the number of Catholic deaf is much larger. The statistics for the schools for the deaf throughout the world may be tabulated as follows:—

	Schools	Teachers	Pupils
Africa	7	16	127
Asia	9	47	453
Australia	7	46	332
Europe	450	3152	25,821
North America	148	1790	12,784
South America	7	34	229
Total	628	5085	39,746

Reports received from fifty-three State schools in the United States, having an aggregate attendance of 10,124 pupils, show the values of the grounds and buildings to be $13,370,576; expenditure for grounds and buildings, $605,027; expenditure for salaries and other expenses, $2,556,459, making a total expenditure of $3,161,486, or $312 average cost per capita.

Reports from forty-three public day-schools show expenditures for salaries and other expenses to be $96,014 for 788 pupils, or an average cost per capita of $122. Reports from three denominational and private schools show an aggregate expenditure of $20,649 for 135 pupils, that is to say, an average cost per capita

of $152. The following tables give the statistics for the United States:—

	No. of Institutions	Men	Women	Total	Deaf
State Schools	60	452	855	1,307	265
Public Day	62	5	150	155	3
Denominational and Private	17	14	76	90	5
Total in U. S.	139	471	1,081	1,552	273

Pupils in	During the Fiscal Year	Present 10 Nov., 1907			Graduates 1905–06.
		Boys	Girls	Total	
State Schools	11,008	5,563	4,542	10,105	238
Public Day	1,118	526	511	1,037	2
Denominational and Private	538	528	278	506	13
In 139 Schools in U. S.	12,664	6,617	5,331	11,648	253

American Annals of the Deaf, ed. FAY; *The Association Review* and *The Reports of Summer Meetings*, published by the American Association to Promote the Teaching of Speech to the Deaf; *History of the American Schools for the Deaf*, 3 vols., ed. FAY (Washington, 1893); VOLTA BUREAU (Washington), *International Reports, Report of the U. S. Commissioner of Education* (Washington, 1906); GORDON, *Education of the Deaf, Notes and Observations* (Washington, 1892), and also for manual alphabets; *Cyclopedia of Education* (New York, 1877); FERRERI, *The American Institutions for the Education of the Deaf*, tr. in the *Association Review;* GREEN, *Vox Oculis Subjecta* (London, 1783); *Facts and Opinions Relating to the Deaf* (London, 1888); MONROE, *Bibliography of Education* (New York, 1897).

F. A. MOELLER.

Edward III, King of England (1312–77), eldest son of Edward II and Isabella, daughter of Philip IV of France; b. at Windsor Castle, 13 Nov., 1312; d. at Shoen, 21 June, 1377. He succeeded to the throne in his fifteenth year through the deposition of his father in January, 1327, Edward II being forced to agree to his own deposition, as the son refused to accept the crown without his father's consent. His marriage to Philippa, daughter of the Count of Hainault, took place at York, 24 January, 1328. In person Edward was graceful, strong, and active; he was fond of hunting, hawking, and all knightly pastimes, especially war. Ambition seems the most prominent point in his character, and his life, characterized throughout by selfishness and extravagance, was spoilt in later years by indulgence in a shameful passion. As a king, though he won great renown by his wars, he seems to have cared neither to maintain the royal prerogatives nor to follow any policy which would benefit his people.

For the first four years of his reign all power was in the hands of the queen-mother and Mortimer, and not till their overthrow in November, 1331, can Edward be said to have begun to rule. His first warlike experience was inglorious. In 1327 the Scots, led by Robert Bruce, bent on recovering their independence, invaded the North of England. Edward marched to meet them; but so quick and active were the Scots that Edward marched from York to Durham without gaining any definite news of their position, and, when he tried to cut them off and force them to fight, was completely outmanœuvred by them. The "Shameful Peace" of Northampton, made in 1328, by which Scotland's independence was again recognized, was one of the causes which brought about the downfall of Mortimer and Isabella. Edward renewed his struggle with Scotland in 1333, supporting Edward Baliol in an attempt on the Scottish throne. He defeated the Scots under Sir Archibald Douglas at Halidon Hill, and set Baliol on the throne. But the Scots quickly expelled Baliol, and, though Edward restored him, the quarrel with France prevented Edward from continuing the struggle. Further contests with Scotland took place during the Crécy campaign, when David Bruce, after securing his rightful place as king, took advantage of Edward's absence in France to invade England, only to be defeated and captured at Neville's Cross, October, 1346. David remained a prisoner for eleven years, but the Scottish raids continued. In 1355 the Scots took Berwick; Edward retook it in the following year, but, though he ravaged the Lothians in the campaign known as "Burnt Candlemas", he was unable to bring the Scots to terms. When David was released, in 1357, and found himself unable to pay the stipulated ransom, he agreed to make Edward heir to the Scottish throne. But David died, in 1371, and left Edward in a position which prevented him from prosecuting his claim or interfering with Scotland's independence.

Partly caused by the war with Scotland in 1333 and 1334 was the great war between England and France known as the Hundred Years War. The Scots had been helped by money from Philip VI of France, and Edward's anger at this was increased through the presence at his court of a French exile, Robert of Artois, who did all in his power to stir up enmity between the English and the French kings. Edward and Philip had been rival claimants for the French throne in 1328, and after Philip had been chosen king there was much dispute over the homage owed by Edward for his French fiefs. Philip, too, was anxious to be king over all France, a claim which involved the annexation of Guienne and Gascony, the parts still held by England. Thus personal and national rivalry combined to cause war. Edward's personal share in the war which lasted from 1338 to 1360 was a distinguished one. The first campaigns, however, were more remarkable for the concessions won by Parliament out of the king's needs than for successes in battle. By the end of 1339 he had agreed not to take a tallage of any kind without the consent of Parliament; and in 1341, to obtain further supplies, he submitted to his accounts being audited by a board chosen in Parliament, and promised not to choose ministers without the consent of his council. But, having received the money, Edward shamefully broke his promises, saying that he had "dissembled in order to avoid greater perils". The campaign of 1340 is noted for Edward's naval victory at Sluys over a fleet of five hundred French ships which attempted to prevent his landing; and this, taken with his victory off Winchelsea, in 1350, over the Spanish fleet, goes some way towards justifying his claim to the sovereignty of the seas.

The next campaign in which Edward took an important part was that of 1346. The Earl of Derby had been appointed to command in Gascony, and in 1346 Edward was about to lead an army to help him, when he was persuaded to attack, instead, the unprotected northern part of France. Landing near Cherbourg, he marched through Normandy, doing as much mischief as he could, and advanced almost to Paris. Then, crossing the Seine, he retreated towards Calais, pursued closely by Philip; and at Crécy, 24 August, he won a complete victory over the French force. Continuing to Calais, he began a lengthy siege which ended in the surrender of the town, August, 1347. Truces frequently signed after this were as frequently broken till open war broke out again in 1355. Edward himself had small part in the warfare which followed till the campaign of 1359–60, when, after trying to take Reims, he concluded a treaty with the regent of France at Brétigny, 8 May, 1360, by which all the ancient province of Aquitaine with Calais, Guines, and Ponthieu was ceded to him, and he renounced his claim to the French crown and to all French provinces except Brittany. The period between 1347 and 1355 was remarkable for the Black Death, a plague which in

England swept off about half the people. Decrease in population caused increase in labourers' wages. And in 1350 the king attempted to deal with the difficulty by proclaiming that labourers must work for the same wages as before the plague, under penalty fixed by statute. (See Gasquet, The Black Death, new ed., London, 1908.)

Ecclesiastically, Edward's reign was marked by some legislation directed against the pope. The difficulties were caused partly by the heavy taxation levied by the pope on the clergy, and partly by the appointment of foreigners to English benefices by the pope; while the irritation of Englishmen at these grievances was increased by the pope's residence at Avignon, under the influence of the French king. In 1351 the Statute of Provisors was passed. The king had, in 1344, complained to the pope against reservations and provisions by which English benefices were given to foreigners, and the rights of patrons were defeated; and this proving ineffectual, the statute now made all who procured papal provisions for benefices liable to fine and imprisonment. But the statute can hardly have benefited patrons, for preferments filled by provisions were declared forfeit to the Crown for that turn. In 1353, by the Statute of Præmunire, all subjects of the king were forbidden to plead in a foreign court in matters which the King's Court could decide, and in 1365 the papal courts were expressly included under this. Urban V in 1366 demanded the annual tribute promised by King John, which was then thirty-three years in arrear; but, on Parliament refusing to pay, nothing more was heard of the claim.

Seal of Edward the Confessor

The last years of Edward's reign were a time of failure and disappointment. In France he had lost, by 1374, all possessions but Calais, Bordeaux, and Bayonne; at sea the English were badly beaten by the Spaniards in 1372; the king himself after the death of his wife, in 1369, was completely under the influence of Alice Perrers; the court became more extravagant than before, and ministers were suspected of corruption. The Commons, supported by the Prince of Wales and William of Wykeham, attacked some of these evils in the "Good Parliament" of 1376. Lord Latimer, the king's chamberlain, and Richard Lyons, his financial agent, were impeached and imprisoned; and though Edward sent a message begging Parliament to deal gently with Alice Perrers for the sake of his love and his honour, she was banished from court. But the death of the Black Prince immediately afterwards was a great blow to the Commons. John of Gaunt was able, on Parliament's dismissal, to recall the impeached ministers, and by Edward's wish Alice Perrers returned. The struggle between the anti-ecclesiastical party, led by John of Gaunt, in alliance with John Wyclif, and the clergy, led by William of Wykeham, is scarcely connected with Edward personally, except in so far as this and other evils were due to Edward's neglect of the affairs of his kingdom. Discontent and conflicts at home, and failure abroad brought his reign to a close. He died deserted by all except one priest who attended him out of compassion. He was buried in Westminster Abbey.

Original Sources.—For early years, *Annales Paulini* and Bridlington in *Chronicles of Edward I. and II.* in *R. S.* (London, 1882–3).—For general history of reign, Adam of Murimuth in *R. S.* (London, 1889); Robert of Avesbury in *R. S.*, 1889; *Eulogium* in *R. S.*, III, 1863; *Chronicon Angliæ* in *R. S.*, 1874; Walsingham, *Historia Anglicana* in *R. S.*, I, 1863.—For French wars, *Chronique de Froissart* (Société de l'Histoire de France, 1869–99); Polain (ed.), tr. adapted McCaulay ed (London, 1893); *Chroniques de Jean le Bel* (Brussels, 1863) For Scottish wars, *Chronicon de Lanercost* (Edinburgh, 1839).

Modern Works.—Stubbs, *Constitutional History of England* (3rd ed.), II, 392–461; Hunt in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; Longman, *History of Edward III* (London, 1869); Warburton, *Edward III* in *Epochs of Modern Hist.* (5th ed., 1892); Ashley, *Edward III. and his Wars* in *Engl. Hist. from Contemp. Writers* (London, 1887); Wyatt-Davies in *History of England for Catholic Schools* (London, 1903), 138–40, has a good summary of ecclesiastical history; and a useful bibliography may be found in the *Annual Report of American Historical Association for 1900*, I, 581–3.

Thomas Williams

Burial of St. Edward the Confessor
Bayeux Tapestry, XI Century

Edward the Confessor, Saint, King of England, b. in 1003; d. 5 January, 1066. He was the son of Ethelred II and Emma, daughter of Duke Richard of

Normandy, being thus half-brother to King Edmund Ironside, Ethelred's son by his first wife, and to King Hardicanute, Emma's son by her second marriage with Canute. When hardly ten years old he was sent with his brother Alfred into Normandy to be brought up at the court of the duke his uncle, the Danes having gained the mastery in England. Thus he spent the best years of his life in exile, the crown having been settled by Canute, with Emma's consent, upon his own offspring by her. Early misfortune thus taught Edward the folly of ambition, and he grew up in innocence, delighting chiefly in assisting at Mass and the church offices, and in association with religious, whilst not disdaining the pleasures of the chase, or recreations suited to his station. Upon Canute's death in 1035 his illegitimate son, Harold, seized the throne, Hardicanute being then in Denmark, and Edward and his brother Alfred were persuaded to make an attempt to gain the crown, which resulted in the cruel death of Alfred who had fallen into Harold's hands, whilst Edward was obliged to return to Normandy. On Hardicanute's sudden death in 1042, Edward was called by acclamation to the throne at the age of about forty, being welcomed even by the Danish settlers owing to his gentle saintly character. His reign was one of almost unbroken peace, the threatened invasion of Canute's son, Sweyn of Norway, being averted by the opportune attack on him of Sweyn of Denmark; and the internal difficulties occasioned by the ambition of Earl Godwin and his sons being settled without bloodshed by Edward's own gentleness and prudence. He undertook no wars except to repel an inroad of the Welsh, and to assist Malcom III of Scotland against Macbeth, the usurper of his throne. Being devoid of personal ambition, Edward's one aim was the welfare of his people. He remitted the odious "Danegelt", which had needlessly continued to be levied; and though profuse in alms to the poor and for religious purposes, he made his own royal patrimony suffice without imposing taxes. Such was the contentment caused by "the good St. Edward's laws", that their enactment was repeatedly demanded by later generations, when they felt themselves oppressed.

Yielding to the entreaty of his nobles, he accepted as his consort the virtuous Editha, Earl Godwin's daughter. Having, however, made a vow of chastity, he first required her agreement to live with him only as a sister. As he could not leave his kingdom without injury to his people, the making of a pilgrimage to St. Peter's tomb, to which he had bound himself, was commuted by the pope into the rebuilding at Westminster of St. Peter's abbey, the dedication of which took place but a week before his death, and in which he was buried. St. Edward was the first King of England to touch for the "king's evil", many sufferers from which disease were cured by him. He was canonized by Alexander III in 1161. His feast is kept on the 13th of October, his incorrupt body having been solemnly translated on that day in 1163 by St. Thomas of Canterbury in the presence of King Henry II.

ST. ELRED, *De Sancto Eduardo Rege; Acta SS.*, 5 Jan. (Antwerp, 1643); *Lives of Edward the Confessor;* WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY, *Gesta Regum*, and MATTHEW PARIS, *Chronica Majora* in *R. S.* (London, 1858, 1872, 1887); BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints* (Dublin, 1872); CHALLONER, *Britannia Sancta* (London, 1745); LINGARD, *History of England* (London, 1883).

G. E. PHILLIPS.

Edward the Martyr, SAINT, King of England, son to Edgar the Peaceful, and uncle to St. Edward the Confessor; b. about 962; d. 18 March, 979. His accession to the throne on his father's death, in 975, was opposed by a party headed by his stepmother, Queen Elfrida, who was bent on securing the crown for her own son Ethelred, then aged seven, in which she eventually was successful. Edward's claim, however, was supported by St. Dunstan and the clergy and by most of the nobles; and having been acknowledged by the Witan, he was crowned by St. Dunstan. Though only thirteen, the young king had already given promise of high sanctity, and during his brief reign of three years and a half won the affection of his people by his many virtues. His stepmother, who still cherished her treacherous designs, contrived at last to bring about his death. Whilst hunting in Dorsetshire he happened (18 March, 979) to call at Corfe Castle where she lived. There, whilst drinking on horseback a glass of mead offered him at the castle gate, he was stabbed by an assassin in the bowels. He rode away, but soon fell from his horse, and being dragged by the stirrup was flung into a deep morass, where his body was revealed by a pillar of light. He was buried first at Wareham, whence three years later, his body, having been found entire, was translated to Shaftesbury Abbey by St. Dunstan and Earl Alfere of Mercia, who in Edgar's lifetime had been one of his chief opponents. Many miracles are said to have been obtained through his intercession. Elfrida, struck with repentance for her crimes, built the two monasteries of Wherwell and Ambresbury, in the first of which she ended her days in penance. The violence of St. Edward's end, joined to the fact that the party opposed to him had been that of the irreligious, whilst he himself had ever acted as a defender of the Church, obtained for him the title of Martyr, which is given to him in all the old English calendars on 18 March, also in the Roman Martyrology.

Anglo-Saxon Chronicle in *R. S.* (London, 1861); MALMESBURY, *Gesta Regum, ibid.* (London, 1872); TYNEMOUTH AND CAPGRAVE, *Nova Legenda Angliæ* (Oxford, 1901); CHALLONER, *Britannia Sancta* (London, 1745); LINGARD, *History of England* (London, 1883); BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints* (Dublin, 1872); STANTON, *Menology of England and Wales* (London, 1892).

G. E. PHILLIPS.

Edwin (ÆDUINI), SAINT, the first Christian King of Northumbria, b. about 585, son of Ælla, King of Deira, the southern division of Northumbria; d. 12 October, 633. Upon Ælla's death in 588, the sovereignty over both divisions of Northumbria was usurped by Ethebric of Bernicia, and retained at his death by his son Ethelfrid; Edwin, Ælla's infant son, being compelled until his thirtieth year to wander from one friendly prince to another, in continual danger from Ethelfrid's attempts upon his life. Thus when he was residing with King Redwald of East Anglia, Ethelfrid repeatedly endeavoured to bribe the latter to destroy him. Finally, however, Redwald's refusal to betray his guest led in 616 to a battle, fought upon the river Idle, in which Ethelfrid himself was slain, and Edwin was invited to the throne of Northumbria. On the death of his first wife, Edwin, in 625, asked for the hand of Ethelburga, sister to Eadbald, the Christian King of Kent, expressing his own readiness to embrace Christianity, if upon examination he should find it superior to his own religion. Ethelburga was accompanied to Northumbria by St. Paulinus, one of St. Augustine's fellow missionaries, who thus became its first apostle. By him Edwin was baptized at York in 627, and thenceforth showed himself most zealous for the conversion of his people. In instance of this, Venerable Bede tells how, at their royal villa of Yeverin in Northumberland, the king and queen entertained Paulinus for five weeks, whilst he was occupied from morning to night in instructing and baptizing the crowds that flocked to him. By Edwin's persuasion, moreover, Eorpwald, King of East Anglia, son of his old friend Redwald, was led to become a Christian. In token of his authority over the other kings as Bretwalda, Edwin used to have the *tufa* (a tuft of feathers on a spear, a military ensign of Roman origin) borne publicly before him, and he received tribute from the Welsh princes. Under him the law was so respected, that it became, as the Venerable Bede attests, a proverb that "a woman might travel

through the island with a babe at her breast without fear of insult". St. Edwin was slain on 12 October, 633, in repelling an attack made on him by Penda, the pagan King of Mercia, who, together with the Welsh prince Cadwallon (a Christian only in name), had invaded his dominion. Perishing thus in conflict with the enemies of the Faith, he was regarded as a martyr and as such was allowed by Gregory XIII to be depicted in the English College church at Rome. His head was taken to St. Peter's church at York, which he had begun. His body was conveyed to Whitby. Churches are said to have been dedicated to him at London and at Breve in Somerset.

PLUMMER ed., *Bedæ Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum* (Oxford, 1896), II, 9–20; TYNEMOUTH AND CAPGRAVE, *Nova Legenda Angliæ* (Oxford, 1901); *Acta SS.*, 12 October; BUTLER, *Lives of Saints* (Dublin, 1872), 4 Oct.; LINGARD, *History of England* (London, 1883); STANTON, *Menology of England and Wales* (London, 1892); RAINE in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.

G. E. PHILLIPS.

Edwy (or EADWIG), King of the English, eldest son of Edmund and St. Aelfgifu, b. about 940; d. 959. Though but fifteen years old at the death of his uncle Edred, he was unanimously chosen king, and was crowned at Kingston in January, 956. Too young, almost, to know his own mind, and surrounded by counsellors who pandered to all that was worst in him, his reign was of short duration. Despite the exhortations of St. Dunstan and Archbishop Odo, both of whom fell under his displeasure, he put imposition after imposition upon his subjects. His relatives were removed from court, honest thanes were despoiled of their lands and inheritances, and his grandmother Eadgive, who, by her piety and dignity, had endeared herself to the entire nation, was deprived of all her possessions.

At length, in 957, the Mercians and Northumbrians, who felt his course most keenly, rose against him. Edgar, Edwy's younger brother, withdrew from the court with Archbishop Odo and put himself at the head of the insurgents. Edwy advanced to meet him but was defeated at Gloucester and obliged to flee for his life. Unwilling to prolong a civil war, the men of Kent and Wessex assented to a general meeting of the thanes from North and South to arrange for peace. It was decided that the country should be divided in half at the Thames, and that each brother should rule over a part. To Edwy was allotted the southern portion, and to Edgar the northern. Taught prudence by his reverses, Edwy governed his portion from that time forward with commendable justice and moderation, but died, prematurely, in 959.

His relations with St. Dunstan were not the happiest, and constitute the chief interest of Edwy's career. His opposition to the saint dated from the refusal of the latter to countenance his relations with Ethelgive, by some presumed to be his foster mother, and her daughter. Seeing that he was in disfavour, Dunstan withdrew for a time to his cloister, but the anger of the king, kept alive by Ethelgive, followed him into that sanctuary. The monks were incited to revolt, the abbey was plundered. Dunstan fled and, though hotly pursued, managed to escape to the Continent, where he remained until after Edwy's death. Osbern's story to the effect that Edwy engaged in a general persecution of the monks may, however, be safely rejected, as the revolt against him was not concerned with the dispute between the regulars and seculars which began only after Edwy's death. On the other hand, Edwy's dislike for Dunstan may have helped to impede the saint's monastic reforms.

Anglo-Saxon Chron.; AETHELWEARD, *Mon. Hist. Brit.*; LINGARD, *Hist. of Eng.* (Dublin, 1878); *Memorials of Dunstan* (Rolls Ser.); HALLAM, *Middle Ages* (London, 1818), II, 264.

STANLEY J. QUINN.

Eestermans, FABIAN A. See LAHORE, DIOCESE OF.

Egan, BOETIUS, Archbishop of Tuam, b. near Tuam, Ireland, 1734; d. near Tuam, 1798. He belonged to a family owning large estates in the County Galway. In the eighteenth century they were reduced in position and means. The penal laws made it then difficult for an Irish Catholic to receive Catholic education at home; nor do we know where young Egan received his early education. Neither is it certain at what age he went to France to be trained for the priesthood. This training he received at the College of Bordeaux, founded by Irish exiles and endowed by Anne of Austria in the seventeenth century. After his ordination he returned to Ireland and laboured in the ministry for some years till, in 1785, he was appointed Bishop of Achonry. Two years later he became Archbishop of Tuam. Accustomed during his whole life in Ireland to the barest toleration of his religion, he joyfully welcomed the Catholic Relief Act of 1793, and hastened to express his gratitude to George III. When Maynooth College was founded in 1795, he was named one of its trustees. One of his last public acts was to sign an address to the Irish viceroy, Lord Camden, condemning the revolutionary associations then in Ireland. In this address George III was described as "the best of kings", and the Irish Parliament as "our enlightened legislature". It was strange language to use of such a king and of such a parliament.

BURKE, *Catholic Archbishops of Tuam* (Dublin, 1882); HEALY, *History of Maynooth College* (Dublin, 1895).

E. A. D'ALTON.

Egan, MICHAEL, first Bishop of Philadelphia, U. S. A., b. in Ireland, most probably in Galway, in 1761; d. at Philadelphia, 22 July, 1814. Entering the Order of St. Francis he was rapidly advanced to important offices. In his twenty-sixth year he was appointed Guardian of St. Isidore's, the house of the Irish Franciscans, at Rome, and held this position for three years, when he was transferred to Ireland. After labouring for several years as a missionary in his native land, he responded to an earnest appeal of the Catholics of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, and went to the United States. Though lacking the constitution demanded by the pastoral duties of that pioneer age, and suffering often from sickness, Father Egan's priestly zeal and his eloquence in the pulpit gained universal recognition, and, in April, 1803, he was appointed by Bishop Carroll one of the pastors of St. Mary's church in Philadelphia. On 8 April, 1808, Pope Pius VII erected this city into an episcopal see, with Michael Egan as first bishop. Archbishop Carroll describes him to the Roman authorities as "a man of about fifty who seems endowed with all the qualities to discharge with perfection all the functions of the episcopacy, except that he lacks robust health, greater experience and a greater degree of firmness in his disposition. He is a learned, modest, humble priest who maintains the spirit of his Order in his whole conduct." Owing to the Napoleonic troubles, the papal Bulls did not reach America until the year 1810. On 28 Oct. Bishop Egan was consecrated by Archbishop Carroll in St. Peter's church, Baltimore. His brief episcopate was embittered and his health shattered by the contumacious behaviour of the lay trustees of St. Mary's church, which he had chosen for his cathedral. These trustees, who were tainted with the irreligious notions of the times, without any legal right, and contrary to the canons of the Church, claimed the privilege of electing and deposing their pastors and of adjusting their salaries. This un-Catholic contention that "the laity own the churches and the clergy are their hired servants" disturbed the peace, retarded the progress, and threatened the existence of the Catholic religion in Pennsylvania during two episcopates. Bishop Egan's troubles were aggravated by the insubordination of two Irish priests whom he had admitted to the diocese, James Harold and his better-known nephew, William

Vincent Harold. Bishop Egan died worn out by his struggles to maintain his episcopal authority.

GRIFFIN, *History of Bishop Egan* (Philadelphia, 1893); SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in the U. S.* (New York, 1890), III; REUSS, *Biog. Cycl. of the Cath. Hierarchy of U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1898).

JAMES F. LOUGHLIN.

Egbert, SAINT, a Northumbrian monk, born of noble parentage c. 639; d. 729. In his youth he went for the sake of study to Ireland, to a monastery, says the Venerable Bede, "called Rathmelsigi", identified by some with Mellifont in what is now County Louth. There, when in danger of death from pestilence, he prayed for time to do penance, vowing amongst other things to live always in exile from his own country. In consequence he never returned to England, though he lived to the age of ninety, and always fasted rigorously. Having become a priest, he was filled with zeal for the conversion of the still pagan German tribes related to the Angles, and would himself have become their apostle, if God had not shown him that his real calling was to other work. It was he, however, who dispatched to Friesland St. Wigbert, St. Willibrord, and other saintly missionaries. St. Egbert's own mission was made known to him by a monk, who, at Melrose, had been a disciple of St. Boisil. Appearing to this monk, St. Boisil sent him to tell Egbert that the Lord willed him instead of preaching to the heathen to go to the monasteries of St. Columba, "because their ploughs were not going straight", in consequence of their schismatic practice in the celebration of Easter. Leaving Ireland therefore in 716, Egbert crossed over to Iona, where the last thirteen years of his life were spent. By his sweetness and humility he induced the Iona monks to relinquish their erroneous mode of computation; in 729 they celebrated Easter with the rest of the Church upon 24 April, although their old rule placed it that year upon an earlier day. On the same day, after saying Mass and joining joyfully in their celebration, the aged Egbert died. Though he is now honoured simply as a confessor, it is probable that St. Egbert was a bishop. By Alcuin he is expressly called *antistes* and *episcopus*, and an Irish account of a synod at Birra names him "Egbert Bishop", whilst the term *sacerdos* used by the Venerable Bede, is sometimes applied by him to bishops.

BEDE, *Hist. Eccles. Angl.* (Oxford, 1896), III, iv, 27, V, ix, xxii; ALCUIN, *De Sanctis Ecclesiæ Eboracensis* in *Historians of York, R. S.* (London, 1879); TYNEMOUTH AND CAPGRAVE, *Nova Legenda* (Oxford, 1901); *Acta SS.*, 24 April; LINGARD, *Anglo-Saxon Church* (London, 1845), ch. xiv; STANTON, *Menology of England and Wales* (London, 1892); LANIGAN, *Eccl. Hist. of Ireland* (Dublin, 1828), III, 95; HEALY, *Ancient Irish Schools* (Dublin, 1892); BRIGHT in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.

G. E. PHILLIPS.

Egbert (ECGBERHT or ECGBRYHT), frequently though incorrectly called "First King of England", d. A. D. 839. He styled himself in 828 *Rex Anglorum*, i. e. "Overlord of East Anglia", a title used by Offa fifty years before; in 830 he described himself as "King of the West Saxons and Kentishmen", and in 833 he is "King of the West Saxons". He came of the royal race descended from Ine of Wessex and, owing to his pretensions to power, was exiled by the joint action of Beorhtric of Wessex and Offa of Mercia. The date and duration of his exile are unknown, but he returned in 802 and was chosen King of the West Saxons. In 815 he ravaged Cornwall and conquered the West Welsh who dwelt there. They rebelled in 825, when he again defeated them just in time to repel a Mercian invasion at the battle of Ellandune. Shortly afterwards Kent, Surrey, Sussex, and Essex accepted him as king and East Anglia submitted to his overlordship. War with Mercia again broke out, and ended in Egbert driving out Wiglaf and receiving the submission of that kingdom. In 829 he attacked Northumbria, but the Northumbrians met him at Dore and recognized him as overlord.

Thus for the first time he had united the whole English race under one overlordship, in this way substantially justifying the title *King of England*, though the idea of territorial kingship had not at that time come into being. Nor was he actually king of all the subject tribes, for the under-kings still ruled, though they were under him as Bretwalda. Thus he restored Wiglaf to the throne of Mercia and made his own son Ethelwulf King of the Kentishmen. In his own Kingdom of Wessex he developed the shire system, carefully regulating the relations of the ealdorman and the bishop to the shire. He also organized the *Fyrd*, or militia. His ecclesiastical policy was very favourable to the Church, and at the Council of Kingston, in 838, he gave the archbishop assurances of friendship and certain privileges which considerably strengthened the primatial see. In 831 he forced the North Welsh (the people of Wales) to accept his overlordship, but three years later he had to defend his realm from Scandinavian pirates who were invading Sheppey. He beat them off, but they returned in 835 and defeated him at Charmouth in Dorsetshire. In 837 he again had to meet a great fleet of Northmen, who on this occasion were helped by an insurrection of the West Welsh. He, however, won a great victory over the allies at Hengestdune, on the borders of Cornwall, after which he remained at peace till his death.

The chronology of the Anglo-Saxon chronicle is often two, and sometimes three, years out with regard to the events of his reign. His coins, which are rare, though specimens from nineteen different mints are known, bear his name and the title *Rex*, the additions *Saxo*, "*M*", or "*A*" denoting Wessex, Mercia, and East Anglia respectively.

Anglo-Saxon Chronicle in *R. S.*, XXIII (London, 1861); FLORENCE OF WORCESTER, *Chronicon ex Chronicis* (Eng. Hist. Soc., London, 1848–9), XIII; HENRY OF HUNTINGDON, *Historia Anglorum* in *Rolls Series* (London, 1874); WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY, *Gesta Regum* (Eng. Hist. Soc., London, 1840), VI; KEMBLE, *Codex Diplomaticus Ævi Saxonici* (Eng. Hist. Soc., London, 1839–48), VII; STUBBS, s. v., in *Dict. Christian Biog.* (London, 1877–87); ID., *Constitutional History of England* (Oxford, 1875–78), I; ID. (especially for the chronology), *Introduction to Roger Hoveden* in *R. S.* (London, 1868–71); HADDAN AND STUBBS, *Ecclesiastical Documents* (Oxford, 1869–78); GREEN, *The Making of England* (London, 1885); HUNT, s. v., in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (London, 1889).

EDWIN BURTON.

Egbert, Archbishop of Trier, d. 8 or 9 December, 993. He belonged to the family of the Counts of Holland. His parents, Count Theodoric I and Countess Hildegarde, sent him to be educated in the Abbey of Egmont, located within their dominions. Egbert is first mentioned in history as head of the imperial chancery, then under Archbishop Willigis of Mainz. Documents of 976 and 977 record him as holding this office. In 977 he was made Archbishop of Trier, which see was vacant by the death of Theodoric. Here he remained till 993. He sought particularly to remove from this great diocese all traces of the ravages caused by the Northmen at the end of the ninth century, and to foster the ecclesiastical reforms that had been progressing since the days of Otto I. He completed the restoration, begun by his predecessor, of the Abbey of S. Maria ad Martyres near Trier. Just outside the city he built the abbey-church of St. Eucharius (St. Mathias), to which Otto II contributed generously. On this occasion the body of St. Celsus was discovered. The abbey itself was richly endowed and its monastic school flourished again. The collegiate church of St. Paulinus, near Trier, was similarly endowed, a regular income for its clergy assured, and a fitting solemnity in Divine worship made possible. Abbot Hetzel of Mettlach was deposed for conduct unworthy of his vows and station. The monastery was reformed, and its school became an active centre of studious occupations. In Münstermaifeld St. Martin's was raised to the dignity of a collegiate church and was correspondingly en-

dowed. From all these regenerated centres, likewise from the Abbeys of Echternach and St. Maximin, that needed no reformation, a beneficent, spiritual, and intellectual influence radiated in all directions through the diocese.

Egbert was an intimate friend of Otto II, and with Willigis of Mainz exerted a wholesome influence over the emperor, whom he accompanied on his journey to Italy in 983. After Otto's death he stood at first for Henry the Wrangler (Zänker), but soon went over to Otto III and his mother Theophano. Other evidence of the religious renaissance in the Diocese of Trier is found in the admirable works of ecclesiastical art inspired by Egbert and executed mostly in Trier itself. Among these are several valuable manuscripts: the famous "Codex Egberti", a book of Gospels written at Reichenau and richly adorned with miniatures, now preserved in the city library of Trier; the "Psalterium Egberti", written in 981 and now in the chapter library of Cividale (Italy), to which it was donated by St. Elizabeth of Thuringia (also called the "Codex Gertrudianus", after the Russian Grand Duchess Gertrude, who became its possessor in 1085); the "Codex Epternacensis", which contains also the Four Gospels and is kept in the Gotha library; likewise several Sacramentaries, transcripts from the "Letter Book" (Registrum) of St. Gregory the Great (596–604), etc. The arts of the goldsmith and of the worker in enamel were particularly well cultivated at Trier. Among valuable specimens still extant are: at Trier a portable altar, at Limburg the golden case or covering with richly adorned head of the so-called St. Peter's Staff, once a part of the relics of the Trier cathedral, now in the sacristy of the Franciscan church at Limburg. Egbert was buried in the chapel of St. Andrew, built by him near the cathedral of Trier.

HIRSCH, *Jahrbücher des deutschen Reiches unter Heinrich II.* (Berlin, 1862); UHLIRZ, *Jahrbücher des deutschen Reiches unter Otto II. und Otto III.* (Berlin, 1902), I; BRAUN, *Geschichte der Trierer Buchmalerei* (Trier, 1896); KRAUS, *Die Miniaturen des Codex Egberti* (Freiburg im Br., 1884); SAUERLAND AND HASELOFF, *Der Psalter Erzbischofs Egbert, Codex Gertrudianus, in Cividale* (Trier, 1901); BEISSEL, *Erzbischof Egbert und die byzantinische Frage* in *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* (Freiburg im Br.), XXVII (1884), 260–274, 479–496; LAMPRECHT, *Der Bilderschmuck des Codex Egberti und des Codex Epternacensis* in *Jahrbücher des Vereins von Altertumsfreunden im Rheinlande*, LXX (1881), 56–122; WATTENBACH, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter* (7th ed., Stuttgart, 1904), 408 sq.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Egbert, Archbishop of York, England, son of Eata, brother of the Northumbrian King Eadbert and cousin of King Ceolwulf, to whom the Venerable Bede dedicated his history; date of birth unknown; d. 19 November, 766. He received his early education in a monastery, and then went to Rome with his brother Ecgred, where he was ordained a deacon. Ecgred died in Rome and Egbert immediately returned to Northumbria. On the resignation of the Bishopric of York by Wilfrid II in 732, King Ceolwulf appointed Egbert his successor. Shortly after his accession Bede wrote a long letter to him advising him to give much time to study and prayer, to ordain more priests for the administration of the sacraments, and to translate the Creed and the Lord's Prayer into the Saxon tongue. He also urged him to strive to obtain the subdivision of many of the dioceses of the North in order that episcopal visitations might be more frequently made. He called his attention to many disorders that were prevalent and particularly urged him to secure the pallium for himself. Acting upon this advice Egbert obtained the pallium from Gregory III at Rome in 735, and thus became the second Archbishop of York, that title having been lost to the Church of York ever since Paulinus had fled into Kent more than a century before. During all those years no one had sought for the restoration of that lost dignity, and this neglect was afterwards used as a strong argument in favour of the precedence of Canterbury, when the well-known controversy arose between the two sees. The restoration of the pallium to Egbert increased his power and authority over the Northern bishops, who thus became his suffragans; and his power was still more strengthened in 738 when his brother Eadbert succeeded to the throne of Northumbria.

Egbert was thus placed in a position which enabled him to carry out many reforms, and in the performance of these he proved himself a strict disciplinarian; but though stern when correction and rebuke were justly deserved, he was remarkable for his sweetness and gentleness. His pupil Alcuin frequently speaks of his piety and energy and always refers to him in terms of the deepest affection. "He is said to have been the first prelate who possessed a mint at York. He paid great attention to the services and music of his church, introducing the observance of the Hours. He was also a benefactor to the fabric of the minster, bestowing upon his cathedral the choice work of the jeweller and the goldsmith, and giving to it figured curtains of silk of foreign workmanship. He was, in all probability, the first introducer of the parochial system into the North" (Fasti Ebor.). One of his greatest works, perhaps, was the foundation of the famous School of York and its celebrated library. The renown of its masters and scholars soon spread through every Christian country, and noble youths from all parts flocked to York to be taught by the great archbishop. He himself taught divinity, whilst his assistant Albert, who afterwards succeeded him as archbishop, gave lessons in grammar and in the arts and sciences. The fact that the illustrious Alcuin was Egbert's pupil, sheds no little lustre on this famous school.

The archbishop's daily work has been thus described by Alcuin himself: "As soon as he was at leisure in the morning, he sent for some of the young clerks, and sitting on his couch taught them successively till noon, at which time he retired to his private chapel and celebrated Mass. After dinner, at which he ate sparingly, he amused himself with hearing his pupils discuss literary questions in his presence. In the evening he recited with them the service of complin, and then calling them in order, he gave his blessing to each as they knelt in succession at his feet" (Mabillon, Acta SS. Ord. S.B., ad an. 815). Towards the end of his life he left the care of the school to Albert and Alcuin, giving himself more time and opportunity to prepare for his end in peace and tranquillity. In this life of retirement and prayer he was joined by his brother King Eadbert, who voluntarily resigned his throne to enter the monastery in 757. Egbert died before his brother, having ruled over the Diocese of York nearly thirty-four years. He was buried in one of the porches of his cathedral at York. His best-known work is the "De Jure Sacerdotali", a collection of canonical regulations. Extracts from it made in the eleventh century, under the title of "Excerptiones e dictis et canonibus SS. patrum" (Mansi, XII, 411–32; Wilkins, I, 101–12), were long current as a work of Egbert. Among the writings attributed to him are "Pontificale", or series of special offices for the use of a bishop; a "Dialogus Ecclesiasticæ Institutionis"; a "Confessionale", and a "Pœnitentiale", both of which were written in the vernacular as well as in Latin. The "Pontificale", an important liturgical text, has been published by the Surtees Society, and his other works may be found in the second volume of Thorpe's "Ancient Laws and Institutes of England". In its present shape the "Pœnitentiale Egberti" (P. L., LXXXIX, 411 sqq.) contains but little from the hand of Egbert, and is a ninth-century Frankish compilation, put together mostly from Halitgar. Similarly, the "Dialogus Eccl. Institutionis" (Mansi, XII, 482–88) is said not to be from Egbert in its present form (see YORK; PENITENTIAL BOOKS; LIBER PONTIFICALIS).

For the writings of EGBERT see *P. L.*, LXXXIX. Cf. RAINE, *Fasti Eboracenses* (London, 1863), I, 94 sqq.; MABILLON, *Acta SS. Ord. S.B.* (Venice, 1733), sæc. III, 548–9, and sæc. IV, 148–

9; IDEM, *Annales O.S.B.* (Paris, 1703–1739), II, 97–8; *Historians of York* in *Rolls Series*, I, 386; SYMEON OF DURHAM, *Hist. Eccles. Dunelm.* in *Rolls Series;* HAHN, *Bonifaz und Lul* (1882), 189 sqq.; WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY, *Gesta Pontif.* in *Rolls Series*, 245; SCHNEIDER, *Kirchenrechtsquellen* (2nd ed., 1892), 70; WASSERSCHLEBEN, *Bussordnungen* (1851), 231 sqq.; SCHMITZ, *Bussbücher* (1883), 565 sqq.

G. E. HIND.

Eger, DIOCESE OF. See AGRIA, DIOCESE OF.

Egfrid (also known as ECFRID, ECHGFRID, EGFERD), King of Northumbria, b. 650; d. 685. He ascended the Northumbrian throne at Oswy's death in 670, and after defeating the Picts who had thought to impose upon his youth by asserting their independence, turned his attention to Wulphere, King of Mercia, and broke, for a time, the power of the southern kingdom. In 679 new trouble with Mercia arose, and in the course of the subsequent struggle Aelfwin, Egfrid's brother, was slain. Through the intervention of Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, peace was at last restored and in lieu of vengeance Egfrid was prevailed upon to accept the legal wergild (fine) for his brother's death.

Egfrid now consolidated his kingdom by diplomacy, annexation, and treaty, bringing Cumberland, Galloway, and North Lancashire under Northumbrian influence. The desire for conquest, however, had entered his veins, and in 684 he dispatched an expedition into Ireland. The invasion was unsuccessful, but nevertheless was productive of much damage and bitterness to a hospitable, friendly people who had conferred numerous benefits on the Angles and who found violence where they expected gratitude. Disregarding the advice of his counsellors, Egfrid led an expedition against the Picts the next year, and, being decoyed into the mountain passes, was trapped and slain. He was buried by the victors in the cemetery on the isle of Hii or Iona, and his brother succeeded to the Northumbrian throne.

See also ETHELDREDA; ELY.

BEDE, *Hist. Eccl.*, v. III and IV; SYMEON, *Hist. Eccl. Dun.*, I and II; BARONIUS, *Ann. Eccl.*, ad an. 684; *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.; LINGARD, *Hist. of England* (Dublin, 1878), I.

STANLEY J. QUINN.

Egidius. See GILES.

Eginhard. See EINHARD.

Egloffstein, FREDERICK W. VON, b. at Aldorf, near Nuremberg, Bavaria, 18 May, 1824; d. in New York, 1885. He served in the Prussian army in his early manhood and then emigrated to the United States. Von Egloffstein has been called "The Father of Halftone Engraving" in the United States, for the reason that he was the first one to employ ruled glass screens, together with photography, to produce engravings. In 1861 he engaged Samuel Sartain, a steel engraver, to rule with wavy lines numbering 250 to the inch glass plates covered with an opaque varnish, and he was engaged in perfecting his experiments in this direction when the Civil War broke out. Abandoning his business, he joined the Union army as a volunteer from New York and was commissioned a colonel. While leading a skirmish in North Carolina, 27 April, 1862, he was severely wounded and retired from the service with the brevet rank of brigadier general. Under the patronage of Archbishop McCloskey he then took up his new system of engraving again, and one of Murillo's madonnas and a picture of the façade of St. Francis Xavier's College, New York, were produced by his patented process. Von Egloffstein thought to circumvent counterfeiting, so prevalent at that period, by having bank-notes engraved by his method. Through Baron Gerolt, Prussian Minister at Washington, he was introduced to a number of officials and prominent men, who organized The Heliographic Engraving and Printing Company, with a plant in New York City. There the von Egloffstein process of engraving was carried on in a secret manner. Each group of workmen was taught a part of the work, but no one was permitted to see the whole process. The United States Government refused to adopt von Egloffstein's method of engraving, and the company abandoned the project. The common method of engraving now is by means of ruled glass screens and photography. Glass screens ruled with wavy lines, such as von Egloffstein adopted in 1861, are also being used (1909). Von Egloffstein, as a member of the United States engineering department, later performed valuable services for the Government in the submarine work at Rock Island, Illinois, and in the blasting operations at Hell Gate in New York Harbour.

War of the Rebellion, Official Records, Series I, Vol. IX. A Portrait and specimen of the VON EGLOFFSTEIN half-tone engraving made in 1866 is given in *Inland Printer* (Chicago, Oct., 1894), 38; *Anthony's Photographic Bulletin* (New York, 1896–97), IX, 201.

S. H. HORGAN.

Egmont, LAMORAL, COUNT OF, PRINCE OF GÂVRE, b. at the Château de La Hamaide, in Hainault, 18 Nov., 1522; beheaded at Brussels, 5 June, 1568. He was a descendant of one of the oldest families of the Low Countries; his patrimonial castle, near the abbey of the same name, was on the coast of the North Sea, about three miles west of Alkmaar, Holland. In 1538 he went to Spain with his elder brother, Charles, and both took part in the expedition to Algiers in 1541, in which Charles was injured. Charles died the following year. Lamoral succeeded to the title and estates, which, beside those of Holland, comprised the principality of Gâvre, seven or eight baronies, and a number of seigniories. When, in 1544, he married Sabina, Duchess of Bavaria and Countess Palatine of the Rhine, the emperor and the King of the Romans assisted at his wedding. Egmont distinguished himself in various campaigns during the reign of Charles V, who, when he was only twenty-six years of age, invested him with the Order of the Golden Fleece, and appointed him to several confidential missions such as sending him to England to seek the hand of Queen Mary for Philip II. His principal titles to military glory are two battles which he won against the French: the battle of St-Quentin, which was fought through his vehement persuasion (1557), and that of Gravelines, the honour of which is due to him exclusively. As a reward for his services he was nominated by Philip II, in 1559, stadtholder of the province of Flanders, and a member of the Council of State for the Low Countries.

LAMORAL, COUNT OF EGMONT
From a contemporary engraving, Cabinet des Estampes, Brussels

But these honours did not satisfy Egmont. Though handsome, brave, rich, generous, and popular, still he viewed with jealousy the prominence given Cardinal Granvella, who was in the confidence of the king. He entered a vigorous protest against the proceedings of this minister and clamoured for his removal, going so far as to refuse to sit in the Council of State if Granvella were allowed to remain. His hatred of the king's favourite led him into the plots of William of Orange against the Spanish Government. Later, when religious troubles broke out in Flanders, it was eviden

that he did not rise to the occasion; he granted the sectarians concessions emphatically disapproved of by the king and assumed a quite equivocal attitude in the matter of the iconoclasts. It is true that he alleged, in excuse, that there were no troops at his disposal and that he was therefore rendered powerless. On the other hand, he refused to take part in the plots against the Government, and when the Duke of Alva arrived in the Netherlands, he would not follow the Prince of Orange into exile, saying that his was a clear conscience. This attitude cost him his life. With the Count of Hoorn he was arrested by the orders of the duke and condemned to death, despite his appeal to the privilege of the Golden Fleece. Both were declared guilty of high treason by the Conseil des Troubles, a court established by the Duke of Alva, and which was his servile instrument. The two friends were beheaded amid universal grief. Egmont met his death with dignity and Christian resignation; he protested to the last moment his devotion to his religion and his king, and to the latter's compassion recommended his wife, who, through the confiscation of his property, was left penniless with the care of eleven children. Egmont had been imprudent, but was guilty of no crime. His death was thenceforth one of the principal grievances of the Low Countries against the Spanish Government.

DE BAVAY, *Procès du comte d'Egmont et pièces justificatives* (Brussels, 1853); DEVILLERS, *Le Journal de Nicolas de Landes, procureur général du Comte d'Egmont* in *Bulletin de la Commission royale d'Histoire* (1881), fourth series, IX; JUSTE, *Le comte d'Egmont et le comte de Hornes* (Brussels, 1862); PRESCOTT, *History of Philip II* (1855–59).

GODEFROID KURTH.

Egoism (Lat. *ego*, I, self), the designation given to those ethical systems which hold self-love to be the source of all rational action and the determinant of moral conduct. In a broad use of the term any system might be called egoistic which makes any good of the ego the end and motive of action. The name, however, has been appropriated by usage to those systems which make happiness, pleasure, or personal advantage the sole end of conduct. In one form or another and with various modifications, the principle pervades the theories of the Cyrenaic, Epicurean, Utilitarian, and Evolutionary Schools; and, slightly disguised, it lurks at the bottom of utilitarian altruism. Its typical expression is to be found in Hobbes and Mandeville, while Jeremy Bentham, combining it with the other cognate principle, that pleasure and pain are the only good and evil, formulates it in its full character as egoistic hedonism. Two of Bentham's statements, when taken together, set forth concisely the egoistic doctrine. "Pleasure is itself a good, nay, setting aside immunity from pain, the only good. Pain is in itself an evil, and indeed without exception, the only evil, or else the words good and evil, have no meaning." (Principles of Morals and Legislation, chap. ix.) "The search after motives is one of the prominent causes of man's bewilderment in the investigation of the question of morals. But this is a pursuit in which every moment employed is a moment wasted. All motives are absolutely good, no man has ever had, can, or could have a motive different from the pursuit of pleasure or shunning of pain." (Deontology, vol. I, p. 126.) The undisputed fact that men do experience sentiments of benevolence and perform disinterested actions offers an obvious difficulty to the egoist. Hobbes seeks to evade it by resolving altruistic impulses into personal hopes and fears. Later hedonists, recurring to the principle of the association of ideas, contend that virtue, which at first is pursued only for the pleasure it brings, comes later on, through a confusion of means and end, to be pursued for its own sake. Innumerable analyses have shown that pleasure and pain are not measurable, and still less commensurable. The scheme devised by Bentham for estimating the quantity of different pleasures by considering their various dimensions—intensity, duration, nearness, certainty, purity (freedom from pain), fruitfulness—is commonly regarded as a piece of absurdity.

This fundamental postulate of egoistic hedonism is, therefore, fallacious. But a deeper and more pernicious vice of the system lies in its primary principle that self-interest is the only motive of human action This doctrine reduces all virtue to mere selfish calculation, it outrages our liveliest moral feelings by resolving the highest and noblest impulses into a base pursuit of personal pleasure. To say that man is incapable of acting from any motive other than self-interest is to degrade human nature. Mankind at large understands very clearly that self-interest is one thing and virtue quite another; that self-sacrifice and heroic devotion do exist, and are not vice and immorality; that a worthy action challenges our approbation in proportion to the disinterestedness of the agent. Let it become known that the hero of what we at first considered a brilliant act of self-sacrifice had after all no other motive than to obtain some advantage for himself, and immediately he appears but a vulgar mercenary. As Lecky says: "No Epicurean could avow before a popular audience that the one end of his life was the pursuit of his own happiness without an outburst of indignation and contempt, no man could conscientiously make this—which according to the selfish theory is the only rational and indeed possible motive of action—the deliberate object of all his undertakings without his character becoming despicable and degraded." (European Morals, vol. I, p. 35.) Besides, if the egoistic impulse is made the sole and unconquerable motive of action, it is idle to speak of obligation and duty. Nor can the hedonist, consistently with his theory, claim that he safeguards the pre-eminent value of virtue by recognizing the happiness derivable from it to be the highest form of pleasure. For if one kind of conduct yields this pleasure, while another does not, then evidently there must be some essential difference, unaccounted for in the egoistic and hedonistic theories, between right and wrong conduct, in virtue of which they produce contrary results of happiness and pain for the agent. But moral judgments are not resolvable into estimates of self-interest; and if we commit ourselves to classifying conduct purely by the advantages, in terms of the pleasure and pain, to be reaped from it, we shall be forced to appraise as virtuous actions which the reasonable judgment of men condemns as immoral; while, on the other hand, we shall be compelled to brand as wrong acts of self-sacrifice such as, in all life and literature, challenge the highest honour and reverence.

At the bottom of the errors of egoistic hedonism there lies a truth which this system misinterprets and perverts. However complete and disinterested we may be, we can never strip ourselves of self. The constitution of his nature compels man to seek his good, however he may err in the deliberate choice that he makes among the various goods that solicit his efforts. The end constituted for him by God is to reach that highest good which consists in realizing the moral perfection of his nature. This good is to be sought for its own sake chiefly, and in its train follows happiness as, if the expression may be permitted, an automatic consequence. Hence in pursuing the moral good, I am implicitly pursuing my own happiness. This self-realization is not egoism; for egoism makes self the centre, the beginning and the end of action. On the other hand, the virtuous man subordinates himself to the moral good, which in the last analysis is identified with God. In this sense, as Aristotle points out, the good man may be said to be a self-lover. "For he gives to himself what is most honourable, and the greatest goods, and gratifies the authoritative part of himself, and obeys it in everything. Therefore, he must be a self-lover, after a dif-

ferent manner from the person who is reproached for it, and differing in as great a degree as living in obedience to reason differs from living in obedience to passion, and as desiring the honourable differs from desiring what seems to be advantageous." (Nich. Ethics., Bk. IX, ch. viii, §§ 6, 7.) When Kant declared that duty must be fulfilled exclusively for duty's sake, with disregard of all considerations of happiness or welfare, he ignored the fact that by annexing happiness as a concomitant of the good the Creator evidently intends that we may legitimately aim at our own happiness, provided we do not invert the order which makes happiness subordinate to the good. Duty is not the be-all and the end-all. It is a means to reach our supreme end and good.

ST. THOMAS, *Summa Theologica*, I, QQ. i-xix; ARISTOTLE, *Nichomachean Ethics*, IX, viii; FARGES, *La Liberté et le Devoir* (Paris, 1902), Part II; MÉRIC, *Du Droit et du Devoir* (Paris, 1877), Part II, ch. i, ii; SIDGWICK, *The Methods of Ethics* (New York, 1890), I, vi–vii; II, i–iii; LECKY, *History of European Morals* (New York, 1870), i; MUIRHEAD, *The Elements of Ethics* (New York, 1892), II, i.—The authoritative presentation of Egoism is to be found in the works of HOBBES, PALEY, BENTHAM, and J. S. MILL.

JAMES J. FOX.

Egwin, SAINT, third Bishop of Worcester; date of birth unknown; d. (according to Mabillon) 20 December, 720, though his death may have occurred three years earlier. His fame as founder of the great Abbey of Evesham no doubt tended to the growth of legends which, though mainly founded on facts, render it difficult to reconcile all the details with those of the ascertained history of the period. It appears that either in 692, or a little later, upon the death of Oftfor, second Bishop of Worcester, Egwin, a prince of the Mercian blood royal, who had retired from the world and sought only the seclusion of religious life, was forced by popular acclaim to assume the vacant see. His biographers say that king, clergy, and commonalty all united in demanding his elevation; but the popularity which forced on him this reluctant assumption of the episcopal functions was soon wrecked by his apostolic zeal in their discharge.

The Anglo-Saxon population of the then young diocese had had less than a century in which to become habituated to the restraints of Christian morality; they as yet hardly appreciated the sanctity of Christian marriage, and the struggle of the English Benedictines for the chastity of the priesthood had already fairly begun. At the same time large sections of England were more or less permanently occupied by pagans closely allied in blood to the Anglo-Saxon Christians. Egwin displayed undaunted zeal in his efforts to evangelize the heathen and no less in the enforcement of ecclesiastical discipline. His rigorous policy towards his own flock created a bitter resentment which, as King Ethelred was his friend, could only find vent in accusations addressed to his ecclesiastical superiors. Egwin undertook a pilgrimage to seek vindication from the Roman Pontiff himself. According to a legend, he prepared for his journey by locking shackles on his feet, and throwing the key into the River Avon. While he prayed before the tomb of the Apostles, at Rome, one of his servants brought him this very key—found in the maw of a fish that had just been caught in the Tiber. Egwin then released himself from his self-imposed bonds and straightway obtained from the pope an authoritative release from the load of obloquy which his enemies had striven to fasten upon him.

It was after Egwin's triumphant return from this pilgrimage that the shepherd Eoves came to him with the tale of a miraculous vision by which the Blessed Virgin had signified her will that a new sanctuary should be dedicated to her. Egwin himself went to the spot pointed out by the shepherd (*Eoves ham*, or "dwelling") and to him also we are told the same vision was vouchsafed. King Ethelred granted him the land thereabouts upon which the famous abbey was founded. As to the precise date of the foundation, although the monastic tradition of later generations set it in 714, recent research points to some year previous to 709. At any rate it was most probably in 709 that Egwin made his second pilgrimage to Rome, this time in the company of Coenred, the successor of Ethelred, and Offa, King of the East Saxons, and it was on this occasion that Pope Constantine granted him the extraordinary privileges by which the Abbey of Evesham was distinguished. One of the last important acts of his episcopate was his participation in the first great Council of Clovesho.

Acta SS., I, 707 sqq.; MABILLON, *Acta SS. O. S. B.*, sec. III, Pars I, 316 sqq.; MACRAY ed., *Chronicles of Evesham* in *R. S.* (1863), XIX, 1–394; DUGDALE, *Monasticon Anglicanum*, II, 1–49; STUBBS in *Dict. Christ. Biogr.*, s. v.; *St. Egwin and his Abbey* (London, 1904); BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, I, 490.

E. MACPHERSON.

Egypt.—This subject will be treated under the following main divisions: I. GENERAL DESCRIPTION; II. ANCIENT EGYPTIAN HISTORY; III. ANCIENT EGYPTIAN RELIGION; IV. LITERARY MONUMENTS OF ANCIENT EGYPT; V. THE COPTIC CHURCH; VI. COPTIC LITERATURE; VII. COPTO-ARABIC LITERATURE.

I. GENERAL DESCRIPTION.—The name *Egypt* properly applies only to the rather narrow valley of the Nile from the Mediterranean, 31° 35′ N. latitude, to the First Cataract, at Assuân (Syene), 24° 5′ 30″ N. latitude, a stretch of about 680 miles by rail. However, from remote antiquity, as now, Egypt held sway over Nubia, reaching by degrees far Napata (Gebel Barkal), 18° 30′ N. latitude, which, under the eighteenth dynasty, was the southernmost city of the empire—another stretch of about 590 miles by rail. Distances by water are somewhat greater owing to the winding course of the river. From Napata the Nile continues for a while in the south-west direction which it follows from Abu-Hamed, but soon assumes its ordinary sinuous course to the north, describing two great principal curves—one to the west down to Wadi Halfa, just below the second cataract, Soleb being the westernmost point, and then another to the east as far as Assiût (Lycopolis), Assuân forming its apex, or easternmost point. As far as Edfu (Appollinopolis Magna) the valley is rather narrow, rarely as much as two to three miles wide. Indeed "in Lower Nubia the cultivable land area is seldom more than a few hundred yards in width and at not a few points, especially on the west bank, the desert advances clear up to the river brink" (Baedeker, Egypt, 1908, p. 376). The general aspect of the Nubian desert is that of a comparatively low table-land, stony in the north, studded with sandy hills in the south. At Assuân the course of the river is broken by the first cataract, where its waters rush between numberless more or less diminutive islands, the most famous of which is the island of Philæ above and Elephantine in front of Assuân. The cataract, however, has lost much of its grandeur since the building of the great dam which now regulates the supply for the irrigation of the country in time of low water. From Assuân to Edfu (about 48 miles) the banks are so high that even in the annual inundation they are above the level of high water, and consequently remain barren. Near Edfu the valley widens out and becomes wider still in the neighbourhood of Esneh (Latopolis). At Luxor (part of Thebæ) it again narrows for a few miles, but after that it maintains a respectable breadth, averaging between twelve and fifteen miles. At Assuân begin the two high ranges of the Libyan and Arabian deserts, between which the valley extends. The range to the left is somewhat farther from the river, so that most of the towns are built on the western bank.

Near Girgeh (Abydos) begins the Bahr-Yûsef, Joseph's Canal. It was formerly a branch of the Nile; it runs parallel to the main stream at a distance of from 5 to 6 miles along the left bank, and empties

into the Fayûm (nome of Arsinoe). One hundred and ten miles above Memphis the Libyan mountains bend to the north-west, and then, facing north-east, they draw nearer again to the Nile, thus surrounding a large extent of territory, which of old was known as Te-She, or Lakeland, from the great inland lake frequently mentioned and described by the Greek travellers and geographers under the name of Lake Mœris. It is still called Fayûm, from the Coptic *piïom*, "the sea". This lake once occupied almost the entire basin of the Fayûm, but within the historical period its circumference does not seem to have exceeded 140 miles. It lay 73 feet above the sea level,

The First Cataract of the Nile

and was very deep, as shown by its last vestige, the Birket-el-Karûn, which lies 144 feet below the same level (Baedeker, op. cit., p. 186 sq.).

A little before reaching Cairo, the Nile flows along the rocky and sandy plateau on which the three best-known pyramids stand. There, too, the two ranges of Arabian and Libyan mountains, which above this point run for many miles close to the river, turn sharply aside in the direction of the north-east and north-west, thus forming a triangle with the Mediterranean shore. The immense alluvial plain thus encompassed was called by the Greeks the Delta, owing to its likeness to the fourth letter of their alphabet(Δ). As soon as the river enters this plain its waters divide into several streams which separately wind their way to the sea and make it a garden of incredible fertility. In ancient times there were seven of these branches, five natural and two artificial. Only two are now of importance for navigation, the Damietta (Tamiathis) and the Rosetta branches, both named from the towns near which they discharge into the sea. It is to be remarked that, as a natural result of the incessant struggle between sea and land, the outline of the Delta is even now somewhat indefinite, and was probably much more so in the remote past. The shore is always partly covered with lagoons which move from one place to another. The most extensive of these are now, from east to west, Lake Menzaleh between the ancient Ostium Phatniticum and Ostium Pelusiacum, Lake Borolos (Lacus Buto or Paralus) east and Lake Edkû west of the Rosetta mouth (Ostium Bolbitinum), and Lake Mariût (Mareotis Lacus) south of the narrow strip of land on which Alexandria stands. Between Lake Menzaleh and the Red Sea, on a line running first south and then south-south-east, are Lake Balah, Lake Timsâh, and the Bitter Lakes (Lacus Amari), now traversed by the Suez Canal. Wâdi Tumilât connects Lake Timsâh with the Delta across the Arabian Desert, and forms the natural entrance to Egypt from the Asiatic side. West of the Delta, in a depression of the Libyan Desert, lies the Wâdi Natrûn (Vallis Nitria), famous in early Christian times, under the name of Desert of Scete, for its Coptic monasteries, four of which exist to this day.

Geology.—The low Nubian table-land through which the Nile meanders consists of a red sandstone, belonging to the upper cretaceous formation. It has furnished the Egyptians with an excellent building stone which they have exploited from remote antiquity, especially at Gebel Silsileh (Silsilis), 26 miles south of Edfu, where the sandstone beds, in sharp contrast with their former low level, rise in steep banks overhanging the river, thus offering unusual facilities for quarrying and transporting the stone. Near Edfu the sandstone is replaced by the nummulitic limestones (Eocene) of the Tertiary period, which form the bulk of the Libyan Desert and of a considerable portion of the Arabian Desert as well. The Libyan Desert is a level, or almost level, table-land, averaging 1000 feet above the sea. On the east it is fringed with craggy cliffs overhanging the valley, while its outward border, running aslant to the north-west, offers here and there deep bays in which lie the oases of Khârgeh and Dâkhleh (Great Oasis), Farâfreh (Tringtheos Oasis), and Siweh (Jupiter Ammon). The oasis of Bahriyeh (Small Oasis), north-east of Farâfreh, lies, on the contrary, in a depression entirely surrounded by the higher plateau. The Fayûm, in fact, is nothing but such an oasis on a larger scale. The plateau itself is waterless and practically without vegetation. Its strata are gently inclined to the

north-west, so that the highest level is in the south, near Luxor, where the oldest (lower Eocene) strata appear, and valleys (Bibân-el-Molûk) take the place of the cliffs, undoubtedly for the same reason as in the Arabian Desert (see below).

East of the Nile the limestone formation originally presented much the same appearance as in the Libyan counterpart. This appearance, however, was changed by a high (6000 to 7000 feet) range of crystalline rocks (granite, gneiss, diorite, porphyry, etc.) which sprang up along the Red Sea, lifting and tilting both the limestone formation and the sandstone beds (which extend farther north on the eastern than on the western side of the river), thus creating numerous deeply eroded valleys. Some of these run north and south, but most of them slope down to the Nile. The Wâdi Hammâmât (the Rehenu Valley of the Egyptians) runs almost straight across the desert from Keft (Coptos) on the Nile in the direction of Koseir (*Leucos Limên* of the Greeks) on the Red Sea. In spite of this the Arabian Desert still preserves its general appearance of a table-land. The open plains, of course, are almost devoid of vegetation, but numerous plants can be seen in the valley after rain, and they thrive in the sheltered ravines among the hills where springs occur. Near Assuân a spur of the eruptive range just mentioned runs in a western direction to the Nile, extending clear across the bed of the river and thus occasioning the so-called first cataract.

The formation of the present Valley of the Nile, in Egypt proper, dates from the Pliocene times, when it first appeared as a fiord into which the water of the Mediterranean Sea flowed at least as far as Keneh (Caenepolis) and perhaps even as far as Esneh (in the older Miocene times, the valley did not exist at all, the Arabian and Libyan Deserts forming one continuous table-land). Intimately connected with the formation of the valley are the sands and loams occurring to the south of the pyramids of Gizeh, as is shown by numerous Pliocene fossils they contain (Baedeker, Egypt, p. l). The silicified wood which abounds in the district of Moghara, west of Wâdi Natrûn (see above), belongs to the Miocene times, as do also the marine limestones of the Plateau of Cyrenaica, north of the Oasis of Sîweh, on the eastern edge of the Arabian Desert and on the shore of the Gulf of Suez. The so-called petrified forests near Cairo consist of stems of trees silicified by the action of the siliceous thermal springs which bubbled forth amid the network of lagoons existing in these parts in Oligocene times. Those forest trees are still more common in the Fayûm, where innumerable bones of extinct terrestrial and marine mammals and reptiles have been found in sands of the same geological age (Baedeker, loc. cit.).

Deposits of alabaster are to be found in the neighbourhood of El 'Amarna, where the alabaster quarries of Hetnub were worked by the Egyptians from the time of the Fourth Dynasty. The cultivated plains of the Delta and the Nile valley consist of recent alluvial deposits, ranging from fine sand to the finest silt laid down by the water of the annual inundation. Under these lie coarser yellowish sands and gravels of Pleistocene age, which here and there reach the surface in the Delta as islands of sandy waste among the rich cultivation of the surrounding country" (Baedeker, Egypt, p. xlix). Gold-bearing quartz and iron ore are plentiful in the eruptive range of the eastern desert both in Nubia and in Egypt, and gold mines were exploited there by the pharaohs. No workings of iron ore have been found (Breasted, "History of the Ancient Egyptians", 122, 142, 154, 155).

Flora and Agriculture.—Since the remotest antiquity Egypt has been famous for its fertility. The black soil, really a gift of the Nile, annually enriched by a fresh layer of silt, requires but little care in tilling and ploughing. Hence the primitive character of the agricultural implements—the plough, in particular, which is precisely the same now as it was 5000 years ago, a pole to which is fastened a piece of wood bent inward at an acute angle and shod, at least in later periods, with a three-pronged piece of iron. There is no trace of large forests similar to our own having ever covered the valley proper of the Nile in quaternary times, much less the Libyan and Arabian ranges, but the Delta still has, and may have had in the past, large groves of palm trees. So far as we can judge from the paintings of the early tombs, the whole cultivable land was laid out in fields, orchards, or gardens. The fields gave rich crops of wheat, barley, millet (*Sorghum vulgare*), flax, lentils, peas, and beans. The orchards were stocked with trees which, as a rule, were planted as much for the shade they afforded as for their refreshing fruit. There were palms of two species: the ordinary date-palm and the dûm-palm, the latter growing in Upper Egypt only. Oranges and lemons were peculiar to Lower Egypt, while sycamores, tamarisks, acacias of various kinds, the vine, the pomegranate, and the olive were common; oleanders, roses, carnations, and geraniums were, as they still are, the principal decorative plants. In the kitchen gardens grew cabbages, cucumbers, melons, leeks, onions, and garlic, which the Israelites seem to have regretted no less than the excellent fish (Num., xi, 5) and the fat fleshpots (Ex., xvi, 3) of the land of bondage Reeds of various kinds grew abundantly in the marshes in Lower Egypt especially; the most important reed was the papyrus; its stalks served to make boats (Is., xviii, 2), ropes, sandals, clothes, and baskets. It was in such a basket that Moses was put by his mother and exposed in the flags by the river brink (Ex., ii, 3). But it was especially as a writing material that the papyrus became famous. Its large, fibrous stalks, being first stripped of their rind, were sliced lengthwise. Two layers of such slices were disposed at right angles on one another and fastened with a sort of glue under some pressure, and the sheet of paper was ready for use as soon as it dried. When written upon, the sheet was rolled up with the writing inside, and the title of contents was then added on the back end of it. In ancient Egypt the tuft of papyrus was the coat of arms or symbol of the Northern Kingdom. This reed, so common in Egypt up to the first centuries of our era, has now completely disappeared from that country, very likely on account of the high tax which the Roman emperors imposed on its cultivation. It exists still, however, on the upper course of the Nile, and, according to Bruce, the Abyssinians still make boats of its stalks. Among the many other aquatic plants must be mentioned the lotus, a water-lily, of which two species, the *Castalia scutifolia* (*Nymphæa cærulea*), with blue flowers, and the *Castalia mystica* (*Nymphæa lotus*), with white blossoms, are often found figured on Egyptian monuments, particularly on columns. The flower of the lotus was the emblem of Upper Egypt, as the tuft of papyrus was of Lower Egypt.

The inundation of the Nile is of the utmost importance to Egypt; it is no exaggeration to say that but for its annual recurrence the rich valley would soon become a desert similar to those of Libya and Arabia. The overflow is due principally to the torrents of rain that fall almost uninterruptedly in Abyssinia during the four months of summer and swell the Blue Nile (Astapus), which discharges into the Nile proper, or White Nile, at Khartûm. The rise of the Nile begins in Egypt a few days before the summer solstice, that is between the 10th and 20th of June; but the inundation does not begin until fully two months later. It reaches its maximum height about the autumnal equinox when it begins gradually to subside until the vernal equinox, so that the whole process of inundation lasts about nine months. The maximum height of the water varies in different places, decreasing as the area covered by the inundation increases. The mean differ-

ence between the highest and lowest stages of the river is 21 feet at Khartûm, 20 feet at Wâdi Halfa, 23 feet at Assuân, 22 feet at Assiût, and 22 feet at Minieh. Below the last-named point controlling works now prevent the normal rise of the river. (Baedeker, Egypt, p. xlvi.) At Cairo to-day the average rise is 16 feet. Some twenty-five years ago it used to be 25 feet at Cairo, 24 feet at Rosetta. When stated generally the height of the inundation must be understood as the height of the nilometre on the island of Rôdah, near Cairo (close by the ancient Babylon). Formerly a rise of 18 to 20 feet was poor, 20 to 24 insufficient, 24 to 27 good, 27 and above too much. For seven years, A. H. 457–464 (A. D. 1065–1072) the inundation failed altogether. The long duration of the overflow is due to the fact that it is controlled by artificial means without which it would undoubtedly prove as detrimental as it is beneficial. The only part left to nature is the process of infiltration which is due to the pressure of the water on the banks and is favoured by the porous nature of the soil, also by the fact that the subsoil, like the surface of the valley, gently slopes down to the mountains. It is only when this natural process is completed that the river is ready to overflow its banks, and then begins man's work. The sluices of the canals are opened, and the waters are led first to the higher level lands nearer the banks, then to the lower lands, for in its general configuration the soil to be submerged, as the subsoil, is convex—not concave, as in the case of ordinary rivers. This is brought about by building earthen dykes across the canals and the fields; the dykes are removed when the preceding tract has been sufficiently irrigated. The reverse is done when the river begins to fall, and the waters are kept in the remotest parts of the valley as high as possible above the level of the river, and they are let out slowly, so as to secure irrigation for the low-water months, March to June. This process, however, is not always possible, either because the inundation is insufficient or because the canals and sluices are not kept in good condition. The fellaheen (tillers of the soil) then have to raise the water from the river, the canals, or the numerous wells fed by natural infiltration, so as to water their fields.

Two machines chiefly are used for this purpose: the *sâkyeh* and the *shâdûf*. The sâkyeh consists of two cog-wheels working at right angles to one another. The perpendicular wheel carries an endless chain to which are attached leathern, wooden, or clay buckets. As the wheel turns the buckets are dipped in the water and filled, when they are lifted and emptied into a channel which carries the water to the fields. These machines are worked by asses or buffaloes in Egypt and by camels in Nubia. The shâdûf is a roughly made pair of gigantic scales in which the trays are replaced by a bucket at one end and a stone on the other, the stone being a little more than the weight of the bucket when filled. A man stands on the bank and, pulling on the rope to which the bucket is attached, submerges the latter, then letting go, the weight of the stone lifts the bucket out, when it can be emptied into the proper channel. In the Lower Delta, where the level of the water in the canals remains nearly the same, they use a wooden wheel called *tâbût*, which raises the water by means of numerous compartments in the hollow felloes. Such methods, however, while absorbing all the energies of the population for most of the year, are far from exhausting the irrigation power supplied by the Nile during inundation, nine-twelfths of the annual outpour being contributed during the three months of maximum rise. It allows one crop only for the irrigated lands, and leaves many districts desert-like for lack of water. The pharaohs of the twelfth dynasty, it seems, tried partly to obviate these defects by using the natural lake of the Fayûm as a reservoir where the surplus of the inundation waters were stored during their highest rise, which allowed them to double the volume of the river below the Fayûm during the three months of low Nile. The immense waterworks necessitated by this undertaking, at the point where the lake was most commonly visited by foreigners, gave the impression that the lake itself was an artificial excavation, as reported by classic geographers and travellers.

This great enterprise was not resumed until the close of the last century, when a series of gigantic dams at different points on the Nile was planned by the Egyptian Government; these, in part at least, have been completed. The Barrage du Nil (about twelve miles below Cairo) was completed in 1890. It extends across the Rosetta and Damietta branches and two of the principal canals of the Delta, thus ensuring constant navigation on the Rosetta branch and perennial irrigation through most of the Delta. The dam of Assiût, constructed 1898–1902, regulates the amount of water in the Ibrâhîmîeh Canal and thus ensures the irrigation of the provinces of Assiût, Minieh, Beni-Suef (10 miles east of Heracleopolis Magna), and, through Bahr-Yûsef, of the Fayûm. Finally the dam of Assuân, also completed in 1902, below the island of Philæ, maintains such a supply of water in the canals of Lower and Middle Egypt that upwards of 500,000 acres have been added to the area of cultivable land in the summer. This dam, the largest structure of the kind in the world, rises 130 feet above the foundation, and dams up the water of the Nile to a height of 83 feet, thus forming a lake of 234,000,000,000 gallons. Its length is 2150 yards; its width 98 feet at the bottom, and 23 feet at the top. The Egyptian Government has lately decided to raise it 23 feet, which will more than double the huge reservoir's capacity and will afford irrigation for about 930,000 acres of land now lying waste in Upper Egypt (Baedeker, Egypt, p. 365). In addition to these gigantic waterworks, the number and capacity of the canals have been considerably increased, thus allowing the inundation waters to reach farther on the outskirts of the desert; to this, probably, is due the fact that the average level of high waters is lower than it used to be—25 feet at Assuân instead of 40, although for the region below Minieh this change is also to be explained by the manipulation of the controlling waterworks (Baedeker, Egypt, p. xlvi).

RECLUS, *Nouvelle géographie universelle* (Paris, 1885), X; tr. of same, *The Earth and Its Inhabitants;* BAEDEKER, *Egypt and Sudan* (Leipzig, 1908); CLOT-BEY, *Aperçu général sur l'Egypte* (2 vols., Paris, 1840); BRUCE, *Travels to Discover the Source of the Nile in the Years 1768–1773* (7 vols., London and Edinburgh, 1813); BURCKHARDT, *Travels in Nubia* (London, 1819); CAILLIAUD, *Voyage à Méroé . . . . 1819–1822* (Paris, 1826–1828); DROVETTI, *Voyage à l'Oasis de Dakel* (Paris, 1821); CHAMPOLLION, *Lettres écrites d'Egypte et de Nubie* (Paris, 1833); RUSSEGGER, *Reisen in Europa, Asien und Afrika, 1835 bis 1841* (Stuttgart, 1841), II; LEPSIUS, *Discoveries in Egypt, Ethiopia and the Peninsula of Sinai in the Years 1842–1845* (London, 1852; 2d ed., 1853); ID., tr. HORNER, *Letters from Egypt, Ethiopia and Sinai* (London, 1853); BRUGSCH, *Die Geographie des alten Aegypten* (Leipzig, 1857); BROWN, *The Fayum and Lake Moeris* (London, 1892); LYONS, *The Physiography of the River Nile and its Basin* (London, 1906); EBERS, *Egypt, Descriptive, Historical, Picturesque* (London, 1881).

II. ANCIENT EGYPTIAN HISTORY.—*Chronology.*—The ancient Egyptians practically had only one kind of year: a vague year consisting of 12 months, each of 30 days, and 5 supplementary days which were intercalated between the 30th day of the last month of the year just elapsed and the first day of the first month of the following year. Technically, those five days did not belong to the year; the Egyptians always said the "year and the five days to be found thereon". The five extra year days were sacred to Osiris, Horus, Set, Isis, and Nephthys. They were days of bad omen. The year was divided into three periods, or seasons, of four months each: the inundation (Egyptian *Echut*, or *Echet*), the sowing-time (*Proyet*), and the harvest

(*Šomu*). In ancient times months had no special names, they were simply designated by ordinal numbers in each season, as "the first month of the inundation" and so on. Each month (as also the decades and hours), however, had as a patron one of the divinities whose feast occurred during that month, and the patrons, it seems, varied according to time and locality. At a rather late period the names of those patrons passed over to the months themselves, hence the names transmitted to us by the classical writers (see table below). Each month was divided into three decades (the Egyptians do not seem to have ever used, or even known, the week of seven days); each day into 24 hours, 12 hours of actual day time and 12 hours of actual night time. The hours of day and night, consequently, were not always of the same length. The sixth hour of night corresponded to midnight, and the sixth hour of day to noon. There were further subdivisions of time, but their relation to the hour is unknown. The day most likely began with the first day-time hour; some, however, think it began with the first hour of night.

The year began with the first day of Thoth (Inundation I) which, of course, was supposed to coincide with the first rise of the river. The first of Thoth was also supposed to coincide with the day of the heliacal rising of Sirius, which was called New Year's Day and celebrated as such each year with a great festival. Isis, typified by Sirius, her star, was believed to bring with the inundation a promise of plenty for the new year; this takes us back into the first centuries of the fifth millennium, when the summer solstice, which precedes by a few days only the inundation, actually coincided with the heliacal rising of Sirius. We know, besides, from the classical writers that the latter phenomenon occurred on the 19th or 20th of July (according to the Julian Calendar), which points to Memphis as the home of the Egyptian Calendar. The Egyptians, however, must have perceived in course of time (if they had not foreseen it) that their calendar of 365 days would not, as they evidently believed at first, bring back the seasons every year at their respective natural times. Their year being about one-fourth of a day shorter than the Sirius year, on the fourth anniversary of its adoption, it had retroceded a whole day on the heliacal rising of Sirius; 486 years later, the retrocession was of about 120 days, so that the calendar indicated the opening of the inundation time when in fact the harvest was only beginning; and so on until, after 1461 revolutions of the civil year and 1460 only of Sirius, the first of Thoth fell again on the same day as the heliacal rising of that star. This period of 1460 Sirius years (1461 Egyptian years) received later the name of *Sothic period* from Σῶθις, a Greek form of Sopdet, the Egyptian name of Sirius. Long before the end of the first Sothic period it was found necessary to consider the first of Thoth as a New Year's Day also, the civil New Year's Day. As early as the Fourth Dynasty we find the two New Year's Days recorded side by side in the tombs.

To the common people, who, as usual, were guided by the appearances, the calendar was steady while Sirius and the natural seasons were moving around it. Consequently Sirius's New Year's Day—which seems to be all they knew or ever cared to know of the Sirius year—was a movable feast, the date of which was to be announced every year. The fact that they estimated its precession on the calendar at six hours exactly, which was not correct except in 3231 B. C. (see E. Meyer, "Aegyptische Chronologie", p. 14), tends to show that the date was not obtained from astronomical observation, but in a mechanical way on the supposition that every four years it would fall one day later, this rule having been ascertained astronomically once for all, and considered as correct (E. Meyer, op. cit., p. 19).

The cycle of the Sothic periods has been established in different ways by various scholars, with slight variations in the years of beginning of the several periods (see Ginzel, "Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie", 187 sqq.). According to E. Meyer (op. cit., 28), a new period began:—

19 July, A. D. 140–141
19 July, 1321–20 B. C.
19 July, 2781–80 B. C.
19 July, 4241–40 B. C.

These dates have been adopted by Breasted in his chronology (Ancient Records of Egypt, I, sec. 44), which we shall follow in the chronological arrangement of the Egyptian dynasties (see below).

We have no evidence of the Egyptians having ever become aware of the difference between the Sirius year and the solar year, which accounts for the shifting of the summer solstice and, consequently, of the beginning of the inundation from 25 July, in 4236 B. C., to 21 June, in 139 A. D. (see Ginzel, op. cit., 190). This divergence, however, was too slow, and amounted to so little, even in the course of several centuries, that the Egyptian astronomers might well have overlooked, or at least ignored, it with regard to the calendar. It is still more remarkable that, after noting the retrocession of their vague year, they should not have tried to even it up with the Sirius year. But the astronomers were also priests and, as such, custodians of the religious side of the calendar, which in their eyes could not have been the less important. The simple insertion of an intercalary day would have been sufficient when the two years agreed, but that happened rarely; and the need of a reform was not felt by the contemporary generation. When that need was most acute, as in the middle of a Sothic period, the intercalation was not enough; the reform, to be satisfactory, would have demanded the bringing back of the seasons to their right times (at least in the measure allowed by the shifting of the summer solstice), which could not be done without passing over several months and days (cf. the Gregorian Reform), and consequently almost as many feasts or popular festivals. Indeed, in Ptolemaic times, when, prompted by pressing politico-religious reasons, the priests finally undertook a reform, they were satisfied with the insertion of a sixth epagomene day every four years. This fixed year, known as the Canopic or Tanitic year, began on 22 October, 238 B. C. (Julian), the first day of Thoth happening then to coincide with that date. It met with but scant favour and was abandoned under Ptolemy IV (Philopator) in honour of whose predecessor, Ptolemy III, the decree had been issued. A second attempt on the same limited scale, and probably in the same spirit of flattery, was made in the early years of Augustus, in connexion with the establishment of the era of Alexandria. The Egyptian year was then brought into harmony with the fixed Julian year, inasmuch as it received every four years an intercalary day. That day was inserted after the 5th epagomene, preceding the Julian intercalary year. The first of Thoth, however, remained where it was when the reform overtook it, viz., on 29 August, except after an intercalary year, when it fell on 30 August. The first year with an intercalary day, it seems, was 23 B. C. (see Ginzel, op. cit., I, 224–28). This fixed year, which is still in use in the Coptic Church, was first adopted by the Greek and Roman portions of the population, while the Egyptians proper for several centuries clung still to the old vague year.

As we have seen in the beginning of this section, the whole arrangement of the Egyptian year and its relation to the astronomical and climatic phenomena of chief importance to the ancient Egyptians indicate that it must have been established at a time when one of the heliacal risings of Sirius coincided with the beginning of the inundation, which takes place shortly (according to the Coptic Calendar three days) after the summer solstice. This points clearly to the begin-

ning of that Sothic period the first year of which fell on 19 July, 4241 B. C., when the summer solstice was on 25 July, and the inundation on 28 July. At the beginning of the preceding period, 19 July, 2781 B. C., the summer solstice had already retroceded to 13 July, so that the inundation (16 July) preceded the heliacal rising of Sirius, while at the beginning of the following period, 19 July, 5701 B. C., the summer solstice was due only on 6 August, and the inundation on 9 August, or 21 days after the heliacal rising of Sirius (cf. Ginzel, op. cit., 190; E. Meyer, op. cit., 14 sqq.). The date 2781, as a possible date of the inauguration of the Egyptian calendar, is also excluded by the fact that the intercalary days (proving the use of the shifting year of 360 plus 5 days) are mentioned in the so-called Pyramid Texts, which are far older than the Fifth and Sixth Dynasties, although they occur for the first time on the monuments of these dynasties (E. Meyer, op. cit., 40; Breasted, "Ancient Records of Egypt", I, 30). The date of the heliacal rising of Sirius varies according to the latitude from which it is observed. The fact that most of the classical writers and the Egyptian documents fix that date at 19 July shows that the Egyptians observed it from the 30th degree of N. latitude, which points to one of the ancient cities of the Southern Delta as the home of the Egyptian year, probably Memphis or Heliopolis (E. Meyer, op. cit., 41; Ginzel, op. cit., I, 186; Breasted, op. cit., I, sec. 45).

The following table exhibits the seasons and the 12 months of the Egyptian year with their Greek names (still in use with slight changes of orthography in the Coptic Calendar) and their respective dates of beginning according to the Julian Calendar, when I Thoth fell on the day of the heliacal rising of Sirius, i. e. at the opening of Sothic periods:—

Inundation	I	Thoth	19 July
	II	Phaôphi	18 August
	III	Athyr	17 September
	IV	Choiac	17 October
Sowing	I	Tybi	16 November
	II	Mechir	16 December
	III	Phamenoth	15 January
	IV	Pharmouthi	14 February
Harvest	I	Pachon	16 March
	II	Payni	15 April
	III	Epiphi	15 May
	IV	Mesôri	14 June
The Five Epagomene days			14 July

The following table shows the correspondence of the present Egyptian (and Coptic) calendar, as reformed under Augustus, with our own calendar, both before and after intercalation:—

Thoth I	29 Aug.	After	Intercalation	30 Aug.
Phaôphi	28 Sept.	"	"	29 Sept.
Athyr	28 Oct.	"	"	29 Oct.
Choiac	27 Nov.	"	"	28 Nov.
Tybi	27 Dec.	"	"	28 Dec.
Mechir	26 Jan.	"	"	27 Jan.
Phamenoth	25 Feb.	"	"	26 Feb.
Pharmouthi	27 Mar.	"	"	28 Mar.
Pachon	26 Apr.	"	"	27 Apr.
Payni	26 May	"	"	27 May
Epiphi	25 June	"	"	26 June
Mesôri	25 July	"	"	26 July
Epagomene day	24 Aug.	"	"	25 Aug.

Although the Egyptians kept track of the Sirius year, in so far as its beginning was the official New Year's day, they do not seem to have made use of it for chronological purposes. The same must be said of other methods of reckoning the year which may have been in use among some classes of the population, as, for instance, the natural year based on the recurrence of the natural seasons. It is not uncommonly taken for granted or advanced that the Egyptian vague year of 365 days was preceded by a round year of 360 days, and that the former was obtained by adding 5 days to the latter. Arguments in favour of that view are few and not convincing. A year of 360 days neither lunar nor solar is hardly imaginable (cf. Ginzel, op. cit., 69; E. Meyer, op. cit., 10). It is more likely that, even before the arrangement of 360 plus 5 days, the Egyptian year (originally a lunar year) had become luni-solar, and increased to 365 days, either as a fixed number for every year by means of intercalary days distributed over the whole year (as in the Julian year), or as an average number in a series of years by process of embolism (as for instance in the Hebrew year). Finally it was decided to adopt the far simpler and more rational arrangement of 12 even months followed by 5 intercalary days; the distribution of the days was changed, not their number. This recast of the calendar found expression at a very early period, if not at the time when it took place, in the following fable preserved by Plutarch (De Iside et Osiride, xii), but undoubtedly very ancient, as we may judge from the fact that the divinities mentioned in it belonged to the earliest stages of the Egyptian Pantheon. Rhea (Egyptian *Nût*) having had secret intercourse with Kronos (*Geb*), Hêlios (*Re*) cast a spell upon her to prevent her from bringing forth during any month of any year. But Hermes (*Thoth*), who loved her, played dice with the Moon and won from her the 73d part (not 60th as Maspéro, "Histoire ancienne", p. 87; nor 70th as E. Meyer, op. cit., p. 9; nor 72d, as Ginzel, op. cit., p. 171) of her courses (literally lights, *φώτων*), which he added to the (remaining) 360 days. During these five days Nût brought forth her children (Osiris, Horus, Set, Isis, and Nephthys).

The ancient Egyptians never had eras in the usual sense of this word, i. e. epochs from which all successive years are counted regardless of political or other changes in the life of the nation. Instead of eras, during the first five dynasties, they used to name each civil year from some great political or religious event (a usage which had its parallel in Babylonia), as "the Year of the Smiting of the Troglodytes", "the Year of the Conquest of Nubia", "the Year of the Defeat of Lower Egypt", "the Year of the Worship of Horus"; or from some fiscal process recurring periodically, as "the Year of [or after] the Second Occurrence of the Census of all Cattle, Gold", etc. which was often abbreviated to "the Year of the Second Occurrence of the Census", or, still more briefly, "the Year of the Second Occurrence". The census having become annual, each year of any given reign came to be identified as the year of the first (or whatever might be the proper ordinal) census of that reign, a new series thus beginning with each reign. From the Eleventh Dynasty on, the years were always numbered from the first of the current reign, and the second year of the reign was supposed to begin with the first day of Thoth next following the date of the king's accession, no matter how recent that date might be. The absence of eras in ancient Egypt is all the more remarkable as there were several periods which could easily have been utilized for that purpose, the Sothic period especially. (On other periods—Phœnix, Apis, etc.—mentioned by the classical writers, but not yet found on Egyptian monuments, as also on the so-called Great and Small Years and the supposed Nubti Era, see Ginzel, op. cit., I, sec. 38 and 45.)

In later times several eras were created or adopted in Egypt, the principal of which was the Era of Alexandria. Its epoch, or starting-point, has been conventionally fixed at 30 (or 31) August of the first year of Augustus (Julian, 30 B. C.), although, as we have seen, it did not acquire its intercalary character until 26, or even 23, B. C., so that its first years were ordinary Egyptian vague years (for further details see Ginzel, op. cit., I, pp. 224–28). The Philippic, or Macedonian, Era (more generally known as the Era of Alexander) was introduced into Egypt in the third century B. C.,

after the death of Alexander the Great (323 B. C.). Up to Ptolemy Philadelphus (285–47 B. C.), Egyptian monuments were dated according to the old Egyptian system, but after that time the Macedonian dates are generally found together with the Egyptian. Macedonian dating was gradually superseded by the use of the fixed eras, yet it is found, sporadically at least, as late as the second century after Christ (Ginzel, op. cit., I, p. 232). The Philippic Era begins on I Thoth, 425 (12 Nov., 324 B. C., Julian style) of the Era of Nabonassar; like the latter it is based on a vague year on the same pattern, months' names included, as the old Egyptian year. The Era of Nabonassar begins at noon, 26 February, 747 B. C. (Julian style). It is the basis of the famous Canon of Ptolemy. It was used in Egypt especially for astronomical purposes, and it met with great favour with the chronographers on account of the certainty of its starting-point and its well established accuracy. The reduction of Nabonassar's years into the corresponding usual Christian reckoning is rather complicated and requires the use of special tables (see Ginzel, op. cit., I, p. 143 sqq.).

Only a very small portion of the colossal mass of inscriptions, papyri, etc. so far discovered in Egypt has any bearing on, or can be of any assistance in, chronological questions. The astronomical knowledge of the ancient Egyptians does not seem to have gone very far, and, as every one knows, accurate astronomical observations rightly recorded in connexion with historical events are the basis of any true chronology of ancient times. It is remarkable that the Egyptian Claudius Ptolemy (second century after Christ) took from the Babylonians and the Greeks all the observations of eclipses he ever used and started his canon (see above) with Babylonian, not with Egyptian, kings. Evidently he held no records of sun observations made in Egypt. Yet, for religious reasons, the Egyptians noted the occurrences of the heliacal risings of Sirius on the various dates of their movable calendar. A few have reached us, and have been of no small assistance in astronomically determining, within four years at least, some of the most important epochs of Egyptian history. The Egyptians also recorded the coincidence of new moons with the days of their calendar. Such data in themselves have no chronological value, as the phases of the moon return to the same positions on the calendar every nineteen years; taken, however, in conjunction with other data, they can help us to determine more precisely the chronology of some events (Breasted, op. cit., I, sec. 46). Moreover, ancient Egypt has bequeathed to us a number of monuments of a more or less chronological character: (1) The calendars of religious feasts [Calendars of Dendera (Tentyris), Edfu, Esneh, all three of which belong to the late period, Calendar of Papyrus Sallier IV] are especially interesting because they illustrate the nature of the Egyptian year (see Ginzel, op. cit., p. 200 sqq.). (2) The lists of selected royal names comprise: the so-called Tables of Sakkâra, Nineteenth Dynasty, forty-seven names beginning with the sixth of the First Dynasty; Karnak (part of Thebæ), Eighteenth Dynasty, sixty-one names, unfortunately not chronologically arranged; Abydos, Nineteenth Dynasty, seventy-six names beginning with Menes. (3) Two chronological compilations known as the Turin Papyrus, Nineteenth Dynasty, and the Palermo Stone, Fifth Dynasty, from the places where they are now preserved. Unfortunately, the first of these last two monuments is broken into many fragments and otherwise mutilated, while the second is but a fragment of a much larger stone. These two documents (cf. E Meyer, op. cit., pp 105–205, and Breasted, op. cit., I, pp. 51 sqq.) are, though fragmentary, of the greatest importance, in particular for the early dynasties and the predynastic times. The Turin Papyrus contains, besides the names of the kings chronologically arranged in groups or dynasties, the durations both of the individual reigns and of the various dynasties or groups of dynasties, in years, months, and days. On the Palermo Stone each year of a reign is entered separately and is often accompanied with short historical notices.—All these documents combined furnish the chronological frame for the vast amount of historical matter contained in thousands of mural inscriptions and *stelæ* collected and worked out with almost incredible patience by several generations of Egyptologists during the last hundred years.

Of secondary importance are the data furnished by the Greek and Latin writers. Still we must mention here the *Αἰγυπτίακα Ὑπομνήματα* of the Egyptian priest Manetho of Sebennytus, third century B. C. Of this work we have: (a) Some fragments which, preserved by Josephus (Contra Apion., I, xiv, xv, xx), were used by Eusebius in his "Præparatio Evangelica" and the first book of his "Chronicon"; (b) an epitome which has reached us in two recensions: one of these recensions (the better of the two) was used by Julius Africanus, and the other by Eusebius in their respective chronicles; both have been preserved by Georgius Syncellus (eighth-ninth century) in his *Ἐκλογὴ Χρονογραφίας*. We have also a Latin translation by St. Jerome and an Armenian version of the Eusebian recension, while fragments of the recension of Julius Africanus are to be found in the so-called "Excerpta Barbara". Judging from that epitome, the work of Manetho was divided into three parts, the first of which contained the reigns of the gods and demi-gods (omitted in the African recension) and eleven dynasties of human kings; the second, eight dynasties of such kings; the third, twelve (the last one added after Manetho's death). Besides a few short notices, the epitome contains nothing but names and figures showing the duration of each reign and each dynasty. Those figures are summed up at the end of each book. In the shape it has reached us Manetho's work is of comparatively little assistance, on account of its chronology, which seems to be hopelessly mixed up, besides being grossly exaggerated; and it must be used with the greatest caution. (For further details on Manetho and his work see the preface of C. Müller in the Didot edition of the second volume of "Fragmenta Historicorum Græcorum", and E. Meyer, op. cit., pp. 69–99.) In the next place should be mentioned a list of so-called Theban kings handed down by Eratosthenes of Cyrene (third century B. C.) and preserved by Syncellus. It seems to be a translation of some Egyptian royal list similar to the Table of Karnak [see C. Müller in the Didot edition of Herodotus (Fragmenta chronographica, p. 182) and E. Meyer, op. cit., pp. 99–103]. Lastly, Herodotus's *Ἱστορίαι* (fifth century B. C.) and Diodorus Siculus's *Βιβλιοθήκη* (first century B. C.) deserve at least a passing mention. Although their interest lies chiefly in another direction, yet we may glean from them occasional chronological data for the times during which these two writers lived.

We cannot enter here upon even a cursory analysis, much less a discussion, of the various systems of Egyptian chronology. The older systems of Champollion, Lepsius, Lesueur, Brugsch, Mariette were, to a considerable extent, based on theories which have since been proved false, or on an imperfect study and an erroneous interpretation of the chronological material. These scholars, however, paved the way for the present generation of Egyptologists, of the German school especially, who have at last succeeded in placing the chronology of ancient Egypt on a firm basis. The following chronological table up to the Twenty-sixth Dynasty is condensed from the excellent work of Professor J. H. Breasted, "Ancient Records of Egypt", I, pp. 40–47. The other dynasties up to the Thirtieth are taken from Professor G. Steindorff's "Outline of the History of Egypt" in Baedeker's

"Egypt" (6th ed., 1908), with the exception of the year 408, the last of the Twenty-seventh Dynasty and first of the Twenty-eighth, which we copy from Maspéro, "Guide to the Cairo Museum" (Cairo, 1903), p. 3:—

4241* B. C.	Introduction of Calendar
3400 B. C.	Accession of Menes and beginning of dynasties
3400–2980 B. C.	First and Second Dynasties
2980–2900 B. C.	Third Dynasty
2900–2750 B. C.	Fourth Dynasty
†2750–2625 B. C.	Fifth Dynasty
†2625–2475 B. C.	Sixth Dynasty
2475–2445 B. C.	Seventh and Eighth Dynasties
2445–2160 B. C.	Ninth and Tenth Dynasties
2160–2000 B. C.	Eleventh Dynasty
2000*–1788* B. C.	Twelfth Dynasty
‡1788*–1580 B. C.	Thirteenth to Seventeenth Dynasties (including Hyksos times)
†1580–1350 B. C.	Eighteenth Dynasty
†1350–1205 B. C.	Nineteenth Dynasty
†1205–1200 B. C.	Interim
†1200–1090 B. C.	Twentieth Dynasty
†1090–945 B. C.	Twenty-first Dynasty
†945–745 B. C.	Twenty-second Dynasty
†745–718 B. C.	Twenty-third Dynasty
†718–712 B. C.	Twenty-fourth Dynasty
†712–663 B. C.	Twenty-fifth Dynasty
663–525 B. C.	Twenty-sixth Dynasty
525–408 B. C.	Twenty-seventh Dynasty
408–398 B. C.	Twenty-eighth Dynasty
398–378 B. C.	Twenty-ninth Dynasty
378–341 B. C.	Thirtieth Dynasty

Dates marked with an asterisk in the above table are astronomically computed and correct within three years, while the date 525 is attested by the Canon of Ptolemy. Several dates besides, within the period of the Eighteenth Dynasty and the initial date of Shebataka, second king of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty, are also astronomically determined. The dagger sign (†) indicates that the numerical difference between the two following dates is the minimum of duration allowed by the monuments for the corresponding dynasties. The double-dagger (‡) on the contrary, indicates the maximum of duration. This is the case only for the period from the Thirteenth to the Seventeenth Dynasties. What this period may lose some day will be the gain of the nine following dynasties, but the extreme dates, 1788 and 663, will not be affected. The duration of 285 years for the Ninth and Tenth Dynasties, indicated by the two extreme dates 2445–2160, is an estimate, in round numbers, based on an average of 16 years for each of their 18 kings. The uncertainty which attaches to that period affects the dates of all the preceding dynasties, which, consequently, may some day have to be shifted as much as a century either way.

GINZEL, *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie:* I, *Zeitrechnung der Babylonier, Aegypter, Mohammedaner, Perser, etc.* (Leipzig, 1906)—pp. 234 sqq. contains a complete bibliography of Egyptian chronology—LEHMANN, *Zwei Hauptprobleme der altorientalischen Chronologie* (Berlin, 1898); MEYER, *Aegyptische Chronologie* (publication of the Berl. Akad., 1904); NIEBUHR, *Die Chronologie der Geschichte Israels, Aegyptens, Babyloniens und Assyriens* (Leipzig, 1896); also chapters in works cited in bibliography at end of next section, especially in BREASTED, *Ancient Records*, and PETRIE, *Illustrated History of Egypt*, I.

Ethnology.—Scholars are at variance as to the origin of the Egyptians. Some, chiefly philologists, suppose that the Egyptians of historical times had come from Western Asia either directly, through the Isthmus of Suez, or, as most will have it, through the Straits of Bab-el-Mandeb and Ethiopia. Others, principally naturalists, think they came from, or at least through, Libya, while others still place the original home of the Egyptians in Central Africa. The first hypothesis is now the most commonly received. Several considerations tend to make it plausible: the fact, for instance, that wheat and barley, which have been found in the most ancient tombs dating from before the First Dynasty, are originally indigenous to Asia, as well as linen, wine, and the produce of other cultivated plants which are represented among the funeral offerings in the tombs of the earliest dynasties. And the same can be said of the two sacred trees of the Egyptian pantheon, the sycamore and the *persea*. Finally, the fact that the ancestor of the domesticated Egyptian ass had its home in the wildernesses south of Egypt would show that the Asiatic invaders or settlers came through Ethiopia. This theory tallies with the Biblical narrative, Gen., x, 6, which makes the ancestor of the Egyptians, under the ethnic name of Misraim, the brother of Cûsh the Ethiopian, of Phût (e. g. *Puanit*, the *Pœni* of the Latins), and Canaan, all three of whom certainly had their original homes in Asia. What seems more certain is that the Egyptians of historical times belong to the same stock as the Libyans and other races, some of which were absorbed, while others were totally or partly driven away by them. Five at least of these are given in the Bible (Gen., x, 13, 14) under ethnic names as sons of Misraim, i. e. Ludim (according to Maspéro, "Histoire Ancienne des peuples de l'Orient", Paris, 1908, p. 16, the *Rotu* or *Romitu* of the hieroglyphics, i. e. the Egyptians proper), Laabim (the Libyans), Naphtûchim (the inhabitants of No-Phtah, or Memphis), Patrûsim (the inhabitants of the To-rêsi, i. e. Upper Egypt), Anamim (the Anûs, who, in prehistoric times, founded On of the North, or Heliopolis, and On of the South, or Hermonthis).

Predynastic History.—At all events, in the predynastic times, when the light of history begins to dawn on Egypt, various races which at different periods had settled in Egypt, had been blended under the moulding influence of the climate of their new home, and turned into a new race, well characterized and easily distinguishable from any other race, Asiatic, European, or African—the Egyptian race. Naturally, a difference of occupation created a certain variety of types within that race. While the tiller of the soil was short and thick-set, the men of the higher classes and the women generally were rather tall and slender, but all were broad-shouldered, erect, spare, flat-footed. The head is rather large, the forehead square and rather low, the nose short and fleshy, the lips thick, but not turned up, the mouth rather large, with an undefinable expression of instinctive sadness. This type perpetuated itself through thirty or forty centuries of revolutions, invasions, or pacific immigrations and survives to this day in the peasant class, the fellaheen, who form the bulk of the population and the sinews of the national strength. All agree that, even before the Egyptian race had attained that remarkable degree of ethnological permanence, Egypt, from a merely pastoral region, had become an agricultural country, as a result of the immigration (or invasion) of Asiatic tribes, for, before the dawn of historical times, they had learned to grow wheat and barley, using the plough in their cultivation. Next came the political organization of the country. It was subdivided into a number of small independent States, which became the *nomes* of pharaonic times, each with its own laws and religion. In course of time some of these States were merged in one another until they formed two large principalities, the Northern Kingdom (*To-Mehi*) and the Southern Kingdom (*To-Rêsi*), an arrangement which must have lasted some time, for when the final degree of centralization was

reached, and the two countries united under one rule, the king took the title of "Lord of Both Lands", or "King of Upper and Lower Egypt" (never "King of Kimit", i. e. of Egypt), and often wore a double crown consisting of the white crown of the South and the red crown of the North; the arms of the United Kingdom were formed by the union of the lotus and the papyrus, the emblems of the two countries.

The capital of the Northern Kingdom was Bûto, under the protection of the serpent goddess of the same name (now Tell-el-Ferâ'in, 20 miles south-west from Rosetta). Nekheb (the modern el-Kâb, a few miles north of Edfu) was the capital of the Southern Kingdom; the vulture-goddess, Nekhabet, was its protecting deity. But at both capitals the hawk-god, Horus, was worshipped as the distinctive patron-deity of both kings. That ancient population of Egypt, referred to in later texts as the "Horus-worshippers", have recently emerged from the mythical obscurity to which their kings had been relegated before the days of Manetho, who knows them as the νέκυες, "the shades", i. e. the deified ancestors. The Palermo Stone has revealed to us the names of six or seven rulers of the Northern Kingdom; and in Upper Egypt, thousands of sepulchres (none of the kings, unfortunately) have recently been excavated. The bodies, unembalmed, lie sidewise, in what is called the "embryonic" posture, surrounded by pottery or stone jars, where remains of food, drink, and ointment can still be discerned, with toilet utensils, flint weapons, and clay models of various objects which the deceased might need in the life hereafter—boats especially, to cross the waters that surround the Elysian Fields. From those early times date, as to the essentials of concept and expression, the Pyramid Texts alluded to in a former section of this article. We have seen, under *Chronology*, that the institution of the calendar dates from predynastic times (4241 B. C.), and that its original home was in the Northern Kingdom, probably at Memphis or at On (Heliopolis). The computations necessary for that calendar show clearly that we must trace to predynastic times the hieroglyphic system of writing which we find fully developed in the royal tombs of the first two dynasties (Breasted, "Ancient History of the Egyptians", pp. 35–39).

Dynastic History.—Since Manetho of Sebennytus (see above) it has been customary to arrange the long series of kings who ruled over ancient Egypt, from the beginning of history until the conquest of Alexander the Great, in thirty dynasties, each of which corresponds, or as a rule, seems to correspond, to a break in the succession of legitimate rulers, resulting from internal dissensions or military reverses, the latter almost invariably leading to an invasion and, eventually, the establishment of a foreign dynasty. Manetho's claim, that his history was compiled from lists of royal ancestry and original documents, is fairly borne out by the monuments—the so-called Tables (royal lists) of Sakkarah, Abydos, Karnak, and especially the famous, but much mutilated, Turin Papyrus and Palermo Stone, as well as annals of individual kings recorded on the walls of temples, tombs, etc.

These thirty dynasties are very unevenly known to us; of a good many we know next to nothing. This is in particular the case for the Seventh and Eighth dynasties (Memphites), the Ninth and Tenth (Heracleopolites), the Eleventh (Theban—contemporary with the Tenth), the Thirteenth (Theban) and the Fourteenth (Xoite—in part simultaneous), the Fifteenth, and Sixteenth (Hyksos), and the Seventeenth Dynasty (Theban—partly contemporary with the Sixteenth). Other dynasties are known to us by their monuments, especially their tombs, which are often extremely rich in information as to the institutions, arts, manners, and customs of Egypt during the lifetime of their occupants, but almost totally devoid of historical evidence proper. Such is the case, for instance, for the first five dynasties, of which all we can say is that they must have ruled successively over the whole land of Egypt and that their kings must have been conquerors as well as builders. We know little or nothing of the peoples they battled with, nor can we detect the political reasons which brought about the rise and fall of the several dynasties. Evidently, in some cases the lack of information on some periods, which must have been very momentous ones in the political life of ancient Egypt, should be attributed to the disappearance of monuments of an historical character, or to the fact that such monuments have not yet been discovered; it is very likely, however, that in many cases no historical evidence was ever handed down to posterity. In Egypt, as in Assyria and Babylonia, it was not customary for kings to place their defeats on record, nor did the chieftain or the soldier of fortune who after a period of internal dissensions succeeded in establishing himself as the founder of a new dynasty, care to take posterity into his confidence as to his origin and previous political career. Manetho, who, as a rule, does not seem to have been much better informed than we are, resorts in such cases to traditions, strongly tinted with legend, which were in the keeping of the priests and belonged, very likely, to the same stock as most of those related by Herodotus on matters that could not fall under his personal observation. Such traditions, until confirmed by the monuments, or at any rate purified of their legendary elements by comparison with them, must of course be kept in abeyance. For the present the royal names are almost all that we can regard as certain for several of the dynasties. Such is the case for the first two dynasties, which until about A. D. 1888 were considered by most scholars as entirely mythical. Their tombs, however, have since been discovered at Ûmm-el-Ga'âb, near Abydos, in the territory of the ancient This (Thinis), and the names of Menes, Zer, Usaphais, and Miebis have already been found. A good many other kings of Manetho's list cannot be identified with the owners of the tombs discovered, owing to the fact that, while Manetho gives only the proper names of the kings, the monuments contained, as a rule, nothing but their Horus names (Maspéro, "Histoire Ancienne", 56 sq.). Monuments of these kings have been discovered in Upper Egypt and at Sakkarah, which shows that they must have ruled over the whole land of Egypt. The various articles found in these early royal tombs point to a high degree of civilization by no means inferior to that of the immediately following dynasties. Religion in general, and the funerary ritual in particular, were already fixed, and the hieroglyphic system of writing had reached its last stage of alphabetic development (Maspéro, loc. cit.; Breasted, "History of Ancient Egyptians", 40 sqq.).

The history of Egypt can be divided into two large periods, the first of which comprises the first seventeen and the second the other thirteen dynasties. In current literature Dynasties Three to Eleven are often variously referred to as the Old Kingdom (*ancien empire*), Dynasties Twelve to Seventeen as the Middle Kingdom (*moyen empire*), Dynasties Eighteen to Twenty as the Empire (*nouvel empire*). The simpler division which we propose here seems to us more rational.

First Period: First to Seventeenth Dynasty.—During this period Egypt and the Asiatic empires never, so far as we know, came into contact, except possibly in a pacific and commercial way; their armies never met in battle. Some of the ancient Babylonian and Chaldean kings, like Sargon I (third millennium B. C.), may have occasionally extended their raids as far as the Mediterranean Sea, but it does not seem that they ever established their rule in a permanent way. They were fully occupied with the war waged among themselves, or with the Elamites

who for centuries contended with Babylonia and Chaldea for supremacy in Western Asia. On their side the kings of Egypt had to secure their own borders (principally the southern) against the neighbouring tribes, a necessity which led them, after many centuries of warfare, to the conquest of Nubia. As early as the reign of Pepi I (Sixth Dynasty) Nubia had been brought under control so far as to receive Egyptian colonies. Under the kings of the Twelfth Dynasty, chiefly under Usertasen III (the Sesostris of the Greeks), the conquest was achieved, and the valley of the Upper Nile as far as the Second Cataract was organized into an Egyptian province. The Libyans, also, and the tribes settled between the Nile and the Red Sea had to be repeatedly repelled or conquered. The brief records of such punitive expeditions, which appear on the Palermo Stone, attribute them to dates as early as the first two dynasties. Extensive commercial relations were maintained with the Syrian coast (whither King Snefrû, of the Third Dynasty, sent a fleet to procure cedar logs from Mount Lebanon), with the Upper Nile districts, with Arabia to the south, and with the Somali coast (*Punt*, *Pûanit*) to the east. Roads were built for this commerce between Coptos and different points on the Red Sea. The chief of these roads led through Wâdi Hammamat (*Rohanû* or *Rehenu* Valley), the rich quarries of which were operated by the Egyptians from the time of the Fifth Dynasty; it furnished the *niger*, or *Thebaicus*, *lapis*, a hard dark stone which was used for statues and coffins. In Asia proper the pharaohs of that time sought no extension of territory, with the exception of a few points in the Peninsula of Sinai, where, as early as the First Dynasty, but especially since the time of Snefrû, they operated mines of copper and turquoise. As a rule on the north-west border they kept on the defensive against the raids of the nomadic tribes established in the Syrian desert and, like the modern bedouins, always ready for plunder. On that side the frontier was protected by a wall across the Wadi Tumilat and a line of forts extending from the Nile to the Red Sea. Occasionally the Egyptians resorted to counter-raids on the Syrian territory, as in the case of the Amus and Hirushaitus under Pepi I, but, the punishment inflicted, they invariably returned to their line of defence.

Columns of "Pharaoh's Bed", Philæ

The seat of government during that first period was several times shifted from one city to another. Menes, before the union of the two kingdoms, very likely resided at This, in his native nome of Abydos, in Upper Egypt. Having succeeded in bringing Lower Egypt under his rule, he appropriately selected Memphis for the capital of the new kingdom, as being more central. During the Ninth and Tenth Dynasties, Heracleopolis, only a short distance south of Memphis, became the official seat of government, for no special known reason—perhaps simply because the pharaohs of the reigning dynasties had originally been natives and princes of these nomes. They were opposed by the princes of Thebes (Eleventh Dynasty) who finally (Twelfth Dynasty) succeeded in overthrowing them and selected their own city as capital. This radical change had the advantage of bringing Nubia within closer range, and it may have contributed substantially to the conquest of that province; but it weakened the northern border, which was now too far from the centre of political life.

The pharaohs of the Thirteenth Dynasty (most of whom were called Sebek-hotep or Nofir-hotep), without abandoning Thebes, seem to have paid more attention than their predecessors to the cities of the Delta, where—at Tanis in particular—they occasionally resided, and it was from Xois (Sakha), a city of Lower Egypt, that the next following (Fourteenth) dynasty arose. It seems that the kings of that dynasty never succeeded in establishing a firm and lasting government. Their rapid succession on the throne and the famous invasion of the Hyksos which Manetho registers at that time, point to internal dissensions and a condition of affairs verging on anarchy. "At this time there came to us a king Timæos by name. Under this king, God, why I do not know, sent an adverse wind to us, and against all likelihood from the parts of the East people of ignoble race, coming unexpectedly, invaded the country and conquered it easily and without battle." This testimony contains contradictory elements. It is difficult to imagine how an invasion could result in a conquest unless it took place gradually and consequently not "unexpectedly". The most probable interpretation of Manetho's words seems to be: that the invaders came in peaceful quest of new homes, and not all in one body, though in comparatively large numbers at a time; that they first settled, with their flocks, in the rich pasture lands of the Delta, then, little by little, adapted themselves to the political life of the country, some succeeding in occupying important situations in the army or in the administration; that finally one of them, favoured by the rivalries of competitors for the vacant throne, seized the reins of government and was recognized as king not only by the men of his own race, but also by quite a considerable party of the natives.

The identity of the Hyksos has been the subject of long discussions. Some, with De Cara, think they were the same as the Hittites, others (Baedeker, "Egypt", p. lxxix) see in them simple Syrian bedouins. The opinion which seems most probable and best agrees with the tradition preserved by Manetho, identifies them with the large Canaanitic family once settled in Lower Chaldea, along the Persian Gulf and the Arabian coast. According to Professor Maspéro (op. cit., 194 sqq.), it was the invasion of the lower Euphrates by the Elamites under Kudurnakhunte (2285 B. C.) that forced this family to migrate to the West in search of a new home. The seafaring tribes settled along the eastern shore of the Mediterranean

Second Pylon, Philæ

Sea to which they gave their name (Phœnicians, Φοίνικες, *Pœni;* Egyptian *Puanit, Punt;* Bible, *Phut*). Others settled in the mountainous districts of Palestine (Canaan proper), where they resumed their nomadic life, and gradually developed into an agricultural race. Others, finally, shepherds also, probably prevented from taking a northern direction by the powerful and well-organized nation of the Hittites, turned to Egypt, where they settled as explained above. Manetho assigns to them three dynasties, the Fifteenth, Sixteenth, and Seventeenth, of which only the Sixteenth held sway over all Egypt. During the Fifteenth Dynasty the princes of the southern homes, for a time at least, managed to retain a certain independence. They regained it under the Third Hyksos Dynasty, with which they share the honour of being recognized as the Seventeenth Dynasty. The last of them, Amosis, after a war of six years, finally succeeded in driving the intruders out of Egypt, pursuing the remnant of their army as far as Sharhuna (perhaps Sharukhen, Jos., xix, 6) in Southern Syria, where the last battle was fought and won by the Egyptians. From the monuments we know the names of at least four of the Hyksos kings, three of the name of Apophi and one Khian. An alabaster vase bearing the names of the last has been found under a wall of the palace of Cnossos in Crete, and a lion in Bagdad. Their capital seems to have been Avaris on the north-eastern border of the Delta. Some think that their rule extended over Palestine and Southern Syria, which would explain the location of their capital. The usage of carrying on official correspondence with the local princes of Syria and Palestine in the Babylonian language and script possibly dates from the period of the Hyksos. Few of the monuments of the Hyksos have been preserved, enough of them, however, to show us that as a rule the Shepherd kings conformed to the ancient culture of Egypt, adopting its language, art, religion (cf. however, Maspéro, op. cit., 203), and political institutions. But they oppressed their Egyptian subjects, and posterity held their memory in abomination.

It is in the Hyksos period that we must place the arrival of the Israelites in Egypt. The migration of the Terachites from Ur in Chaldea may have coincided with, or at all events was posterior to, that of the great Canaanitic family. Although of different stock, the two families had long been thrown together in their former common home and spoke the same language; and this may partly explain the favour which the children of Israel found at the hands of an Egyptian ruler, himself of Canaanitic, or possibly of Semitic, origin. "The scarabs of a Pharaoh who evidently belonged to the Hyksos time give his name as Jacob-her or possibly Jacob-El, and it is not impossible", remarks Professor Breasted, "that some chief of the Jacob-tribes of Israel for a time gained the leadership in this obscure age" (Hist. of Anc. Egypt, 181).

Second Period: Eighteenth to Thirtieth Dynasty. —The second period is chiefly characterized by the Asiatic victories of the pharaohs with which it opens, and by the repeated invasions of Egyptian territory by Asiatic powers, which was the reaction of those victories. During the first period Egypt could be great at home, within her natural borders along the Nile valley; every page of her history is her own. During the second period her greatness is in proportion to her conquests abroad on another continent; almost every page of her history belongs to the history of the world.

The first ambition of the kings of the Eighteenth Dynasty, inaugurated by Ahmosis (1580–1557 B. C.), was to secure their own borders against the Libyans, who had encroached upon the Delta during the period of confusion preceding the expulsion of the Hyksos, and, against the Nubians, who had availed themselves of the same opportunity to shake off the yoke of Egyptian domination. The first point was achieved by Amenhotep I, the second by Thotmes I, whose two successive reigns lasted from 1557 to 1501 B. C. Not satisfied with recovering and reorganizing the ancient province of Nubia, Thotmes I pushed more than 400 miles farther south to Napata, below the Fourth Cataract, where the southern frontier of Egypt remained fixed for the next eight hundred years or so. Both Amenhotep I and Thotmes I, and perhaps Ahmosis, too, had already undertaken the conquest of Syria. But it was reserved for Thotmes III (1501–1447 B. C.) to complete it and to organize the conquered territory as a permanent dependency of Egypt. Circumstances were favourable. Both Assyria and Babylonia were in decline, and the powerful Hittites were restricted within their own borders beyond the Cilician Gates in Asia Minor. Nevertheless, the great confederation of the Canaanitic cities (perhaps to be identified with the Hyksos), backed by the Phœnician cities, the State, or States, of Naharin (from the Mediterranean to the bend of the Euphrates), and the Aryan kingdom of Mitanni (between the Euphrates and the Belik), was not an enemy to be despised, and it cost the army and fleet of the pharaoh no less than seventeen campaigns to achieve a permanent victory. The Kings of Assyria and Babylonia, and even the Hittites, sent presents which Thotmes took for tribute; but he does not seem to have invaded their territories; he probably never crossed the Belik nor the Cilician Gates, which mark the limits of the greatest extension of Egyptian control in Asia. The whole region conquered was organized as a simple tributary territory under the supervision of a governor general backed by Egyptian garrisons in the chief cities. The local rulers were otherwise left unmolested except in case of rebellion, when the punishment was prompt and severe in the extreme. Their sons were educated in Egypt, and were generally appointed to succeed them at their death. The administration of this territory, which included also the island of Cyprus, and was, like Nubia, the source of immense wealth to Egypt, gave rise to a considerable correspondence between suzerain and vassals. On the part of the latter it was written on clay tablets in the Babylonian language and characters —at that time the official language and characters of Western Asia. From that correspondence (so-called Tell-Amarna tablets) we learn that under Amenhotep IV (1375–1358 B. C.) the vigilance of the Egyptian court had considerably relaxed; the local dynasties were constantly and vainly asking for Egyptian troops against the encroachments of the Hittites and the Khabiri. This led, towards the end of the dynasty, to a complete loss of the Asiatic territory conquered by Thotmes III.

The Eighteenth Dynasty was an era of great international prosperity. With the single exception of Amenhotep IV, who allowed himself to be drawn into a scheme to reform the Egyptian religion, all its kings were wise and just rulers. They were also great builders, and devoted their vast resources in men—chiefly captives taken in war—in gold, and silver, derived from tribute, to the erection of magnificent temples and temple-like mortuary chapels, all of which they richly endowed. The reform attempted by Amenhotep IV consisted in proclaiming Aton (an old form of Re, or Ra, the sun-god of Heliopolis) the sole god, and in enforcing his worship at the expense of others, particularly that of Amon for which the priesthood of Thebes claimed precedence over the others. He ordered the word *god*, as applied to the other deities, to be chiselled out wherever it could be found on the temples and other monuments. He changed his own name to *Ikhnaton*, "Spirit of Aton", in honour of the new god, to whom he erected a temple at Thebes called Gem-Aton. Lastly, he changed his residence from Thebes to Akhetaton, "Horizon of Aton" (now

El 'Amarna), a city which he founded in a like spirit, and he also founded two other cities of the same name, each with a Gem-Aton temple, one in Nubia, at the foot of the Third Cataract (where it was discovered in 1907 by Professor Breasted), and another in Syria, the site of which is still unknown. This reform was violently opposed by the established priesthood, and the land was soon thrown into a state of general confusion verging on anarchy. The temples and cities dedicated to Aton were destroyed and abandoned soon after the royal reformer's death.

Harmhab (1350–1315 B. C.), the founder of the Nineteenth Dynasty, was principally engaged in bringing the land out of the confusion into which it had fallen during the last years of the preceding dynasty, and restoring the temples of the ancient gods to their former splendour. Seti I (1313–1292) attempted to recover the Asiatic provinces lost by

COLOSSAL FIGURE AT ABU SIMBEL

Amenhotep IV, but he does not seem to have pushed his advance farther than the Hauran and the southern slopes of Mount Lebanon. He probably did no more than skirmish with the Hittites, who were now in possession of the valley of the Orontes, and had occupied the strong post of Kadesh on that river; even his conquest of Palestine does not appear to have been permanent. At all events Seti's son, Ramses II (1292–1225), had to begin all over again. After three years spent in recovering Palestine, Ramses finally succeeded in dislodging the Hittites from the valley of the Orontes. The war nevertheless continued some ten or eleven years longer without great results, the Hittites apparently returning to their former positions as soon as Ramses had retired to Egypt for the winter season; when the Hittites proposed to him a treaty of permanent peace and alliance, he gladly accepted it (1272 B.C.). This treaty, of which we have two Egyptian transcripts and a Hittite copy in the Babylonian language and character, does not stipulate anything with regard to the boundary between the two countries, which was, very likely, about the same as under Seti, save possibly on the coast, where it may have extended to the Nahr-el-Kelb as suggested by the presence of three stelæ carved there on the rocks by Ramses. Thirteen years later the Hittite king visited Egypt on the occasion of the marriage of his eldest daughter with the pharaoh. Diplomatic unions of that kind had already taken place during the preceding dynasty. The treaty was faithfully observed by both parties, at least until the second year of Merneptah (1225–1215), the son and successor of Ramses II, when the Hittites seem to have taken part in an invasion of the Delta by the Libyans and various peoples of the northern Mediterranean, their allies.

Neither this, however, nor the disaffection which at the same time was rampant among his Asiatic vassals spurred Merneptah to new conquests. The Hittite war of Ramses II, it seems, had completely exhausted the military enterprise of Egypt. Her armies from that time keep to the defensive. Merneptah was satisfied to bring back Palestine to submission and defeat and drive out the Libyans—among whom the Tehenu tribe was prominent apparently because they were settled on the Egyptian border—and their allies, the Sherden (Sardinians), the Shekelesh (Sicilians?), the Ekwesh (Achæans?), and the Lycians. But even these were considered great achievements, and the people sang:—

The Kings are overthrown, saying: "Salâm!"
Not one holds up his head among the nine nations of the bow.
Wasted is Tehenu,
The Hittite land is pacified,
Plundered is the Canaan, with every evil,
Carried off is Askalon,
Seized upon is Gezer,
Yenoam is made as a thing not existing,
Israel is desolated, her seed is not,
Palestine has become a [defenceless] widow for Egypt.
All lands are united, they are pacified,
Every one that is turbulent is bound by King Merneptah.

(Breasted, op. cit., 330; "Ancient Records of Egypt", III, 603 sqq.) The situation at home was no brighter, and it became worse under Merneptah's successors, Amenmeses, Memeptah-Siptah, and Seti II, until complete anarchy prevailed. Thrusting aside a host of less daring pretenders, a Syrian named Irisu (or Yerseu), who held an important position as head of one of the nomes, seized the power and for five years ruled the land in tyranny and violence. (Breasted, "Ancient Records of Egypt", IV, § 398.) Thus ended the Nineteenth Dynasty.

Of Setnakht (1200–1198 B. C.), the founder of the following dynasty, we know little except that he was a strong man who succeeded in restoring order. His son, Ramses III (1198–1167), was confronted by very much the same situation as Merneptah some twenty-five years before, only a great deal more serious. The allies of the Libyans defeated by Merneptah were only the vanguard of a far more dreadful army of invasion. This was now approaching. It was followed at close range by motley hordes of immigrants from the islands and the northern shores of the Mediterranean, the "peoples of the sea", as the Egyptians called them. Besides those already mentioned we find now the Peleset (Philistines) and the Denyen (Danaoi). Some of the invaders were coming by sea, along the coast, others by land. Ramses III showed himself equal to the occasion. Having defeated a first contingent who had already landed in the Delta and joined the Libyans, he sent a strong fleet to check the advance of the main body of the invaders' ships and hastened by land, with his army, to Syria, where he expected to find the enemy. Both the land and the naval battles were fought in about the same region, for Ramses, having routed the land forces of the enemy, was in time to co-operate with the Egyptian fleet in defeating that of the invaders. This brilliant campaign stayed the advance of the immigrants who now came straggling along, settling here and there as vassals of

NATIVES DRAWING WATER ON THE NILE
SÂKYEH, OR NILE WATER-WHEEL



THE ROCK OF ABU SIMBEL

DESERT NEAR THE SUEZ CANAL

THE TABLES OF ABYDOS (See Page 337)
PLATEAU OF THE PYRAMIDS, NEAR CAIRO

TOMBS OF THE KINGS (BIBIÂN EL MOLUK)
COLONNADE OF ISIS, PHILÆ

Egypt, in Syria and in Palestine, where, later, one of their tribes, the Peleset, or Philistines, offered a stubborn resistance to the invasion of the Hebrews. On the other hand the great Hittite confederation had been very much weakened, if not entirely disintegrated, as a result of the invasion. Ramses III had to repel another invasion of the Libyans, impelled this time by the Meshwesh (the Maxyes of Herodotus), and shortly after he found it necessary to appear again with his army in Northern Palestine, where rebellion had broken out among some of his vassals. The boundary remained, probably, where it was under the Nineteenth Dynasty, including the whole course of the River Leontes (or Litany) and possibly a small portion of the upper Orontes, excluding Kadesh. Ramses III had no further trouble with his Asiatic vassals.

MUMMY OF RAMSES II
(Bulak Museum)

With the successors of Ramses III, nine weak pharaohs of the same name (Ramses IV–XII), national decay sets in. Egypt entirely loses her prestige abroad, particularly in Asia, where Assyria is expanding under Tiglath-Pileser I; at home everything is confusion. Priests, officials, and mercenaries, whose wealth and prerogatives have been steadily growing at the expense of both pharaoh and his people, now fight among themselves for the controlling political influence, the pharaoh being reduced to a mere puppet. Such a state of disorganization prevails everywhere that, in the necropolis of Thebes, in sight of the temple of Amon, where the high-priest is so powerful, the tombs of the pharaohs are desecrated and plundered by a gang of robbers, and the royal mummies despoiled of all their most costly ornaments.

At some period during the Nineteenth Dynasty the pharaohs had their capital at Tanis (Sân-el-Hagar) in the Delta, Thebes remaining the religious capital of the empire. There Ramses XII resided when a local noble, Nesubenebded, seized the power (1113 B. C.) and established himself as king over the Delta. The weak pharaoh retired to Thebes, where he was soon overshadowed by Hrihor, the high-priest of Amon, who, when Ramses XII died as ingloriously as he had lived, was finally proclaimed supreme ruler of Egypt by an oracle of Khonsu followed by the approval of Amon (1090). Hrihor's rule, in fact, never extended over Lower Egypt, and his independence was not even suspected by Manetho who, after Ramses XII, introduces the Twenty-first Dynasty, with Nesubenebded as its founder. The division between the two countries was to continue, save for short intervals, for about four hundred and fifty years. Thebes, however, rarely during that time enjoyed complete independence, and still more rarely ruled over the whole country. Her relations to the Delta were usually those of a vassal to a suzerain. Her influence was particularly felt in Nubia, whither descendants of Hrihor seem to have retired at an early period, eventually founding an independent kingdom at Napata. Confusion and disorder still prevailed all over the land. To save them from further desecration, the royal mummies had to be concealed in an old, and probably unused, tomb of Amenhotep I, near the temple of Deir el-Bahri, where they remained hidden until they were rifled some thirty-five years ago by the Arabs. Most of them are now at the Museum of Cairo. The capital of this dynasty was at Tanis. Its last king, Psibkhenno II, may be the pharaoh mentioned in III Kings, xi, 18; iii, 1; ix, 16 (see below). Assyria was then on the decline and we can best represent to ourselves David and Solomon as at least nominal vassals of Egypt.

Sheshonk (945–924), founder of the Twenty-second Dynasty, was a powerful mercenary prince, or chief of hired troops, of Heracleopolis, where his ancestors, of Libyan origin, had settled early in the Twenty-first Dynasty. In 945 B. C. he proclaimed himself king, establishing his residence at Bubastis, in the Delta. Sheshonk seems to have been an ambitious and energetic ruler. He certainly led a successful campaign in Palestine, perhaps the same mentioned in III Kings, xiv, 25 (cf. II Paralip., xii, 2 sqq.), where it is said that he came to Jerusalem in the fifth year of Roboam, and took away the treasures of the house of the Lord, although Jerusalem is not among the one hundred and fifty-six Palestinian cities recorded in his inscription. In Solomon's time Sheshonk had given hospitality to Jeroboam (III Kings, xi, 40). According to Professor Breasted (Ancient Egyptians, 362), Sheshonk is also to be identified with the pharaoh who gave his daughter as a wife to Solomon (III Kings, iii, 1) and later on conquered Gezer and turned it over to his daughter, Solomon's wife, as a dowry (III Kings, ix, 16) while Professor Maspéro (Hist. Anc., 416) refers these episodes and that of Hadad (III Kings, xi, 14 sqq.) to Psibkhenno II, the last king of the Twenty-first Dynasty. During the following reigns of this dynasty history records nothing but endless civil wars between the two principalities of Thebes and Heracleopolis, and feuds between the mercenary lords of the Delta. On the other hand, Assyria was more powerful than ever. Shalmaneser defeated, at Karkar on the Orontes, a Syrian

MUMMY OF SETI I
(Bulak Museum)

coalition to which one of Sheshonk's successors—probably Takelot II—had contributed one thousand men (854 B. C.). Under such circumstances Egypt's influence in Palestine must have dwindled to nothing.

One of the Delta lords, Pedibast, at the death of Sheshonk IV, the last king of the Twenty-second Dynasty, succeeded in establishing a new dynasty, which Manetho places at Tanis, although Pedibast was of Bubastite origin. But neither he himself nor his successors could control the situation. Under his successor, Osorkon III, a dynast of Sais, Tefnakhte undertook to supplant him and the many other dynasts, several of whom were claiming the title and prerogatives of royalty. He had partly succeeded when Piankhi, ruler of the independent kingdom of Napata (see above), overran Egypt as far as the Mediterranean, obliging all the pretenders, Osorkon and Tefnakhte included, to recognize his suzerainty. But as soon as the invaders had withdrawn, Tefnakhte resumed his designs and was eventually successful in subduing Osorkon, who acknowledged himself his vassal. (We must refer to this period the King of Egypt mentioned in IV Kings, xvii, 4, as inciting Osee of Samaria to rebel against Shalmanaser IV.) Tefnakhte's son Bochoris, however, was regarded as the founder of a new dynasty, his father, probably, having died before Osorkon. Scarcely had he reigned six years when Shabaka, Piankhi's brother, invaded Egypt in his turn, and so firmly did he intrench himself there that he became the founder of the Twenty-fifth, or Ethiopian, Dynasty. Unfortunately for him and his successors, Assyria, having absorbed all the principal states of Syria and Palestine, and holding the others well under control, was now threatening to invade the territory of Egypt. Shabaka, alive to the danger, formed an alliance with Philistia, Juda, Moab, Edom, and Tyre, against Sennacherib, and sent to Syria an army under the command of his nephew Taharka (cf. IV Kings, xix, 9, where Taharka is called King of Ethiopia). The allies were completely defeated, and Sennacherib was beleaguering Jerusalem, which alone, so far, with Tyre, had resisted him, when, to use the words of the Bible, "an angel of the Lord came, and slew in the camp of the Assyrians a hundred and eighty-five thousand. And when he arose early in the morning, he saw all the bodies of the dead. And Sennacherib king of the Assyrians departing went away, and he returned and abode in Ninive" (IV Kings, xix, 35, 36). But the power of Assyria was not broken for all that, although Taharka, who was now reigning, might have believed it when, twenty-seven years later, he succeeded in repelling Esar-haddon, of which repulse he made great display on the pedestal of a statue of his, drawing on the lists left by Ramses II of Asiatic captured cities to swell his own victory. In 670 the Assyrians appeared again, more formidable than ever, defeated Taharka, captured Memphis, and withdrew after having organized at least Lower Egypt into an Assyrian dependency. Among the princes who hastened to do homage to the King of Assyria the first place is given to Necho of Sais, a descendant of Tefnakhte through Bochoris. Taharka had fled to the south, where he raised fresh troops, and marched on Lower Egypt hoping to recover the lost provinces, but with no other result than to bring back the Assyrians, who routed him again and pursued him almost as far as Thebes (668 B. C.). The reigning family of the Delta, who had sided with him, were sent to Nineveh in chains. Necho was one of them, but he knew how to ingratiate himself with Assurbanipal, who restored him to his Kingdom of Sais. Tanutamon, having succeeded his father Taharka (663 B. C.), undertook in his turn the recovery of Lower Egypt, but with no better success. This time Assurbanipal's army pursued the enemy to Thebes, which was sacked and plundered.

Psamtik, son of Necho, took advantage of the struggle in which his protector, Assurbanipal, had now become involved with Babylonia to free himself from the Assyrian allegiance. He succeeded in suppressing practically all of the mercenary lords and local dynasties, repaired the long-neglected irrigation system, and gave a strong impulse to commerce. The Twenty-sixth Dynasty, which he introduces, was, as a whole, a period of restoration and great internal prosperity. It was also a period of renascence in art, religion, and literature, marked by a return to archaic traditions. Industrial art flourished as never before. The army was reorganized and strengthened with large contingents of Greek mercenaries, the Libyans having lost their efficiency in becoming Egyptianized. Psamtik does not seem to have made much use of the army, but Necho and his successors could not refrain from interfering with the affairs of Asia. The temptation was great. During the long reign of Psamtik I Assyria had been constantly declining. In 609 he was succeeded by his son Necho, and three years later Nineveh was finally captured, and Assyria had come to an end forever. Necho thought this a favourable chance to recover the old Asiatic possessions of Egypt, and marched on Carchemish (cf. II Paralip., xxxv, 20; Jerem., xlvi, 7–9). At Magiddo the King of Juda, Josias, who foolishly persisted in disputing his passage, was routed and mortally wounded (II Paralip., xxxv, 22). This incident brought Necho to Jerusalem, where he deposed Joahaz, the successor of Josias, and put in his place his brother Eliakim, changing his name to Jehoiakim. As for Joahaz, he took him to Egypt (II Paralip., xxxvi, 1–4; cf. IV Kings, xxiii, 29–34). Hearing of Necho's conquest, Nabopolassar, to whom that country had fallen in the division of Assyria's possessions, sent his son Nebuchadnezzar (Nabuchodonosor) to check his advance. Necho was so completely defeated at Carchemish (605 B. C.) that he did not dare to make another stand, and retreated to Egypt; "And the king of Egypt came not again any more out of his own country: for the king of Babylon had taken all that had belonged to the king of Egypt, from the river of Egypt, unto the river Euphrates" (IV Kings, xxiv, 7). Apries (588–569 B. C.), Necho's second successor, was not more fortunate in a similar attempt. Zedekiah had sent to him for assistance against Nebuchadnezzar (Ezech., xvii, 15), but Apries either retired without fighting (Jerem., xxxvii, 6) or was defeated (Josephus, Antiq. Jud., X, vii, §3), and Jerusalem was captured, and her temple destroyed (587 B. C.). When, however, the remnant of the Jews fled to Egypt, taking Jeremiah with them, Apries received them and allowed them to settle in different cities of the Delta, at Memphis, and in Upper Egypt (Jer., xli, 17–18; xliv, 1).—Such, very likely, was the origin of the Jewish colony established in the island of Elephantine "before Cambyses", as related in the Judæo-Aramaic papyri recently discovered there (see below, under Twenty-seventh Dynasty). Later, probably after Tyre had finally surrendered to the Chaldeans (574), Apries successfully carried out a naval expedition against Phœnicia (Masp., Hist. anc., 639; Breasted, Hist. of the Anc. Egypt., 409, places that expedition in 587 B. C.).

The reverses of Necho and Apries in Asia did not affect the prosperity of Egypt during the reign of these two pharaohs, any more than did the rivalry of one of his officials, Amasis, whom Apries had sent to repress a mutiny of the Egyptian native troops, and who was proclaimed king by them. Apries and Amasis reigned together for some time, and when, a conflict having arisen between the two, Apries was defeated and slain, Amasis gave him an honourable burial. Strange to say, Amasis, who had been the champion of the native element as against the Greeks, now favoured the latter far more than any of his predecessors. He founded for them the city of Naucratis, in the Delta, as a home and market, and they soon made it the most impor-

tant commercial centre of Egypt. The foreign policy of Amasis, as a rule, was one of prudence; his only conquest was Cyprus, over which, since the days of Thotmes III, Egypt had often exercised suzerainty. He made, however, one fatal mistake: he joined the abortive league formed by Crœsus, King of Lydia, against Cyrus, and, although he afterwards carefully avoided crossing the path of the Persian conqueror, the latter's son, Cambyses, taking the will for the deed, did not fail to resent his past inclinations.

Cambyses invaded Egypt in 525 B. C., shortly after Psamtik III had succeeded his father. The pharaoh was put to death under cruel circumstances, the tomb of Amasis was violated, his mummy burnt to ashes, and a Persian governor was appointed. Otherwise Cambyses did all he could to conciliate his Egyptian subjects. He assumed the traditional pharaonic titles and ceremonial, and caused himself to be initiated in the mysteries of the goddess Neit. He made good the damages sustained by the temples during the conquest, led an unsuccessful expedition against the oases of the Libyan desert, and was not much happier in a campaign against the independent Kingdom of Napata. Embittered by these reverses, he departed, in later years, from his former conciliatory policy, and committed sacrilegious acts which exasperated the people against him. Darius I (521–486) completed the canal begun by Necho between the Nile and the Red Sea. He reopened the road from Keft (Coptos) to the Red Sea, garrisoned the oases, and otherwise furthered the prosperity and security of Egypt. In his reorganization of the Persian Empire, which he divided into a number of governments under a central administration, Egypt, with Cyrene, Barca, and Lower Nubia, formed the sixth government, or satrapy. This, however, affected only the garrisoned cities and their respective territories. Elsewhere the old feudal organization was left untouched, and from time to time the local princes availed themselves of their semi-independence to rebel.

After the battle of Marathon (487) the Egyptians revolted and expelled the Persians. But in the following year Achemenes, who had just been appointed satrap by his brother Xerxes I (486–465), brought them back to submission. Of a far more serious character was the insurrection which broke out in 463 under Artaxerxes I (465–425), and which was not quelled until its leader, Inaros (of the house of Psamtik), aided by the Athenians, had routed two successive Persian armies (454). Under Darius II the power of the Persians began to decline. The weakness of their administration at that time is attested by the Judæo-Aramaic papyri recently discovered at Elephantine. From these documents we learn that, while the provincial governor was absent, the commander of the garrison of Syene had been bribed by the Egyptian priests of Chnûb (Chnûm) to plunder and destroy the temple of the Jewish colony of Elephantine. The culprits, it seems, were put to death by the Persian authorities, yet, when the victims applied for a permission to rebuild their temple, their request was granted only on the condition that they should not in future offer up bloody sacrifices—a concession, evidently, to the priests of Chnûb, who probably objected to the slaughtering of the ram, an animal sacred to their god. The little colony, we may well suppose, did not long enjoy its curtailed privileges; it very probably succumbed to Egyptian fanaticism during the two following dynasties (Stähelin, "Israel in Aegypten nach neugefundenen Urkunden", 14 sqq.).

Finally, in 404 B. C., the last year of Darius II (424–404) and first year of Artaxerxes II (404–362), a certain Amyrtæos of Saitic birth succeeded in proclaiming Egypt's independence. His six years of reign constitute the Twenty-eighth Dynasty. The Twenty-ninth Dynasty (Mendesian), comprising the reigns of Nepherites, Achoris, and Psammuthis, who took an active part in the wars of Greece against Artaxerxes II, lasted twenty years. The Thirtieth Dynasty (Sebennytic) began with Nectanebo I (378–361), who successfully repelled the Persians. Tachos (360–359), his successor, attempted to invade the Syrian territory, but, as a result of rivalries and dissensions between himself and his namesake Tachos, whom he had appointed as regent, he was supplanted by Nectanebo II (358–342), a cousin of Tachos the regent, and took refuge with Artaxerxes II, at whose court he died. Nectanebo II was at first successful in repelling the attack of Artaxerxes III (Ochus—362–338); later, however, he was defeated, and the Persians once more became masters of Egypt (341). The king fled to Ethiopia, and the temples were plundered. It was then that Egypt lost forever the right of being governed by rulers of her own.

MASPÉRO, *Histoire ancienne des peuples de l'Orient classique* (3 vols., Paris, 1897–9); also MCCLURE, tr. of same, ed. SAYCE, *The Dawn of Civilization (Egypt, Chaldæa)*, and *The Struggle of the Nations (Egypt, Syria and Assyria)* (3rd ed., 2 vols., London, 1897); MASPÉRO, *Histoire ancienne des peuples de l'Orient* (7th ed., Paris, 1908); BREASTED, *The Ancient Records of Egypt* (the Egyptian historical documents in English, complete from the earliest times to the Persian Conquest—5 vols., Chicago, 1906–7); BREASTED, *A History of Egypt* (New York, 1905); ID., *A History of the Ancient Egyptians* (New York, 1908); MEYER, *Geschichte des alten Aegyptens* (Berlin, 1887); WIEDEMANN, *Aegyptische Geschichte* (Gotha, 1884–1885); BISSING, *Geschichte Aegyptens* (Berlin, 1904); BUDGE, *History of Egypt* (7 vols., London); PETRIE (ed.), *Illustrated History of Egypt* I–III, *From the Earliest Times to the End of the XXXth Dynasty* (3 vols., London, 1897——); MAHAFFY, *History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty* (London, 1899); MILNE, *History of Egypt under Roman Rule* (London, 1898); LANE-POOLE, *History of Egypt in the Middle Ages* (London, 1901)—these three forming vols. IV–VI in Petrie's series.

EGYPT AND THE BIBLE.—VIGOUROUX, *La Bible et les découvertes modernes* (4 vols., Paris, 1884—); MEYER, ed., *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme;* STEINDORFF in *Recent Research in Bible Lands*, ed. HILPRECHT (Philadelphia, 1906); GRIFFITH in *Authority and Archæology*, ed. HOGARTH (New York, 1899); MÜLLER, *Asien und Europa nach altägyptischen Denkmälern* (Leipzig, 1893); SPIEGELBERG, *Aegyptische Randglossen zum Alten Testament* (Strasburg, 1904); IDEM, *Aufenthalt Israels in Aegypten* (Strasburg, 1904).

III. ANCIENT EGYPTIAN RELIGION.—God and man, those two essential terms of every religion, are but imperfectly reflected in the Egyptian religious monuments. A book similar in scope to our Bible certainly never existed in Egypt, and if their different theological schools, or the priests of some particular theological school, ever agreed on certain truths about God and man, which they consigned to official didactic writings, such writings have not reached us. Nor is the vast body of religious monuments bequeathed to us by ancient Egypt of such a nature as to compensate for this lack of positive and systematic information. The figured and inscribed monuments discovered in the temples, and especially in the tombs, acquaint us with the names and external aspects of numerous deities, with the material side of the funerary rites, from which we may safely conclude that they admitted the dependency of man on superior beings, and a certain survival of man after death. But as to the essence of those gods, their relation to the world and man as expressed by the worship of which they were the objects, the significance and symbolism of the rites of the dead, the nature of the surviving principle in man, the nature and modes of the survival itself as depending on earthly life, and the like, the monuments are either silent about or offer us such contradictory and incongruous notions that we are forced to conclude that the Egyptians never evolved a clear and complete system of religious views. What light can be brought out of this chaos we shall concentrate on two chief points: (a) *The Pantheon*, corresponding to the term *God;* and (b) *The Future Life*, as best representing the term *Man.*

(a) *The Egyptian Pantheon.*—By this word we understand such gods as were officially worshipped in one or more of the various nomes, or in the country at large. We exclude, therefore, the multitude of

dæmons or spirits which animated almost everything man came in contact with—stones, plants, animals—and the lesser deities which presided over every stage of human life—birth, naming, etc. The worship they received was of an entirely local and private nature, and we know almost nothing of it.

Each nome had its own chief deity or divine lord, male or female, apparently inherited from the ancient tribes. With each deity an animal, as a rule, but sometimes also a tree or mineral, was associated. Thus Osiris of Busiris was associated with a pillar, or the trunk of a tree; Hathor of Denderah, with a sycamore; Osiris of Mendes, with a goat; Set of Tanis, with an ass; Buto of the city of the same name, with a serpent; Bast of Bubastis, with a cat; Atûm, or Tûm, of Heliopolis, with a serpent, a lion, or possibly, later the bull Mnevis; Ptah of Memphis, with the bull Apis; Sovek, in the Fayûm and at Ombos (Kôm Ombo), with a crocodile; Anubis of Assiût, with a jackal;

THE OX APIS
Relief from a Tomb at Zakarah

Thoth of Hermopolis, with an ibis or a baboon; Amon of Thebes, and Chnûm, at the Cataract, with a ram; Horus of el-Kâb and Edfu, with a hawk. According to some scholars, this association at first was merely symbolical; it was not till the Nineteenth Dynasty that sacred animals, having gradually come to be considered as incarnations, or at least as dwelling-places, of the various gods, began to be worshipped as gods (Breasted, "Hist. Anc. Egypt.", 59, 324). But this view, once quite common, is now generally abandoned, and fetishistic animal-worship is now considered as the true basis of the Egyptian religion [cf. Chantepie de la Saussaye, "Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte" (1905), I, 194 sqq.]. In any case the origin of the association of certain animals with certain gods, whether symbolical or not, is unknown; as a rule, the same may be said of the various attributes of the various gods or goddesses. We understand that Thoth, being a lunar god, could have been considered the god of time, computation, letters, and science (although we do not know how, being associated with the ibis or a baboon, he became a lunar god); but we do not see why the ram-god Chnûm should have been represented as a potter, nor why the cow-goddess, Hathor, and the cat-goddess, Bast, were identified with beauty, joy, and love, while the lioness-deity, Sekhmet, was the goddess of war, and Neith was identified both with war and with weaving. The names of the gods, as a rule, give no clue. At an early date the crude primitive fetishism was somewhat mitigated, when the deities were supposed to reside in statues combining human figures with animal heads.

Triads.—In other respects gods and goddesses were imagined to be very much like men and women; they ate, drank, married, begat children, and died. Each nome, besides its chief god or goddess, had at least two secondary deities, the one playing the part of a wife or husband to the chief deity, the other that of a son. Thus, in Thebes the group of Amon, Mût (or Ament), and Chons; in Memphis the group of Ptah, Sekhmet, and Nefertem; etc. Sometimes the triad consisted of one god and two goddesses, as at Elephantine, or even of three male deities. Those groups were probably first obtained by the fusion of several religious centres into one, the number three being suggested by the human family, or possibly by the family triad Osiris, Isis, and Horus, of the Osiris cycle. In some cases the second element was a mere grammatical duplicate of the first, as Ament, wife of Amen (Amon), and was considered as one with it; it was then natural to identify the son with his parents, and so arose the concept of one god in three forms. There was in this a germ of monotheism. It is doubtful, however, whether it would ever have developed beyond the limits of henotheism but for the solar religion which seems to have sprung into existence towards the dawn of the dynastic times, very likely under the influence of the school of Heliopolis. But before we turn to this new phase of the Egyptian religion, we must consider another aspect of the ancient gods which may have furnished the first basis of unification of the various local worships.

The Gods of the Dead.—Gods, being fancied like men, were, like them, subject to death, the great leveller. Each community had the mummy of its god. But in the case of gods, as in that of men, death was not the cessation of all life. With the assistance of magical devices the dead god was simply transferred to another world, where he was still the god of the departed who had been his devotees on earth. Hence two forms of the same god, frequently under two different names which eventually led to the conception of distinct gods of the dead. Such were Chent-Ament, the first of the Westerners (the dead) at Abydos, Sokar (or Seker), probably a form of Ptah, at Memphis. Sometimes, however, the god of the dead retained the name he had before, as Anubis at Assiût, Khonyu at Thebes, and Osiris, wherever he began to be known as such.

Legend of Osiris.—Each of these gods had his own legend. Osiris was the last god who reigned upon the earth, and he was a wise and good king. But his brother Set was a wicked god and killed Osiris, cutting his body into fragments, which he scattered all over the land. Isis, sister and wife of Osiris, collected the fragments, put them together, and embalmed them, with the assistance of her son Horus, Anubis (here, perhaps, a substitute for Set, who does not seem to have been originally conceived as his brother's slayer), and Nephthys, Set's wife. Isis then, through her magical art, revives her husband who becomes king of the dead, while Horus defeats Set and reigns on the earth in his father's place. According to another version, Qeb, father of Osiris, and Set put an end to the strife by dividing the land between the two competitors, giving the South to Horus and the North to Set.

Sidereal and Elemental Gods.—It is generally conceded that some of the local gods had a sidereal or elemental character. Horus, of Edfu and el-Kâb (Ilithyaspolis), and Anher, of This, represented one or other aspect of the sun. Thoth of Hermopolis and Khonsu of Thebes were lunar gods. Min, of Akhmim (Chemmis) and Coptos, represented the cultivable land and Set, of Ombos (near Nakadeh), the desert. Hapi was the Nile, Hathor the vault of heaven. In some cases this sidereal or elemental aspect of the local gods may be primitive, especially among the tribes of Asiatic origin; but in other cases it may be of later date and due to the influence of the solar religion of Re, which, as we have already said, came into prominence, if not into existence, during the early dynastic times.

Solar Gods, Re or Ra.—That Re was such a local god representing the sun, is generally taken for granted although by no means proven. We cannot assign him to any locality not furnished with another

god of its own. We never find him, like the vast majority of the local gods, associated with a sacred animal, nor is he ever represented with a human figure, except as a substitute for Atûm, or as identified with Horus or some other god. His only representative among men is the pharaoh, who in the earliest dynastic monuments appears as his son. Finally, it is difficult to understand how the kings of the southern kingdom, after having extended their rule to the north, should have given up their own patron god, Horus, for a local deity of the conquered land. It looks as if the worship of Re had been inaugurated some time after the reunion of the two lands, and possibly for political reasons. At all events, the solar religion soon became very popular, and it may be said that to the end it remained the state religion of Egypt. Re, like the other gods, had his legend—or rather myth—excogitated by the theological school of Heliopolis in connexion with the cosmogonic system of the same school. He had created the world and was king over the earth. In course of time the mortals rebelled against him because he was too old, whereupon he ordered their destruction by the goddess of war, but on the presentation of 7000 jars of human blood he was satisfied and decided to spare men. Tired of living among them, he took his flight to heaven, where, standing in his sacred bark, he sails on the celestial ocean. The fixed stars and the planets are so many gods who play the parts of pilot, steersman, and oarsmen. Re rises in the east, conquers the old foe (darkness), spreads light, life, wealth, and joy on all sides, and receives everywhere the applause of gods and men; but now he comes to the western horizon, where, behind Abydos, through an enormous crevice, the celestial waters rush down to the lower hemisphere. The sacred bark follows the eternal river and, unretarded, the god passes slowly through the kingdom of night, conquering his foes, solacing his faithful worshippers, only, however, to renew his course over the upper hemisphere, as bright, as vivifying, as beautiful as ever. Soon each phase of the sun's course received a special name and gradually developed into a distinct god; thus we find Harpochrates (Horus's Child) representing morning sun; Atûm, the evening sun; Re, the noon sun; while Harmakhuti (Horus on the two horizons—Harmachis, supposed to be represented by the great Sphinx) is both the rising and the setting sun.

Cosmogony and Enneads.—Different cosmogonic systems were excogitated at a very early date (some of them, possibly, before the dynastic times) by the various theological schools, principally by the School of Heliopolis. Unfortunately, none of these systems seem to have been handed down in the primitive form. According to one of the versions of the Heliopolitan cosmogony, the principle of all things is the god Nûn, the primordial ocean, in which Atûm, the god of light, lay hidden and alone until he decided to create the world. He begat all by himself Shu, the atmosphere, and Tefnût, the dew. In their turn Shu and Tefnût begat Qeb, the earth, and Nût, the vault of heaven. These two were lying asleep in mutual embrace in the Nûn, when Shu, stealing between them, raised Nût on high. The world was formed, and the sun could begin its daily course across the heavens. Qeb and Nût begat Osiris, the cultivable land and the Nile united in one concept, Set the desert, and the two sisters Isis and Nephthys. To this first ennead, of which Tûm (later supplanted by Re) appears as the head, two others were added, the first of which began with Horus, as son of Osiris and Isis. The three enneads constituted as many dynasties of gods, or demi-gods, who reigned on the earth in predynastic times. We have seen above that the third of these dynasties, called "the shades" (*νέκυες*) by Manetho, represents the predynastic kings mentioned on the Palermo Stone. The Heliopolitan Ennead became very popular, and every religious centre was now ambitious to have a similar one, the same gods and order being generally retained, except that the local deity invariably appeared at the head of the combination.

It has long been customary to assert that in Egypt human life was compared to the course of the sun, and that Osiris was nothing but the sun considered as dead. It is far more correct, however, to say, with Professor Maspéro [Revue de l'histoire des religions (1887), XV, 307 sqq.], that the course of the sun was compared to that of human life. Osiris is not a sun that has set, but the sun that has set is an Osiris; this is so true that when the sun reappears on the eastern horizon, he is represented as the youth, Horus, son of Osiris.

The great prominence given to Re and Osiris by the Heliopolitan School of theology not only raised the Egyptian belief to a higher plane, but brought about a certain unification of it—a consolidation, so to speak, of the local worships. Naturally, the local gods retained their original external appearance, but they were now clothed with the attributions of the new Heliopolitan deity, Re, and were slowly identified with him. Every god became now a sun-god under some aspect; and in some cases the name of the Heliopolitan god was added to the name of the local god, as Sobek-Re, Chnûm-Re, Ammon-Re. It was a step towards monotheism, or at any rate towards a national henotheism. This tendency must have been encouraged by the pharaohs in their capacity rather of political than of religious rulers of the nation. There could be no perfect and lasting political unity as long as the various nomes retained their individual gods.

It is significant that in the only two periods when the pharaohs seem to have had absolute political control of Egypt—viz. from the Fourth to the Fifth and from the Eighteenth to the Twentieth Dynasty—the systems of Re, in the former period, and his Theban form, Ammon-Re, in the latter period, come clearly to the front, while the local religious systems fall into the background. These, however, though they were no more than tolerated, seemed to constitute a menace to political unity. The effort of Amenhotep IV to introduce the cult of his only god, Aton (see above, in *Dynastic History;* Second Period), was perhaps not prompted exclusively by a religious ideal, as is generally believed. A similar attempt in favour of Re and his ennead was perhaps made by the Memphite kings. From Khafre, second king of the fourth dynasty, to the end of the sixth dynasty, the word *Re* is a part of the name of almost every one of those kings, and the monuments show that during that period numerous temples were erected to the chief of the Heliopolitan Ennead in the neighbouring nomes. Such encroachments of the official religion on the local forms of worship may have caused the disturbances which marked the passage from the fifth to the sixth dynasty and the end of the latter. That such disturbances were not of a merely political nature is clear in the light of the well-known facts that the royal tombs and the temples of that period were violated and pillaged, if not destroyed, and that the mortuary statues of several kings, those of Khafre in particular, were found, shattered into fragments, at the bottom of a pit near these pyramids. Evidently, those devout "sons of Re" were not in the odour of sanctity with some of the Egyptian priests, and the imputation of impiety brought against them, as recorded by Herodotus (II, 127, 128; cf. Diodorus Siculus, I, 14), may not have been quite as baseless as is assumed by some modern scholars (Maspéro, Histoire Ancienne, pp. 76 sq.).

If the foregoing sketch of the Egyptian religion is somewhat obscure, or even produces a self-contradictory effect, this may perhaps be attributed to the fact that the extremely remote periods considered (mostly, in fact, prehistoric) are known to us from monuments of later date, where they are reflected in

superimposed outlines, comparable to a series of pictures of one person at different stages of life, and in different attitudes and garbs, taken successively on the same photographic plate. The Egyptians were a most conservative people; like other peoples, they were open to new religious concepts, and accepted them, but they never got rid of the older ones, no matter how much the older might conflict with the newer. However, if the writer is not mistaken, two prominent features of their religion are sufficiently clear: first, animal fetishism from beginning to end in a more or less mitigated form; secondly, superposition, during the early Memphite dynasties, of the sun-worship, the sun being considered not as creator, but as organizer of the world, from an eternally pre-existing matter, perhaps the forerunner of the demiurge of the Alexandrine School.



SETI I BETWEEN ISIS (HATHOR) AND OSIRIS, OFFERING SACRIFICE TO THE LATTER

(b) *The Future Life.*—As early as the predynastic times the Egyptians believed that man was survived in death by a certain principle of life corresponding to our soul. The nature of this principle, and the conditions on which its survival depended, are illustrated by the monuments of the early dynasties. It was called the *ka* of the departed, and was imagined as a counterpart of the body it had animated, being of the same sex, remaining throughout its existence of the same age as at the time of death, and having the same needs and wants as the departed had in his lifetime. It endured as long as the body, hence the paramount importance the Egyptians attached to the preservation of the bodies of their dead. They generally buried them in ordinary graves, but always in the dry sand of the desert, where moisture could not affect them; among the higher classes, to whom the privilege of being embalmed was at first restricted, the mummy was sealed in a stone coffin and deposited in a carefully concealed rock-excavation over which a tomb was built. Hence, also, the presence in the tombs of lifelike statues of the deceased to which the *ka* might cling, should the mummy happen to meet destruction. But the *ka* could also die of hunger or thirst, and for this reason food and drink were left with the body at the time of the burial, fresh supplies being deposited from time to time on the top of the grave, or at the entrance of the tomb. The *ka*, or "double", as this word is generally interpreted, is confined to the grave or tomb, often called "the house of the *ka*". There near the body, it now lives alone in darkness as once, in union with the body, it lived in the sunny world. Toilet articles, weapons against possible enemies, amulets against serpents, are also left in the tomb, together with magic texts and a magic wand which enable it to make use of these necessaries.

Along with the *ka*, the earliest texts mention other surviving principles of a less material nature, the *ba* and the *khu*. Like the *ka*, the *ba* resides in the body during man's life, but after death it is free to wander where it pleases. It was conceived as a bird, and is often represented as such, with a human head. The *khu* is luminous; it is a spark of the divine intelligence. According to some Egyptologists, it is a mere transformation which the *ba* undergoes when, in the hereafter, it is found to have been pure and just during lifetime; it is then admitted to the society of the gods; according to others, it is a distinct element residing in the *ba*. Simultaneously with the concepts of the *ba* and the *khu*, the Egyptians developed the concept of a common abode for the departed souls, not unlike the Hades of the Greeks. But their views varied very much, both as to the location of that Hades and as to its nature. It is very likely that, originally, every god of the dead had a Hades of his own; but, as those gods were gradually either identified with Osiris or brought into his cycle as secondary infernal deities, the various local concepts of the region of the dead were ultimately merged into the Osirian concept. According to Professor Maspéro, the kingdom of Osiris was first thought to be located in one of the islands of the Northern Delta whither cultivation had not yet extended. But when the sun in its course through the night had become identified with Osiris, the realm of the dead was shifted to the region traversed by the sun during the night, wherever that region might be, whether under the earth, as more commonly accepted, or in the far west, in the desert, on the same plane with the world of the living, or in the north-eastern heavens beyond the great sea that surrounds the earth.

As the location, so does the nature of the Osirian Hades seem to have varied with the different schools; and here, unfortunately, as in the case of the Egyptian pantheon, the monuments exhibit different views superimposed on one another. We seem, however, to discern two traditions which we might call the pure Osiris and the Re-Osiris traditions. According to the former tradition the aspiration of all the departed is to be identified with Osiris, and live with him in his kingdom of the Earu, or Yalu, fields—such a paradise as the Egyptian peasant could fancy. There ploughing and reaping are carried on as upon the earth, but with hardly any labour, and the land is so well irrigated by the many branches of another Nile that wheat grows seven ells. All men are equal; all have to answer the call for work without distinction of former rank. Kings and grandees, however, can be spared that light burden by having *ushebtis* (respondents) placed with them in their tombs. These *ushebtis* were small statuettes with a magic text which enabled them to impersonate the deceased and answer the call for him.

To procure the admission of the deceased into this realm of happiness his family and friends had to perform over him the same rites as were performed over Osiris by Isis, Nephthys, Horus, and Anubis. Those rites consisted mostly of magical formulæ and incantations. The mummification of the body was considered an important condition, as Osiris was supposed to have been mummified. It seems, also, that in the beginning at least, the Osirian doctrine demanded a certain dismemberment of the body previous to all further rites, as the body of Osiris had been dismem-

bered by Set. Possibly, also, this took place in the predynastic times, when the bodies of the dead appear to have been intentionally dismembered and then put together again for burial (Chantepie de la Saussaye, op. cit., I, 214). At all events Diodorus narrates that the surgeon who made the first incision on the body previous to the removal of the viscera had to take to flight immediately after having accomplished his duty, while the mob pretended to drive him away with stones (Diodorus Siculus, I, 91), as though he impersonated Set. This custom, however, of dismembering bodies may be older than the Osirian doctrine, and may explain it rather than be explained from it (Chantepie de la Saussaye, op. cit., I, 220). When all the rites had been duly performed the deceased was pronounced Osiris so-and-so—he had been identified with the god Osiris. He could now proceed to the edge of the great river beyond which are the Earu fields. Turn-face, the ferryman, would carry him across, unless the four sons of Horus would bring him a craft to float over, or the hawk of Horus, or the ibis of Thoth, would condescend to transport him on its pinions to his destination. Such were, during the Memphite dynasties, the conditions on which the departed soul obtained eternal felicity; they were based on ritual rather than on moral purity. It seems, however, that already at that time some texts show the deceased declaring himself, or being pronounced, free of certain sins. In any case, under the twelfth dynasty the deceased was regularly tried before being allowed to pass across the waters. He is represented appearing before Osiris, surrounded by forty-two judges. His heart is weighed on scales by Horus and Anubis, over against a feather, a symbol of justice, while Thoth registers the result of the operation. In the meantime the deceased recites a catalogue of forty-two sins (so-called "negative confession") of which he is innocent. Between the scales and Osiris there is what seems to be a female hippopotamus, appearing ready to devour the guilty souls; but there was no great danger of falling into her jaws, as the embalmers had been careful to remove the heart and replace it by a stone scarab inscribed with a magical spell which prevented the heart from testifying against the deceased. The concept of retribution implied by the judgment very likely originated with the School of Abydos [see Maspéro, "Revue de l'histoire des religions" (1887), XV, 308 sqq.].

According to another tradition, which is represented along with the foregoing in the Pyramid Texts, the deceased is ultimately identified not with Osiris himself, but with Re identified with Osiris and his son Horus. His destination is the bark of Re on the eastern horizon, whither he is transported by the same ferryman Turn-face. Once on the sacred bark, the deceased may bid defiance to all dangers and enemies, he enjoys absolute and perfect felicity, leaves the kingdom of Re-Osiris, and follows Re-Horus across the heavens into the region of the living gods. The same concept was resumed by the Theban School. An important variant of this Re-Osiris tradition is to be found in two books due to the Theban Ammon-Re School of theology, the "Book of what there is in the Duat" (Hades) and the "Book of the Gates". In both compositions the course of Re in the region of darkness is divided into twelve sections corresponding to the twelve hours of night, but in the latter book each section is separated by a gate guarded by gigantic serpents. Some of these sections are presided over by the old gods of the dead, Sokar and Osiris, with their faithful subjects. The principal features of these two books is the concept of a retribution which we now meet clearly expressed for the first time. While the innocent soul, after a series of transformations, reaches at last, on the extreme limit of the lower world, the bark of Re, where it joins the happy crowd of the gods, the criminal one is submitted to various tortures and finally annihilated (see, however, below under IV).

IV. Literary Monuments of Ancient Egypt.—The earliest specimens of Egyptian literature are the so-called *Pyramid Texts* engraved on the walls of the halls and rooms of the pyramids of Unis (Fifth Dynasty) and Teti II, Pepi I, Mernere, and Pepi II (Sixth Dynasty). They represent two ancient rituals of the dead, the older of which, as is generally conceded, antedates the dynastic times. The texts corresponding to this one are mostly incantations and magic prayers supposed to protect the deceased against serpents and scorpions, hunger and thirst, and old age. The gods are made to transmit to the deceased the offerings deposited in the tomb; nay, these offerings are so placed in his power that he positively eats and digests them, thus assimilating their strength and other desirable qualities. In these last two features Professor Maspéro sees an indication that although the concept of the *ba* had already been superposed on that of the *ka*, when that ritual first came into existence, yet anthropophagical sacrifices, if no longer in use, were still fresh in the memory of the Egyptians. This high, probably predynastic, antiquity is confirmed by peculiarities of language and orthography, which in more than one case seem to have puzzled the copyists of the Fifth and Sixth Dynasties [Maspéro, in "Revue de l'hist. des religions", XII (1885), pp. 125 sqq.]. The other ritual represented in the Pyramid Texts is the Book of Funerals, known already in several recensions and published by Professor E. Schiaparelli (Il libro de' funerali degli Antichi Egiziani, Rome, 1881–2). It is supposed to be the repetition of the rites by which Isis and Horus had animated the mummy of Osiris with the life he had as god of the dead. The principal ceremony consisted in the opening of the mouth and eyes of the mummy, so that the deceased, in his second life, could enjoy the mortuary offerings and guide and express himself in the next world. For the details of this exceedingly interesting ritual we refer the reader to the excellent analysis of Professor Maspéro in the "Revue de l'Histoire des Religions" [XV (1887), 158 sqq.]. These two books were very popular with the Egyptians down to the end of the Ptolemaic times, especially the second one, which is profusely illustrated in the tomb of Seti I.

The Book of the Dead.—Next in antiquity comes the Book of the Dead, the most widely known monument of Egyptian literature. Numerous copies of it are to be found in all the principal museums of Europe. It may be best described as a general illustrated guide-book of the departed soul in Amenti (the Region of the West). There, whatever his belief as to the survival of man in the hereafter, or the location and nature of the region of the dead, the deceased found what he had to do to be admitted, what ordeals he would have to undergo before reaching his destination, what spirits and genii he would have to propitiate, and how to come out of all this victorious. Broadly speaking, the book can be divided into three sections: (1) "Book of the Going Out by Daytime" (cc. i–xvi), a title generally, though wrongly, extended to the whole book; (2) Chapters xvii–cxxiv: fitting the deceased for admission (xvii–xci) to the kingdom of Osiris, his itinerary thereto, whether by water or overland (xciii–cii, cxii–cxix), and his settlement therein (ciii–cx), without further formality than conciliating the ferryman or the guardian genii with certain incantations and magical prayers recited with the right intonation; in case the deceased believed in retribution, before gaining admission he had to repair to the Hall of Justice, there to be tried by Osiris (cxxiii–cxxv); (3) Chapter cxxv to the end: practically another guide-book for the special profit of the followers of the School of Abydos. It begins with the trial, after which it goes over pretty much the same ground as the com-

mon guide, with variations peculiar to the doctrine of the school. For further details see the masterly review by Maspéro of Naville's edition of the Book of the Dead during the Eighteenth to Twentieth Dynasties, in "Revue de l'histoire des religions", XV (1887), pp. 263–315. The most important chapters, from a theological viewpoint, are perhaps the seventeenth, a compendious summary of what the deceased was supposed to know on the nature of the gods with whom he was to identify himself, and the one hundred and twenty-fifth, where, along with the disclaimer of forty-two offences, we find also an enumeration of several good works, as feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, making offerings to the dead, and sacrificing to the gods. The Book of the Dead naturally received many additions in the course of centuries, as new concepts evolved from the older ones. It would not be correct, however, to conclude that all the chapters not to be found in the older copies are of recent date. Comparison between various copies of known dates shows that, as a rule, they were mere abstracts from the standard copies preserved by the corporations of embalmers, or undertakers, the deceased individual having, as a rule, ordered during his lifetime a copy to be prepared according to his own belief and means. The fact that certain chapters, like lxiv, were assigned by the manuscripts to what seem to us remote dates, such as the reigns of King Khufu (Cheops), of the fourth, or King Usaphais, of the first, dynasty, does not prove that these chapters were thought to be older than the others; the reverse is more likely to be the correct view. The bulk of the chapters were believed by the Egyptians to antedate the human dynastic times, and, as Professor Maspéro remarks, the discovery of the Pyramid Texts, to which the Book of the Dead is closely related, shows that this idea was not altogether futile (op. cit., XV, 299). The Book of the Dead contains several passages in common with the ritual of the dead represented by the Pyramid Texts, and its first fifteen chapters were likewise read at burials, but otherwise it constitutes a distinct type. The Book of the Dead occurs in two recensions: the Theban (Eighteenth to Twentieth Dynasty) and the Saitic (Twenty-sixth Dynasty). The latter, which, naturally, is the longer (165 chapters), was published by Lepsius (Das Todtenbuch der Aegypter, Leipzig, 1842), from a Turin papyrus. The first two translations of the Book of the Dead by Birch (in Bunsen, "Egypt's Place in Universal History", V, 66-333) and Pierret (Le Livre des Morts des Anciens Egyptiens, Paris, 1882) are based on that edition. In 1886 E. Naville published a critical edition of the Theban recension, "Das ägyptische Todtenbuch der XVIII. bis XX. Dynastie", Berlin, 1886. In 1901 Dr. E. A. W. Budge published a translation of that same recension, but augmented with a considerable number of chapters (in all, 160) from new Theban manuscripts and 16 chapters from the Saitic recension (The Book of the Dead, London, 1901). For further bibliographical details see Budge, "The Papyrus of Ani" (London, 1895, 371 sqq.).

Substitutes for the Book of the Dead.—Other books similar in scope to the Book of the Dead, and often substituted for it in tombs, are: (1) "The Book of the Respirations communicated by Isis to her brother Osiris to restore a new life to his soul and body and renew all his limbs, so that he may reach the horizon with his father Re, and his soul may rise to the heavens in the disk of the moon, and his body shine in the stars of Orion on the bosom of Nût; in order that this may also happen to the Osiris N." This book has so far been found only with the mummies of the priests and priestesses of Ammon-Re. It not only makes allusion to the formulæ and acts by means of which the resurrection is effected, but also treats of the life after death (tr. by P. J. Horrack in "Records of the Past", IV, 119 sqq.). A variation of this book under the title of "Another Chapter of Coming Forth by Day, in order not to let him [the deceased] absorb impurities in the necropolis, but to let him drink truth, eat truth, accomplish all transformations he may please, to restore a new life" etc. (as above) was published by Wiedemann, "Hieratische Texte aus den Museen zu Berlin u. Paris" (Leipzig, 1879). (2) "The Lamentations of Isis and Nephthys" (tr. by Horrack, op. cit., II, 117 sqq.). (3) "The Book of the Glorification of Osiris", a variation of the preceding, published by Pierret from a Louvre papyrus. (4) The "Book of the Wandering of Eternity", published by Bergmann, "Das Buch vom Durchwandel der Ewigkeit" in "Sitzungsber. d. K.K. Ak. d. Wiss. in Wien", 1877.

Mythological Compositions.—A different group of funeral books is represented by certain mythological compositions. They consist principally of figures relating to the various diurnal and nocturnal phases of the sun, accompanied with explanatory legends. The oldest of such compositions can be assigned to the Eighteenth Dynasty, and refers to both the daily and nightly courses of the sun, the two being often combined in one picture in two sections. In later times the nocturnal aspect of the sun prevails, and the composition becomes more and more funereal in character and scope, until the diurnal solar symbols disappear almost entirely (see Devéria, "Catalogue" etc., pp. 1–15). Several of the figures are borrowed from the Book of the Dead.

Book of the Duat.—Closely related to these mythological compositions is the "Book of what there is in the Duat" (or Lower Hemisphere, as commonly, though perhaps wrongly, understood. See below, under *Astronomy*). It consists of a hieroglyphic text with numerous mythological or symbolical illustrations describing the nocturnal navigation of the sun (represented as the ram-headed god Chnûm) on the river Uernes (cf. the Οὐρανός of the Greeks) during the twelve hours of night, through as many halls. To each hall corresponds one of the successive modifications through which every being was supposed to be brought back from death to a new life. Such modifications are effected by the deities in charge of the various halls, who, in addition, contribute, either by towing or in some other mysterious way, to the progress of the solar bark on the Uernes, typifying that of the regeneration. However, this process of regeneration is not accomplished in Chnûm himself but in the god Sokari, who plays the part of the dead sun. The deceased, who is never mentioned by his name, appears as a mere figurant, or rather an onlooker. All those who take part in the action seem to be permanently settled in the Duat, with no other apparent purpose than to play their own parts on the passage of the solar bark. This is the case even with the damned, who, when the time of retribution comes at the end of the tenth, and during the eleventh, hour, impersonate the enemies of Osiris, and for the time being are submitted to atrocious torments and even annihilated. Whether one is justified, as generally granted, in seeing in this last point a proof that the Egyptians as a people believed in eternal retribution, does not appear quite certain if we consider the highly mystical character of that book, the understanding of which was the privilege of a few initiated. For further details see the introduction to and the analysis of that book by Devéria ("Catalogue" etc., pp. 15–39. See also Jéquier, "Livre de ce qu'il y a dans l'Hadès", Paris, 1894).

Ritual of the Embalming.—To close the above remarks on the funereal literature we must mention the Ritual of Embalming, published by Professor Maspéro (Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits etc., t. XXIV, Paris, 1882).

Liturgies.—The religion of the living, if we may so express ourselves, is far from being as largely repre-

sented in Egyptian literature as that of the dead. Yet we have a few important works such as the ritual, or rather the liturgy, of Osiris in his temple at Abydos, of which an illustrated edition has been preserved on the walls of that temple (published by Moret, "Le Rituel du culte divin journalier en Egypte", 1902), and the liturgy of the Amon-worship contained in a Berlin papyrus (O. v. Lemm, Ritualbuch des Amondienstes, 1882). The Litany of the Sun has been translated by Naville, in "Records of the Past", VIII, 103 sqq.; also a fragment of the Legend of Re to which we have already alluded (op. cit., VI, 103 sq.) and several hymns to Osiris (op. cit., New Series, IV, 17 sq.), the Nile (op. cit., New Series, III, 46 sqq.), and Amon-Re (in Maspéro, "Histoire ancienne", pp. 328 sqq.; Grébaut, "Hymne à Ammon-Ra", Paris, 1875; cf. Stern in "Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache", 1877, and Brugsch, "Religion u. Mythologie der alten Aegypter", Leipzig, 1885, pp. 690 sqq.). From the point of view of composition and style these hymns are the most remarkable literary products of ancient Egypt, as they are the most striking specimens of the monotheistic tendencies which developed under the Eighteenth-Twentieth Dynasties as a result of the political supremacy of Thebes. Not less noteworthy are the hymns composed by Amenophis IV in honour of his sole god Aton (see the specimen published by Breasted, "History of the Ancient Egyptians", pp. 273 sqq.).

Moral.—Several Egyptian literary compositions of a moral nature have reached us. The two oldest are attributed to Kagemme, vizier of King Snefrû, and Ptahhotep, vizier and chief judge under King Isesi, last but one of the fifth dynasty. Both compositions, preserved in a manuscript of the Twelfth Dynasty, consist of apophthegms and proverbs of a rather positive and practical nature, as "A slight failure is enough to make vile a great man" (Kagemme), or "A docile son shall be happy on account of his obedience; he shall grow old and get favour", or "If you are a wise man, fix your house pleasantly, love your wife, do not quarrel with her, give her food and jewels, because this makes her comely, give her perfumes and pleasures during your life. She is a treasure which must be worthy of its owner" (Ptahhotep). Under the Twelfth Dynasty we have the teaching of Amenemhet I, where the old king warns his son and successor, Usertesen, against placing too much confidence in, and being too intimate with, those around him, exemplifying his teaching from his own experience (translated in "Records of the Past", II, p. 9 sqq.). Of a much higher order and wider scope are the counsels that Ani, a scribe of the Nineteenth Dynasty, gives to his son Khons-Hotep: "Let thine eye observe the deeds of God; it is he that strikes whatsoever is stricken. Piety to the gods is the highest virtue"; "It is I who gave thee to thy mother, but it is she that bore thee and while she was carrying thee she suffered many pains. When the time of her delivery arrived thou wert born and she carried thee like the veriest yoke, her pap in thy mouth, for three years. Thou didst grow, and thy filthiness never so far disgusted her as to make her cry out: 'Oh! what am I doing?' Thou wert sent to school. She was anxious about thee every day, bringing thee meat and drink from home. Thou didst take a house and wife of thine own, but never forget the pains of childbed thou didst cost to thy mother; give her not cause to complain of thee, lest perchance she lift up her hands to the divinity, and he give ear to her will"; "Keep this in mind whenever thou hast to make a decision: Even as the most aged die thou also shalt lie down among them. There is no exception; even for him whose life is without blame, the same lot awaits him as well. Thy death-messenger will come to thee too, to carry thee away. Discourses will avail thee nothing, for he is coming, yea, he is ready even now. Do not begin to say: 'I am still but a child, I whom thou takest off.' Thou knowest not how thou shalt die. Death comes to the suckling babe; yea, to him who is yet in the womb, as well as to the old, old man. See, I tell thee things for thy good, which thou shalt ponder in thy heart before acting. In them thou shalt find happiness and all evil shall be put far from thee" (tr. of Chabas, "L'Egyptologie", Paris, 1876–8).

History.—Egyptian historical literature is somewhat illustrated from what we have said of the sources of chronology (see above, II., subsection *Chronology*). In sharp contrast with the aridity which generally characterizes such documents, the so-called prose-poem of Pentaur stands alone so far. Pentaur is the name of the copyist, not of the author, as was long believed. Its subject is an episode of the famous campaign of Ramses II against the Hittites. When taken by surprise he, with only the household troops and a few officers who happened to be there, bravely charged the van of the enemy who were in pursuit of his defeated army, and so brilliantly successful was he that the rout was turned into a victory. The work displays a good deal of literary skill and is the nearest approach to an epic to be found in Egyptian literature (Breasted, "Hist. of the Anc. Egyptians", 320; cf. Maspéro, "Hist. Anc.", 272 sq.). Not less remarkable, perhaps, although less pretentious in point of style are: (1) the long autobiography of Uni, under three successive kings (Teti II, Pepi I, and Mernere) of the sixth dynasty, the longest funerary inscription and the most important historical document of that time (Breasted, "Anc. Rec. of Egypt", I, 134 sq.); (2) the famous stele of Piankhi (see above, II. under *Dynastic History;* Second Period) which Professor Breasted calls the clearest and most rational account of a military expedition which has survived from ancient Egypt (Hist. of the Anc. Egyptians, 370); (3) the great Papyrus Harris, a huge roll one hundred and thirty feet long, the longest document from the Early Orient. It contains an enormous inventory of the gifts of Ramses III to the three chief divinities of Egypt, a statement of his achievements abroad, and his benefactions to his people at home (op. cit., 347).

Fiction.—If history proper is not more largely represented in Egyptian literature, it is because its naturally positive and dry character, which the structure of the Egyptian language made it difficult to disguise, was not in harmony with the highly imaginative Egyptian mind. No doubt the Egyptians were proud of their kings; but from one end of the country to the other the waters of the Nile reflected temples and mortuary chapels without number, on the walls of which the achievements of the pharaohs were spread in gorgeous inscriptions and reliefs. That was all the history they needed. It furnished them with historical outlines which their fertile imaginations filled out with stories or tales after their own taste, tales in the style of the "Arabian Nights", where animals and mummies spoke like ordinary folks, as for instance in the tale of "The Two Brothers", from the Nineteenth Dynasty (Records of the Past, II, 137 sqq.), and the story of Satni-Khâmois from Ptolemaic times (op. cit., IV, 131 sq.). In "The Doomed Prince", Twentieth Dynasty (op. cit., II, 153 sq.), men fly like birds; in "The Shipwrecked", Twelfth Dynasty (translated, with all the others, in Maspéro, "Les contes populaires de l'Egypte ancienne", 3d ed., Paris, 1905), the hero is shipwrecked on the Island of the Ka (one of the popular concepts of the Land of the Dead), where a gigantic serpent addresses him with a human voice and treats him with the utmost kindness. In "The Daughter of the Prince of Bakhtan", Twentieth Dynasty, the prince's younger daughter is delivered from a demon or spirit by the statue of the god Khonsu for which he had sent to Thebes. Sometimes, however, the action remains within the limits of the natural order, and the interest consists in some extraordinary

change of fortune, as in the case of Sinuhit, Twelfth Dynasty, or in some clever stratagem, as in "How Thutiy captured Joppa", Twentieth Dynasty, and in the story of Rampsinitos (Herod., II, 121), Saitic times. The *dramatis personæ* of such tales and stories are often persons of royal blood, the pharaoh himself not infrequently playing the principal part; and the names which they bear, as a rule, are real historic names, so that in some cases it is not clear, at first sight, whether one has to deal with history or with fiction. More frequently, however, the names have been selected at random, sometimes from proper names, sometimes from the *prænomina*, or even from popular nicknames. Moreover, chronology, as is usual in popular fiction, is grossly disregarded. In the story of "Satni-Khâmois", for instance, Menephtah, instead of appearing as the brother of the hero, is alluded to as a remote predecessor of Ramses II (Usirmarî of the tale, a *prænomen* of Ramses II in his youth). This literature of historical fiction was evidently very popular in Egypt at all times and in all classes of society. That it was chiefly from this source that Herodotus collected most of his notices concerning the ancient kings of Egypt is evident from the chronological confusion and the great mixture of names, *prænomina*, and nicknames which prevail in his writings. See on this all-important point the very interesting introduction of Prof. Maspéro to his "Contes populaires de l'ancienne Egypte" (3d ed., Paris, 1905).

Astronomy.—We have no special treatise on astronomy written by ancient Egyptians in book form. The monuments, however, the temples and tombs especially, give us a fair idea of their astronomical knowledge. On the whole, their notions were rather elementary. They knew the zodiac and the principal constellations, and had special names for Orion (*Sahu*) and Sirius (*Sopdit*), the former being sacred to Osiris and the latter to Isis, and for the thirty-six *decani* which presided over the thirty-six decades of the year. They had compiled tables of the risings and settings of a great many, if not all, of the stars visible to the naked eye. They knew the difference between fixed stars and planets, and the apparently retrograde motion of Mars at certain periods of the year had not escaped their attention. Beyond this they knew probably little or nothing (see Ginzel, "Handbuch der mathematischen u. technischen Chronologie", I, 153). We have seen above (II., subsection *Chronology*) how the Egyptians used what they knew of astronomy for the division of time and its computation. They fancied the earth round and flat, surrounded with mountains beyond which flowed a large river which they called Uernes (cf. the *Ὠκεανός* of the Greeks). At the four cardinal points the mountains rose higher and supported the celestial vaults, which they imagined as solid, although transparent. Over this vault flowed the celestial waters on which the sun, and the moon, and the stars floated in barks. The sun at the end of every day went out through the western mountains, and sailed on the Uernes first northward, then southward to the mountain of the east, where he entered our world again through a large gate. Egyptian mythology saw in the celestial vault an immense cow (Hathor), or a woman, the goddess Nût, whom Shu (the atmosphere) had separated from her husband Qeb, or Sib (the earth), and who brought forth the sun every morning, and swallowed it every evening (Maspéro in "Revue de l'histoire des religions", XV, 269 sqq.). The many representations of the celestial vault in tombs and on the inner sides of the lids of sarcophagi are purely mythological (op. cit., I, 151).

Mathematics.—Our earliest Egyptian treatise on mathematics is the Rhind Papyrus of the British Museum [ed. Eisenlohr, Ein mathematisches Handbuch der alten Aegypter, 1877; L. Rodet in Jour. de la Soc. Math. de France, VI (1878), 139 sqq.]; it dates back to the Nineteenth Dynasty. It contains: (a) several theorems of plane geometry with rules for measuring solids; (b) a manual of the calculator on a purely arithmetical basis, not algebraic. [Rodet in Jour. Asiatique (1881), XVIII, 184 sq., 390 sq.]. The numerical system was decimal, and contained figures for one and for each power of ten; these figures were repeated as many times as contained in the number to be expressed. With the exception of *two-thirds*, the only fractions which they could write with one sign were those having 1 as numerator.

Astrology.—Among the documents belonging to this science the most important is a fragmentary astrological calendar (British Museum) written during the Nineteenth Dynasty. It contains a list of the things which it is proper to do or to avoid on each day of the year. The reason why such a day was *fas* or *nefas* was ordinarily taken from some mythological tradition. The Greeks and Romans were not ignorant of this science, but the name "Egyptian days" (*dies Ægyptiaci*), by which they designated it, shows clearly that they borrowed it from Egypt.

Medicine.—The Museum of Berlin preserves a copy of an Egyptian treatise on medicine, said to have been completed by, or at least under, kings of the First and Second Dynasties. There is besides, in the University Library of Leipzig, a papyrus commonly known as the Ebers Papyrus containing a copy (Eighteenth Dynasty) of another treatise attributed to King Cheops of the Fourth Dynasty. From these two documents and others of less importance we may infer that the Egyptians knew little about theoretical medicine, as, for religious reasons, they were not allowed to study anatomy. Practical medicine on the other hand, was so far developed among them that the Egyptian physicians were those most highly esteemed by the Greeks and Romans. The names given to diseases are not always clear, but the description of symptoms is often sufficiently detailed to enable a physician to identify them. Pharmaceutical science was still more advanced. Four kinds of remedies are to be found in the recipes: ointments, potions, plasters, clysters; they were usually taken from vegetables, sometimes from minerals (as sulphate of copper, salt, nitre, memphitic stone); the raw flesh, blood (fresh or dried up), hair, and horn of animals were also used, especially to reduce inflammations. The elements of such remedies were first mashed, boiled, and strained, then diluted in water, beer, infusions of oats, milk, oil, and even human urine. But the Egyptians believed that not all diseases were of natural origin; some were caused by evil spirits who obsessed the patients.

For *Egyptian Art* see TEMPLE.

DEVÉRIA, *Catalogue des manuscrits égyptiens etc. qui sont conservés au musée égyptien du Louvre* (Paris, 1872); MASPÉRO, *Les inscriptions des pyramides de Saqqarah* (Paris, 1894)—reprint from *Recueil de travaux* etc., vols. III-V, VII-XII, XIV; NAVILLE, *Das ägyptische Todtenbuch der 18–20. Dynastie* (Berlin, 1886); BUDGE, *The Book of the Dead* (3 vols., London, 1898; London and Chicago, 1901); LEPSIUS, *Das Todtenbuch der Aegypter nach dem hieroglyphischen Papyrus in Turin* (Leipzig, 1842); LEFÉBURE, *Hypogées royaux* in *Mém. de la Mission archéolog. française*, II-III, 1–2; JÉQUIER, *Livre de ce qu'il y a dans l'Hadès* (Paris, 1894); ERMAN, *A Handbook of Egyptian Religion*, tr. by GRIFFITH (London, 1907); STEINDORFF, *The Religion of the Ancient Egyptians* (New York and London, 1905); WIEDEMANN, *Die Religion der alten Aegypter* (Münster, 1890)—also to be had in English; MASPÉRO, *Études de Mythologie et d'archéologie égyptiennes* (3 vols., Paris, 1893–98); LANGE, *Die Aegypter* in DE LA SAUSSAYE, *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte* (Tübingen, 1905), I, 172–245; ERMAN, tr. TIRARD, *Life in Ancient Egypt* (London, 1895—chapter XV is a general sketch of Egyptian literature proper); MASPÉRO, *Les contes populaires de l'Egypte ancienne* (3rd ed., Paris, 1905); GRIFFITH, *Stories of the High Priests of Memphis* (London, 1900); PETRIE, *Egyptian Tales* (London—after GRIFFITH and MASPÉRO).

V. THE COPTIC CHURCH, the Church of the Copts or Egyptians, the usual modern name for the Church of Alexandria, though very often arbitrarily restricted to the period beginning with its secession (451) from the Catholic Church under its patriarch Dioscurus (q. v.) when it became a distinctly national church. The word *Copt* is an adaptation of the Arabic *Qibt* or *Qubt*

(a corruption of Gr. Αἰγύπτιος). The Arab conquerors thus designated the old inhabitants of Egypt (in vast majority followers of Dioscurus) in contradistinction both to themselves and to the Melchites of Greek origin and language who were still in communion with the Catholic Church, but have since drifted within the orbit of the so-called Orthodox, i. e. schismatic Greek, Church. A general article on the Coptic Church will be found under ALEXANDRIA, THE CHURCH OF. Special features of importance are treated under the titles ALEXANDRIA, COUNCILS OF; GNOSTICISM; MONASTICISM; PERSECUTION; SACRAMENTS; VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE. See also ATHANASIUS; CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA; DIONYSIUS OF ALEXANDRIA; MARK; THEOPHILUS, PATRIARCH OF ALEXANDRIA; CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA; ORIGEN; DIOSCURUS; MELCHITES; MISSIONS. In the present article we shall treat in particular of the origins and constitution of the Coptic Church, especially the question of its episcopate, to the Council of Nicæa (325). We shall close with a short sketch of the present condition of both the Jacobite and the Uniat branches of the Coptic Church, chiefly from the point of view of their organization.

1. *Early Christianity in Egypt.*—We have no direct evidence of Christianity having existed in Egypt until Clement of Alexandria (A. D. 150–220) when it had already spread over the land. What we know of the Church of Egypt before that time is exclusively through inferences or unconfirmed traditions preserved principally by Eusebius (see below). Thus we may infer the existence of Christianity in Egypt during the second century from the fact that under Trajan a Greek version of the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" was being circulated there (Duchesne, Histoire Ancienne de l'Eglise, I, 126). We know that this Gospel was the book of the Judæo-Christians. Its very name points to the existence at the same date of another Christian community, recruited from among the Gentiles. This, presumably, followed another Gospel which Clement of Alexandria calls "the Gospel according to the Egyptians". (On the Gospel of the Egyptians, see Harnack, Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur, I, 1, pp. 612–22; on the Gospel of the Hebrews, ibid., pp. 631–49.) This writer quotes it along with the "Gospel according to the Hebrews". However, he clearly distinguishes both from the canonical Gospels, which shows that those two apocrypha were then mere relics of the past, or at least were old enough to be entitled to some consideration in spite of their uncanonical character. Some writers, as Bardenhewer (Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, I, 387), think that the "Gospel according to the Egyptians" owed its name to its diffusion among the Egyptians throughout the land, in contradistinction to some other Gospel, canonical or uncanonical, in use in Alexandria. In this case we might conclude furthermore to the existence of a third Christian community, consisting of native Egyptians, as it is difficult to suppose that two Hellenistic communities would have used two different Gospels. But we have no evidence of a native Church having existed at as early a period as suggested by the elimination of the Gospel of the Egyptians from the canon at the time of Clement of Alexandria.

Again, organized Christianity at an early date in Egypt is, indirectly at least, attested by the activity of the Gnostic schools in that country in the third and fourth decades of the second century. Eusebius is authority that "Basilides the heresiarch", founder of one of these schools, came into prominence in the year 134. Other Egyptian founders of such schools, Valentinus and Carpocrates, belong to the same period. Valentinus had already moved to Rome in 140, under the pontificate of Pope Hyginus (Irenæus, Adv. Hær., III, iv, 3), after having preached his doctrines in Egypt, his native country. As Duchesne (op. cit., I, 331) well remarks, one cannot believe that these heretical manifestations represent all the Alexandrine Christianity. These schools, precisely because they are nothing but schools, suppose a Church, "the Great Church", as Celsus calls it; such aberrations, precisely because labelled with their authors' names, testify to the existence of the orthodox tradition in the country where they originated. This tradition, from which heresies of such a power of diffusion could separate themselves without putting its very existence in jeopardy, must have been endowed with a vitality which cannot be accounted for without at least half a century of normal growth and an organization under the guidance of strong and vigilant bishops. We may, therefore, safely conclude that as early as the middle decades of the first century there were in Alexandria, and probably in the neighbouring nomes, or provinces, Christian communities consisting principally of Hellenistic Jews and of those pious men (φοβούμενοι τὸν Θεόν) who had embraced the tenets and practices of Judaism without becoming regular proselytes. These communities must have had some numerical importance, for on the one hand the Jews were exceedingly numerous (over one million) in Egypt, and particularly in Alexandria, where they constituted two-fifths of the whole population; and on the other hand the philosophical eclecticism that generally prevailed in Alexandria at that time co-operated in favour of Christian ideas with the great doctrinal tolerance then obtaining throughout Judaism, to the extent, indeed, as Duchesne tersely puts it, that one might think like Philo or like Akiba, believe in the resurrection of the flesh or its final annihilation, expect the Messias or ridicule that hope, philosophize like Ecclesiastes or like the Wisdom of Solomon (op. cit., I, 122). Along with this judaizing Church, whose hopes and expectations were centred in Jerusalem and the Temple, who accepted Christianity and yet continued to observe the Law, there was another Church, decidedly Gentile—we might say, Christian—in its character and aspirations, as well as in its practices. It is difficult to surmise what the relations of those two Churches to one another were in their details. It is very probable that the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple by Titus, by putting an end to the hopes of many among the judaizing Church, brought them over to the Great Church, which henceforth gained rapidly in numbers and prestige and soon became the only orthodox Christian Church.

2. *Chronology of Early Episcopate.*—Eusebius, both in his "Chronicle" and his "Ecclesiastical History" (cf. Harnack, "Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur", I, 1, pp. 70–208), registers the names and years of pontificate of ten bishops supposed to have occupied in succession the See of Alexandria prior to the accession of Demetrius (188–9). Those names he took from the now lost "Chronography" of Julius Africanus, who visited Egypt in the early portion of the third century. They are as follows: Anianus, 22 years; Abilius, 13; Cerdo, 11; Primus, 12; Justus, 11; Eumenes, 13; Marcus, 10; Celadion, 14; Agrippinus, 12; Julianus, 10. Dates are also given, each bishop being entered under the year of reign of the Roman Emperor in which his accession took place. Thus Anianus is entered under the eighth year of Nero (A. D. 62–3). It seems certain, however, that these synchronistic indications do not belong to the list as found by Julius Africanus, but were computed by himself, from Demetrius down, on the years of pontificate of the several bishops. The same writer (Harnack, "Chronologie", I, 1, p. 706) is authority for another tradition preserved also by Eusebius, to the effect that Christianity was first introduced in Egypt by St. Mark the Evangelist in the third year of Claudius (A. D. 43), only one year after St. Peter established his see in Rome, and one year before Evodius had been raised to the See of Antioch. He preached there his Gospel and founded Churches in Alexandria. Little is added by

Eusebius, viz. that, according to Clement of Alexandria, Mark had come to Rome with St. Peter (probably after Agrippa's death in 44), and that, according to Papias, after Peter's death (probably 64), Mark had written there the Gospel that bears his name (see Harnack, "Chronologie", I, 1, pp. 652–3). This latter point is confirmed by Irenæus, op. cit., III, i, 2: "Post vero horum [Petri et Pauli] excessum, Marcus, discipulus et interpres Petri, et ipse quæ a Petro nuntiata erant per scripta nobis tradidit."

Other chronological traditions, often mere variations of those just related, concerning the apostolate and death of St. Mark, have been handed down mostly by the Oriental compilers of chronicles. They are strongly legendary and often conflict with one another and with the Eusebian traditions. In more than one instance they seem to have originated from a misunderstanding of Eusebius's text, of which we know there was a Coptic translation, or from an effort to harmonize or supplement the traditions reported (but not confirmed) by that writer. Until these Oriental sources have been critically edited and their chronology brought out of its chaotic state, it is impossible to make use of them to any considerable extent. It seems, however, certain (1) that St. Mark died a martyr, though the constant tradition that his martyrdom was on Easter Day and on the 24th or 25th of April seems to be worthless, seeing that from the year 45 to the end of the first century Easter never fell on either of those dates; (2) that, having temporarily left Egypt to go (or to return) to the Pentapolis, St. Mark had appointed Anianus his successor several years prior to his own death. Severus of Nesteraweh, a bishop of the ninth century, says that it was seven years before his martyrdom. It is remarkable that Eusebius, while stating that Anianus succeeded St. Mark in the eighth year of Nero (A. D. 62–3), does not mention Mark's death (as in the case of St. Peter). Probably he had found no tradition on that point. The fact, however, that he gives Anianus as the first Bishop of Alexandria shows that, in his mind, the two events were not contemporaneous. For if Anianus had taken possession of the see on St. Mark's death he would have been the second, and not the first, bishop. There is some reason to suspect the correctness of the traditions transmitted by Julius Africanus through Eusebius. The round number of ten bishops for a period of which we otherwise know nothing, the fact that in every case the pontificate consisted of complete years only without extra months and days, the further fact that we find in that short list two pontificates of ten years, two of eleven, two of twelve, two of thirteen, which seems to indicate that the other two originally were fourteen years each—all this might suggest that the list of Julius Africanus is to some extent at least artificial, and based on a uniform number of twelve years for each pontificate, giving a sum total of one hundred and twenty years for the list. One might surmise that the list was originally supposed to start from St. Mark's death, and that later on the enthronement of Anianus was taken as its beginning, his pontificate being, as a consequence, increased by from four to eight years. Nor is it, perhaps, entirely fortuitous that the different recensions of the "Chronicon" of Eusebius (the Armenian recension, for instance) count so very near 144 years (12×12) from St. Mark's arrival in Egypt to Demetrius. It would not be difficult to find other instances of chronologies of predocumentary times thus artificially rounded out on the basis of the numbers ten and twelve.

We have, perhaps, a relic of an entirely different tradition in a remark to be found in the "Chronicon Orientale" of Peter Ibn Râhib, namely, that after the pontificate of Abilius there was a vacancy of three years, owing to the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem under Titus. If we had not the list of Julius Africanus, such a statement might not seem devoid of plausibility. As we have seen before, the first Christian community of Alexandria consisted chiefly of Jews, and we should naturally suppose that its first pastors were chosen from among the Jews. At any rate they were regarded as Jews by the Government. Now it is known that, after the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem, Vespasian adopted measures of extreme rigour against the Jewish population of Egypt, lest they should try to make their temple of Leontopolis the national centre of their race, and thus defeat his very purpose in wiping out of existence the Temple of Jerusalem. It was not until A. D. 73, when this obnoxious temple was, in its turn, destroyed, that the persecution ceased, and the Jews were restored to their former privilege of free worship. Supposing that the predecessor of Abilius died A. D. 70, it would appear likely enough that the see should have remained vacant during the time of the persecution.

3. *Nature of Early Episcopate.*—There is much discussion as to the nature of the early episcopate of Egypt. Tradition seems to point to a collective episcopate consisting of twelve presbyters with a bishop at their head. St. Jerome, in a letter to Evangelus (P. L., XXII, 1194), insisting on the dignity of the priesthood, says: "At Alexandria, from the time of St. Mark the Evangelist to that of the Bishops Heraclas and Dionysius [middle of the third century] the presbyters of Alexandria used to call bishop one they elected from among themselves and raised to a higher standing, just as the army makes an emperor, or the deacons call archdeacon, one from their own body whom they know to be of active habits." This is confirmed by: (1) A passage of a letter of Severus of Antioch, written from Egypt between 518 and 538. Speaking of a certain Isaias who adduced an ancient canon to prove the validity of his episcopal ordination although performed by a single bishop, Severus says: "It was also customary for the bishop of the city famous for the orthodoxy of its faith, the city of the Alexandrines, to be appointed by priests. Later, however, in agreement with a canon which obtained everywhere, the sacramental institution of their bishop took place by the hands of the bishops." (2) A passage of the annals of Eutychius, Melchite Patriarch of Alexandria who flourished in the early decades of the tenth century: "St. Mark along with Ananias [Anianus] made twelve priests to be with the patriarch; so that when this should be wanting they might elect one out of the twelve priests and the remaining eleven should lay their hands upon his head and bless him and appoint him patriarch; and should after this choose a man of note and make him priest with them in the place of the one who had been made patriarch from among the twelve priests, in such sort that they should always be twelve. This custom, that the priests of Alexandria should appoint the patriarch from the twelve priests, did not come to an end till the time of Alexander Patriarch of Alexandria, one of the three hundred and eighteen [the Fathers of Nicæa] who forbade the presbyters [in the future] to appoint the patriarch, but decreed that on the death of the patriarch the bishops should convene and appoint the patriarch, and he furthermore decreed that on the death of the patriarch they should elect a man of note from whichsoever place, from among those twelve priests or not . . . and appoint him" (tr. from the Arabic text ed. Cheikho, in "Corpus Script. Christ. Orientalium; Scriptores Arabici", Ser. IIIa, tom. VI, 95, 96). Finally, we read in the apophthegms of the Egyptian monk Pœmen (Butler, "Lausiac History of Palladius") that certain heretics came to Pœmen and began to scoff at the Archbishop of Alexandria as having ordination (*χειροτονίαν*) from priests. The old man did not answer, but he said to the brothers: "Prepare the table, make them eat, and dismiss them in peace." It is generally supposed that the heretics in question were Arians and really intended to make Pœmen believe that the then Archbishop of Alexandria had been

ANCIENT EGYPT
(Down to A. D. 640)
Showing alluvial Valley of the Nile, with detail map of the Delta.
For the convenience of the reader place names are given, where possible, in the
Old Egyptian (GOTHIC TYPE, LIKE THIS)
Classical (Roman Type, like this)
Modern Arabic (Italic Type, like this)
Longitude East from Greenwich
MARE MAGNUM
MARE AEGYPTIUM
DELTA
AETHIOPIA
HEPTA NOMIS
ARABIA PETREA
THE BAIS
DODECASCHOENUS
Scale of Miles
Schoeni Ægypt.
Stadia
Nilus
Nile
Rosetta
Damietta
Lake Mariut
Wadi Natrûn
Bitter Lakes
Gosen
Sinus Arabicus
Mons Porphyrites
Mons Claudianus
Regnum Axomitarum
Insula Meroë
Gebel Barkal
Aualitae
Sebritae
Troglodytice
Arabia
Heroopolitanus Sinus
Desertum Etham
Desertum Pharan
Desertum Arabiae
Desertum Libycum
Desertum Nubae
Desertum Thebaicum
Desertum Syenites
Desertum Troglodytarum
Desertum Berenicidis
Desertum Ptolemaidis
Desertum Memphitum
Desertum Heliopolitanum
Desertum Arsinoitum
Desertum Alexandrinum
Desertum Scetis
Desertum Cleopatridis
Desertum Phacusae
Desertum Tanitum
Desertum Pelusiacum
Desertum Serbonidis
Desertum Casii
Desertum Sirbonis
Desertum Rhinocolurae
Desertum Gerrhaeorum
Desertum Ostracinae
Desertum Phatmeticum
Desertum Mendesium
Desertum Thennesus
Desertum Buccolicum
Desertum Paralus
Desertum Bolbitinum
Desertum Canobicum
Desertum Heracleum
Desertum Nicopolis
Desertum Pharus
Desertum Lacus Mareotis
Desertum Lacus Maris
Desertum Lacus Borolos
Desertum Lacus Sirbonis
Desertum Lacus Amari
Desertum Lacus Timsah
Desertum Lacus Pelusiacum
Desertum Lacus Tanitum
Desertum Lacus Phatmeticum
Desertum Lacus Buccolicum
Desertum Lacus Paralus
Desertum Lacus Bolbitinum
Desertum Lacus Canobicum
Desertum Lacus Heracleum
Desertum Lacus Nicopolis
Desertum Lacus

ordained by priests, and St. Athanasius is supposed to have been that archbishop. Now, as it is a well-known fact that St. Athanasius was consecrated by bishops, that accusation is considered one of the many calumnies the Arians used to spread against him. If this interpretation be true, the Lausiac text proves nothing for the nature of the early Alexandrian episcopate. But it seems highly improbable that the Arians should have dared to assert what everyone in Egypt in the least familiar with contemporary events, must have known to be false. In fact the Lausiac text is susceptible of a more plausible interpretation, to wit, that the episcopal character of the Archbishop of Alexandria was to be traced to simple presbyters, while in other Churches the Apostolic succession had been transmitted from the very beginning through an uninterrupted line of bishops. In this case the Lausiac would be the oldest witness of the tradition transmitted by Jerome, Severus, and Eutychius, for Pœmen flourished in the first half of the fifth century (Dict. Christ. Biogr., s. v.), or even as early as the latter half of the fourth century, if Charles Gore is right in his argument that Rufinus visited that holy hermit in 375 (Journal of Theological Studies, III, 280). Moreover, that the bishops of Alexandria were originally not only elected, but also appointed, by presbyters is, indirectly at least, confirmed by another tradition for which Eutychius is authority, to wit, that, till Demetrius there was no other bishop in Egypt than the Bishop of Alexandria. This was denied by Sollerius (Hist. Chron. Patr. Alex., 8*= 10*) and others, but we shall see in the following section that their reasons are not conclusive (cf. Harnack, "Miss. u. Ausbreitung", 2d ed., II, 133, n. 3). The tradition that the early Bishops of Alexandria were elected and appointed by a college of presbyters, is therefore, if not certain, at least highly probable. On the other hand it seems almost certain that that custom came to an end much earlier than Eutychius, or even Jerome, would have it. Significant is the fact that they disagree on the *terminus ad quem;* still more significant that Severus of Antioch is silent on that point. Besides, several passages of the works of Origen and Clement of Alexandria can hardly be understood without supposing that the mode of episcopal election and ordination was then the same as throughout the rest of the Christian world (see Cabrol in his "Dict. d'archéologie chrét.", s. v. Alexandrie: Election du Patriarche).

We may not dismiss the question without recalling the use which Presbyterians, since Selden, have made of that tradition to uphold their views on the early organization of the Church. It suffices to say that their theory rests, after all, on the gratuitous assumption (to put it as mildly as possible) that the presbyters who used to elect the Bishop of Alexandria, were priests as understood in the now current meaning of this word. Such is not the tradition; according to Eutychius himself, Selden's chief authority, the privilege of patriarchal election was vested not in the priests in general, but in a college of twelve priests on whom that power had been conferred by St. Mark. They were in that sense an episcopal college. Later on, when it became necessary to establish resident bishops in the provinces, the appointees may have been selected from the college of presbyters, while still retaining their former quality of members of the episcopal college. So that, little by little, the power of patriarchal election passed into the hands of regular bishops. The transfer would have been gradual and natural; which would explain the incertitude of the witnesses of the tradition as to the time when the old order of things disappeared. Eutychius may have been influenced in his statement by the fourth Nicene canon. As for St. Jerome, he may have meant Demetrius and Heraclas, instead of Heraclas and Dionysius, for he may have been aware of the other tradition handed down by Eutychius, to the effect that those two patriarchs were the first to ordain bishops since St. Mark (see below).

4. *The Episcopate in the Provinces.—Delegated Bishops or Itinerant Bishops.*—We have said that according to an ancient tradition handed down by Eutychius, the Bishop of Alexandria was for a long time the only bishop in Egypt. Eutychius's words are as follows: "From Annianus, who was appointed Patriarch of Alexandria by Mark the Evangelist, until Demetrius, Patriarch of Alexandria (and he was the eleventh patriarch of Alexandria), there was no bishop in the province [*sic*—read *provinces*—see below] of Egypt [Arabic, *Misr*], and the patriarchs his predecessors had appointed no bishop. And when Demetrius became patriarch he appointed three bishops, and he is the first Patriarch of Alexandria who set the bishops over provinces. And when he died Heraclas was made Patriarch of Alexandria, and he appointed twenty bishops" (translated from the edition of L. Cheikho, in "Corp. Script. Christ. Orient.: Script. Arabici", ser. III, tom. VI, I, p. 96). It has been objected against this tradition that the Emperor Hadrian, writing to Servianus on the religious conditions of Egypt (Vopiscus, "Vita Saturnini", 8), speaks of Christian bishops; but this letter is now generally considered as a forgery of the third century (cf. Harnack, "Mission u. Ausbreitung des Christentums", 2d ed., II, 133, n. 3), and even if it were genuine it would be necessary to know exactly what Hadrian meant by the word *bishop;* we shall see that it could be used in a sense rather different from the current meaning. A stronger objection is taken from the "Lives of the Patriarchs of Alexandria" by Severus of Ashmunein, where we read that three of the early patriarchs—Cerdo, Celadion, and Julian—were elected by bishops as well as by the people. It is far from certain, however, that the word *bishop* in these three cases has its ordinary meaning. In the case of Cerdo the text reads: "When the priests and the bishops, who were representing the patriarch in the towns, heard of his death they were grieved, and they all went to Alexandria and, having taken counsel with the orthodox people", etc. It seems evident that these "bishops" were nothing but delegated bishops acting in virtue of a special and temporary, not an ordinary and permanent, delegation of powers as ordinary bishops (see below); for in this case delegation, being a matter of course, would not be mentioned. They were not bishops in the ordinary canonical sense of the word. In Celadion's case the text says: "The bishops who were in Alexandria in those days"—i. e., probably, *who were stationed* there, resided there, which certainly cannot be understood of ordinary bishops, whose residence would have been in their respective dioceses. There was room for but one such bishop in Alexandria. Still clearer is the passage concerning Julian: "A party of bishops from the synod assembled with the people of Alexandria", etc. What was that synod? Evidently not a council which happened to be in session, for in that case all certainly would have taken part in the election. Besides, if Celadion's predecessor had called a synod or council, Severus, or the author from whom he borrowed that meagre biography, would not have failed to swell it with this important event. There seems to be no other solution than to see in that synod a body of presbyters or delegated bishops who were habitually in residence in Alexandria, but some of whom, being on the mission, were not able to take part in the election. There was, therefore, under the early Bishops of Alexandria, a body of men who could be called bishops, and yet had no ordinary jurisdiction, as is evidenced, first, by the express statement in Cerdo's case and, secondly, by the fact that they usually resided in Alexandria, as stated or implied in the other two cases. Such a body of men the twelve presbyters of Eutychius must have been; so that

those three passages, far from contradicting Eutychius's testimony, rather confirm it. We find, however, a more direct confirmation of Eutychius's statement in another, so far equally misinterpreted, passage of Severus. In the biography of Julian, the immediate predecessor of Demetrius, we read: "After this patriarch, the Bishop of Alexandria did not remain always there, but he used to go out secretly and organize the hierarchy [*yausim kahanat*, literally, "ordain clergy"], as St. Mark the Evangelist had done." The same remark is to be found in the "Chronicon Orientale" of Peter Ibn Râhib, with the variation, "No bishop always remained in Alexandria"; and the omission of the last words "as St. Mark" etc. We know that the words *yausim kahanat* have been so far rendered "ordinationes sacerdotum faciebant" (Renaudot, Hist. Patr. Alexandr., p. 18), "ordained priests" (Evetts, "Hist. of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria" in Graffin-Nau's "Patrologia Orientalis", I, 154). There is no doubt, however, that the word *kahanat* (plur. of *kâhin*) as a rule stands for bishops and deacons as well as for priests. That it really is so in this case is made clear from a comparison among three versions of the same episode of the life of St. Mark. The author of the second biography in Severus's work says that the Evangelist, seeing that the people of Alexandria were plotting against his life, went out from their city (secretly, adds Severus of Nesteraweh, Bargès, op. cit., p. 56) and returned to the Pentapolis, where he remained two years, *appointing bishops, priests, and deacons in all its provinces*. The Melchite Martyrology of Alexandria, under 25 April, says that St. Mark went from Alexandria to Barca (Pentapolis) and beautified the churches of Christ, "instituting bishops and the rest of the clergy [*kahanat*] of that country". (It is evident that in the mind of the author of the latter passage *kahanat*, on the one hand, and "bishops, priests, and deacons", on the other, are interchangeable.) Finally, in the "Chronicon Orientale", where the same episode of St. Mark's life is related, we find simply: "appointing clergy [*kahanat*] for them", without special mention of the bishops. And the argument will appear all the more convincing if we notice that the remark of Julian's biography must have had in view the labours of St. Mark in the Pentapolis, when he added "as St. Mark the Evangelist had done", for neither the Oriental nor any other sources record a further instance of ordinations performed by St. Mark outside of Alexandria.

Before we dismiss this interesting passage of Julian's biography, let us call attention to another detail of it. The patriarch is styled simply the Bishop of Alexandria, which shows that the source from which the remark was borrowed must belong to a time when the expressions *archbishop* and *patriarch* had not yet come into use. It may, therefore, be considered as absolutely certain that, according to all the Oriental sources, there was from the times of St. Mark to Julian's death only one diocese in the whole territory of Egypt proper, namely, the Diocese of Alexandria, and only one bishop, the Bishop of Alexandria. That bishop was assisted by a college of presbyters. These were bishops to all intents and purposes, excepting jurisdiction, which they had by delegation only. If Eutychius calls them presbyters, it is because he found that word in the source he was using, possibly the very same in which the author of Julian's biography found the word *bishop* used to designate the patriarch. In the "Lives of the Patriarchs" by Severus of Ashmunein, they are called bishops, in agreement with the current use of the time when those biographies were first written down. On so much the Oriental sources agree, and substantially they confirm the traditions preserved by St. Jerome and Severus of Antioch. They disagree as to the number of presbyters created by St. Mark; Makrizi, who probably copied Eutychius, gives the same number (twelve) and does not speak of deacons. Severus's second biography of St. Mark, Al-Makîn, and the "Chronicon Orientale" say three presbyters and seven deacons. According to Severus of Nesteraweh, St. Mark "ordained priests the sons of Anianus, who were but few, and eleven deacons". It is impossible to reconcile these data. If Eutychius's figure, as is very likely, has no historical foundation, it might be based on Mark, iii, 14. The number three in the other sources, if fictitious, might reflect the fourth canon of Nicæa. Although we have no means of determining, even approximately, to what extent Christianity had spread over Egyptian territory during the first two centuries of our era, there is hardly any doubt that the number of communities, as well as the area over which they were scattered, very much exceeded the proportions of an ordinary diocese of the primitive Church. Christianity, says Clement of Alexandria (Strom., VI, xviii, 167), has spread *κατὰ ἔθνος καὶ κώμην καὶ πόλιν πᾶσαν*, i.e. whole houses and families have embraced the faith, which has found adherents in all classes of society. And this statement is borne out by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., VI, i), who says that in the year 202, during the Severian persecution, Christians were dragged to Alexandria, for trial *ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου καὶ Θηβαΐδος ἁπάσης*. It would seem that under ordinary circumstances there must have been a call for an ordinary resident bishop at least in each of the three great provinces of Heptanomis (Middle Egypt), Thebais (Upper Egypt), and Arsinoe (the Fayûm).

But in Egypt, as elsewhere, the Church in its infancy naturally copied the political organization of the country, and Egypt, in that respect, was entirely different from the rest of the Roman Empire. Rome, or rather Augustus, in taking possession of Egypt as his personal spoil, took in almost bodily the old political organization created by the Pharaohs and developed and strengthened by the Ptolemies, simply replacing the king by a prefect in whom, as his representative, all authority, judicial and military, was vested. That organization was characterized by the total absence of municipal institutions; no organized cities, as in the rest of the Roman Empire, no magistrates elected by a senate and governing in its name. The country was divided, as of old, into nomes, each of which was administered by a strategos (formerly, nomarch) under the prefect, though occasionally two nomes were temporarily united under one strategos, or one nome was divided between two strategoi. The strategos appointed all subaltern officials throughout the nome, subject to approval from the prefect, and transmitted to them his orders. In judicial matters they could initiate proceedings, but could deliver judgment only when specially empowered as delegates by the prefect. In each village there was a council of elders who acted as intermediaries for the payment of taxes, and were held responsible to the authorities of the nome for the good order of their fellow villagers; they had, however, no authority except by way of delegation. Alexandria was no exception to that rule; it was not until the reign of Septimius Severus that the city was granted a senate, and even then the citizens were not permitted to elect their own magistrates. The situation was probably the same in other cities which at a still later period secured the privilege of a senate. For convenience' sake the Ptolemies had grouped the nomes of Upper Egypt into one province governed by an epistrategos; the Romans at first did the same for the nomes of Middle Egypt (including the Arsinoite nome, the modern Fayûm) and the Delta, or Lower Egypt. But this and other later arrangements of the nomes into provinces never affected the political organization of the country. The epistrategoi were the usual delegates for many of the powers nominally exercised by the prefect. They appointed the strategoi and other local officials, subject to confirmation by the prefect. In a general way they acted as intermedi-

aries for the transmission to the authorities of the nome of the orders issued by the prefect (Milne, p. 4–6). In each nome there was a metropolis which was the residence of the strategos and, as such, the political centre of the nome. It was a religious centre as well, as it contained the chief sanctuary of the special god of the whole nome. The chief priest in charge of that sanctuary naturally ruled in religious matters over all the secondary temples scattered throughout the territory of the nome. There was in Alexandria a "High-Priest of Alexandria and all Egypt", appointed by the emperor, and probably a Roman, like the prefect upon whom he depended and whose substitute he was in religious matters. He had supreme authority over the priests and control of the temple treasures all over Egypt. In course of time, particularly under Diocletian, several changes took place in that organization; but these changes affected in no way the workings of the administration of the country, which, through a chain extending from the prefect to the last and least subaltern of the smallest village, brought every inhabitant under the control of the imperial prefect.

A more striking example of centralized power can hardly be imagined: one master, supreme in all branches of administration; between him and the people, intermediaries who transmit his orders, but never act except on his behalf, and refer to him all cases of any importance. Such, also, was the organization of the Coptic Church in the first one hundred and twenty years of its existence: one master only, one seat and source of jurisdiction, one judge—the Bishop of Alexandria. It is, therefore, this fullness of jurisdiction rather than the fullness of the priesthood—*plenitudo sacerdotii*—that is understood by the title of *bishop*. The presbyters who elect the Bishop of Alexandria, also have the fullness of the priesthood, but they have no jurisdiction of their own. We found them temporarily in charge in the provinces, but they were acting in behalf of the bishop; and for that reason, in the older sources, they are not called bishops. With Demetrius (188–232) a new era opens. The bishops of Alexandria, we have seen, began to leave the city secretly, and ordained bishops, priests, and deacons everywhere, as St. Mark himself had done when he went to the Pentapolis. The word *secretly* is suggestive of times of persecution (cf. Abraham Ecchellensis, "Eutychius vindicatus", 126; Renaudot, "Hist. Patriarcharum Alexandrinorum", I). It would seem that this new departure of Demetrius took place in the very first years of the third century, when the Severian persecution broke out. The dangers then threatening the Christian communities—which by this time had greatly increased in all parts of Egypt—may have been the chief consideration that prompted the bishop to come to the assistance of his flock by giving it permanent pastors (see, however, Harnack, "Mission", II, 137, note 2, quoting Schwartz). According to the tradition of Eutychius, Demetrius created three bishops; Heraclas (232–48), as many as twenty. The number of bishops so increased, under Dionysius (248–65), Maximus (265–82), Theonas (282–300), Peter Martyr (300–11), Achillas (312), and Alexander (313–326), that the last of these could, in 320, muster nearly one hundred bishops against Arius (Socrates, Hist. Eccl., I, vi), from Egypt, Libya, and the Pentapolis. The Egyptian hierarchy was then fully organized (cf. Harnack, op. cit., II, 142), a fact which explains, and is explained by, the wholesale Christianization of Egypt during the third century. In spite, however, of that astonishing development of the hierarchy, the old institution of itinerant bishops had not yet entirely disappeared. It happened often during the persecutions that bishops were incarcerated pending trial, and therefore were unable to hold ordinations. Their places were then filled by *περιοδευταί*, or itinerant bishops ordained for that purpose, and resident in Alexandria when not actively engaged in their sacred functions. It was for having presumed to usurp the functions of such *περιοδευταί*, that Meletius, Bishop of Lycopolis (in Upper Egypt) was censured by the Patriarch Alexander, and finally condemned and deprived of his jurisdiction by the Council of Nicæa (see Hefele-Leclercq, Hist. des Conciles, Paris, 1907, I, 488–503, where all the sources are indicated).

The existence of metropolitans (in the canonical sense of the word) in the Church of Egypt is a matter of considerable doubt (see Harnack, op. cit., II, 150, note 3, where reference is made to Schwartz, "Athanasiana", I, in "Nachricht. d. K. Gesellschaft d. Wiss. zu Göttingen", 1904, p. 180, and Lübeck, "Reichseintheilung u. kirchliche Hierarchie", pp. 109 sq., 116 sqq.). If some bishops (which is very likely; see Hefele, "Conciliengeschichte", I, pp. 391, 392) bore that title, they could not have differed from the ordinary Egyptian bishops in their relations to the Bishop of Alexandria. It is a well-known fact that the Bishop of Alexandria was wont to ordain not only his metropolitans, as did the other patriarchs, but also their suffragans, with the sole proviso that their election should have been sanctioned by their respective metropolitans (Hefele, op. cit., I, p. 393). St. Epiphanius, writing of Meletius, whom he calls *ἀρχιεπίσκοπος* (Hæres., lxix, c. iii), by which he means really *metropolitan* (Hefele, ibid.), says: "Ille quidem cæteris Ægypti episcopis antecellens, secundum a Petro [Alexandrino] dignitatis locum obtinebat, utpote illius adjutor sed eidem tamen subjectus et ad ipsum de rebus ecclesiasticis referens" [He indeed, being preeminent over all the other bishops of Egypt, held the position next in dignity to that of Peter (of Alexandria), as being his helper, yet subject to him and dependent on him in ecclesiastical affairs]. In what concerns Meletianism St. Epiphanius is not to be implicitly trusted. In this case, however, his testimony is probably correct; his words depict just such a condition of affairs as we should naturally expect from the general analogy of the church-organization with the civil government. The existence of the epistrategoi and the nature of their relations to the prefect of Egypt might well have suggested the appointment of metropolitans with just as limited an independence of the Bishop of Alexandria as St. Epiphanius attributes to Meletius.

PRESENT STATE OF THE COPTIC CHURCH. — *The Jacobite Church* has thirteen dioceses in Egypt: Cairo under the Patriarch of Alexandria, with 23 churches and 35 priests; Alexandria, with a metropolitan, having charge also of the Provinces of Bohaireh and Menufiyeh, 48 churches, 60 priests; the three provinces of Dakalieh, Sharkieh, and Gharbieh, 70 churches, 95 priests; Gizeh and the Fayûm, 25 churches, 40 priests; Beni-Suef, 24 churches, 70 priests; Minieh, 40 churches, 90 priests; Sanabû, 32 churches, 65 priests; Manfalût, 28 churches, 55 priests; Assiût (metropolitan see), 25 churches, 66 priests; Abûtig (metropolitan see), 45 churches, 105 priests; Akhmim and Girgeh (metropolitan see), 50 churches, 101 priests; Keneh, 24 churches, 48 priests; Luxor and Esneh (metropolitan see), 24 churches, 48 priests. By way of summary it may be said that the Jacobite Coptic Church has 1 patriarch, 6 metropolitans, 6 bishops, 856 priests, 449 churches, and about 600,000 souls. There are in addition, outside of Egypt, a metropolitan in Jerusalem, a bishop for Nubia and Khartûm, a metropolitan and two bishops in Abyssinia. Some ten years ago the abbots of the monasteries of Moharrak (province of Assiût), St. Anthony, St. Paul (both in the Arabian Desert), and Baramûs (in the desert of Nitria) were raised to the dignity of bishops.

There are three categories of schools. (a) Church schools, under the patriarch (conservative): 1 ecclesiastical college, 50 pupils; 6 boys' schools, 1100 pupils;

2 girls' schools, 350 pupils. (b) Tewfik schools, under the society of the same name (rather liberal and in opposition to the patriarch): 1 boys' school, 290 pupils; 1 girls' school, 140 pupils. (c) Private schools: 5 boys' schools, 300 pupils; 1 girls' school, 5 pupils.—In all 2235 pupils attend these Jacobite schools.

The Uniat Church.—The Catholic, or Uniat, branch of the Coptic Church dates from 1741, when Benedict XIV, seeing that the patriarch and majority of the bishops could not be depended on to effectuate union with Rome, granted to Amba Athanasius, Coptic Bishop of Jerusalem, jurisdiction over all Christians of the Coptic Rite in Egypt and elsewhere. Athanasius continued to reside in Jerusalem, whence he ministered to his charge in Egypt through his vicar-general, Justus Maraghi. During his administration flourished Raphael Tuki, a native of Girgeh and an alumnus of the Urban (Propaganda) College at Rome. After a few years of fruitful labours in his native land he was recalled to Rome (where he received the title of Bishop of Arsinoe) to superintend the printing of the Coptic liturgical books (Missal, 1746; Psalter, 1749; Breviary, 1750; Pontifical, 1761; Ritual, 1763; Theotokiæ, 1764). Athanasius was succeeded (1781) by John Farargi as Vicar Apostolic of the Coptic Nation, with the title of Bishop of Hypsopolis; but he never received episcopal consecration, there being no Catholic bishop of the Coptic Rite to perform it. The same can be said of his successor Matthew Righet, appointed in 1788, and made Bishop of Uthina in 1815; he died in 1822, and was succeeded by Maximus Joed, also made Bishop of Uthina in 1824, and a few months later Patriarch of Alexandria, by decree of Leo XII, who, at the request of the Khedive Mehemet-Ali, had decided to restore the Catholic Patriarchate of Alexandria. That decree, however, never went into effect, owing, apparently, to the opposition of Abraham Cashoor, then at Rome, where he had been consecrated Archbishop of Memphis by the pope himself. Maximus died in 1831. His successor was Theodore Abû-Karim, made Bishop of Alia in 1832, and appointed Delegate and Visitator Apostolic of Abyssinia in 1840. He died in 1854, and was succeeded in 1856 by Athanasius Khûzam, Bishop of Maronia, who in turn was succeeded in 1866 by Agapius Bshai, Bishop of Cariopolis, representative of his nation at the Vatican Council in 1869–70. Owing to regrettable differences with his flock, this bishop, more learned and pious than tactful, was recalled to Rome in, or soon after, 1878, and did not return to Egypt until 1887, forty days before his death. During his absence, and after his death, the Church was administered by an Apostolic visitator, Monsignor Anthony Morcos (not a Copt nor a bishop) with the title of provicar Apostolic. His successor was also a simple Apostolic visitator and governed the Uniat Copts until 1895, when the Patriarchate of Alexandria was restored by Leo XIII (Litter. Apost. "Christi Domini") with a bishop, Cyril Macaire, as Apostolic administrator, and two suffragan sees, Hermopolis (residence at Minieh) and Thebes (residence at Tartah), which were entrusted respectively to Bishops Maximus Sedfaoui and Ignatius Berzi, both consecrated in 1896. In 1899 Bishop Cyril Macaire was promoted to the title and rank of Patriarch of Alexandria, with residence at Cairo, taking the name of Cyril II; he resigned in 1908, and Bishop Sedfaoui was named administrator. The Uniat Coptic Diocese of Alexandria counts (Lower Egypt and Cairo) 2500 souls, 4 churches or chapels, 14 priests (2 married), a *petit séminaire* with 8 pupils (under the direction of the Jesuits), and 1 school for boys (under the Christian Brothers). In the Diocese of Hermopolis (Middle Egypt) there are 2500 Catholics, 10 priests (4 married), 7 churches or chapels, 12 stations, 9 schools for boys, with 240 pupils, and 1 for girls, with 50 pupils. The Diocese of Thebes (part of Upper Egypt) has 15,250 souls, 31 priests (15 married), 35 churches or chapels, 18 stations, 1 theological seminary (for all three dioceses), with 17 pupils, 21 schools for boys, with 240 pupils, and 5 schools for girls, with 253 pupils. In addition to the above-mentioned clergy and institutions, there are several houses of Latin religious (both men and women) whose members minister to the Catholic Copts.

KRUGER in *Grande Encycl.*, s. v. *Eglise copte;* CRUM in *Realencykl. für prot. Theol. u. Kirche*, s. v. *Koptische Kirche* (concise and complete, generally accurate); FULLER in *Dict. of Christ. Biogr.*, s. v. *Coptic Church;* STERN in ERSCH AND GRUBER, *Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften u. Künste*, s. v. *Kopten, Koptische Sprache und Litteratur;* SOLLERIUS, *Hist. chronol. patriarcharum Alex.* in *Acta SS.*, V or (new ed.) VII; *De S. Marco Evangelista* in *Acta S.S.*, April, III (25 April); MACAIRE (CYRIL II), *Histoire de l'église d'Alexandrie depuis St. Marc jusqu'à nos jours* (Cairo, 1874); *Missiones Catholicæ* (Rome, 1907); RENAUDOT, *De Patriarcha Alexandrino* in his *Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio*, I; REHKOPF, *Vitæ Patriarcharum Alexandrinorum quinque*, Specimen I (Leipzig, 1758); Spec. II (Leipzig, 1759); *Animadversiones historico-criticæ ad vitas Patriarcharum Alex. sæc. primi et secundi*, Spec. III (Leipzig, 1759); RENAUDOT, *Historia patriarcharum Alexandrinorum Jacobitarum*, etc. (Paris, 1713); LEQUIEN, *Oriens Christianus*, II; *De patriarchatu Alexandrino*, 329–86 (preceded by a map), 387–512, and 513–640; NEALE, *History of the Holy Eastern Church; Patriarchate of Alexandria* (London, 1847); BUTLER, *The Ancient Coptic Churches of Egypt* (Oxford, 1884); BUTCHER, *The Story of the Church of Egypt* (London, 1897); FOWLER, *Christian Egypt, Past, Present, and Future* (2d ed., London, 1902).

Original Sources.—ZOTENBERG, tr., *Chronique de Jean évêque de Nikiou, texte éthiopien* in *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, XXIV, 125–605, 1883 (for the period beginning with Diocletian)—cf. ZOTENBERG, *La Chronique de Jean évêque de Nikiou*, extract from *Journal Asiatique* (Paris, 1879); SEVERUS, BISHOP OF ASHMUNEIN, *History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria; St. Mark to Benjamin* (661) text and tr. by EVETTS in GRAFFIN-NAU, *Patrologia Orientalis*, I, II, IV; also text only, for the same period, by SEYBOLD in *Corpus Script. Christ. Orientalium: Scriptores Arabici*, ser. 3, tom. IX; SEVERUS, BISHOP OF ASHMUNEIN, *Réfutation de Sa'id Ibn Batrik* [Eutychius]; *Le livre des conciles*, text and tr. by CHÉBLI, in GRAFFIN-NAU, *Patr. Orient.*, III, 2; SELDEN, *Eutychii Ægyptii Patriarchæ Orthodoxorum Alexandrini*, etc., *ecclesiæ suæ origines* (London, 1642); ABRAHAM ECCHELLENSIS, *Eutychius Patriarcha vindicatus* (Rome, 1661); EUTYCHIUS (SA'ID IBN BATRIK, Melchite Patriarch of Alexandria), *Annals*, Arabic text ed. CHEIKHO in *C. S. C. O.: Script. Arabici*, ser. 3, VI; earlier edition of the same by POCOCKE (2 vols., 4to, Oxford, 1658, 1659); PETER IBN RÂHIB (also known as ABÛ SHÂKIR), *Chronicon Orientale*, Arabic text and Latin tr. by CHEIKHO in *C. S. C. O., Scriptores Arabici*, ser. 3, II (1903); there is also a Latin tr. by ABRAHAM ECCHELLENSIS (Paris, 1651, 1685), corrected by JOS. SIM. ASSEMANI (Venice, 1749); MAKRIZI (fourteenth-century Mahommedan writer), *Geschichte der Copten*, ed. WÜSTENFELD (Göttingen, 1845); VANSLEB, *Histoire de l'Eglise d' Alexandrie fondée par St Marc*, chiefly from ABÛ'L-BARAKÂT (Paris, 1677); ABÛ SÂLIH, *The Churches and Monasteries of Egypt*, text and tr. by BUTLER (Oxford, 1895); BARGÈS, *Homélie sur St Marc, Apôtre et Evangéliste* (Paris, 1877) [by SEVERUS OF NESTERAWEH].

General Works on Later History of Egypt.—MILNE, *History of Egypt under Roman Rule* (New York, 1898); BUTLER, *The Arab Conquest of Egypt* etc. (London, 1902); POOLE, *Hist. of Egypt in the M.A.* (New York, 1901); LANE, *Modern Egyptians* (London, 1860); KLUNZINGER, *Bilder aus Oberägypten* (1877), tr. *Upper Egypt, Its People and Its Products* (New York, 1878).

VI. COPTIC LITERATURE, the literature of Christian Egypt, at first written in the Coptic language and later translated into, or written outright in, Arabic. That literature is almost exclusively religious, or rather (with the exception of the Gnostic writings and a few magical texts) ecclesiastical, either as to its contents (Bible, lectionaries, martyrologies, etc.) or as to its purpose (grammars and vocabularies composed with reference to the ecclesiastical books). Thus defined, however, Coptic literature is by no means the equivalent of literature of the Egyptian Church, as this would include as well the Greek writings of the Fathers of the Church, and other Greek monuments of Egyptian origin. They will be found under the headings of their respective authors; see for instance ALEXANDER; ATHANASIUS; CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA; CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA; ORIGEN; THEOPHILUS, PATRIARCH OF ALEXANDRIA, etc.

The Coptic Language is an offspring of the Egyptian, or rather it is that very same language in the various popular forms it had evolved when Egypt as a whole became Christian (third and fourth centuries). Consequently it appears in several dialects: the Sahidic (formerly called Theban), or dialect of Upper Egypt

(Arab. *Essa'id*, "the high"); the Akhmimic, originally in use in the province of Akhmim, afterwards superseded by Sahidic; the Fayûmic, or dialect of the Fayûm; the Middle Egyptian; and the Bohairic (formerly Memphitic), i. e. the dialect of Bohaireh or the Region of the Lake (Mariût?), a name now applied to the north-western province of the Delta, of which Damanhûr is the seat of government. From the literary point of view the Sahidic and the Bohairic are by far the most important, although, as we shall see, the most ancient, and in some respects most valuable, Coptic manuscripts are in the Akhmimic dialect. The question of priority between these dialects—if understood of the greater or lesser similarity which they bear to the respective dialects of the ancient Egyptian from which they are derived, or of the time when they first came into use as Christian dialects—cannot, in the opinion of the present writer, be safely decided. All we can say is that we have no Bohairic manuscript or literary monument as old as some Sahidic manuscripts or literary monuments. The Coptic alphabet, some letters of which are peculiar to the one or the other of the dialects, is the Greek alphabet increased by six or seven signs borrowed from the Demotic to express sounds or combinations of sounds unknown to the Greeks. On the other hand, some of the Greek letters, like Ξ and Ψ, never occur except in Greek words. In all Coptic dialects Greek words are of frequent occurrence. Some of these undoubtedly had crept into the popular language even before the introduction of Christianity, but a good many must have been introduced by the translators to express ideas not familiar to the ancient Egyptians, or, as in the case of the particles, to give more suppleness or roundness to the sentence. Almost any Greek verb of common occurrence could be used in Coptic by prefixing to its infinitive auxiliaries, which alone were inflected. Thus, also, abstract substantives could be obtained by joining a Greek adjective to certain Coptic abstract prefixes, as, *met-agathos*, goodness, kindness. Frequently a Greek word is used along with its Coptic equivalent. Greek words which had, so to speak, acquired a right of citizenship, were often used to translate other Greek words such as μόλις for μόγις, πύλη for θύρα. The relation of Coptic to Greek, from that point of view, is about the same as that of French or English to Latin, although in lesser proportion.

Scripture and Apocrypha.—Greek being the original language of the Church of Egypt, the first Coptic literary productions were naturally translations from the Greek. Undoubtedly the most important of such translations was that of the Bible into the several dialects spoken by the various native Egyptian communities. For these see VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE. The Apocrypha were also translated and widely diffused, judging from the many fragments of manuscripts, especially in Sahidic, which have reached us. Such translations, however, unlike the versions of the Bible, are far from being faithful. The native imagination of the translators invariably leads them to amplify and embellish the Greek original. Among the Apocrypha of the Old Testament we must mention, first, the "Testament of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob", in Bohairic, published by Prof. I. Guidi in the "Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei", 18 March, 1900: "Il testo copto del Testamento di Abramo"; and 22 Apr., 1900: "Il Testamento d'Isaaco e il Testamento di Giacobbe (testo Copto)"; then three Apocalypses of late Jewish origin: one anonymous (in Akhmimic) and the other two attributed to Elias (Akhmimic and Sahidic) and Sophonias (Sahidic). They have been published by G. Steindorff in Gebhardt and Harnack's "Texte u. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur", N. S., II; "Die Apokalypse des Elias: Eine unbekannte Apokalypse und Bruchstücke der Sophonias-Apokalypse" (text and translation, Leipzig, 1899). Part of the same texts had already been published and translated by Bouriant, "Les Papyrus d'Akhmîm" in "Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission Archéologique Française au Caire", I (1881–4), pp. 261 sqq. and by Stern, "Die koptische Apokalypse des Sophonias" in "Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache", etc., XXIV (1886), pp. 115 sqq. There is also a Sahidic fragment of an Apocalypse of Moses-Adam published by G. Schmidt and Harnack ("Sitzungsberichte d. Kgl. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.", 1891, p. 1045) and one in Sahidic, too, of the Fourth Book of Esdras, published by Leipoldt and Violet ("Ein sahidisches Bruchstück d. vierten Esrabuches" in "Texte u. Untersuchungen", N. S. XI, I *b*.).

The New Testament class is of course much more largely represented. Several apocryphal writings of the Gospel class have been published by F. Robinson, "Coptic Apocryphal Gospels, Translations together with the texts of some of them" etc., Cambridge, 1896 (Texts and Studies, IV, 2). The chief documents reproduced in this work are the "Life of the Virgin" (Sahidic), the "Falling Asleep of Mary" (Bohairic and Sahidic), and the "Death of St. Joseph" (Bohairic and Sahidic). The "Life of the Virgin" is somewhat similar to the "Protevangelium Jacobi". The "Falling Asleep of Mary" exists also in Greek, Latin, Syriac, and Arabic, and the Coptic texts may serve to throw light on the relations of these various recensions and on the origin of the tradition. The only other known text of the "Death of St. Joseph" is an Arabic one, more closely related to the Bohairic than to the Sahidic text. There is also among the papyri preserved at Turin a Sahidic version of the "Acta Pilati" published by Fr. Rossi, "I Papiri Copti del Museo Egizio di Torino" (2 vols., Turin, 1887–92), I, fasc. 1, "Il Vangelo di Nicodemo". Some Sahidic fragments published by Jacoby ("Ein neues Evangelium fragment", Strasburg, 1900), and assigned by him to the Gospel of the Egyptians, are thought by Zahn to belong to the Gospel of the Twelve [Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift, XI (1900), pp. 361–70]. To the Gospel of the Twelve Revillout assigns not only the Strasburg fragments and several of those published both by himself ("Apocryphes coptes du Nouveau Testament, Textes", Paris, 1876) and Guidi (see below), but also a good many more Paris fragments which he publishes and translates. Other Paris fragments Revillout thinks belong to the Gospel of St. Bartholomew (Les Apocryphes coptes; I, Les Evangiles des douze Apôtres et de S. Barthélemy" in Graffin-Nau, "Patrologia Orientalis", II, 1, Paris, 1907). However, before the publication of Revillout appeared, the Paris texts had been published by Lacau, who found them to belong to five different codices corresponding to as many different writings all referring to the ministry or Passion and Resurrection of Christ. One would be the Gospel of Bartholomew and another the Apocalypse of the same Apostle ("Fragments d'Apocryphes de la Bibliothèque Nationale" in "Mémoires de la Mission française d'archéologie orientale", Cairo, 1904). According to Leipoldt we have the first evidence of a Coptic recension of the "Protevangelium Jacobi" in a Sahidic folio published by him [Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, VI (1905), pp. 106, 107].

The apocryphal legends of the Apostles are still more numerous in the Coptic literature, where they constitute a group quite distinct and proper to Egypt, which seems to be their original home, although in vast majority translated from Greek originals into the Sahidic dialect. They were always popular, and long before Coptic ceased to be universally understood, some time between the eleventh and fourteenth century, they were translated into Arabic and then from Arabic into Ethiopic. Among the principal are the Preachings of St. James, son of Zebedee, St. Andrew, St. Philip, Sts. Andrew and Paul, and Sts. Andrew and

Bartholomew; the Martyrdoms of St. James, son of Zebedee, St. James the Less, St. Peter, St. Paul; also the life by the Pseudo-Prochoros and the μετάστασις of St. John and a Martyrdom of St. Simon (different from the documents generally known under the names of "Preaching" and "Martyrdom" of that Apostle, and of which short fragments only have been preserved in Coptic). The texts of all these have been published by Professor I. Guidi in his "Frammenti Copti" (Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei, III and IV, 1887–88), and "Di alcune pergamene Saidiche" (Rendiconti della R. Acc. dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, II, fasc. 7, 1893), and the translations in the same author's "Gli atti apocrifi degli Apostoli" (Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana, vol. II, pp. 1–66, 1888), and in his "Di alcune Pergamene", just mentioned. The same documents have been to no small extent supplemented from St. Petersburg manuscripts by Oscar v. Lemm, in his "Koptische apocryphe Apostelacten" in "Mélanges Asiatiques tirés du Bulletin de l'Académie impériale de St Pétersbourg", X, 1 and 2 [Bulletin, N. S., I and III (XXXIII and XXXV), 1890–92].

We close this section with the mention of two documents of more than usual interest: first, seven leaves of papyrus (Berlin P. 8502) of the πρᾶξις Πέτρου and a considerable portion of the Acta Pauli (Heidelberg Copt. Papyrus I), in their original form (i. e. including the so-called "Acta Pauli et Theclæ"). Both of these documents have been published, translated into German, and thoroughly discussed by C. Schmidt ["Die alten Petrusakten", etc. in "Texte u. Unters.", N. S., IX (1903); "Acta Pauli", Leipzig, 1904, 2 vols. (vol. II, photographic reproduction of the Coptic text); 2d edit. (without photographic plates), Leipzig, 1905, 1 vol.].

Patrology.—Ante-Nicene Fathers.—But few Coptic translations from the Ante-Nicene Fathers have been preserved. As Dr. Leipoldt justly remarks, when the native Church of Egypt began to form its literature, the literary productions of the early Church had lost much of their interest. We have, however, two fragments of the letters of Ignatius of Antioch, published by Pitra (Anal. sacra, 255 sqq.) and Lightfoot (Apost. Fathers, II, III, London, 1889, 277 sqq.) and several of the "Shepherd" of Hermas, published by Leipoldt (Sitzungsberichte der K. Gesellsch. d. Wissensch. in Berlin, 1903, pp. 261–68), and Delaporte [Revue de l'Orient Chrétien, X (1905), pp. 424–33; XI (1906), pp. 31–41], and, what is more, two papyrus codices in Akhmimic dialect, one (Berlin) of the fourth, and the other (Strasburg) of the seventh or eighth century, both containing the first epistle of Clement to the Corinthians under its primitive title (Epistle to the Romans). The Berlin codex, which is almost complete, has just been published, with a German translation and an exhaustive commentary, by C. Schmidt (Der 1. Clemensbrief in altkoptischer Ueberlieferung untersucht u. herausgegeben, Leipzig, 1908). Extracts from the commentaries of Hippolytus of Rome, Irenæus, and Clement of Alexandria are to be found in the famous Bohairic *catena* (dated A. D. 888) of Lord Zouche's collection (Parham, 102; published by de Lagarde, "Catenæ in Evangelia Ægyptiaca quæ supersunt", Göttingen, 1886). But it is very likely that this manuscript was translated from a Greek *catena*, and consequently it does not show that the writings of those Fathers existed independently in the Coptic literature. Clement of Alexandria, in any case, and also Origen, were considered as heretics, which would explain their absence from the repertory of the Coptic Church.

Post-Nicene Fathers.—The homilies, sermons, etc., of the Greek Fathers from the Council of Nicæa to that of Chalcedon were well represented in the Coptic literature, as we may judge from what has come down to us in the various dialects. In Bohairic we have over forty complete homilies or sermons of St. John Chrysostom, several of St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Gregory Nazianzen, Theophilus of Alexandria, and St. Ephraem the Syrian, while in Sahidic we find a few complete writings and a very large number of fragments, some quite considerable, of the homiletical works of the same Fathers and of many others, like St. Athanasius, St. Basil, Proclus of Cyzicus, Theodotus of Ancyra, Epiphanius of Cyprus, Amphilochius of Iconium, Severianus of Gabala, Cyril of Jerusalem, Eusebius of Cæsarea, and the pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite. Liberius of Rome and St. Ephraem are also represented by several fragments of sermons. We need not say that these writings are not infrequently spurious, and that they can in no case be held up as models of translation.

The Bohairic part of this great mass of literature is still almost entirely unedited, we might say unexplored. Two sermons of St. Ephraem have been published, one, on the adulterous woman of the Gospel, by Guidi (Bessarione, Ann. VII, vol. IV, Rome, 1903), the other (fragment) on the Transfiguration by Budge (Proceedings of the Soc. of Bibl. Archæology, IX , 1887, pp. 317 sqq.). Budge published also a large fragment of an encomium on Elijah the Tishbite attributed to St. John Chrysostom (Transactions of the Soc. Bibl. Arch., IX, 1893, pp. 355 ff.), and Amélineau, a sermon of St. Cyril of Alexandria on death ("Monuments pour servir à l'Histoire du Christianisme en Egypte aux IV^{e} et V^{e} siècles—Mémoires publiés par les Membres de la Mission Archéologique Française au Caire, IV, 1888). As for the Sahidic portion, two homilies of St. John Chrysostom, of doubtful genuineness if not altogether spurious, and all the homiletical fragments of the Turin museum, were published and translated into Italian by Fr. Rossi in his "Papiri Coptici del Museo Egizio di Torino" (2 vols., Turin, 1887–92), and quite a number of fragments, often unidentified, were published in the catalogues of the various collections of Coptic manuscripts, principally in the catalogue of the Borgian collection by Zoega ("Catalogus codicum copticorum manuscriptorum", etc., Rome, 1810; Latin translations generally accompany the texts). Among the Sahidic versions of Greek writings of this class and period we must mention, in view of their importance, first, a fragment of the Ἀγχυρωτός of St. Epiphanius (J. Leipoldt, "'Epiphanios' von Salamis 'Ancoratus', in Saïdischer Uebersetzung" in "Berichte d. philol.-hist. Klasse d. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. zu Leipzig", 1902); secondly, several fragments of the lost Festal Letters of S. Athanasius (C. Schmidt, "Der Osterbrief des Athanasius vom Jahre 367" in "Nachrichte d. K. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, Philol.-Hist. Kl.", 1898; "Ein Neues Fragment des Osterbriefes des Athanasius vom Jahre 367", Göttingen, 1901; O. v. Lemm, "Zwei koptische Fragmente aus den Festbriefen des heiligen Athanasius" in "Recueil des travaux rédigés en mémoire du jubilé scientifique de M. Daniel Chwolson", Berlin, 1899).

Post-Chalcedon Fathers.—Only a few of these had the honour of a place in Coptic literature. The separation of the Church of Egypt from the Catholic world was complete after the deposition of her patriarch Dioscurus (451), and, in spite of the efforts of the Byzantine Court to bring back Egypt to unity by forcing orthodox pontiffs on her and by other means of coercion, the native Egyptians stubbornly refused their allegiance to the "intruders", and from that time on would have nothing to do with the Greek world, the very name of which became an abomination to them. The chief exception was in favour of the works of Severus, the expelled Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch, who had taken refuge and died in Egypt. We have a complete encomium of his on St. Michael, in Bohairic, published by E. A. Wallis Budge ("St. Michael the Archangel: Three Encomiums" etc., London, 1894), several fragments of homilies in Sahidic, and a letter in Bohairic to the Deaconess Anastasia (cf. Wright, "Catalogue of Syriac manuscripts in the British Museum", No. DCCCCL, 10). We may

also mention here a panegyric of St. George, Martyr, by Theodosius, Monophysite Bishop of Jerusalem (d. after 453), published and translated into English by E. A. Wallis Budge, "The Martyrdom and Miracles of St. George of Cappadocia" (Oriental Text Series, I, London, 1888). The constant political agitation in which the Monophysite successors of Dioscurus were involved accounts probably for the almost complete absence of their works from Coptic literature in general and in particular from this section. The only homilies or sermons we can record are, first, a sermon on the Assumption of the Virgin (already mentioned among the Apocrypha) and an encomium on St. Michael by Theodosius (the latter published by Budge, "Three Encomiums", mentioned above), both in Bohairic and probably spurious; also a Sahidic fragment of a discourse pronounced by the same on the 11th of Thoth; secondly, a sermon on the Marriage at Cana, by Benjamin, in Bohairic; thirdly, the first sermon of Mark II on Christ's Burial, also in Bohairic. Rarer still are the sermons or homilies by other bishops of Egypt. The only two names worthy of mention are those of John, Bishop of Parallou (Burlos), and Rufus of Shôtep, both of unknown date; of the former we have one short Sahidic fragment of a discourse on "St. Michael and the blasphematory books of the heretics that are read in the orthodox churches"; of the latter, several important fragments of homilies on the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, also in Sahidic. (See MARTYRS; MONASTICISM.)

Church Discipline.—Among the various early collections of Apostolic precepts and church regulations which the Copts incorporated from the Greek into their native literature, we shall mention:—

(1) The Didache.—It is true that up to the present this document is not known to be extant in Coptic except in so far as chapters iv–xiv of the Apostolic Church Ordinance (see below) are but a paraphrase of the first four chapters of the Didache as revealed to us by Bryennios. Towards the end of the last century, however, the first part of the Didache (chapters i–x, the so-called "Duæ Viæ") was discovered imbedded in Shenûte's Arabic life published by Amélineau (Monuments pour servir à l'histoire de l'Egypte chrétienne aux IV^{e} et V^{e} siècles. Vie de Schnoudi", pp. 289 sqq., in "Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission archéologique française au Caire", IV, Paris, 1888); and although that insertion is in Arabic, like the rest of the Life, its grammar is so thoroughly Coptic that there can be no doubt that it, also, was translated from a Coptic original. For further detail see Iselin and Heusler, who were first to make the discovery ("Eine bisher unbekannte Version des ersten Teiles der Apostellehre" in "Texte u. Untersuchungen", XIII, I, 1895), and U. Benigni, who, three years later, quite independently from Iselin and Heusler, had reached the same conclusions [Didache Coptica: 'Duarum viarum' recensio Coptica monastica per arabicam versionem superstes, 2d ed., Rome, 1899 (Reprint from "Bessarione", 1898)].

(2) The so-called Apostolic Church Ordinance, consisting of thirty canons, and extant both in Bohairic and in Sahidic. The former text was published and translated into English by H. Tattam (The Apostolical Constitutions or Canons of the Apostles, London, 1848, pp. 1–30), and re-translated into Greek by P. Bötticher (later P. de Lagarde) in Chr. C. Bunsen's "Analecta Ante-Nicæna" (London, 1864, II, 451–460); the latter text was edited, without translation, both by P. de Lagarde, in his "Ægyptiaca" (Göttingen, 1883, pp. 239–248, Canons 0–30), and U. Bouriant, in "Les Canons Apostoliques de Clément de Rome; traduction en dialecte thébain d'après un manuscrit de la bibliothèque du Patriarche Jacobite du Caire" [in "Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptienne et assyrienne", V (1884), pp. 202–206].

(3) The Egyptian Church Ordinance, consisting of thirty-two canons and extant, likewise, both in Bohairic and in Sahidic. The Bohairic was published and translated into English by H. Tattam (op. cit., pp. 31–92), and re-translated into Greek by P. Bötticher (in Bunsen's "Analecta", pp. 461–477). The Sahidic was published by de Lagarde, "Ægyptiaca" (pp. 248–266, can. 31–62) and Bouriant (op. et loc. cit., pp. 206–216). A translation into German by G. Steindorff, from the edition of de Lagarde, is found in Achelis, "Die Kanones Hippolyti" (Leipzig, 1891, in "Texte u. Untersuchungen", VI, 4, pp. 39 sqq.).

(4) An epitomized recension of sections 1–46 of the Eighth Book of the Apostolic Constitutions; also both in Bohairic (published and translated into English by H. Tattam, op. cit., pp. 93–172) and in Sahidic (published by de Lagarde, "Ægyptiaca", pp. 266–291, canons 63–78, and Bouriant, op. cit., VI, pp. 97–109; examined and translated into German from the Lagarde edition, by Leipoldt, "Saïdische Auszüge", etc., in "Texte u. Untersuchungen", new series, I *b*, Leipzig, 1894). According to Leipoldt (op. cit., pp. 6–9), this abstract, in which the liturgical sections are either curtailed or entirely omitted, has much in common with the "Constitutiones per Hippolytum" not only in the choice of the selection, as already shown by Achelis, but also in point of style; the Coptic document is beyond doubt of Egyptian origin. Besides the above Bohairic and Sahidic texts, there is a fragment (de Lagarde, can. 72–78, 24) of another Sahidic text which, according to Leipoldt (who first published it and translated it into German, op. cit.), belongs to an older recension. The text published by de Lagarde and Bouriant is derived from an older recension, with corrections from the Greek Apostolic Constitutions as they were when the "Constitutiones per Hippolytum" were taken from them. On this theory of Leipoldt's, however, see Funk, "Das achte Buch der apostolischen Konstitutionen in der Koptischen Ueberlieferung" in "Theologische Quartalschrift", 1904, pp. 429–447).

The above three documents, (2), (3), (4), form one collection of 78 canons, under the following title: "These are the Canons of our holy Fathers the Apostles of Our Lord Jesus Christ, which they established in the Churches". As a whole they are known, since de Lagarde's edition, as "Canones Ecclesiastici". The Bohairic manuscript (Berlin, or. 4° 519) used by Tattam was translated, and the Sahidic one (library of the Jacobite Coptic patriarch) used by Bouriant was copied on the manuscript (British Museum or. 1320 dated A. D. 1006) reproduced by de Lagarde. Bouriant's edition is faulty. A complete edition of the Canones Ecclesiastici and Canons of the Apostles (see below), with the Ethiopic and Arabic parallel texts and an English translation, is due to G. Horner (The Statutes of the Apostles or Canones Ecclesiastici, London, 1904). The author gives variant readings from several manuscripts for each version, and in a long introduction he examines the mutual relationships of the various texts.

(5) Canones Apostolorum.—A recension of Book VIII, 47, of the Apostolic Constitutions entitled: "The Canons of the Church which the Apostles gave through Clêmês [Clement]". These canons are usually called Canones Apostolorum, with de Lagarde, by whom a Sahidic recension was first published (op. cit., pp. 201–238; published also by Bouriant, op. cit., VI, pp. 109–115). This recension contains 71 canons. A Bohairic recension of 85 canons, as in the Greek, was published and translated into English by H. Tattam (op. cit., pp. 173–214); published also by de Lagarde along with the Sahidic text (op. et loc. cit.).

(6) Canones Hippolyti.—A Sahidic fragment of the Paris collection (B. N. Copte 129 14 ff. 71–78) contains a series of canons under the title of "Canons of the Church which Hippolytus, Bishop of Rome, wrote". So far as the present writer knows, these

canons have not yet been the object of a critical study; nor does it seem that they were ever published.

(7) The Canons of Athanasius, or rather the Coptic writing which underlies the Copto-Arabic collection of 107 canons bearing that name, are undoubtedly one of the oldest collections of church regulations and very likely rightly attributed by the tradition to St. Athanasius of Alexandria, and, in that case, perhaps to be identified with the "Commandments of Christ" which the Chronicle of John of Nikiu attributes to this Father of the Church and the "Canons of Apa Athanasius" mentioned in the catalogue of the library of a Theban monastery, which catalogue dates from about A. D. 600. The Sahidic text, unfortunately not complete, was published and translated (along with the Arabic text by Riedel) by Crum from a British Museum papyrus (sixth or seventh century) and two fragments of a manuscript on parchment (tenth century) preserved in the Borgian Collection (Naples) and the Rainer collection (Vienna), in Riedel and Crum's "Canons of Athanasius of Alexandria", London, 1904. To this work we are indebted for the information contained in this brief notice. Although this interesting document is a pure Egyptian production, there is but little doubt that it was originally written in Greek.

(8) The Canons of St. Basil, preserved in a Turin papyrus broken into many hopelessly disconnected fragments, which Fr. Rossi published and translated although he could not determine to what writing they belonged (I Papiri Copti del Museo Egizio di Torino, II, fasc. IV). Of late those fragments were identified by Crum, who, despairing of establishing their original order, arranged them for convenience according to the Arabic recension published by Riedel (Die Kirchenrechtsquellen des Patriarchats Alexandrien, Leipzig, 1900, p. 231) and translated them into English ["Coptic Version of the Canons of St. Basil" in "Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology", XXVI (1904), pp. 81–92].

History.—Among the historical productions of Coptic literature, none of which can be highly commended, we shall mention:—

(1) An Ecclesiastical History in twelve books, extending from a period we cannot determine, to the re-establishment of Timothy Ælurus as patriarch of Egypt. If we suppose that in this, as often in similar works, the author continued his narrative until his own times, it would seem almost certain that he wrote it in Greek. At all events the prominence given to the affairs of the Church of Alexandria shows him an Egyptian, as from his tone it is clear that he professed Monophysitism. Like so many other Coptic literary productions, the Ecclesiastical History reached us in the shape of fragments only. They are all in Sahidic, and once belonged to two different copies of the same work, or perhaps to two copies of two works very similar in scope and method. Both copies (or works) contain a number of passages translated (more frequently paraphrased, sometimes abridged) from the "Ecclesiastical History" of Eusebius. On the other side the Coptic work was heavily laid under contribution by Severus of Ashmunein in his "History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria". Some of the fragments were published by Zoega in "Catalogus Codicum Copticorum", with a Latin translation, some by O. v. Lemm, "Koptische Fragmente zur Patriarchengeschichte Alexandriens" ("Mémoires de l'Acad. Imp. de S. Pétersb.", VII^e sér., XXXVI, 11, St. Petersburg, 1888; and "Bulletin de l'Acad. Imp. de S. Pétersb.", 1896, IV, p. 237, in both cases with German translation; the others by Crum, "Eusebius and Coptic Church Histories" in "Proceedings of the Soc. of Bibl. Archæology", XXIV, 1902, with English translation).

(2) The Acts and Canons of the Council of Nicæa, preserved in Sahidic fragments in the Turin and Borgian collections. They have been published, translated into French, and discussed at length by E. Revillout, "Le Concile de Nicée d'après les textes coptes et les diverses collections canoniques, I, textes, traductions et dissertation critique", Paris, 1881 (Journal Asiatique, 1873–75); vol. II, "Dissertation critique (suite et fin)", Paris, 1899. The author believes in the genuineness of this collection; see, however, the two excellent reviews of Vol. II by Batiffol (Revue de l'histoire des religions, XII, 1900, pp. 248–252) and Duchesne (Bulletin critique, 1900, I, pp. 330–335).

(3) The Acts of the Council of Ephesus, of which we have considerable fragments of a Sahidic text in the Borgian and Paris collections. The fragments of the former collection were published by Zoega, "Catalogus", pp. 272–280, with a Latin translation; those of the latter collection by Bouriant, "Actes du concile d'Ephèse: texte Copte publié et traduit" ("Mémoires publiés par la Mission archéol. française au Caire", VIII, Paris, 1892). The Paris fragments have also been translated into German and thoroughly discussed by Kraaz, with the help of C. Schmidt, "Koptische Acten zum Ephesinischer Konzil vom Jahre 431" (Texte u. Untersuchungen, new series, XI, 2, Leipzig, 1904). Kraaz thinks that this recension is the work of an Egyptian and, in substance, a good representative of the Greek documents already known. These fragments contain, however, additional information not entirely devoid of historical value.

(4) The so-called "Memoirs of Dioscurus", a Monophysitical counterpart of the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon. It is in the shape of a Bohairic panegyric of Macarius, Bishop of Tkhôu, delivered by Dioscurus during his exile at Gangræ in presence of the Egyptian delegates who had come to announce to him the death of Macarius. The publication of that curious document with French translation and commentary was begun by Revillout under the title of "Récits de Dioscore exilé à Gangres sur le concile de Chalcédoine" (Revue Egyptologique, I, pp. 187–189, and II, pp. 21–25, Paris, 1880, 1882), published and translated into French by E. Amélineau, "Monuments pour servir" (Mémoires publiés, etc., IV, Paris, 1888), pp. 92–164. As against Revillout, Amélineau asserts the spuriousness of these Acts. Almost immediately after the latter's publication, Krall published and translated some Sahidic fragments which exhibited a better recension of the same document, and show that in this, as in other cases, the Bohairic text was translated from the Sahidic. In disagreement with Amélineau, Krall thinks it more probable that the Memoirs of Dioscurus were originally written in Greek, and sees no reason to doubt their genuineness ("Koptische Beiträge zur ägyptischen Kirchengeschichte" in "Mittheilungen aus der Sammlung der Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer", IV, p. 67, Vienna, 1888). In 1903 Crum published copies by A. des Rivières of ten leaves of a papyrus codex, once a part of the Harris collection, now lost. Three of those leaves belonged to the panegyric of Macarius, while the others were part of a life of Dioscurus, of which a Syriac recension was published by Nau ("Histoire de Dioscore, patriarche d'Alexandrie écrite par son disciple Théophiste" in "Journal Asiatique", Série X, t. I, pp. 5–108, 241–310). Nau thinks that the Syriac and Coptic recensions of the life are independent of each other, which points to a Greek original for that document and probably also for the panegyric (Notes sur quelques fragments coptes relatifs à Dioscore, ibid., t. II, pp. 181–4).

(5) A correspondence in Bohairic between Peter Mongus, Patriarch of Alexandria, and Acacius, Patriarch of Constantinople. It includes the Henoticon which Zeno issued at the suggestion of Acacius. It was published in a French translation by E. Revillout, "Le premier schisme de Constantinople" [Revue des questions historiques, XXII (1877), Paris, pp. 83–134], and by Amélineau, "Lettres de Pierre Monge et

d'Acace" (Monuments pour servir, etc.; Mémoires publiés par les Membres de la Mission Archéologique française au Caire, IV, pp. 196–228). This correspondence is obviously spurious.

(6) On another document possibly of greater historical interest, but too short or too badly preserved to be of any practical use, see Crum, "A Coptic Palimpsest" in "Proceed. of the Soc. of Bibl. Arch.", XIX (1897), pp. 310–22 (Justinian times; name of Zoilus occurs). Two Sahidic fragments of the lives of a certain Samuel, superior of a monastery, and Patriarch Benjamin, both of whom lived at the time of the Arabic conquest, furnished E. Amélineau with the basis of a new solution of the problem as to the identity of the Makaukas ["Fragments coptes pour servir à l'hist. de la conquête de l'Egypte par les Arabes" in "Journal Asiatique", VIII^{e} Série., t. XII, pp. 361–410. Cf. A. J. Butler, "On the Identity of Al Mukaukis" in "Proceedings Soc. of Bibl. Arch.", XXIII (1901), pp. 275 sqq.].

There is also quite a number of Sahidic fragments of lives or encomiums of patriarchs and bishops, etc. which either have not yet been examined or have proved to contain none of the historical information often to be found in documents of their nature.

Liturgy.—The Coptic liturgy was derived from the ancient Alexandrine liturgy by the simple way of translation. The fact that in all the principal Coptic liturgical books most of the parts recited by the deacon (*Diakonika*), the responses by the people, and several prayers by the priest appear in Greek, even to this day, bears sufficient witness to the correctness of this statement. The change of language did not take place everywhere at the same time. At any rate it was gradual. The vernacular Coptic appeared first in the side column, or on the opposite page, as an explanation of the Greek text, which was no longer sufficiently intelligible to the people. In course of time the Greek disappeared entirely, with exception of the Diakonika and corresponding responses, which, on account of their shortness and frequent recurrence, continued to be familiar to the people. The most ancient relics of Coptic liturgy are all in the Sahidic dialect, a fact which by itself, perhaps, would not be a sufficient reason for asserting that in the north of Egypt Bohairic was not used as a liturgical language as early as the Sahidic in Upper Egypt; although, for reasons which time and space do not allow us to discuss, this seems quite probable. For several centuries Bohairic, which was the liturgical language adopted by the Jacobite patriarchs when they gave up Greek, has been the sole sacred idiom all over Egypt. The substitution of the Northern dialect for the Southern one probably took place by degrees and was not completed until about the fourteenth century, when Sahidic ceased to be generally understood by the faithful. It was not a mere substitution of language, but one of recension as well, as evidenced by the remains of the Sahidic liturgy.

The literature of the Coptic Liturgy, as now in force, comprises the following books:—

Euchologium (Arabic, *Khulāgî*).—Like the Εὐχολόγιον τὸ μέγα of the Greeks, it is a combination of the Εὐχολόγιον with the λειτουργικόν. It includes, therefore, not only the Liturgy proper, or Mass, with the Diaconicum (which contains the part of the deacon and responses of the people), but also all the various liturgical matter pertaining to the Pontifical and Ritual. It contains in addition the services of the morning and of the evening incense, performed at Vespers, Matins, and Prime. The Mass consists of (1) the Ordo Communis (Prothesis and Mass of the Catechumens), which never varies; (2) the Mass of the Faithful or Anaphora, of which there are three varieties: St. Basil's for ordinary days; St. Cyril's (a recension of the Alexandrine Anaphora of St. Mark) for the month of Choiac (Advent) and Lent, and St. Gregory Nazianzen's for feast days.

The Euchologium was edited by Raphael Tuki in three books under both Coptic and Arabic titles, which we translate as follows: (1) "Book of the three Anaphoras, namely, those of St. Basil, St. Gregory the Theologian, and St. Cyril, with the other holy prayers", Rome, Propaganda, 1736, pp. 282, 389—Contents: Evening Incense, and Morning Incense with the *proprium temporis* thereto; Mass, including the three Anaphoras; Prayers Before and After Meals, Blessing of the Water, and the Ordo Renovationis Calicis. (2) "Book containing all the holy prayers", ibid., 1761–2, 2 vols.—Contents: I, Ordinations, Blessing of Religious Habit, Enthronization of Bishops, Consecration of *myron* (Holy Chrism) and Churches (676 pages); II, Consecration of Altars and Sacred Vessels, Blessing of Church Vestments, Sacred Pictures, Relics, Consecration of Churches (if rebuilt) and Baptismal Fonts; Blessing of the Boards used for the *Heikel* (Holy of holies); Reconciliation of the same if replaced because decayed or if desecrated; Special Services for the Epiphany, Maundy Thursday, Pentecost, the Feast of St. Peter and St. Paul; Reconciliation of persons guilty of apostasy and other special crimes; Blessing of the Oil, Water, and Loaf for one bitten by a mad dog, etc., etc. (515 pages). (3) "Book of the Service of the Holy Mysteries, Funerals of the Dead, Canticles, and one month of the Katameros" (this last item, a reduction of the work of the same name described hereunder, is printed here for convenience). The three books just described are generally referred to as "Missale Copto-Arabice", "Pontificale Copto-Arabice", and "Rituale Copto-Arabice", although these designations do not appear on the title pages nor elsewhere in the books. Neither does the name of the editor (Tuki) appear.

The Missale has been edited anew with a slightly different arrangement, both in Coptic and Arabic, under the title: "Euchologium of the Alexandrine Church", Cairo, Catholic Press of St. Mark, Era of the Martyrs 1614 (A. D. 1898). Another Egyptian edition (Jacobite?) of the Missale (Cairo, 1887) is mentioned by Brightman (Liturgies Eastern and Western, I, p. lxvii), and a Jacobite "genuine" edition of the "Euchologium [complete?] from manuscript sources" (Cairo, 1902), by Crum (Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie, 3d edition, XII, p. 810). The Missal edited by Tukï does not differ from the oldest manuscript of the Vatican Library (thirteenth cent.), except that the names of Dioscurus, Severus of Antioch, and Jacobus Baradæus have been expunged from the diptychs, and that of the pope added to them, the mention of Chalcedon introduced after that of Ephesus, and the *Filioque* inserted in the Creed. As for his Pontifical and Ritual, they certainly contain everything that is essential and common to the majority of good codices. Naturally the latter vary both in the arrangement and in the selection of prayers according to their origin and date of compilation. Tuki's Ordo Communis, and St. Basil's Anaphora, with rubrics in Latin only, were reprinted by J. A. Assemani, "Missale Alexandrinum", pars II, pp. 1–90, in "Codex Liturgicus", VII (Rome, 1754). John, Marquess of Bute, published also an edition of the Morning Incense, Ordo Communis (from Tuki's text with some additions), and St. Basil's Anaphora (from Tuki's?): "The Coptic Morning Service for the Lord's Day" (London, 1882), pp. 35 sqq. (See Brightman, op. et loc. cit.)

There has been no complete translation. The Ordo Communis and the three Anaphoras have been translated into (1) Latin, (a) from an Arabic (Vienna?) manuscript by Victor Scialach, "Liturgiæ Basilii Magni, Gregorii Theologi, Cyrilli Alexandrini ex Arabico conversæ" (Vienna, 1604—reprinted in "Magna Bibliotheca Patrum", Paris, 1654, t. VI); (b) from a Paris Coptic manuscript by Renaudot, "Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio" (2 vols., Paris; Frankfort, 1847), I; (2) English, (a) from "an old manuscript", by Malan, "Original Documents of the Coptic Church; V, the

Divine Εὐχολόνιον" (London, 1875); (b) from a manuscript now in the library of Lord Crawford, by Rodwell, "The Liturgies of St. Basil, St. Gregory and St. Cyril from a Coptic manuscript of the thirteenth century" (London, 1870). The Ordo Communis and St. Basil's Anaphora in Latin, by Assemani, from Tuki's Arabic (op. et loc. cit.); in English from Renaudot's Latin, by Neale, "History of the Eastern Church" (London, 1850), introduction, pp. 381 sqq., 532 sqq. The Ordo Communis and St. Cyril's Anaphora (from Bodleian manuscripts of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries), by Brightman (op. cit., pp. 144–188). Morning Incense, Ordo Communis, and St. Basil's Anaphora, by John, Marquess of Bute (op. cit.).

Horarium (Arab. *Agbiah*, *Egbieh*), corresponding to our Breviary, edited by R. Tuki under the following title (Coptic and Arabic): "A Book of the seven prayers of the day and of the night" (Rome, 1750), generally referred to as "Diurnum Alexandrinum Copto-Arabicum" [Morning (Prime), Terce, Sext, None, Evening (Vespers), Sleep (Complin), Prayer of the veil (extra-canonical?), Midnight (Matins)]. This book is intended for private recitation and gives but an imperfect idea of the office as performed in the monasteries or even in the churches where a numerous clergy is in attendance.

Katameros (Gr. Κατὰ μέρος, Arab. *Kutmârus*) contains the portions of the Psalms, Acts, Catholic Epistles, St. Paul's Epistles, and the Gospels which are read at the canonical Hours and Mass. It is divided into three volumes: (I) from Thoth to Mechir; (II) from the beginning of Lent to Pentecost inclusive; (III) from Pachon to the Epagomene days which the Copts called the "little month" or in Arabic, the "forgotten days". The Katameros for the two weeks from Palm Sunday to Easter Sunday has been published under the Coptic and Arabic title of "Book of the Holy Pasch according to the rite of the Alexandrine Church" (Catholic Press of St. Mark, Cairo, 1899). This portion of the Katameros contains numerous lessons from the Old Testament (see VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE). Its arrangement is attributed to Gabriel Ibn Tureik, seventieth patriarch (d. 1145). Mai (Scriptorum veterum nova collectio, IV, Rome, 1831, pp. 15–34) gives a table of the Gospels for feasts and fasts and for Saturdays, Sundays, Wednesdays, and Fridays of the year. Malan (Original Documents of the Coptic Church, IV, London, 1874) gives the Sunday Gospels and versicles for Vespers, Matins, and Mass for the year. De Lagarde tabulated all the lessons and Psalms from Athyr to Mechir, and from Epiphi to the "little month", also those for Lent and the Ninevites' fast, for the Sundays of Eastertide, and for the principal feasts (Abhandlungen d. histor-philol. Klasse d. Kgl. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, XXIV, 1879).

The Psalmodia.—This is a collection of poetical compositions in honour of Our Lord and the Blessed Virgin, the saints and the angels, sung during the various services, especially at Vespers, Matins, and Prime. They form two distinct systems, one of which, called *Theotokia*, is most elaborate, and, as its name indicates, deals exclusively with the Mother of God. The other, the *Doxologia*, extends to all saints. A compendium of this book has been published by Tuki, under the Coptic and Arabic title "Book of the Theotokia and Katataxis of the month of Choiac" (Rome, 1746), 344 pp. The book is the subject of an interesting study by Mallon, "Les Théotokies ou office de la Sainte Vierge dans le rite copte" in "Revue de l'Orient Chrétien" (1904), IX, pp. 17–31.

The Antiphonarium (Arab. *Andifnârî*, *Difnarî*), a collection of anthems in honour of the saints. The composition or the arrangement of this book is attributed to Gabriel Ibn Tureik. (See MONASTICISM.)

Of the Sahidic recension (or recensions) of the Egyptian Liturgy we have fragments from the various books, which books seem to have been the same as in the Bohairic recension. The most interesting of those relics belong to the Liturgy proper or Mass, to the Anaphoras principally. Of these the Churches of Upper Egypt apparently had a large number, for we have portions of those of St. Cyril, St. Gregory, St. Matthew, St. James, St. John of Bosra, and of several others not yet identified. Some have been published and translated by Giorgi (Lat. tr.), Krall (Ger. tr.), and Hyvernat (Lat. tr. only). For the titles of the publications and further information on nature of fragments published, see Brightman, "Liturgies Eastern and Western" (Oxford, 1896), I, pp. lxviii–lxix. There are also important relics of the Diaconicum, probably enough to reconstruct that book entirely (one fragment published by Giorgi, "Fragmentum Evangelii Sti. Joannis" etc., Rome, 1789, a very large number of fragments of the Katameros, lectionaries, and not a few hymns (some of them popular rather than liturgical) which of late have aroused the interest of students of Coptic poetry [see Junker, "Koptische Poesie des 10. Jahrhunderts" in "Orient Christianus" (1906), VI, pp. 319–410; with literature on the subject complete and up-to-date]. The fragments in British Museum and Leiden Collections have been published in full in the catalogues of Crum (pp. 144–161, 969–978) and Pleyte-Boeser. A complete edition and translation of the Sahidic liturgy is being prepared (1909) by the writer of this article for the "Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium".

VII. COPTO-ARABIC LITERATURE.—Long before Coptic became extinct as a spoken idiom it had ceased to be a literary language. The change seems to have taken place about the tenth century. The old Coptic literature continued for some centuries to be copied for the benefit of a few, but at the same time the work of translating it into Arabic was being carried on on a large scale and must have been completed early in the thirteenth century, at the latest. John of Semenûd, who about 1240 composed a Coptic lexicon of the liturgical language, is highly praised by one of his successors, Abû Ishâq Ibn al-'Assâl, for having realized the uselessness of composing, as used to be done before, dictionaries extending to the whole literature. This remark would hardly be intelligible if the translating of the non-liturgical part of Coptic literature had not then been completed, much less if it had not yet begun. Those early translations include not only the works already reviewed in the preceding section of this article, but a good many more now lost in the Coptic version or translated anew from the Greek or the Syriac originals. Among the latter are quite a number of Nestorian writers, expurgated when necessary. But the glory of the Copto-Arabic literature lies in its original writings. We have already mentioned (see above, V.) the three historians of the Coptic Church, Severus of Ashmûnein, Eutychius, and Al-Makîn. The authors of new Canons are: Christodulos, sixty-sixth patriarch, 1047–77; Cyrillus II, sixty-seventh patriarch, 1078–92; Macarius, sixty-ninth patriarch, 1103–29; Gabriel Ibn Tureik, seventieth patriarch, 1131–45; Cyrillus III Ibn Laqlaq, seventy-fifth patriarch, 1235–43, and Michael, Metropolitan of Damietta, twelfth century.—Collectors of Canons: Abû Solh Ibn Bânâ, eleventh cent., Macarius, fourteenth cent. (if not to be identified with the Simeon Ibn Maqârâ, mentioned by Abû 'l-Barakât).—Compilers of Nomo-Canons: Michael of Damietta, twelfth cent., Abû 'l-Fadâil Ibn al-'Assâl, thirteenth cent., etc. (see Riedel, "Die Kirchenrechtsquellen des Patriarchats Alexandrien", Leipzig, 1900).—Hagiographers are represented by Peter, Bishop of Melîg, twelfth and thirteenth cent., credited by Abû 'l-Barakât with the composition of the Sinaksâri or martyrology, and Michael, also Bishop of Melîg, fifteenth cent., to whom the same book is also attributed (probably because he revised and completed the work of his predecessor).—Severus of Ashmûnein, Peter of Melîg,

ECCLESIASTICAL MAP OF
NORTH AFRICA
showing the boundaries of the
COPTIC PATRIARCHATE
and of the
ARCHDIOCESES, DIOCESES,
VICARIATES, and
PREFECTURES APOSTOLIC
of the LATIN RITE
LATIN RITE
1 Pref. Delta of the Nile.....Cairo
2 Vic. Egypt.....Alexandria
3 Pref. Tripoli.....Tripoli
4 Archb. Carthage.....Tunis
5 Bish. Constantine.....Constantine
6 Archb. Algiers.....Algiers
7 Bish. Oran.....Oran
8 Bish. Ceuta.....joined to Cadiz
9 Pref. Morocco.....Tangier
10 Bish. Angra....Angra, Isl. of Terceira, (not on the map).....Azores
11 " Funchal.....Funchal, Madeira
12 " San Cristobal, S. Cruz, Teneriffe, Canaries
13 " Canaries.....Las Palmas
14 Pref. Ghardaia....Ghardaia, Laghouat, S. Terr., French Sahara
15 Vic. Sahara.....Segou-Sikora, French West Africa
16 Pref. Senegal.....St. Louis, Senegal
17 Vic. Senegambia.....Dakar, Senegal
18 Bish. São Thiago.....São Thiago, Cape Verde Islands
19 Pref. French Guinea.....Konakry
20 Vic. Sierra Leone.....Freetown
21 Pref. Ivory Coast.....Grand Bassam
22 Vic. Gold Coast.....Cape Coast Castle
23 Pref. Togoland.....Lome, Togoland
24 Vic. Dahomey.....Whydah, Dahomey
25 " Benin.....Lagos, Lagos
26 Pref. Northern Nigeria.....Lokoya
27 " Southern Nigeria.....Onitsha
28 Vic. Kamerun.....Duala
29 " Fernando-Po.....Santa Isabel
29a " Bata Mission.....Bata, Rio Muni
30 Bish. São Thomé.....Isl. São Thomé
31 Vic. Gabun.....Libreville, Fr. Congo
32 " Fr. Upper Congo.....Brazzaville
35 " Congo Indep. State..Leopoldville
66 " N. Victoria Nyanza.....Rubaga
68 " Stanley Falls.....St. Leopold
69 Pref. Welle.....Amadi
70 Vic. Uganda.....N'Sambya
71 " Galla-Land.....Harrar
72 Br. Somaliland (to Vic. Arabia), Berbera
73 Pref. Eritrea.....Cheren
74 Vic. Abyssinia.....Alitiena
75 " Sudan.....Assuan, Egypt
76 Pref. Benadir....Brava, It. Somaliland
77 " Kenia Mission.....
78 " Liberia.....Monrovia
81 Vic. Ubanghi-Shari.....Ste. Famille
COPTIC RITE
I Patr. Alexandria..Cairo
II Bish. Hermopolis.....Minieh
III " Thebes.....Tahta
See articles CONGO and AFRICA for maps giving in detail the ecclesiastical and political boundaries and seats of remainder of Africa.
Seat of Patriarchate:
Archbishopric:
Bishopric:
Bishopric (vacated):
Vicariate Apostolic:
Prefecture Apostolic:
Sees of Coptic Rite:
Boundaries of same thus: +++++
Madeira Is. (Port.)
to Province of Lisbon
Funchal
Canary Islands (Span.)
to Province of Seville
Teneriffe I.
Las Palmas
Cape Verde Islands
to Province of Lisbon
P. P. Richard, Morat and Pouplard murdered 1881
P. P. Bouchaud, Paumier, and Menoret murdered 1870
Hoggar or Ahaggar
IMOSHAGH OR TUAREG
TROPIC OF CANCER
RIO DE ORO
Mauretania
UPPER SENEGAL AND NIGER
SENEGAMBIA
PORT. GUINEA
FRENCH GUINEA
SIERRA LEONE
IVORY COAST
GOLD COAST
TOGO
DAHOMEY
SOUTHERN NIGERIA
NORTHERN NIGERIA
KAMERUN
ANGLO-EGYPTIAN SUDAN
EGYPT (EL MISR)
TRIPOLI
FEZZAN
ALGERIA
MOROCCO
TUNIS
SPAIN
PORTUGAL
Lisbon
Cadiz
Gibraltar
Ceuta
Tangier
Algiers
Tunis
Palermo
Sicily
Catania
Crete
Cyprus
Alexandria
Cairo
Benghazi
Tripoli
Gulf of Sidra
MEDITERRANEAN SEA
ATLANTIC OCEAN
Sta. Cruz de Teneriffe
Gran Canaria
C. Bojador
Rio de Oro
C. Blanco
C. Mirik
C. Verde
Dakar
St. Louis
Bathurst
Bissagos Is.
Boffa
Konakry
Freetown
Sherbro I.
Robertsport
Monrovia
Greenville
Harper
C. Palmas
San Pedro
Sassandra
Grand Lahu
Bingerville
Grand Bassam
Assini
C. Three Points
Cape Coast Castle
Accra
Lome
Whydah
Lagos
Bight of Benin
Mouth of Nun (Niger)
Sta. Isabel
I. Fernando Po
Bata
Rio Muni
to Prov. Bight of Biafra
São Thome
Libreville
Gaboon R.
Ste. Famille
Fort Crampel
Fort Sibut
Bangui
Banzyville
Mobaye
Semio
Doruma
Lado
Tarangole
Jabbir
Dufile
Wadelai
Amadi
Upoto
Basoko
Stanleyville
New Antwerp
Lulanga
St. Leopold
INDEPENDENT STATE CONGO
UGANDA PROTECT.
BRITISH EAST AFRICA
Rubaga
N'Sambya
Victoria Nyanza
Albert Nyanza
Kioga L.
Rudolf L.
Layuka
Boran
Ababua
Mobutu
Semliki R.
Aruwimi R.
Uele R.
Shari R.
Logone R.
Benue R.
Niger R.
Gulf of Aden
Strait of Bab-el-Mandeb
Aden (Br.)
Sokotra (Br.)
Brother Is.
Hanish Is.
Perim I.
Obbia
Bandar Bela
Illig
Brava (Barawa)
Magadishu
ITALIAN SOMALILAND
BRITISH SOMALILAND
Berbera
Harrar
Addis Abeba
Jibuti
FRENCH SOMALILAND
Zeila
Adowa
Adigrat
Makalle
Massaua
Asmara
Keren
Cheren
Alitiena
Kassala
Gedaref
Sennar
Khartoum
Omdurman
Wad Medani
Abeshr
El-Fasher
El-Obeid
Foja
Darra
Shekka
Fashoda
Kirin
Kobbo
Ankober
Gore
Jimma
Bonga
Gaba-Shambe
Dem Siber
Ndele
Hofra-en-Nahas
Lake Chad
Kanem
Bornu
Kano
Sokoto
Zaria
Gando
Nguri
Mao
Birni
Busso
Gujba
Marua
Yola
Lamé
Lai
Garua
Bauchi
Kefi
Bida
Sungeru
Ilorin
Abeokuta
Ibadan
Lokoya
Onitsha
Old Calabar
Banjo
Ngaumdere
Guikora
Bamum
Kunde
Gasa
Carnot
Bubanjidah
Bafut
Bali
Banyo
Tibati
Yaunde
Lolodorf
Ebolowa
Mvundu
Wesso
Duala
Bueia
Bonaberi
Mungo R.
Benue R.
Niger R.
Kuka
Dikoa
Ngigmi
Tawa
Jajiduma
Sinder
Agades
Asben (Air)
Timbuktu
Gao
Beduaram
Taghajit
Tin-tellust
Dirki
Bilma
Agadem
Ennedi
Tibesti
Ortu
Borku
Yin
Tedatibbu
Bardai
Afafi
Vat
Asiu
Timissao
Taudeni
Wadan
Shingeti
Tichit
Arawan
Walata
Bassikunu
Nioro
Sokolo
Gumbu
Banjaguro
Jenne
Wahiguya
Dori
Say
Wagadugu
Kury
Babaku
Sigiri
Sikaso
Kurussa
Timbo
Falaba
Kissidugu
Odienne
Beyla
Kono
Sakala
Bonduku
Kwadukon
Kusie
Ft. Binger
Kumassi
Misahoe
Takwa
Axim
Cape Coast Castle
Accra
Lome
Whydah
Lagos
Bight of Benin
Mouth of Nun (Niger)
Sta. Isabel
I. Fernando Po
Bata
Rio Muni
to Prov. Bight of Biafra
São Thome
Libreville
Gaboon R.
Ste. Famille
Fort Crampel
Fort Sibut
Bangui
Banzyville
Mobaye
Semio
Doruma
Lado
Tarangole
Jabbir
Dufile
Wadelai
Amadi
Upoto
Basoko
Stanleyville
New Antwerp
Lulanga
St. Leopold
INDEPENDENT STATE CONGO
UGANDA PROTECT.
BRITISH EAST AFRICA
Rubaga
N'Sambya
Victoria Nyanza
Albert Nyanza
Kioga L.
Rudolf L.
Layuka
Boran
Ababua
Mobutu
Semliki R.
Aruwimi R.
Uele R.
Shari R.
Logone R.
Benue R.
Niger R.
Gulf of Aden
Strait of Bab-el-Mandeb
Aden (Br.)
Sokotra (Br.)
Brother Is.
Hanish Is.
Perim I.
Obbia
Bandar Bela
Illig
Brava (Barawa)
Magadishu
ITALIAN SOMALILAND
BRITISH SOMALILAND
Berbera
Harrar
Addis Abeba
Jibuti
FRENCH SOMALILAND
Zeila
Adowa
Adigrat
Makalle
Massaua
Asmara
Keren
Cheren
Alitiena
Kassala
Gedaref
Sennar
Khartoum
Omdurman
Wad Medani
Abeshr
El-Fasher
El-Obeid
Foja
Darra
Shekka
Fashoda
Kirin
Kobbo
Ankober
Gore
Jimma
Bonga
Gaba-Shambe
Dem Siber
Ndele
Hofra-en-Nahas
Lake Chad
Kanem
Bornu
Kano
Sokoto
Zaria
Gando
Nguri
Mao
Birni
Busso
Gujba
Marua
Yola
Lamé
Lai
Garua
Bauchi
Kefi
Bida
Sungeru
Ilorin
Abeokuta
Ibadan
Lokoya
Onitsha
Old Calabar
Banjo
Ngaumdere
Guikora
Bamum
Kunde
Gasa
Carnot
Bubanjidah
Bafut
Bali
Banyo
Tibati
Yaunde
Lolodorf
Ebolowa
Mvundu
Wesso
Duala
Bueia
Bonaberi
Mungo R.
Benue R.
Niger R.
Kuka
Dikoa
Ngigmi
Tawa
Jajiduma
Sinder
Agades
Asben (Air)
Timbuktu
Gao
Beduaram
Taghajit
Tin-tellust
Dirki
Bilma
Agadem
Ennedi
Tibesti
Ortu
Borku
Yin
Tedatibbu
Bardai
Afafi
Vat
Asiu
Timissao
Taudeni
Wadan
Shingeti
Tichit
Arawan
Walata
Bassikunu
Nioro
Sokolo
Gumbu
Banjaguro
Jenne
Wahiguya
Dori
Say
Wagadugu
Kury
Babaku
Sigiri
Sikaso
Kurussa
Timbo
Falaba
Kissidugu
Odienne
Beyla
Kono
Sakala
Bonduku
Kwadukon
Kusie
Ft. Binger
Kumassi
Misahoe
Takwa
Axim
Tripoli
Misratah
Nulut
Kasr Gharian
Misda
Sinaun
Bu-Njem
Sirt
Muktar
Benghazi
Tokra
Bengazi
Derna
Bombo
Gulf of Sidra
Tobruk
Sollum
Port Said
Damietta
Alexandria
Cairo
Tanta
Medinet-el-Fayum
Oasis Siwah (Jupiter Ammon)
Oasis Bahariya
Beni-Suef
Minieh
Tahta
Akhmim
Assiut
Girgeh
Akabah
Suez
Oasis of Kufrah
Kosseir
Assuan
Ras Benas
Korosko
Wady Halfa
Jiddah
Mecca
Selma
Bisharin
Nubian Desert
Arabian Desert
Nile R.
Red Sea
Abu Hamed
Suakin
Saduan
Kunfuda
Ibli
Makhlul
Farsan
Abu Arish
Sana
Dongola
Khandak
Merowe
Berber
Tokar
Adarama
Hadendoa
Kababish
Omdurman
Khartoum
Kassala
Alitiena
Cheren
Massaua
Asmara
Adowa
Adigrat
Axum
Adua
Zula
Goudar
Sokota Assab
Afar Obok
Tajura
Famaka
Samara
Monkorer
Tarof
Bulhar
Rat
Botidila
Bandar Bela
Illig
Warandab
Bohotle
Shelkh-Hussein
Imi
Bari
Obbia

Abû Isḥâq Ibn al-'Assâl and his brother Abû 'l-Fadâil Ibn al-'Assâl are the chief representatives of theology, as Severus of Ashmûnein and Abû 'l-Farag Ibn al-'Assâl, thirteenth cent., are of Scriptural studies, and John Abu Zakariah Ibn Saba and Gabriel V, eighty-eighth patriarch (fifteenth century), of liturgy; John's treatise "Gauharat an-nafîsah" (Precious Gem) has been published (Cairo, 1902).—For the grammarians and lexicographers, several of whom have already been mentioned in one connexion or another, see the excellent study of A. Mallon, S.J., "Une école de savants Egyptiens au moyen âge" in "Mélanges de la faculté Orientale de l'université Saint Joseph", I, pp. 109–131, II, pp. 213–264. There remains to mention the great ecclesiastical encyclopedia of the Coptic Church, the "Lamp of Darkness and Illumination of the Church Service" of Shams al-Ri'âsah Abû 'l-Barakât Ibn Kibr (1273–1363). This stupendous work sums up, so to speak, the four centuries of literary activity we have just reviewed. (See Riedel, op. cit., pp. 15–80.)

Coptic Literature.—Quatremère, *Recherches sur la langue et la littérature de l'Egypte* (Paris, 1818); Renaudin, *Essai de bibliographie Copte* (Poitiers, 1896); *Littérature chrétienne de l'Egypte* in *Université Catholique*, New Ser. XXX (1899); Stern, *Koptische Sprache* in Ersch and Gruber, XXXIX; Benigni, *Bibliografia Copta* in *Bessarione* (Rome, 1900), year V, vol. VIII; Crum in *Archæological Report of Egypt Exploration Fund*, every year from 1893; Leipoldt, *Gesch. der koptischen Lit.* in *Litteraturen des Ostens in Einzeldarstellungen*, VII, 131–183; Zoega, *Catalogus Codicum Copticorum, manuscriptorum qui in Musæo Borgiano Velitris asservantur* (Rome, 1810); Mingarelli, *Ægyptiorum Codicum reliquiæ Venetiis in Bibliotheca Naniana asservatæ* (Bologna, 1785); Crum, *Catalogue of the Coptic Manuscripts of the British Museum* (London, 1905); Pleyte-Boeser, *Manuscrits Coptes du Musée d'Antiquités des Pays-Bas* (Leyden, 1897).

Copto-Arabic Literature.—Vansleb, *Histoire de l'Eglise d'Alexandrie* (Paris, 1677), 331–343, abstract from Abu'l-Barakât's encyclopedia; Riedel, the same abstract in Ger. tr. in *Nachrichten von d. Kgl. Gessellsch. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, Philolog.-hist. Klasse* (1902), 5; Mallon, *Ibin al-'Assâl, Les trois écrivains de ce nom* in *Journal Asiatique*, X Sér., VI (1905), pp. 509 sq.; Mai, *Script. Vet. Nova Collectio, IV Codices Arabici*, etc. (Rome, 1831). See also other catalogues of Christian Arabic MSS. (Paris, London, Oxford, etc.).

Egypt in General.—Among the older works on Egypt the following still possess value: Bunsen, *Egypt's Place in Universal History* (London, 1848–67); Wilkinson, *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians* (Boston, 1883).

For further bibliographical information see the bibliographies in Breasted, *History of the Ancient Egyptians*, 445 sqq., and Baedeker, *Egypt*, clxxxi sqq. The most complete bibliography of Egypt is: Hilmy, *The Literature of Egypt and the Soudan* (London, 1886).

H. Hyvernat.

Egyptian Church Ordinance, an early Christian collection of thirty-one canons regulating ordinations, the liturgy, and other main features of church life. It is called Egyptian because it first became known to the Western world in languages connected with Egypt. In 1677 the Dominican Wansleben first gave a brief account of these canons, which were found in the "Synodos", or what may be called the Ethiopic "Corpus Juris". In 1691 Ludolf published a fragment of this Ethiopic collection and added a Latin translation. In 1895 a further fragment, i. e. to the end of the ordination prayer for deacons, was published in German by Franz Xaver von Funk. In 1848 H. Tattam published all the canons in Bohairic (Lower Egyptian) with English translation. In 1883 Lagarde published the same canons in Sahidic (Upper Egyptian) from an excellent manuscript of A. D. 1006. This text was translated into German by G. Steindorff and this translation was published by H. Achelis (Harnack, "Texte und Untersuchungen", VI, 4). In 1900 E. Hauler discovered a very ancient Latin translation in a manuscript of the fifth or sixth century. This translation is of great value because it apparently is slavishly literal, and it contains the liturgical prayers, which are omitted in the Bohairic and Sahidic. The original text, though not yet found, was doubtlessly Greek.

The Egyptian Church Order is never found by itself, but is part of the Pseudo-Clementine Legal Hexa- or Octateuch in the form in which it was current in Egypt. In Hauler's Latin "Fragmenta Veronensia" (Leipzig, 1900) the order is: Didascalia, Apostolic Church Order, Egyptian Church Order, Book VIII of the Apost. Constit.; in the Syrian Octateuch, "The Testament of the Lord", Apostolic Church Order, "On Ordinations" (by Hippolytus), Book VIII of the Apostolic Constitutions, Apostolic Canons; in the Egyptian Heptateuch, Apostolic Church Order, Egyptian Church Order (or Ordinance), Book VIII Apost. Constit., Apostolic Canons. The Egyptian Church Order is one of a chain of parallel and interdependent documents, viz. (1) the Canons of Hippolytus, (2) the "Canones per Hippolytum", (3) "The Testament of the Lord", (4) Book VIII of Apost. Constit. For some time a scholarly duel has been fought between two eminent men as to the relation between these documents. Document No. 3, "The Testament of the Lord" only came into consideration after its discovery and publication by Rahmani in 1899. H. Achelis strenuously maintained that the "Canones Hippolyti" are the oldest in the series and were written early in the third century; on it, according to him, the other documents depend, the Eighth Book of the Apostolic Constitutions being the latest development. Von Funk maintained the same order of documents as Achelis, only inverting their sequence, beginning with Book VIII of the Apostolic Constitutions, and ending with the "Canons of Hippolytus". Gradually, however, Funk's thesis seems to be winning almost universal acceptance, namely that Book VIII of the Apostolic Constitutions was written about 400, and the other documents are modifications and developments of the same, the Egyptian Church Order in particular having arisen in Monophysite Egyptian circles between the years 400 and 500.

Cooper and Maclean, *The Testament of the Lord* (Edinburgh, 1902); Wordsworth, *The Ministry of Grace* (London, 1901); von Funk, *Das Testament unseres Herrn und die verwandten Schriften* (Mainz, 1901); Baumstark, *Nichtgriech. Parralleltexte zum VIII. Buche der Ap. Const.* in *Oriens Chr.* (Rome, 1901); Bardenhewer, tr. Shahan, *Patrology* (Freiburg im Br., 1908), 353–57.

J. P. Arendzen.

Egyptians, Gospel according to the. See Apocrypha.

Eichendorff, Josef Karl Benedikt, Freiherr von, "the last champion of romanticism", b. 10 March, 1788, in the Upper-Silesian castle of Lubowitz, near Ratibor; d. at Neisse, 26 Nov., 1857. Till his thirteenth year he remained on the parental estate under a clerical tutor; then he was sent with his brother William to Breslau where he attended the Maria-Magdalenen gymnasium, at that time still Catholic. During those student years (1804) were written the first of Eichendorff's extant poems; no doubt his poetical talent had already been awakened in his romantic home. In the spring of 1805 he matriculated at the University of Halle. Here, under the influence of Professor Steffens, he became a follower of the Romantic School of poetry, and at the same time became acquainted with Calderon, some of whose plays were performed by the ducal company of Weimar in the neighbouring town of Lauchstädt. In later years he translated several *autos sacramentales* in truly poetical language. Eichendorff's development was even more strongly influenced by his sojourn in Heidelberg (1807), where the triumvirate of romanticism, Görres, Arnim, and Brentano, had, in the "Einsiedler Zeitung", taken the field against pedantry and philistinism. With the two last-named the young poet did not then cultivate a closer acquaintance—he certainly did so in 1809 at Berlin—but the lectures of the great Görres made a deep impression on him. Recommended by Count Loeben, Eichendorff's first poems were printed in Ast's periodical, among them the famous song "In einem kühlen Grunde". The

first of his larger works, the novel "Ahnung und Gegenwart", was written partly at home, in Lubowitz, where he spent several years after the completion of his studies, partly in Vienna, where he had gone to qualify himself for the Austrian civil service; his friendly relations with Fr. Schlegel and his adopted son, the painter Veit, kept awake the poet's romantic enthusiasm.

In 1813, when Prussia and Austria were preparing for the War of Liberation, Eichendorff abandoned his poetry, his professional studies, and his preparation for the civil service, and joined the famous volunteers of Lützow at Breslau. Again, in 1815, when Napoleon had returned from Elba, he followed the call to arms, although he had just married (Oct., 1814) Luise von Larisch, and entered Paris with the conquerors. It was only in 1816 that the chivalric baron left the army and entered the Prussian civil service as a lawyer at Breslau. The next three years passed in quiet seclusion; their principal literary production is the story "Das Marmorbild". He received his first appointment in 1820 on the Catholic board of education at Danzig; there he took a lively interest in the restoration of the Marienburg, a house of the Teutonic Order; later (1844) he wrote its history at the request of the Government. His tragedy "Der letzte Held von Marienburg" was suggested by this circumstance. At the same time appeared his most popular production, "Aus dem Leben eines Taugenichts". In the year 1831 he was called to Berlin as councillor in the ministry of public worship. In this high office he found many opportunities to be useful to the Church; but he also met with difficulties under a government which did not shrink from imprisoning the Archbishop of Cologne, Clemens August. When Eichendorff, who was a stanch Catholic, was asked to defend the measures of the Government in public, he asked for his dismissal, which, however, was not granted till 1844. The succeeding years were passed mostly in Berlin, where the poet was occupied more with literary and historical than with poetical work; after the death of his wife (1855) he lived with his family at Neisse. Two years later, having finished his swan-song, the epic "Lucius", he died.

EICHENDORFF

What has established the fame of Eichendorff as a poet and has given him a place not only in literature, but also in the heart of the people, are his simple but heartfelt songs. Many of them have become *Volkslieder* (popular songs) in the truest sense of the word; almost all are fitted for singing owing to their spirit and their melodious language. There is hardly another German poet who has found so many composers for his songs. The great lyrical talent which made Eichendorff the master of the short story ("Aus dem Leben eines Taugenichts", "Das Marmorbild", "Schloss Dürande"), was prejudicial to the novel "Ahnung und Gegenwart", and to the longer story "Dichter und ihre Gesellen", inasmuch as the action is neglected for discursive discussions. Lack of compression and of action has also been censured in the two dramas, "Ezelin von Romano" and "Der letzte Held von Marienburg". Still, "Ezelin", the tragedy of a consuming pride ruined through the very abuse of its gigantic strength, no less than "Der letzte Held", in which Plauen fails on account of his exceeding magnanimity and bravery, amply testify to the dramatic talent of the poet. His best comedy "Die Freier" has been found very well adapted to the stage. In his later years Eichendorff devoted his genius more to the history of literature. His history of the poetical literature of Germany (Kempten, 1907), especially the description of romanticism, outlined as it is by one of its best representatives, is of lasting value, also the sketch of the German novel in the eighteenth century. His solid character and his strong religious faith raise "the champion of romanticism" far above his fellow-poets. Not only did his genius never lead him away from the duties which religion and custom imposed upon him, but he also knew how to distinguish between poetical ideal and reality, and to avoid the underlying want of truth to which the earlier romanticism had succumbed.

GÖDEKE (GÖTZE), *Grundriss zur Gesch. der deutsch. Dichtung*, VIII, 176–196, where everything pertaining to his bibliography up to 1905 can be found. Important publications after 1905 are:—NOWACK, *Lubowitzer Tagebuchblätter* (Gross Strehlitz, 1907); a critical edition of EICHENDORFF'S complete works has been begun.

N. SCHEID.

Eichstätt (EYSTADIUM), DIOCESE OF (EYSTETTENSIS or AYSTETTENSIS), in Bavaria, lies north of the Danube, and is suffragan to Bamberg. The diocese was founded by St. Boniface, who consecrated his nephew St. Willibald (born 700 of an Anglo-Saxon royal family) first as abbot- and regional bishop (741), and then (745) circumscribed and organized the diocese. Willibald called to his aid his brother Wunibald, who, together with St. Boniface, had been active on the German mission of Thuringia, and also his sister St. Walburga. He erected for them the monastery of Heidenheim on the Hahnenkamm, where the saintly pair laboured most effectively and found their resting-place (Wunibald d. 761, Walburga d. 779). Willibald, well known for his knowledge of the Christian Orient and as a pilgrim to Palestine, founded in Eichstätt a flourishing school over which he presided as magister. He died in 781. The unbroken series of his successors down to the present time (1909) counts seventy-five names. Bishop Erchanbold (882–912) of the Carlovingian line laid the foundation for the secular power of the see. Gradually this increased, especially through the inheritance of the Counts of Hirschberg (extinct in 1305), under Bishop Johann von Dirpheim (1305–1306), who was also chancellor of Emperor Albrecht I. Like other German princes, the bishops of Eichstätt acquired sovereignty (under Bishop Hartwig in 1220), and after various struggles became, from the fourteenth century, independent rulers over a territory which at one time comprised 437 square miles with 56,000 subjects. In the "secularization" of 1803 these domains were made over to Bavaria.

There were many illustrious incumbents of the See of Eichstätt. Bishop Reginold (965–989) was admired as a poet, musician, scholar, and orator. Bishop Heribert (1022–1042) was a patron of the cathedral school. Gundekar II (1057–1075) rebuilt the cathedral, composed the "Pontificale", in which the lives of his predecessors, the "Vitæ Pontificum Eystettensium", and many other subjects, especially liturgical, are treated. This work, still preserved in the original (Codex M), is of great value for the history of the diocese. Gundekar is venerated as a saint. His predecessor was Gebhard I (1042–1057), the chancellor and friend of Henry III. Hildebrand, afterwards Gregory VII, did not rest until this emperor allowed the reluctant Gebhard to assume the papal dignity. He was the first pope whom in a long time the clergy and people of Rome had chosen freely. As Victor II (1055–

1057) he was friendly to reforms, an extremely energetic man, and saintly in his life. Had he lived longer he would have taken rank among the greatest of the popes; he died in 1057 at the age of thirty-nine. Bishops Eberhard I (1099–1112), Ulrich II (1112–1125), Gebhard II (1125–1149), and Otto (1182–1195) vigorously inaugurated reforms that were perfected and confirmed in the diocesan synod of 1186. A similar activity was displayed by Bishops Henry IV (1246–1259), Reimboto (1279–1297), and Philipp von Rathsamshausen (1306–1322). The last-named was a prolific writer, patron of the cathedral school, and by synods tried to raise clergy and people to a higher level. Berthold (1354–1365), a Hohenzoller by birth, built the Willibaldsburg, provided for the material welfare of the clergy, and protected them against the attacks of laity, nobility, and princes (Constitutio Bertholdiana). On all sides we meet with evidence of his regulating and stimulating zeal (Synodal statutes of 1354).

The Western Schism left its traces on the diocese. Bishop Johann III von Eich (1446–1464), a saintly man, did all in his power to efface them. He reformed the monasteries, organized the instruction of the clergy, issued pastoral directions, protected vigorously the property of the Church, and attracted to Eichstätt a number of scholars (among them the Humanist Albert of Eyb). Having been, before his election, chancellor of the emperor and his representative at the Council of Basle, he continued as bishop to serve the State on diplomatic missions of great importance. Thus, he represented the emperor in the congress of princes which Pius II called at Mantua. His friend and successor, Wilhelm von Reichenau (1464–1496), the tutor of Maximilian I, was a statesman, diplomat, and patron of the fine arts, but also a bishop who walked in the footsteps of his predecessor and left after him the memory of a brilliant administration. In 1480 he made a visitation of the whole diocese. The original records of this visitation, the oldest thus far known, are still extant, and give us an interesting picture of religious life in the Middle Ages, in which, however, there are not lacking deep shadows. His successors, the cultured Gabriel von Eyb (1496–1535) and the noble Moritz von Hutten (1539–1552), were men who fully understood the critical situation and set themselves against the perilous innovations of their time, but they could not prevent the imperial cities of Nuremberg and Weissenburg, the margraves of Ansbach and the palgraves of the Rhine, from annexing a large part of the territory of the diocese in order to restore their finances by means of church property, and from forcing the people to apostatize. Bishop Moritz gathered about him men of ability (Vitus von Ammerbach, Cochlæus), and convoked (1548) a diocesan synod whose records exhibit the spreading spiritual desolation.

Bishop Martin von Schaumberg (1560–1590) founded the first Tridentine seminary (1564) one year after the close of the council, and secured for it excellent teachers (Robert Turner, Peter Stewart, Frederick Staphylus). Bishop Konrad von Gemmingen (1593–1612) rebuilt the Willibaldsburg, founded the "Hortus Eystettensis", a garden well known to all European botanists, ordered frequent visitations of the diocese, and embellished the cathedral with precious jewels. Bishop Christoph Johann von Westerstetten (1612–1636) invited the Jesuits to Eichstätt, built a magnificent (Renaissance) church for them, and committed the episcopal seminary to their care. In 1634 the Swedes reduced almost the whole episcopal city to ashes, but it soon rose to new splendour under the long and prosperous reign of Bishop Marquard II (1636–1685), a scion of the family of Schenk von Castell. He reorganized the ecclesiastical and secular administration of the diocese, won part of its territory (in the Upper Palatinate) back to Catholicism, and was for years imperial plenipotentiary at the diets and eminent as a diplomat.

The eighteenth century brought peace and prosperity, and many a magnificent structure in city and diocese rose under the gifted prince-bishops of those days (residence and garden, the fountains called Marienbrunnen and Willibaldsbrunnen, castle of Hirschberg, monastery of Notre-Dame). Bishop Raymund Anton, Count of Strassoldo (1757–1781), prepared for his clergy the well-known "Instructio Pastoralis", a book of pastoral direction, which in its latest (fifth) edition (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1902) is even yet much admired. The "secularization" (1803) robbed the Bishop of Eichstätt of his ancient secular authority, but the diocese remained and was reorganized by the Bull of circumscription of 1821. Cardinal Karl August von Reisach (Bishop of Eichstätt, 1835–1846) renewed its ecclesiastical and religious life, opened the seminary for boys (1838) and the lyceum (1844), with a philosophical and a theological faculty, and in union with Joseph Ernst (d. 1869), president (*Regens*) of the latter institution, breathed into it the true spirit of the Church, a spirit which since then has never failed. Bishop Georg von Oettl (1847–1866) and his successor, Franz Leopold von Leonrod (1867–1905), faithfully continued and completed the work begun by Reisach. The conditions of the diocese are as well regulated as is possible; its people are solidly grounded in the Faith, while the learning, life, and labours of the clergy are considered exemplary throughout Germany.

The diocese is rich in monuments of ecclesiastical architecture and art. The Gothic cathedral exhibits many excellent works of art from the fourteenth to the eighteenth century; especially noteworthy is its *mortuarium*. The Gothic church of Our Lady in Ingolstadt and the conventual churches of Kaste (Romanesque) and Freystadt (Renaissance) are important monuments. Among ecclesiastical artists may be mentioned: Hans Paur (fifteenth century), Hans Pildschnitzer (fifteenth century), Loy Hering (sixteenth century), Gabriel de Gabrielis (seventeenth-eighteenth century), Ignaz Breitenauer (eighteenth century). In the Middle Ages Eichstätt possessed a flourishing cathedral school dating from the time of St. Willibald. Mostly with ecclesiastical funds and through the zeal of Wilhelm von Reichenau, the University of Ingolstadt was founded in 1472. Many of its professors became famous. Among its theologians are Johann Eck, P. Canisius, Gregory of Valencia, Salmeron, Jacob Gretser; among its canonists: Reiffenstuel, Pirhing, Schmalzgrueber; among its jurists, Wiguleus Kreittmayr, Ad. Ickstatt; among its philosophers, scientists, and mathematicians: Johann Reuchlin, Conrad Celtes, Christoph Scheiner, Caspar Scioppius, Philipp and Petrus Apian, Fuchs Leonhard, and others. Early in the nineteenth century the university was transferred to Landshut, thence to Munich.

The most important monastery of the diocese in olden times was the Benedictine abbey founded by St. Willibald in 740 and out of which grew the diocese. At the end of the tenth century it became the cathedral chapter with secular canons. Heidenheim was at first a double monastery, founded by St. Willibald; it was changed (800) to a chapter of canons; later it became again a Benedictine monastery. Before the change the monks moved to Herrieden and erected there, under Abbot Dietker and through the benevolence of Charlemagne, a new monastery, which was changed to a chapter of canons in 888 and secularized in 1804. The nuns moved from Heidenheim to Monheim, taking with them some of the relics of St. Walburga, which were lost in the "secularization" of the sixteenth century. St. Walburg (Benedictine nuns) in Eichstätt (founded 870) was endowed in 1035 by Count Leodegar and reorganized by Bishop Heribert. It is yet flourishing despite its temporary seculariza-

tion (1802–1835), and possesses some relics of St. Walburga. Kastel in the Upper Palatinate, founded 1098 (Benedictines from the Cluniac congregation), took a prominent part in the reforms of the twelfth century; it was secularized in 1556, and in 1636, during the Counter-Reformation, its domains were transferred to the Jesuit college in Amberg, and after the suppression of the Jesuits (1773) to the Knights of Malta; in 1806 it was secularized once more. Plankstetten (Benedictines, founded 1129) was also secularized in 1802. Heilsbronn (Cistercians, founded 1132), also zealous for ecclesiastical reforms, was secularized in 1530 by the margraves of Ansbach. Rebdorf (Augustinian canons, founded 1159 through the powerful help of Frederick Barbarossa) was the home of Prior Kilian Leib (1471–1552), linguist and historian; the abbey was secularized in 1802. Bergen (Benedictine nuns, founded 976) was suppressed in 1552 by the Protestant princes of Neuburg; its estates passed later into the hands of the Jesuits, who used them to found the seminary and gymnasium in Neuburg on the Danube (1664). The "Schottenkloster zum heiligen Kreuz" (The Irish Monastery of the Holy Cross), an Irish foundation of 1140 in Eichstätt, passed over to the Capuchins in 1623, lived through the "secularization" of the early nineteenth century, and is still flourishing. In the thirteenth century arose the monasteries of Engelthal (suppressed in 1550 by the people of Nuremberg); Seligenporten (Cistercian nuns), secularized in 1556, after the re-Catholicizing of the Upper Palatinate given to the Salesian nuns of Amberg and Munich, and again secularized in 1802; Gnadenthal in Ingolstadt (Franciscan nuns, founded in 1276), still flourishing. In the fifteenth century were founded: Gnadenberg (Brigittines), Mariastein near Rebdorf (Augustinian nuns), Königshofen, Marienburg near Abenberg, all of which disappeared during the last secularization (1802–1806). Eichstätt had still other monasteries in the Middle Ages: thus the Dominicans had a monastery in the city (founded 1279, secularized in 1802); the Carmelites in Weissenburg, the Franciscans in Ingolstadt (1275). From the seventeenth century the Jesuits had flourishing colleges in Eichstätt and Ingolstadt, the Capuchins in Eichstätt and Wemding (1669). The Teutonic Knights had a flourishing commandery in Ellingen which was secularized in 1802.

At present (1909) the diocese numbers one monastery of the Benedictines (Plankstetten), four of the Franciscans (Ingolstadt, Dietfurt, Berching, Freystadt), two of the Capuchins (Eichstätt, Wemding), two convents of nuns (St. Walburg and Gnadenthal), and about forty-six houses of female congregations, among them the flourishing institute of the English Ladies in Eichstätt. The seminary, restored by Reisach, was enlarged in 1844 by the addition of a philosophico-theological academy (lyceum), and under eminent scholars has attained a high degree of prosperity and scientific fame. (Professors: Johann Pruner, d. 1907; G. Suttner, d. 1888; Franz Morgott, d. 1900; Valent. Thalhofer, d. 1891; Alb. Stöckl, d. 1895; Math. Schneid, d. 1893; Phil. Hergenröther, d. 1890; Mich. Lefflad, d. 1900.) Since about 1898 bishops of the United States have been sending students to the Lyceum for training in philosophy and theology. During the nineteenth century the Diocese of Eichstätt also contributed several prominent men to the Church in the United States, among them Archbishop Michael Heiss of Milwaukee. Foundations of Benedictine nuns were also made in the United States from the convent of St. Walburg. In 1908 the diocese had about 185,000 Catholics, 206 parishes, 63 benefices, 79 assistancies, 373 secular and 39 regular priests.

The sources of the diocesan history were compiled by SUTTNER, *Bibliotheca Eystett. diœcesana* (Eichstätt, 1866–67); original records may be found in LEFFLAD, *Regesten der Bischöfe von Eichstätt* (Eichstätt, 1875—), which goes (1909) as far as 1306 and is being continued. Much material is published in the *Pastoralblatt*, the organ of the diocese (Eichstätt, 1854—). Earlier accounts of the diocesan history are: GRETSER, *Opp. omn.* (Ratisbon, 1734), X; FALKENSTEIN, *Antiquitates Nordgavienses*, 2 parts, and *Codex diplomaticus* (Frankfort, 1733); IDEM, *Analecta Nordgaviensia* (Schwabach, 1734–47); STRAUSS, *Viri insignes, quos Eichstadium genuit vel aluit* (Eichstätt, 1799). See also SUTTNER, *Gesch. des (alten) bischöfl. Seminars in Eichstätt* (Eichstätt, 1859); HOLLWECK, *Gesch. des neuen bischöfl. Seminars* (Eichstätt, 1888); HERB-MADER-THURNHOFER-SCHLECHT, *Eichstätts Kunst* (Eichstätt, 1902); SCHWERTSCHLAGER, *Der Eichstätter botanische Garten* (Eichstätt, 1890); ROMSTÖCK, *Statistik des bischöfl. Lyzeums in Eichstätt* (Eichstätt, 1894); GROTHE, *Der hl. Richard und seine Kinder* (Berlin, 1908). There are many modern monographs on scholars and artists of the diocese, e. g. MADER, *Loy Hering;* THURNHOFER, *Adelmann v. Adelmansfelden;* HAEMMERLE, *Pappenheimer Altar;* IDEM, *Die Kirche in Bergen.* See GÖTZ, *Die Glaubensspaltung im Gebiete der Markgrafschaft Ansbach-Kulmbach, 1520–1535* (Freiburg, 1907). Abundant material may also be found in the *Sammelblatt d. hist. Vereins Eichstätt* (Eichstätt, 1886—); SAX, *Gesch. des Hochstifts u. der Stadt Eichstätt* (Nuremberg, 1884); IDEM, *Gesch. der Fürstbischöfe v. Eichstätt* (Eichstätt, 1882); SUTTNER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Eichstätt.*

JOSEF HOLLWECK.

Eimhin, SAINT, Abbot and Bishop of Ros-mic-Truin (Ireland), probably in the sixth century. He came of the royal race of Munster, and was brother of two other saints, Culain and Dairmid. Of the early part of his religious life little is known. When he became abbot of the monastery of Ros-mic-Truin, in succession to its founder, St. Abban, he had been apparently connected with one of the religious houses of the south of Ireland, since it is recorded that a number of monks "followed the man of God from his own country of Munster". Ros-mic-Truin lies in South Leinster on the bank of the River Barrow, and is distant only eight miles, by water, from the confines of Munster, at the point where the Suir and Barrow meet, and in confluence enter the Atlantic. Although the Abbey of Ros-mic-Truin was founded by St. Abban, it is said to have been colonized by St. Eimhin, and from the number of religious and students belonging to the south of Ireland who dwelt there the place came to be called "Ros-glas of the Munstermen". St. Eimhin is said by some to have been the author of the life of St. Patrick, called the "Vita Tripartita" (ed. Whitley Stokes in R. S.), originally published by Father John Colgan, O.S.F. It contains a greater variety of details concerning the mission of the Apostle of Ireland than any other of the lives extant. St. Eimhin was famous for many and great miracles. The date of his death has not been recorded; however competent authorities assign it to the earlier half of the sixth century. After St. Eimhin's death, it is said, his consecrated bell was held in great veneration, and was used as a swearing relic down to the fourteenth century, oaths and promises made upon it being deemed inviolable. Among the MSS. of the library of the Royal Irish Academy, Dublin, is a prose tract entitled "Caine Emine" (i. e. the tribute or rule of Eimhin), also a poem of several stanzas relating to the saint's bell. St. Eimhin is given in the Irish calendars on 22 December.

COLGAN, *Acta SS. Hiberniæ* (Louvain, 1645); *Book of Ballymote; Vita Sti Abbani;* LANIGAN, *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland* (Dublin, 1829); *Life of St. Molua* (Clonfert); O'CURRY, *Lectures on the MS. Materials of Ancient Irish History* (Dublin, 1860).

J. B. CULLEN.

Einhard (less correctly EGINHARD), historian, born c. 770 in the district watered by the River Main in the eastern part of the Frankish Empire; d. 14 March, 840, at Seligenstadt. His earliest training he received at the monastery of Fulda, where he showed such unusual mental powers that Abbot Baugulf sent him to the court of Charlemagne. His education was completed at the Palace School, where he was fortunate enough to count among his masters the great Alcuin, who bears witness to his remarkable talent in mathematics and architecture, and also to the fact that, in spite of his unattractive person, he was among the emperor's most trusted advisers. Charlemagne gave

Einhard charge of his great public buildings, e. g. the construction of the Aachen cathedral and the palaces of Aachen and Ingelheim, for which reason he was known in court circles as Beseleel, after the builder of the tabernacle (Ex., xxi). Charlemagne also availed himself of Einhard's tact and prudence to send him on various diplomatic missions. Thus, in 802 he placed in his hands the negotiations for the exchange of distinguished Saxon hostages, and in 806 he was dispatched to Rome to obtain papal approbation for the partition of the empire, which the emperor had just decided upon.

During the reign of Louis the Pious he retained his position of trust, and proved a faithful counsellor to Louis's son, Lothair. Unsuccessful, however, in his attempts to settle the contests for the crown which had been stirred up by Empress Judith, and unable to bring about a lasting reconciliation between Louis and his sons, Einhard, in 830, withdrew to Mühlheim (Mulinheim) on the Main, which he had been granted as early as 815, together with other estates, as a mark of imperial favour. He transferred thither the relics of Sts. Marcellinus and Peter, and called the place Seligenstadt. Moreover, between 831 and 834 he established here a Benedictine abbey, where, after the death of his wife, Emma (or Imma), sister of Bishop Bernhar of Worms (not daughter of Charlemagne), he spent the rest of his life as abbot. It is not certain whether he was ordained priest. His epitaph was written by Rabanus Maurus.

The most important of Einhard's works is the "Vita Caroli Magni" (in "Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script.", II; printed separately, 4th ed., Hanover, 1880; also in Jaffé, "Bibliotheca rerum germanicarum", IV; Germ. tr. by Abel, 3rd ed., Berlin, 1893, in "Geschichtsschreiber der deutschen Vorzeit"). This, the best biography of the whole period of the Middle Ages, written in close imitation of Suetonius, particularly his "Vita Augusti", shows the emperor from the standpoint of the most intimate personal acquaintance with all sides of his character, and with a genuine attempt at truth of portrayal. The diction is in general elegant, though not polished. The annals of the Carlovingian Empire, which have been handed down as Einhard's (ed. Kurze, 1895), are, in their present form, older materials worked over. Those for the years between 796 and 820 may date back to Einhard. In addition, we have from his hand the "Translatio et Miracula SS. Marcellini et Petri" (Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script., XV), containing data which are important for the history of culture. The seventy-one letters, written by Einhard between 825 and 830 (ed. Jaffé, "Bibliotheca", Berlin, 1867, IV) in a clear, simple style, constitute an important source for the history of Louis the Pious. A collective edition of Einhard's works was published by Teulet (Paris, 1840–43), with French translation.

KURZE, *Einhard* (Berlin, 1899); WATTENBACH, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, I, s. v.; GLAISTER, tr., *Life of Charlemagne* (London, 1877).

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

Einsiedeln, ABBEY OF, a Benedictine monastery in the Canton of Schwyz, Switzerland, dedicated to Our Lady of the Hermits, that title being derived from the circumstances of its foundation, from which the name *Einsiedeln* is also said to have originated. St. Meinrad, of the family of the Counts of Hohenzollern, was educated at the abbey school of Reichenau, an island in Lake Constance, under his kinsmen Abbots Hatto and Erlebald, where he became a monk and was ordained. After some years at Reichenau, and the dependent priory of Bollingen, on Lake Zurich, he embraced an eremitical life and established his hermitage on the slopes of Mt. Etzel, taking with him a wonder-working statue of Our Lady which had been given him by the Abbess Hildegarde of Zurich. He died in 861 at the hands of robbers who coveted the treasures offered at the shrine by devout pilgrims, but during the next eighty years the place was never without one or more hermits emulating St. Meinrad's example. One of them, named Eberhard, previously Provost of Strasburg, erected a monastery and church there, of which he became first abbot. The church was miraculously consecrated, so the legend runs, in 948, by Christ Himself assisted by the Four Evangelists, St. Peter, and St. Gregory the Great. This event was investigated and confirmed by Pope Leo VIII and subsequently ratified by many of his successors, the last ratification being by Pius VI in 1793, who confirmed the acts of all his predecessors. In 965 Gregory, the third Abbot of Einsiedeln, was made a prince of the empire by Otto I, and his successors continued to enjoy the same dignity up to the cessation of the empire in the beginning of the nineteenth century. In 1274 the abbey, with its dependencies, was created an independent principality by Rudolf of Hapsburg, over which the abbot exercised temporal as well as spiritual jurisdiction. It continued independent until the French Revolution. The abbey is now what is termed *nullius diœcesis*, the abbot having quasi-episcopal authority over ten

ABBEY OF EINSIEDELN

parishes served by the monks and comprising nearly twenty thousand souls. For the learning and piety of its monks Einsiedeln has been famous for a thousand years, and many saints and scholars have lived within its walls. The study of letters, printing, and music have greatly flourished there, and the abbey has contributed largely to the glory of the Benedictine Order. It is true that discipline declined somewhat in the fifteenth century and the rule became relaxed, but Ludovicus II, a monk of St. Gall who was Abbot of Einsiedeln 1526–44, succeeded in restoring the stricter observance. In the sixteenth century the religious disturbances caused by the spread of the Protestant Reformation in Switzerland were a source of trouble for some time. Zwingli himself was at Einsiedeln for a while, and used the opportunity for protesting against the famous pilgrimages, but the storm passed over and the abbey was left in peace. Abbot Augustine I (1600–29) was the leader of the movement which resulted in the erection of the Swiss Congregation of the Order of St. Benedict in 1602, and he also did much for the establishment of unrelaxed observance in the abbey and for the promotion of a high standard of scholarship and learning amongst his monks.

The pilgrimages, just mentioned, which have never ceased since the days of St. Meinrad, have tended to make Einsiedeln the rival even of Rome, Loreto, and Compostela, and constitute one of the features for which the abbey is chiefly celebrated. The pilgrims number from 150,000 to 200,000 annually, from all parts of Catholic Europe. The miraculous statue of Our Lady, originally set up by St. Meinrad, and later

enthroned in the little chapel erected by Eberhard, is the object of their devotion. This chapel stands within the great abbey church, in much the same way as the Holy House at Loreto, encased in marbles and precious woodwork, elaborately decorated, though it has been so often restored, rebuilt, and adorned with the offerings of pilgrims, that it may be doubted whether much of the original sanctuary still remains. The fourteenth of September and the thirteenth of October are the chief pilgrimage days, the former being the anniversary of the miraculous consecration of Eberhard's basilica, and the latter that of the translation of St. Meinrad's relics from Reichenau to Einsiedeln in 1039. The millenary of St. Meinrad was kept there with great splendour in 1861. The great church has been many times rebuilt, the last time by Abbot Maurus between the years 1704 and 1719, and one of its chief treasures now is a magnificent corona presented by Napoleon III when he made a pilgrimage there in 1865. The library, which dates from 946, contains nearly fifty thousand volumes and many priceless MSS. The work of the monks is divided chiefly between prayer, the confessional, and study. At pilgrimage times the number of confessions heard is very large. The community numbers about one hundred priests and forty lay brothers, and attached to the abbey are a seminary and a college for about two hundred and sixty boys, both of which are taught by the monks, who also direct six convents of nuns. In 1854 a colony was sent to America from Einsiedeln to work amongst the native Indian tribes. From St. Meinrad's Abbey, Indiana, which was the first settlement, daughter-houses were founded, and these in 1881 were formed into the Swiss-American Congregation, which comprised (in 1906) seven monasteries and nearly four hundred religious. Dom Thomas Bossart, the fifty-third Abbot of Einsiedeln and formerly dean of the monastery, was elected in 1905.

Gallia Christiana (Paris, 1781), V; *Album Benedictinum* (St. Vincent's, Pennsylvania, 1880); MIGNE, *Dict. des Abbayes* (Paris, 1856); RÉGNIER, *Chronique d'Einsiedeln* (Paris, 1837); *Précis Historique de l'Abbaye et du Pèlerinage de Notre-Dame-des-Ermites* (Einsiedeln, 1870); MOREL, *Die Regesten der Benediktiner-Abtei Einsiedeln* (Chur, 1848); BRUNNER, *Ein Benediktinerbuch* (Würzburg, 1880); RINGHOLZ, *Geschichte des fürstlichen Benediktinerstiftes L. F. von Einsiedeln* (Einsiedeln, 1904), the most important work on the history and antiquities of the abbey.

G. CYPRIAN ALSTON.

Eis, FREDERICK. See MARQUETTE, DIOCESE OF.

Eisengrein, MARTIN, a learned Catholic theologian and polemical writer, b. of Protestant parents at Stuttgart, 28 December, 1535; d. at Ingolstadt, 4 May, 1578. He studied the humanities at the Latin school of Stuttgart, and the liberal arts and philosophy at the University of Tübingen. To please his father, who was burgomaster of Stuttgart, Eisengrein matriculated as student of jurisprudence at the University of Ingolstadt, 25 May, 1553, but before a year had passed he was at the University of Vienna, where he took the degree of Master of Arts in May, 1554. During the tolerant rule of Ferdinand I, Eisengrein, though still a Protestant, became in 1555 professor of oratory and, two years later, of physics at the University of Vienna, a Catholic institution. Though his Catholic surroundings and especially his frequent intercourse with the Jesuits of Vienna may have had great influence in bringing about his acceptance of the Catholic Faith, still his conversion was one of conviction, as is apparent from his numerous controversial writings and his scrupulous solicitude for the integrity of Catholic Faith and morals at the University of Ingolstadt. His conversion took place about 1558. In 1559 he received a canonry at St. Stephen's in Vienna, and a year later he was ordained priest. In 1562 he went to the University of Ingolstadt whither he had been invited by the superintendent of the university, Frederick Staphylus. He was appointed pastor of the church of St. Maurice, which was incorporated with the university, and in April of the same year he was elected rector of the university. Besides being professor, he devoted much of his time to the study of theology and, after receiving the degree of licentiate in this science on 11 No-

EINSIEDELN, SWITZERLAND

vember, 1563, he began to teach it in January, 1564. Duke Albert V of Bavaria chose him as councillor, appointed him provost of the collegiate church of Moosburg, and shortly afterwards of the collegiate church of Altötting and the cathedral church of Passau. In 1563 and 1564 he took part in the politico-religious conferences at the imperial court of Vienna; in 1566 Duke Albert sent him to Pope Pius V to advocate the appointment of Prince Ernest as Prince-Bishop of Freising, and in 1568–9 he was imperial court chaplain at Vienna. In 1570 he was appointed superintendent of the University of Ingolstadt, and henceforth he turned his whole attention to the advancement of the university.

Just at this time the friction between the lay professors and the Jesuits, which dated from the time when the latter began to hold professorial chairs at the university in 1556, threatened to become serious. In 1568 Eisengrein and Peter Canisius had peacefully settled certain differences between the two factions, but when in 1571 Duke Albert decided to put the *pædagogium* and the philosophical course into the hands of the Jesuits, the other professors loudly protested. By his tact Eisengrein succeeded in temporarily reconciling the non-Jesuit professors to the new arrangement. Soon, however, hostilities began anew, and in order to put an end to these quarrels, the Jesuits transferred the *Pædagogium* and philosophical course to Munich in 1573. It seems that the Jesuits were indispensable to the University of Ingolstadt, for two years later they were urgently requested by the university to return, and in 1576 they again went to Ingolstadt. In the settlement of the differences between the Jesuit and non-Jesuit professors, Eisengrein always had the welfare of the university at heart. He publicly acknowledged the great efficiency of the Jesuits as educators in an oration which he delivered before the professors and students of the university on 19 February, 1571, and he was pleased to see their influence gradually increase at Ingolstadt. There were indeed, some differences between Eisengrein and the Jesuits in 1572, but the estrangement was only temporary, as is apparent from the fact that he bequeathed 100 florins to the Jesuit library.

The greatest service which Eisengrein rendered the University of Ingolstadt was his organization of its library. It was owing to his efforts that the valuable private libraries of John Egolph, Bishop of Augsburg, Thaddeus Eck, chancellor of Duke Albert, and Rudolph Clenek, professor of theology at Ingolstadt, were added to the university library. Eisengrein's activities were not confined to the university. By numerous controversial sermons, some of which are masterpieces of oratory, he contributed not a little to the suppression of Lutheranism in Bavaria. Many of his sermons were published separately and collectively in German and Latin during his lifetime. Some have been edited by Brischar in "Die kath. Kanzelredner Deutschlands" (Schaffhausen, 1867–70), I, 434–545. He is also the author of a frequently reprinted history of the shrine of the Blessed Virgin at Altötting (Ingolstadt, 1571) and a few other works of minor importance.

PFLEGER, *Martin Eisengrein* in *Erläuterungen und Ergänzungen zu Janssens Gesch. des deutschen Volkes* (Freiburg im Br., 1908), VI, fasc. 2 and 3; IDEM, *Martin Eisengrein und die Universität Ingolstadt* in *Historisch-politische Blätter* (Munich, 1904), CXXXIV, 705–23, 785–811; KOBOLT, *Bayerisches Gelehrten-Lexikon* (Landshut, 1795), I, 195–201; RÄSS, *Die Convertiten seit der Reformation* (Freiburg im Br., 1866), I, 364–412.

MICHAEL OTT.

Eithene, SAINT, styled "daughter of Baite", with her sister Sodelbia, are commemorated in the Irish calendars under 20 March. They were daughters of Aidh, son of Caibre, King of Leinster, who flourished about the middle of the sixth century. The designation "daughters of Baite" usually coupled with their names would seem not to refer to any title of their father, but might be more correctly interpreted as the "children of Divine or ardent love". This interpretation is further strengthened by an account of a vision, accorded the two virgins, in which it is related that Christ in the form of an infant rested in their arms. In one of the legends contained in the "Acts" of St. Moling, Bishop of Ferns, it is told that Eithene and her sister were visited by this venerable saint. The abode of St. Eithene, called *Tech-Ingen-Baithe*, or the "House of the daughters of Baite" lay near Swords, in the present Barony of Nethercross, County Dublin. This saint is also venerated at Killnais, the former name of a townland in the same locality.

COLGAN, *Acta Sanctorum Hiberniæ* (Louvain, 1645); *Leabhar Breach;* O'DONOVAN, *Annals of the Four Masters;* O'CURRY, *Lectures* (Dublin, 1860); TODD, *St. Patrick* (Celtic Scotland) (London, 1864); SKENE, *Ordnance Survey Letters; Martyrology of Donegal; Kalendar of Drummond.*

J. B. CULLEN.

Eithne, SAINT, styled "of the golden hair", is commemorated in the Irish martyrologies under the 11th of January. She was daughter of Leoghaire, Ard-Righ, or Hy-Sovereign of Ireland at the time of St. Patrick's first visit, as a missionary, to the court of Tara (433). According to the prevailing custom of those days the children of kings and princes were frequently placed, at an early age, in charge of the family of some of the chieftains who coveted the honour of guardianship of the royal offspring. Hence it is assumed that Eithne and her younger sister were fostered close to Cruachan Magh Ai, the dwelling-place, or royal residence, of the Gaelic kings of Connaught. However the brief story of the saint's life centres in the one scene, which took place beside the brook of Clebach, County Roscommon, and is described in the "Acts" of the national apostle of Ireland.

On his way to the royal abode, during his mission to the western province, it is told that St. Patrick and his disciples camped one evening close to the Well of Clebach. On the following day the clerics rose at dawn to chant the Divine Office, and prepare for the mystic sacrifice. It would appear that the two royal princesses were accustomed to visit the same fountain in the early morn, and on this occasion were surprised at the appearance of the strange company who were in possession of the place. They were not, however, dismayed, and Eithne, the elder of the sisters, accosted Patrick and his companions, asking who they were and whence they came. Whereupon the apostle said—"It were better for you to confess your faith in our true God than ask about our race." Then, at their request, St. Patrick unfolded to them the doctrines of Christianity, which, under the influence of Divine grace, they accepted with heart and soul. Having baptized them, the saint placed on their brows the veil of virginity.

Then, it is related, Eithne and her sister asked "to see the face of Christ, the Son of the true God", but Patrick said: "You cannot see the face of Christ unless you taste death, and receive the Sacrifice". Whereupon they besought him to give them the Sacrifice that they might see their Spouse, the Son of God. So, by the brink of the fountain, the Sacrifice was offered, and having received their First Communion, Eithne and her sister, in an ecstasy of rapture, swooned away and died. When the days of mourning were ended both were laid side by side, close by the scene of their death, where afterwards a church was raised over the grave.

COLGAN, *Acta Sanctorum Hiberniæ* (Louvain, 1645); *Tripartite Life of St. Patrick; Book of Armagh; Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish;* HEALY, *Life of St. Patrick* (Dublin, 1895).

J. B. CULLEN.

Ekkehard, name of five monks of the (Swiss) Abbey of St. Gall from the tenth to the thirteenth century.

(1) EKKEHARD I (MAJOR, "the Elder"), d. 14 Jan., 973. He was of noble birth, of the Jonschwyl family in Toggenburg, and was educated in the monastery of St. Gall; after joining the Benedictine Order, he was appointed director of the inner school there. Later, under Abbot Kralo, who trusted him implicitly, he was elected dean of the monastery, and for a while directed all the affairs of the abbey. Ekkehard made a pilgrimage to Rome, where he was retained for a time by Pope John XII, who presented him with various relics of St. John the Baptist. After Kralo's death Ekkehard refused the abbatial succession, because of lameness resulting from a fractured leg. However, he directed the choice of Burkard, son of Count Ulrich of Buchhorn, who governed St. Gall with the advice and co-operation of Ekkehard. The latter erected a hospice in front of the monastery for the sick and strangers, and was in many other ways a model of charity. He was also distinguished as a poet, and wrote a Latin epic "Waltharius", basing his version on an original German text. He dedicated this poem to Bishop Erkanbald of Strasburg (965–991). It describes the elopement of Walter of Aquitaine with the Burgundian princess Hildegunde, from the land of the Huns, followed by the battle of Wasgenstein between Walter and the followers of Gunther and Hagen (ed. Peiper, Berlin, 1873). He also composed various ecclesiastical hymns and sequences, e. g. in honour of the Blessed Trinity, St. John the Baptist, St. Benedict, St. Columbanus, St. Stephen (Meyer, "Philologische Bemerkungen zum Waltharius" in "Abhandl. der bayr Akad. d. Wissenschaften", Munich, 1873; Strecker, "Ekkehard und Virgil" in "Zeitschrift f. deutsches Altertum", 1898, XLII, 338–366).

(2) EKKEHARD II (PALATINUS, "the Courtier"), d. 23 April, 990. He and Ekkehard III were nephews of the preceding, who educated also at St. Gall his other nephews, Notker the physician and Burkard, later abbot of the monastery. Ekkehard II was taught by his uncle and the monk Geraldus, and was later a teacher in the monastery school. A number of his pupils joined the order; others became bishops. According to the "Casus Sancti Galli" he was called later to Hohentwiel, the seat of the Duchess Hadwig of Swabia, widow of Burkard II. The duchess was wont occasionally to visit St. Gall, and eventually (973) asked for and obtained the services of Ekkehard as her tutor in the reading of the Latin classics. Nevertheless, he continued to render great services to his monastery, especially on the occasion of the differences between St. Gall and Reichenau (Abbot Ruodmann); in many other ways also he proved himself useful to the monks by the influence he had obtained as tutor of the duchess. Ekkehard was also prominent at the imperial court of Otto I. Later he became provost of the cathedral of Mainz, where he died 23 April, 990. He was buried in the church of St. Alban, outside the city gates. He was the author of various ecclesiastical hymns, known as sequences, all of which are lost, except one in honour of St. Desiderius.

(3) EKKEHARD III, also a nephew of Ekkehard I and a cousin of the preceding. He shared the educational advantages of his cousin and, at his invitation, accompanied him to Hohentwiel to superintend and direct the studies of the local clergy. On his return to St. Gall he was made dean of the abbey, and is reported to have filled this office for thirty years. He died early in the eleventh century.

(4) EKKEHARD IV.—According to the testimony in his "Chronicle" (especially in view of his statement that he had heard from eyewitnesses of the great conflagration at St. Gall in 937), the date of his birth is usually placed about 980; he died 21 Oct., but the year of his death is unknown (1036?–1060?). The same "Chronicle" indicates Alsace as his birthplace, though we do not know with certainty either the place of his birth, or his family origin. His boyhood was spent at St. Gall where he had for tutor Notker Labeo the German, one of the most learned scholars of his time. From him Ekkehard acquired a profound knowledge of the Latin and Greek classics; he also studied mathematics, astronomy, and music, and was acknowledged while living as a scholar of note even outside the monastery. After the death of Notker Labeo (1022) Ekkehard was called to Mainz by Archbishop Aribo, where he became director and teacher in the cathedral school, and held both offices until the death of his patron (1031), distinguishing himself as head of the school; indeed, he was noted as a successful teacher and promoter of learning. A treatise on the "Jube me, Domine, benedicere", inscriptions, and benediction prayers remain as evidences of his literary activity. Emperor Conrad II, when at Ingelheim near Mainz, distinguished him by marks of personal favour (Easter, 1030). Shortly after his return to St. Gall Abbot Tietbald died (1034) and Norbert of Stavelot, who introduced the reforms of Cluny, was elected to succeed him. A dissension, therefore, arose among the monks, the seniors being dissatisfied with the new reforms. Ekkehard, meanwhile, began work on the ancient abbey chronicle, the famous "Casus S. Galli", begun by Ratpert and continued to Abbot Salomon (883), and carried it on from that date to Notker (972). This work is a most important document for the contemporary history of St. Gall (ed. von Arx in "Mon. Germ. Historica: Scriptores" II, Hanover, 1829; ed. Meyer von Knonau in "St. Gallische Geschichtsquellen" in "Mitteil. zur vaterländ. Geschichte" (new series, nn. 5 and 6, St. Gall, 1877); it is also the main source of our knowledge concerning the Ekkehards. The "Casus" is mostly a compilation of anecdotes and traditions concerning distinguished monks. They contain, however, many historical errors and misrepresentations, and the Latin diction is often barbarous. Nevertheless, owing to the excellence and simplicity of the narrative, they are a valuable source of contemporary history, especially of its culture. The second important literary work of Ekkehard is his "Liber Benedictionum". It comprises metrical inscriptions for the walls of the Mainz cathedral, and benedictions (also in verse) for use in choir-service and at meals, also poems in honour of the festivals of various saints, partly from his own pen and partly by Notker Labeo. In poetical merit these works are inferior enough; nevertheless they betray a very fair knowledge of Latin. The glosses from his pen, both on his own manuscripts and others belonging to the abbey, remain as proof of his lifelong zeal in pursuit of knowledge. He was also skilled in music, especially ecclesiastical music, always diligently and successfully cultivated at St. Gall.

(5) EKKEHARD V (MINIMUS), d. about 1220. He is the last of the St. Gall Ekkehards, and flourished towards the end of the twelfth, and the beginning of the thirteenth, century. No particulars are known concerning his life, and tradition is silent as to his origin, the year of his birth and of his death. He was dean of the abbey in the reign of Innocent III. About 1214 he wrote a life of St. Notker Balbulus, a learned monk of St. Gall, who lived towards the end of the ninth, and the beginning of the tenth, century (Acta SS., April, I, 579), from which work we gather that its author was versed in ecclesiastical music.

MEYER VON KNONAU, *Die Ekkeharte von St. Gallen* in *Oeffentl. Vorträge*, etc. (Basle, 1876), III, 10 sq.; WATTENBACH, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen* (9th ed., Berlin); DÜMMLER, *Ekkehard IV. von St. Gallen* in *Zeitschrift f. deutsches Alterium* (1867), II, 1–73; VON ARX, *Gesch. des Klosters St. Gallen*, I, 273 sq.; FABRICIUS, *Bibliotheca mediæ et infimæ latinitatis* (Florence, 1858), I, 491; *Allg. deutsche Biographie* (Leipzig, 1877), V, 790 sqq.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Ekkehard of Aura (Uraugiensis), Benedictine monk and chronicler, b. about 1050; d. after 1125. Very little is known of his life. About 1101 he went on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and in 1106 took part in the Council of Guastalla. Apparently he belonged at first to the monastery of St. Michael at Bamberg, and later (1108 or 1113) was abbot of the monastery of Aura, founded by Bishop Otto of Bamberg, on the Franconian Saale, near Kissingen, Bavaria; this monastery followed the Rule of Hirschau. The "Chronicon universale", called after Ekkehard, is the chief source for the history of Germany during the years 1080–1125. In its present form it is divided into five books: the first contains ancient history from the Creation to the building of the city of Rome; the second extends to the birth of Christ; the third reaches the time of Charlemagne; the fourth goes to the opening of the reign of Emperor Henry V; the fifth contains an account of the reign of this ruler. No other medieval general chronicle covers so much ground; in the manuscripts now extant it is evidently not the work of one man but represents rather a fusion of various recensions and continuations. Bresslau, in his acute investigation of the subject (Neues Archiv für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde, VII), traces these changes, for the most part, to Frutolf, prior of St. Michael's (d. 17 Feb., 1103). It is now believed that Ekkehard simply rewrote the greater part of the chronicle, and that his original contribution is the account of the reign of Emperor Henry V. The chronicle, taken as a whole, is a very skilful compilation, and shows in the selection and arrangement of the matter a sound understanding and mastery of the material at hand. The language is good and simple, and the presentation clear and well summarized. Continuations were written by various chroniclers, among whom may be mentioned Conrad of Lichtenau and Albert of Stade. Ekkehard's chronicle has been published several times (Mon. Germ. Hist., Script., VI, 13–265; Migne, P. L., CLIV, 459–1060). A German translation was issued by Pflüger (Leipzig, 1893), as vol. LI of the series "Geschichtsschreiber der deutschen Vorzeit".



Pope Paschal II Giving Imperial Insignia to Henry V
Miniature from the Chronicle of Ekkehard of Aura, Bk. V, MS. at Cambridge

Buchholz, *Ekkehard von Aura* (Leipzig, 1888); Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen* (Berlin, 1893), II, 169.

Patricius Schlager.

Elæa, a titular see of Asia Minor. Elæa, said to have been founded by Menestheus, was situated at a distance of twelve stadia from the mouth of the Caicus, one hundred and twenty stadia from Pergamus. It appears in history about 450 B. C., at the time of the Athenian naval league. It belonged to Alexander, then to the kings of Pergamus, and was the port of the latter. In 190 B. C. it was besieged by Antiochus of Syria, in 156 by Prusias, who ravaged all the country. It was partly destroyed in A. D. 90 by an earthquake. In its Roman period it struck coins. As a suffragan of Ephesus Elæa is mentioned by most "Notitiæ episcopatuum" as late as the twelfth or the thirteenth century. We know only three of its bishops: Isaias in 451, Olbianus in 787, Theodulus in the twelfth century (Lequien, Or. Christ., I, 699). In the tenth century St. Paul the Younger, a monk of Mount Latros, was born there (Analecta Bollandiana, XI, 1–74, 136–182). The city must have been destroyed either by the Mongols or by the Turks. The ruins stand about three kilometres south of Kilisse Keui in the vilayet of Smyrna. The Greek Church also gives the title of Elæa to auxiliary bishops.

S. Pétridès.

Elba, the largest island of the Tuscan Archipelago, is to-day a part of the Italian province of Leghorn and is separated from the mainland by the Channel of Piombino. The island is traversed throughout by treeless mountain ranges, the highest peak being Monte Capanne (about 3343 feet); its area is 86 square miles; according to the census of 1901 it had 25,556 inhabitants, mostly Catholics. Politically the island forms the district of Porto Ferrajo; the chief town is Porto Ferrajo on the north coast, a place with 3940 inhabitants; the commune contains 6701 inhabitants. Outside of Porto Ferrajo the principal towns of the island are Orte Rio, with 2478 inhabitants, and the strongly fortified Porto Longone, which has a good harbour and a population of 4761. Ecclesiastically Elba belongs to the Diocese of Massa Marittima (see Massa Marittima) and contains eleven parishes: Porto Ferrajo, Porto Longone, Marciana, Marciana Marina, Poggio, Capoliveri, Rio, Rio Marina, Marina Campo, Sant' Ilario in Campo, and San Pietro in Campo. The Sisters of Mercy of St. Vincent de Paul have a house at Porto Longone, and the Sisters of St. Vincent, or Ladies of Christian Love, founded by the Venerable Cottolengo, have one at Porto Ferrajo; these are the only houses of religious on the island. The chief industry of Elba is the mining of the rich iron ore which was famous even in antiquity, but which, on account of lack of fuel, is generally smelted on the opposite coast of the mainland (the Maremma). The agricultural products are wheat, maize, wine, and semi-tropical fruits, and there are very profitable tunny and anchovy fisheries. The commerce is carried on through five ports, which were visited in 1900 by 2549 merchant vessels with a total of 492,418 tons burden. The smaller surrounding islands of Capraja, Pianosa, Palmaola, and Monte Cristo are connected in government with the island of Elba. Concerning the famous monastery of San Mamiliano, now in ruins, on the island of Monte Cristo, see Angelli, "L'Abbazia e l'Isola di Montecristo" (Florence, 1903), and for other information Kehr, "Regesta Pontificum Romanorum; Italia Pontificia" (Berlin, 1908), III, 276–78.

In the tenth century Elba came into the power of Pisa, from which it was wrested in 1290 by the city of Genoa. In 1399 Gian Galeazzo Visconti gave the island and the principality of Piombino to Gherardo Appiano in exchange for the lordship of Pisa. After that the island belonged as a Spanish fief to the Dukes of Sora and the Princes of Piombino. The Emperor Charles V gave a part of Elba to the Grand Duke Cosimo I of Tuscany, who built the citadel of Cosmopoli and thus laid the foundation of the later Porto Ferrajo, the chief town of the island; another district including Porto Longone came into the power of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. In 1736 the whole of Elba with the principality of Piombino passed under the jurisdiction of the Kingdom of Naples; in 1801 the Peace of Lunéville gave it to the Kingdom of Etruria, and in the following year, by the Peace of Amiens, it was transferred to France. After the first abdication of Napoleon Elba was made over to him as a sovereign principality. He

landed on the island, 4 May, 1814, but left it on 26 February, 1815; during his short administration Napoleon did much for the benefit of the island, especially in the improvement of the roads. The Congress of Vienna, in 1815, restored the island to Tuscany, with which it was finally incorporated into the united Kingdom of Italy.

SIMONIN, *La Toscane et la mer Tyrrhénienne* (Paris, 1868); PULLÉ, *Monografia agraria del circondario dell' Elba* (Porto Ferrajo, 1879); FATICHI, *Isola d'Elba* (Florence, 1885); GRUYER, *Napoléon roi de l'île d'Elba* (Paris, 1905, tr. London, 1906); GREGOROVIUS, *Wanderjahre in Italien* (9th ed., Leipzig, 1905), I, 1–50; HÖRSTEL, *Die Napoleonsinseln Korsika und Elba* (2nd ed., Berlin, 1908); *Annuario Ecclesiastico* (Rome, 1909), s. v. *Massa Marittima.*

GREGOR REINHOLD.

Elcesaites (or HELKESAITES), a sect of Gnostic Ebionites, whose religion was a wild medley of heathen superstitions and Christian doctrines with Judaism. Hippolytus (Philosophumena, IX, 13–17) tells us that under Callistus (217–222) a cunning individual called Alcibiades, a native of Apamea in Syria, came to Rome, bringing a book which he said had been received from Parthia by a just man named Elchasai (Ἠλχασαί; but Epiphanius has Ἠλξαί and Ἐλκεσαῖοι; Methodius, Ἐλκεσαΐος, and Origen, Ἐλκεσαΐται). The contents of the book had been revealed by an angel ninety-six miles high, sixteen miles broad, and twenty-four across the shoulders, whose footprints were fourteen miles long and four miles wide by two miles deep. This was the Son of God, and He was accompanied by His Sister, the Holy Ghost, of the same dimensions. Alcibiades announced that a new remission of sins had been proclaimed in the third year of Trajan (A. D. 100), and he described a baptism which should impart this forgiveness even to the grossest sinners. Harnack makes him say "was proclaimed" instead of "has been proclaimed" (as if εὐαγγελισθῆναι and not εὐηγγελίσθαι), and thus infers that a special year of remission is spoken of as past once for all—that Alcibiades had no reason for inventing this, so that Hilgenfeld was right in holding that Elchasai really lived under Trajan, as Epiphanius supposed. If we put aside this blunder of Harnack's (and also his earlier odd conjecture that the remission in the third year of Trajan meant that the first two books of the Pastor of Hermas were published in that year), we see that the remission offered is by the new baptism. Hippolytus represents this doctrine as an improvement invented by Alcibiades on the lax teaching of his enemy Callistus. He does not perhaps expect us to take this seriously—it is most likely ironical—but he seems to regard Alcibiades as the author of the book. Origen, writing somewhat later (c. 246–9), says the heresy was quite new; he seems to have met with Alcibiades, though he does not give his name. There is no reason why we should dissent from these contemporary witnesses, and we must place the first appearance of the book of Elchasai c. 220. A century and a half later, St. Epiphanius found it in use among the Sampsæans, descendants of the earlier Elcesaites, and also among the Ossæans, and many of the other Ebionite communities. En-hedim, an Arabic writer, c. 987, found a sect of Sabæans in the desert who counted El-Chasaiach as their founder (Chwolsohn, Die Ssabier, 1856, I, 112; II, 543, cited by Salmon).

According to Hippolytus the teaching of Alcibiades was borrowed from various heresies. He taught circumcision, that Christ was a man like others, that he had many times been born on earth of a virgin, that he devoted himself to astrology, magic, and incantations. For all sins of impurity, even against nature, a second baptism is enjoined "in the name of the great and most high God and in the name of His Son the great King", with an adjuration of the seven witnesses written in the book, sky, water, the holy spirits, the Angels of prayer, oil, salt, and earth. One who has been bitten by a mad dog is to run to the nearest water and jump in with all his clothes on, using the foregoing formula, and promising the seven witnesses that he will abstain from sin. The same treatment—forty days consecutively of baptism in cold water—is recommended for consumption and for the possessed. Other Ebionites in Epiphanius's time practised this treatment. That saint tells us that mention was made in the book of Elchasai's brother, Iexai, and that the heresiarch was a Jew of the time of Trajan. Two of his descendants, two sisters, Marthus and Marthana, lived till the days of Epiphanius. They were reverenced as goddesses and the dust of their feet and their spittle were used to cure diseases. This suggests that Elchasai was not a fictitious personage. He was presumably a primitive leader of an Ebionite community, to whom Alcibiades ascribed his own book. We learn further from Epiphanius that the book condemned virginity and continence, and made marriage obligatory. It permitted the worship of idols to escape persecution, provided the act was merely an external one, disowned in the heart. Prayer was to be made not to the East, but always towards Jerusalem. Yet all sacrifice was condemned, with a denial that it had been offered by the patriarchs or under the Law. The Prophets as well as the Apostles were rejected, and of course St. Paul and all his writings. It has been customary to find Elcesaite doctrine in the Clementine "Homilies" and "Recognitions", especially in the former. On the groundlessness of this see CLEMENTINES.

HIPPOLYTUS, *Philosophumena*, IX, 13–17; X, 29; ORIGEN in EUSEBIUS, *H. E.*, VI, 38; METHODIUS, *Conviv.*, VIII, 10; EPIPHANIUS, *Hær.*, XIX and LIII, also XXX, 3, 17, 18. THEODORET has simply used EPIPHANIUS. See HILGENFELD, *N. T., extra canonem receptum* (Leipzig, 1881), fasc. III; cf. also ID., *Judentum und Christentum* (Leipzig, 1886) and the various writers on the *Pseudo-Clementines*, esp. UHLHORN. A good article by SALMON is in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v. *Elkesai;* more recent are HARNACK, *Gesch. der altchr. Lit.*, I, 207; II, i, 267; II, ii, 167; BARDENHEWER, *Gesch. der altkirchl. Lit.*, I, 350; IDEM, SHAHAN tr., *Patrology* (Freiburg im Br., 1908), 81.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

Elder, GEORGE, educator, b. 11 August, 1793, in Kentucky, U. S. A.; d. 28 Sept., 1838, at Bardstown. His parents, James Elder and Ann Richards (a convert), natives of Maryland, emigrated shortly after their marriage to Hardin's Creek, in the present Marion County, Kentucky, where George, the second of their seven children was born. The Elders enjoyed a moderate competency and were full of zeal for their Catholic Faith. George's early education devolved mainly upon his father, who was well versed in the Scriptures and thoroughly acquainted with the teaching of the Church, which he frequently defended in discussion and explained to converts who were preparing for baptism. George Elder imbibed a love for serious study, and in his sixteenth year he entered Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Maryland, to pursue classical studies. Here he became the friend of William Byrne (q. v.), afterwards founder of St. Mary's College, Kentucky. Both studied theology in St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, and were ordained priests at Bardstown by Bishop David, 18 Sept., 1819. In addition to the duties of an assistant at the cathedral there, Father Elder was entrusted by Bishop Flaget with the founding of a high-grade school or college for lay students. This was, at first, a day school and was taught in the basement of the theological seminary (erected in 1818). A separate building was erected in 1820–23. The college was then one of the largest and best appointed educational structures in the entire West. The arrival, in 1825, of fifty southern students was the beginning of the extensive patronage the college received from the Southern States, notably Louisiana and Mississippi, and which continued down to the Civil War. In 1827 the Rev. Ignatius A. Reynolds (afterwards Bishop of Charleston) was appointed president and Father Elder was given charge of the congregation of St. Pius, in Scott

County. Dr. Reynolds was transferred in 1830 to pastoral work, and Father Elder again became president, a position which he held until his death. He frequently did duty in the cathedral and was one of the editors of the Louisville "Catholic Advocate" newspaper (founded in 1836), to which he contributed a series of well-written articles on the education of children and the obligations of parents in such matters. "Letters to Brother Jonathan", half satirical, half controversial, were also the product of his pen. His sense of justice forced him, in spite of his characteristic amiability, to prosecute a bigoted preacher, Nathan L. Rice, for libelling, after the manner of "Maria Monk", a worthy Kentucky priest, then absent in Europe. Father Elder's last illness was brought on by over-exertion and fatigue at the burning down (25 Jan., 1838) of the main college building.

SPALDING, *Sketches of Early Cath. Missions in Kentucky* (Louisville, 1844); WEBB, *The Centenary of Catholicity in Kentucky* (Louisville, 1884); SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in U. S.* (New York, 1890); J. L. SPALDING, *Life of Archbishop Spalding* (New York, 1873); *Catholic Advocate* (Louisville, 1836–7–8), files.

P. M. J. ROCK.

Elder, WILLIAM HENRY, third Bishop of Natchez, Mississippi, U. S. A., and second Archbishop of Cincinnati, b. in Baltimore, Maryland, 22 March, 1819; d. in Cincinnati, 31 Oct., 1904. His father, Basil Elder, was a descendant of William Elder, who had emigrated from England to America, in colonial times; his mother, Elisabeth Miles (Snowden) Elder. In 1831 he entered Mt. St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Maryland, then presided over by the Rev. John Baptist Purcell, who afterwards became the second Bishop, and later the first Archbishop, of Cincinnati. In 1842 he went to Rome, to complete his theological studies at the College of the Propaganda, where he received the degree of Doctor of Divinity. He was ordained priest in Rome, 29 March, 1846. Returning to Maryland, he became professor at Emmitsburg, which position he held until he was appointed Bishop of Natchez, for which he was consecrated in the cathedral of Baltimore, by Archbishop Kenrick, 3 May, 1857. In 1864 he was brought into prominence by his refusal to obey the order of the Federal troops at Natchez, to have certain prayers for the President of the United States recited publicly in the churches of his diocese. He was arrested, tried, and convicted; but the decision of the military court was reversed at Washington. His devotion to his people during the yellow-fever epidemic of 1878 won universal commendation. On 30 January, 1880, he was made titular Bishop of Avara and transferred to Cincinnati, as coadjutor with the right of succession to Archbishop Purcell, whom he succeeded 4 July, 1883. Great financial difficulties clouded the last years of Archbishop Purcell's life and made the task of his successor a trying one. But the reopening of the theological seminary, Mt. St. Mary's of the West, the founding of St. Gregory's Preparatory Seminary, the enlarging of St. Joseph's Orphan Asylum, besides the building of numerous other religious institutions, show how well Archbishop Elder overcame these difficulties. (See CINCINNATI.)

WILLIAM HENRY ELDER

Archbishop Elder's Jubilee Album (Cincinnati, 1896); REUSS, *Biog. Cycl. Cath. Hierarchy U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1898); *Catholic Telegraph* (Cincinnati), Oct., 1904 and files.

TIMOTHY J. DEASY.

Eleazar (Heb. אלעזר, God's help).—I. Elizabeth, daughter of Aminadab and sister of Nahason, bore to Aaron four sons, Nadab, Abiu, Eleazar, and Ithamar (Ex., vi, 23), all of whom, with their father, "were anointed . . . and consecrated, to do the functions of priesthood" (Num., iii, 2–3; Lev., viii, 1–13). As Nadab and Abiu died without children, punished for offering strange fire before the Lord (Lev., x, 1–7; I Par., xxiv, 1–2), "Eleazar and Ithamar performed the priestly office in the presence of Aaron" (Num., iii, 4). Thus entitled to succeed his father in the office of high-priest, "Eleazar . . . took a wife of the daughters of Phutiel", and so became the father of Phinees (Ex., vi, 25). Prince of the princes of the Levites "that watch for the guard of the sanctuary" (Num., iii, 32), directing the sons of Caath when wrapping up "the sanctuary and the vessels thereof at the removing of the camp" (Num., iv, 15–16), Eleazar was selected as the suitable official, "to whose charge pertaineth the oil to dress the lamps, and the sweet incense, and the sacrifice . . . and the oil of unction, and whatsoever pertaineth to the service of the tabernacle, and of all the vessels that are in the sanctuary" (Num., iv, 16). At the very moment when his brothers were punished "by fire coming out from the Lord", Eleazar, though deeply affected by mental anguish, obeyed the order of Moses, and completed their unfinished sacrifice (Lev., x, 1–20). After the terrible punishment inflicted on the daring usurpers, Core, Dathan, and Abiron, as if to make more evident his right to become the high-priest, Eleazar, complying with orders, beat into plates the still smoking censers used by these unfortunate rebels, and for a sign and a memorial, fastened this metal to the altar (Num., xvi, 1–40). Appointed to preside over the immolation of the red cow (Num., xix, 1–10), Eleazar next appears, clothed with the vesture of Aaron, and exercising the office of high-priest (Num., xx, 22–29). Hence it is that we find Eleazar associated with Moses, in numbering the children of Israel after the slaughter of the twenty-four thousand (Num., xxvi, 1–4), in settling the inheritance case presented by the daughters of Salphaad (Num., xxvii, 1–3), in distributing the spoils taken from the Madianites (Num., xxxi, 1–54), and, finally, in considering the request of Ruben and Gad for land east of the Jordan (Num., xxxii, 1–5). To Eleazar, Josue, the successor of Moses, is presented by the Jewish lawgiver himself (Num., xxvii, 12–23). On the list of those appointed to divide among the Israelites the lands west of the Jordan, the very first name is that of Eleazar (Num., xxxiv, 16–19; Jos., xiv, 1–2; xix, 51), who was buried "in Gabaath, that belonged to Phinees his son, which was given him in mount Ephraim" (Jos., xxiv, 33). If we except the period from Heli to Solomon, during which the descendants of Ithamar exercised the office of high-priest (I Kings, ii, 30–36; III Kings, ii, 26–27), those holding this most sacred calling, down to the time of the Machabees, belonged to the family of Eleazar (Ex., vi, 25).

II. ELEAZAR, surnamed Abaron, was the fourth son of Mathathias (I Mach., ii, 1–5). With some probability, he is identified with the Esdras who before the battle with Nicanor read the Holy Book to the Jewish warriors (II Mach., viii, 22–24). In the engagement at Bethzacharam, he displayed marvellous courage in attacking and killing the elephant, on which "it seemed to him that the king [Antiochus Eupator] was". Crushed to death beneath the dying elephant, Eleazar "exposed himself to deliver his people

and to get himself an everlasting name". (I Mach., vi, 17–46.)

III. Eleazar, a scribe and doctor of the law, though ninety years of age, bravely preferred to die a most glorious death than to purchase a hateful life by violating the law which forbade to the Israelite the use of swine's flesh. His friends, "moved with wicked pity", were willing to substitute lawful flesh, that Eleazar, feigning to have eaten the forbidden meat, might be delivered from death. But, considering "the dignity of his age . . . and the inbred honour of his grey head", Eleazar spurned this well-meant proposal, which if accepted, though securing his deliverance from punishment, might scandalize many young persons, and could not deliver from the hand of the Almighty. Having thus changed into rage the rejected sympathy of his friends, the holy man bravely endured his cruel torture, probably at Antioch, during the reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. (II Mach., vi, 18–31; I Mach., i, 57–63.)

Palis and Levesque in Vig., *Dict. de la Bible* (Paris, 1898); Allen in Hast., *Dict. of the Bible* (New York, 1898); Gigot, *Outlines of Jewish History* (New York, 1905).

D. P. Duffy.

Elect denotes in general one chosen or taken by preference from among two or more; as a theological term it is equivalent to "chosen as the object of mercy or Divine favour, as set apart for eternal life". In order to determine the meaning of the word more accurately, we shall have to study its usage both in the Old Testament and the New.

I. The Old Testament applies the term *elect*, or *chosen*, only to the Israelites in as far as they are called to be the people of God, or are faithful to their Divine call. The idea of such an election is common in the Book of Deuteronomy and in Is., xl–lxvi. In Ps. civ, 6 and 43, and cv, 5, the chosen ones are the Hebrew people in as far as it is the recipient of God's temporal and spiritual blessings; in Is., lxv, 9, 15, and 23, they are the repentant Israelites, as few in number "as if a grain be found in a cluster" (ibid., 8); in Tob., xiii, 10, they are the Israelites remaining faithful during their captivity; in Wisd., iii, 9, and iv, 15, they are God's true servants; in Ecclus., xxiv, 4, 13, and xlvi, 2, these servants of God belong to the chosen people.

II. The New Testament transfers (excepting perhaps in Acts, xiii, 17) the meaning of the term from its connexion with the people of Israel to the members of the Church of Christ, either militant on earth or triumphant in heaven. Thus I Pet., i, 1, speaks of the elect among the "strangers dispersed" through the various parts of the world; I Pet., ii, 9, represents them as "a chosen generation, a kingly priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people", called from darkness into God's marvellous light. St. Paul, too, speaks of the elect (Rom., viii, 33) and describes the five degrees of their election: they are foreknown, predestined, called, justified, and glorified (loc. cit., 29, 30). He returns to the idea again and again: II Thess., ii, 12 sq.; Col., iii, 12; Tit., i, 1, 2; II Tim., ii, 10. St. John gives the title of elect to those who fight on the side of the Lamb against the powers of darkness (Apoc., xvii, 14). According to St. Luke (xviii, 7), God hears the cries of his elect for vengeance; according to the first two Evangelists he will shorten the last days for the sake of the elect (Matt., xxiv, 22, 24, 31; Mark, xiii, 20, 22, 27).

If it be asked why the name *elect* was given to the members of the Church Militant, we may assign a double reason: first, they were freely chosen by God's goodness (Rom., xi, 5–7, 28); secondly, they must show in their conduct that they are choice men (Ephes., iv, 17). In the sentence "many are called, but few are chosen", the latter expression renders a word in the Greek and Latin text which is elsewhere translated by *elect* (Matt., xx, 16; xxii, 14). It is agreed on all sides that the term refers to members of the Church Triumphant, but there is some doubt as to whether it refers to mere membership, or to a more exalted degree. This distinction is important; if the word implies mere membership in the Church Triumphant, then the chosen ones, or those who will be saved, are few, and the non-members in the Church Triumphant are many; if the word denotes a special degree of glory, then few will attain this rank, and many will fail to do so, though many are called to it. The sentence "many are called, but few chosen" does not, therefore, settle the question as to the relative number of the elect and the lost; theologians are divided on this point, and while Christ in the Gospels urges the importance of saving one's soul (Luke, xiii, 23, 24), he alternately so strengthens our hope and excites our fear as not to leave us any solid ground for either presumption or despair.

Lesêtre in *Dict. de la Bible* (Paris, 1899), II, 1708 sqq.; Murray, *Dict. of the Bible* (New York, 1900), I, 678 sqq.; Knabenbauer, *Evang. secundum Matthæum* (Paris, 1893), II, 178, 247; Monsabré, *Conférences de Notre-Dame* (1899), Conference VI.

A. J. Maas.

Election (Lat. *electio*, from *eligere*, to choose from).—This subject will be treated under the following heads: I. Juridical Concept; II. Electors; III. Persons Eligible; IV. The Act of Electing: Forms and Methods; V. After Election; VI. Elections Now in Use.

I. Juridical Concept.—In its broadest sense election means a choice among many persons, things, or sides to be taken. In the stricter juridical sense it means the choice of one person among many for a definite charge or function. If we confine ourselves to ecclesiastical law, canonical election, in a broad sense, would be any designation of a person to an ecclesiastical charge or function; thus understood it includes various modes: postulation, presentation, nomination, recommendation, request or petition, and, finally, free collation. In a narrower sense, election is the canonical appointment, by legitimate electors, of a fit person to an ecclesiastical office. Its effect is to confer on the person thus elected an actual right to the benefice or charge, independently of the confirmation or collation ulteriorly necessary. Hence it is easily distinguished from the aforesaid modes that only in a broad sense can be termed election.

(a) Postulation differs canonically from election, not as regards the electors, but as regards the person elected, the latter being juridically ineligible on account of an impediment from which the superior is asked to dispense him. For instance, if in an episcopal election the canons designate the bishop of another see, or a priest under thirty years of age, or one of illegitimate birth, etc., no actual right would be conferred on such a person, and the ecclesiastical superior would be in no wise bound to recognize such action; hence the electors are then said to *postulate* their candidate, this postulation being a matter of favour (*gratia*), not of justice. (b) Presentation, on the contrary, differs from election not in respect to the person elected but to the electors; it is the exercise of the right of patronage, and the patron may be a layman, whereas the electors to ecclesiastical dignities must be clerics. In both cases the right of the candidate is the same (*jus ad rem*); but while an election calls for canonical confirmation, presentation by a patron leads to canonical institution by a competent prelate. Moreover, when the right of patronage belongs to a moral body, e. g. a chapter or an entire congregation, presentation may have to follow along the lines of election. Though frequently called nomination, the designation of bishops and beneficed clergy by the civil authority in virtue of concordats is in reality presentation, and results in canonical institution. (c) Correctly speaking, nomination is the canonical act by which the electors propose several fit persons to the free choice of the superior. The rôle of electors in nomination is

the same as in election properly so called; as election, however, can fall only on one person, so nomination cannot confer on several a real right to a benefice—rather, their right is real inasmuch as it excludes third parties, though none of them possesses the *jus ad rem* (c. Quod sicut, xxviii, De elect., lib. I, tit. vi). (d) Recommendation is the name applied to the designation of one or several fit persons made to the superior by certain members of the episcopate or clergy, chiefly in view of sees to be filled (see Bishop). It differs from election and nomination in that the bishop or members of the clergy do not act as electors; hence the persons designated do not acquire any real right, the Holy See remaining perfectly free to make a choice outside of the list proposed. (e) Still further removed from election is simple request, or petition, by which the clergy or people of a diocese beg the pope to grant them the prelate they desire. The authors of this petition, not being properly qualified, as in the case of recommendation, to make known their appreciation of the candidate, it is needless to say the latter acquires no right whatsoever from the fact of this request. (f) Finally, free collation is the choice of the person by the superior who confers canonical institution; it is the method most in use for appointment to inferior benefices, and the practical rule for the filling of episcopal sees, apart from some well-known exceptions. Evidently, where free collation obtains, election, properly so called, is excluded.

II. Electors.—Electors are those who are called by ecclesiastical law or statute to constitute an electoral college, i. e. to designate the person of their choice, and who have the qualifications required for the exercise of their right to vote. The law appoints competent electors for each kind of election: cardinals for the election of a pope; the cathedral chapter for the election of a bishop or a vicar capitular; and the various chapters of their order, etc. for the election of regular prelates. In general, election belongs, strictly speaking, to the college, i. e. the body, of which the person elected will become the superior or prelate; it this college have a legal existence, like a cathedral chapter, it can exercise its right as long as it exists, even if reduced to a single member, though, of course, such a one could not elect himself. Electors called upon to give a prelate to the Church must be ecclesiastics. Hence laymen are excluded from all participation in a canonical election; it would be invalid, not only if made by them exclusively (c. iii, h. t.), but even if they only co-operate with ecclesiastics, every custom to the contrary notwithstanding. Ecclesiastics alone, and those only who compose the college or community to be provided with a head, can be electors. This is well exemplified in the cathedral chapter, all of whose canons, and they alone, are episcopal electors. Other ecclesiastics have no right to associate with the chapter in the election of a bishop, unless (a) they are in full possession of this right and it is proved by long prescription; (b) hold a pontifical privilege, or (c) can show a right resultant from the foundation of the chapter or the church in question. To exercise their right, the electors, whoever they may be, must be full members of the body to which they belong, and must, moreover, be in a condition to perform a juridical, human act. Hence natural law excludes the demented and those who have not reached the age of puberty; ecclesiastical law debars (1) canons who have not attained full membership in the chapter, i. e. who are not yet subdeacons (Council of Trent, Sess. XXII, c. iv, De ref.), and (2) religious who have not made their profession. Moreover, in punishment of certain offences, some electors may have forfeited their right to elect, either for once or permanently, e. g. those excommunicated by name, those suspended, or those placed under interdict. The Constitution of Martin V, "Ad evitanda scandala", permits the excommunicated known as *tolerati* (tolerated) to take part in an election, but exception may be taken to them, and their exclusion must follow; if, after such exception, they cast a vote, it must be considered null. Apart from censures incurred, privation of an active share in elections occurs frequently in the ecclesiastical law affecting regulars; in common law and for the secular clergy, it exists in only three cases: Electors lose the right to elect, for that time, first, when they have elected or postulated an unworthy person (c. vii, h. t.); second, when the election has been held in consequence of an abusive intervention of the civil authority (c. xliii, h. t.); finally, when it has not been made within the required time. In all these cases the election devolves upon the superior (c. xli, h. t.).

III. Persons Eligible.—Those persons are eligible who meet the requirements of common ecclesiastical law, or special statutes, for the charge or function in question; hence, for each election it is necessary to ascertain what is required of the candidate. In general, for all kinds of elections, the necessary qualifications are mature age, moral integrity, and adequate knowledge (c. vii, h. t.); for each charge or function dependent on an election these conditions are defined with more precision and fullness. Thus, neither a layman nor an ecclesiastic who is not yet a subdeacon can be elected bishop; and no regular can be elected superior, etc., unless he has made his final profession. Some of the aforesaid requirements are easily verified, e. g. the proper age, adequate knowledge, the latter being presumable when the law formally exacts an academic degree (Council of Trent, Sess. XXII, c. ii, De ref.); others, especially an upright life, must usually depend on negative evidence, i. e. on the absence of proof to the contrary, such proof being positive offences, particularly when they have seriously impaired the reputation of the person in question or called for canonical punishment. It is principally candidates of censurable morality who are termed unworthy; the sacred canons constantly repeat that the unworthy must be set aside. Such unworthy persons are: (1) all outside the Church, viz. infidels, heretics, and schismatics; (2) all who have been guilty of great crimes (*crimina majora*), viz. the sacrilegious, forgers, perjurers, sodomites, and simoniacs; (3) all whom law or fact, for whatever reason, has branded as infamous (*infamiâ juris aut facti*); (4) all under censure (excommunication, suspension, interdict), unless said censure be occult; (5) all whom an irregularity, particularly a penal one (*ex crimine*), debars from receiving or exercising Holy orders. Those also are excluded who, at the time of election, hold several incompatible benefices or dignities without dispensation (c. liv, h. t.); or who, at a preceding election, have already been rejected as unworthy (c. xii, h. t.), and all who have consented to be elected through the abusive intervention of lay authority (c. xliii, h. t.). There are other cases in which regulars cease to be eligible. The legislation here described was meant for the episcopal elections of the thirteenth century and aims at abuses now impossible.

IV. The Act of Election: Forms and Methods.—In this matter, even more than in the preceding paragraphs, we must consider special laws and statutes. Strictly speaking, the common ecclesiastical law, which dates from the thirteenth-century Decretals, considers only episcopal elections (lib. I, tit. vi, De electione et electi potestate; and in VI°). Since an election is held to appoint to a church or an ecclesiatical charge or office that is vacant, it is obvious that the first condition requisite for an election is precisely the vacancy of said church, charge, or office, in consequence of death, transfer, resignation, or deposition; any election made with a view to filling an office not yet vacant is a canonical offence. When an election becomes necessary, the first step is to convoke the electoral assembly in some specified place, and for a certain day within the legal time-limit. The

place is ordinarily the vacant church or, if it be question of an election in a chapter, wherever the deliberations of the chapter are usually held. The time-limit set by common ecclesiastical law is three months, after the lapse of which the election devolves upon the immediate superior (c. xli, h. t.). In an electoral college, the duty of convoking the members belongs to the superior or president; in a chapter this would be the highest dignitary. He must issue an effectual summons, for which no special form is prescribed, to all the electors without exception, whether present in the locality or absent, unless, however, they be too far away. The distance considered as constituting a legitimate excuse for absence (see c. xviii, h. t.) should be more narrowly interpreted to-day than in the thirteenth century. It is unnecessary to convoke electors publicly known to be incompetent to exercise their electoral right, e. g. canons excommunicated by name or not yet subdeacons. So binding is this convocation that if even one elector be not summoned he can, in all justice, enter a complaint against the election, though the latter is not *ipso facto* null by reason of such absence. Such an election will stand provided the unsummoned elector abides by the choice of his colleagues or abandons his complaint. As no one is bound to use a right, common law does not oblige an elector to attend the assembly and take part in the voting; the absent are not taken into consideration. As a general rule the absent cannot be represented or vote by proxy unless, according to the chapter "Quia propter" (xlii, h. t., Lateran Council, 1215), they are at a great distance and can prove a legitimate hindrance. Moreover, they can choose as proxy only a member of the assembly, but they can commission him to vote either for a particular person or for whomsoever he himself may deem most worthy.

On the appointed day the president opens the electoral assembly. Though the common law requires no preliminary solemnities, such are frequently imposed by special statute, e. g. the Mass of the Holy Ghost, which should be attended by all the assembled electors and those not prevented from assisting; also the recital of certain prayers. Moreover, the electors are often obliged previously to promise under oath that they will conscientiously vote for the most worthy. However, apart from such oath, their obligation is none the less absolute and serious. These preliminaries over, the electoral assembly proceeds, if necessary, to verify the credentials of certain electors, e. g. those who act as delegates, as happens in the general chapters of religious congregations. Then follows the discussion of the merits (*tituli*) of the candidates. The latter need not have previously made known their candidacy, though they may do so. The electors, nevertheless, have all freedom to propose and sustain the candidates of their choice. Frank and fair discussion of the merits of candidates, far from being forbidden, is perfectly conformable to the law, because it tends to enlighten the electors; indeed, some maintain that an election made without such a discussion would be null or could be annulled (Matthæucci, in Ferraris, "Bibliotheca", s. v. "Electio", art. iv, n. 5). It is more accurate to say that the election would be vitiated if the presiding officer were to oppose this discussion for the purpose of influencing votes. However, though the law strictly prohibits cabals and secret negotiations in the interest of certain candidates, the line between illicit manœuvring and permissible negotiating is in practice not always easily recognizable. [See the Constitution "Ecclesiæ" of Innocent XII (22 Sept., 1695), on the elections of regulars (in Ferraris, art. iii, no. 26), also the regulations that govern a conclave (q.v.).]

The discussion concluded, voting begins. Actually there is only one customary method, i. e. secret voting (*scrutinium secretum*) by written ballots. The common ecclesiastical law (c. Quia propter, xlii, h. t., Lateran Council, 1215) admits only three modes of election: the normal or regular method by ballot, and two exceptional modes, namely, compromise and quasi-inspiration. Recourse to lots is especially prohibited; nevertheless, the Sacred Congregation of the Council (Romana, Electionis, 2 May, 1857) ratified an election where the chapter, equally divided between two candidates in other respects fit, had drawn lots; just about as was done for the Apostolic election of St. Matthias. As to the two exceptional methods: (1) Election by quasi-inspiration takes place when the electors greet the name of a candidate with enthusiasm and acclamation, in which event the ballot is omitted as useless since its result is known in advance, and the candidate in question is proclaimed elected. However, modern custom in this matter differs from ancient habits, and it is wiser, even in the case of such apparent unanimity, to proceed by ballot. (2) Compromise occurs when all the electors confide the election to one or several specified persons, either members of the electoral college or strangers, and ratify in advance the choice made by such arbitrator or arbitrators. Formerly this exceptional method was often resorted to, either to terminate long and fruitless sessions, or when there was a lack of exact information concerning the candidates; it is minutely regulated by the law of the Decretals. The compromise must be agreed to by all the electors without exception, and can be confided to ecclesiastics only. It may be absolute, i. e. leaving the arbitrators quite free, or conditional, i. e. accompanied by certain reservations concerning the manner of election, the persons to be elected, the time-limit within which the election should be held, and so on.

The normal or regular method by ballot, according to the law of the Decretals was necessarily neither secret nor written. The law "Quia propter" (see above) merely calls for the choice of three trustworthy scrutineers from among the electors. These were charged with collecting secretly (in a whisper) and in succession the votes of all; the result was then drawn up in writing and made public. The candidate who had obtained the votes of the more numerous or sounder party (*major vel sanior pars*) of the chapter was declared elected. However, this appreciation, not only of the number but also of the value of the votes, led to endless discussions, it being necessary to compare not only the number of votes obtained, but also the merits of the electors and their zeal, i. e. the honesty of their intentions. It was presumed, of course, that the majority was also the sounder party, but proof to the contrary was admitted (c. lvii, h. t.). The use of the secret and written ballot has long since remedied these difficulties. If the Council of Trent did not modify on this point the existing law, at least it exacted the secret ballot for the elections of regulars (Sess. XXV, c. vi, De regul.). According to this method the scrutineers silently collect the ballots of the electors present; when occasion requires it, certain members are delegated to collect the votes of sick electors beneath the same roof (e. g. at a conclave or at one of the regular chapters) or even in the city (for cathedral chapters), if the statutes so prescribe. This accomplished, the scrutineers count the number of ballots collected, and if, as should be, they tally with the number of electors, the same officers proceed to declare the result. Each ballot is in turn opened, and one of the scrutineers proclaims the name inscribed thereon, then passes it to the second scrutineer for registration, while the third, or secretary, adds up the total number of votes obtained by each candidate. As a general rule, election is assured to the candidate who obtains the majority of votes, i. e. an absolute, not merely a relative, majority; however, certain statutes require, e. g. in a conclave, a majority of two-thirds. When the electors are odd in number, a gain of one vote ensures the majority; if the number be

even, it requires two votes. In calculating the majority, neither absent electors nor blank ballots are taken into account; whoever casts a blank vote is held to have forfeited his electoral right for that ballot. If no candidate obtains an absolute majority, balloting is recommenced, and so on until a definitive vote is reached. However, not to prolong useless balloting, special statutes can prescribe, and in fact have provided, various solutions, e. g. that after three rounds of fruitless balloting the election shall devolve upon the superior; or again, that in the third round the electors can vote only between the two most favoured candidates; or, finally, that in the fourth round a relative majority shall suffice (Rules of the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars for congregations of women under simple vows, art. ccxxxiii sq.). Other special regulations provide for the case of two candidates receiving the same number of votes (the voters being of even number), in which event the election is decided in favour of the senior (by age, ordination, or religious profession); sometimes the deciding vote is assigned to the presiding officer. For all these details it is necessary to know and observe the special legislation that covers them.

When the final vote is obtained, whatever its character, it should be made public, i. e. officially communicated to the electoral assembly by the presiding officer. The decree of election is then drawn up; in other words, the document which verifies the voting and the election. The rôle of the electoral college thus fulfilled, the election is closed.

The principal duty of an elector is to vote according to his conscience, without allowing himself to be actuated by human or selfish motives, i. e., he must vote for him whom he deems the most worthy and best qualified among the persons fit for the office in question. External law can scarcely go farther, but moralists rightly declare guilty of mortal sin the elector who, against his conscience, casts his vote for one who is unworthy. In order, however, to fulfil his duty, the elector has a right to be entirely free and uninfluenced by the dread of any unjust annoyance (*vexatio*) which might affect his vote, whether such annoyance be in its source civil or ecclesiastical (cc. xiv and xliii, h. t.).

V. After Election.—We are confronted here by two hypotheses: either an election is or is not disputed. An election may be disputed by whoever is interested in it, in which case the question of its validity is referred to the superior, in accordance with the same rule as for judicial appeals. Now, an election may be defective in three ways, i. e. as to the electors, the person elected, or the mode of election. The defect concerns the electors if, through culpable neglect, one or more of those who have a right to participate in the election are not summoned; or if laymen, excommunicates *vitandi*, or unauthorized ecclesiastics are admitted as electors. The defect lies with the person elected if it can be proved that he was not fit (*idoneus*), in which case he may be postulated, or that he was positively unworthy, in which event the election is invalid. Finally, the defect concerns the form or mode of election when the legal prescriptions relative to balloting or compromise have not been observed. The challenged election, with proofs of its imperfection, is judged canonically by the proper ecclesiastical superior. If the alleged defect is not proven, the election is sustained; if it be proven, the judge declares it, whereupon the law provides the following sanctions: An election made by laymen, or with their assistance, is invalid (c. lvi, h. t.); the one at which an excommunicated person has been admitted to vote, as also that to which an elector has not been invited, must be closely investigated, but is not to be annulled unless the absence of the excommunicated person, or the presence of the unsummoned elector might have given a different turn to the vote. The election of a person who is not unworthy, but simply the victim of an impediment, may be treated indulgently; that of an unworthy person is to be annulled, while the electors who, knowing him to be such, nevertheless elected him, are deprived for that time of the right to vote and are suspended for three years from the benefices they hold in the vacant church in question. Finally, the election wherein the prescribed form has not been observed must be annulled. In all of these cases the right to elect (bishops) devolves upon the Holy See (Boniface VIII, c. xviii, h. t., in VI°); the only case in which it devolves upon the immediate superior is when the election has not been made within the prescribed time-limit.

If, on the contrary, the election meets with no opposition the first duty of the presiding officer of the electoral college is to notify the person elected that choice is made of his person. If he be present, e. g. in the elections of regulars, the notification takes place immediately; if he be absent, the decree of election must be forwarded to him within eight days, barring legitimate hindrance. On his side, the person elected is allowed a month within which to make known his acceptance or refusal, the month dating from the time of receiving the decree of election or the permission of the superior when such is obligatory. If the person elected refuses the honour conferred upon him, the electoral college is summoned to proceed with a new election, under the same conditions as the first time and within a month. If he accepts, it is his right as well as his duty to demand from the superior the confirmation of his election within the peremptory limit of three months (c. vi, h. t., in VI°); but if, without legitimate hindrance, he allows this time to pass unused, the election has lapsed. From the moment of his acceptance, the person elected acquires a real, though still incomplete, right to the benefice or charge, the *jus ad rem* to be completed and transformed into full right (*jus in re*) by the confirmation of the election; it is his privilege to exact this confirmation from the superior, just as it is the latter's duty to give it, except in the event of unworthiness, of which fact the superior remains judge. However, until the person elected has received this confirmation, he cannot take advantage of his still incomplete right to interfere in any way whatever in the administration of his benefice, the punishment being the invalidity of all administrative acts thus accomplished and privation of the benefice itself. The ecclesiastical legislation on this point is very severe, but it concerns episcopal sees only. In the time of Innocent III (1198–1216) those elected to an ordinary episcopal see had to seek the confirmation of their election from the metropolitan only. Bishops outside of Italy who had to obtain from Rome the confirmation of their election (metropolitans, or bishops immediately subject to the Holy See) were authorized (c. xliv, h. t.), in cases of necessity, to enter at once on the administration of their churches, provided their election had aroused no opposition; meanwhile the confirmation proceedings went their ordinary course at Rome.

At the Second Council of Lyons, in 1274 (c. Avaritiæ, v, h. t., in VI°), elected persons were forbidden, under penalty of deprivation of their dignity, to meddle in the administration of their benefice by assuming the title of administrator, procurator, or the like. A little later, Boniface VIII (Extrav., Injunctæ, i, h. t.) established the rule still in force for entering on possession of major benefices and episcopal sees, according to which the person elected must not be received unless he present to the provisional administrators the Apostolical Letters of his election, promotion, and confirmation. The Council of Trent having established the vicar capitular as provisional administrator of the diocese during the vacancy of the see, it became necessary to prohibit elected persons from entering on the administration of their future dioceses in the ca-

pacity of vicars capitular. This was done by Pius IX in the Constitution "Romanus Pontifex" (28 August, 1873), which recalls and renews the measure taken by Boniface VIII. In this Constitution the pope declares that the law "Avaritiæ" of the aforesaid Council of Lyons applies not only to bishops elected by chapters, but also to candidates named and presented by heads of states in virtue of concordats. He rules that chapters can neither appoint temporarily vicars capitular nor revoke their appointment. He also forbids them to designate as such persons nominated by the civil power, or otherwise elected to a vacant church. Offences against this law are severely punished, by excommunication specially reserved to the pope and by privation of the revenues of their benefices for those dignitaries and canons who turn over the administration of their church to a person elected or nominated. The same penalties are pronounced against said elected or nominated persons, and against all who give them aid, counsel, or countenance. Moreover, the person elected or nominated forfeits all acquired right to the benefice, while all acts performed during his illegitimate administration are declared invalid.

We may now return to the confirmation of the election according to the law of the Decretals. It belonged to the immediate superior. It was his duty to extinguish all opposition by summoning the elected person to defend himself. Even if there were no opposition the superior was bound to summon, by a general edict posted on the door of the vacant church, all who might possibly dispute the election to appear within a fixed period; all this under penalty of the nullity of subsequent confirmation (c. xlvii, h. t., in VI°). The superior had to examine carefully both the election and the person of the one elected, in order to satisfy himself that everything was conformable to law; if his investigation proved favourable he gave the requisite confirmation whereby the elected person became definitively prelate of his church and received full jurisdiction. While the law did not bind the superior to any strict time-limit for the granting of confirmation, it authorized the elected person to complain if the delay were excessive. All this legislation, especially elaborated for episcopal elections, is now no longer applicable to them; however, it is still in force for inferior benefices, e. g. canonries, when they are conferred by way of election.

VI. Elections Now in Use.—Election, considered as the choice made by a college of its future prelate, is verified first of all in the designation of a pope by the cardinals (see Conclave). The election of bishops by chapters is still, theoretically, the common rule, but the general reservation formulated in the second rule of the Apostolic Chancery has suppressed in practice the application of this law; episcopal elections, in the strict sense of the word, occur now in only a small number of sees (see Bishop). Finally, the prelates of regulars are normally appointed by election; the same is true of abbesses. (See the Council of Trent, Sess. XXV, c. vi, De regul.) The common ecclesiastical law provides for no other elections. There are, however, other ecclesiastical elections that do not concern real prelates. Religious communities of men and women under simple vows proceed by election in the choice of superiors, superiors general, assistants general, and usually the members of the general councils. In cathedral churches it is by election that, on occasion of the vacancy of a see, the chapter appoints the vicar capitular (Council of Trent, Sess. XXIV, c. xvi, De ref.). It is also according to the canonical form of election that colleges, especially chapters, proceed in appointing persons, e. g., to dignities and canonries, when such appointment belongs to the chapter; to inferior benefices to which the chapter has a right to nominate or present; again in the appointment of delegates on seminary commissions (Council of Trent, Sess. XXIII, c. xviii, De ref.), or in bestowing on some of its members various capitulary offices, or making other such designations. The same is true of other ecclesiastical groups, e. g. the chapters of collegiate churches, etc., also of confraternities and other associations recognized by ecclesiastical authority. In the latter cases, however, there is no election in the strictly canonical sense of the term.

See Commentaries on the *Corpus Juris Canonici* at the title *De electione et electi potestate*, Lib. I, tit. vi; and in VI°; Santi-Leitner, *Prælect. Jur. Can.* (Ratisbon, 1898); Ferraris, *Prompta Bibliotheca*, s. v. *Electio;* Passerini, *De electione canonicâ* (Cologne, 1661).

A. Boudinhon.

Election, Capitulations of. See Capitulations, Episcopal and Pontifical.

Election, Papal. See Papal Election.

Eleison. See Kyrie Eleison.

Eleutherius (Eleutheros), Saint, Pope (c. 174–189). The Liber Pontificalis says that he was a native of Nicopolis, Greece. From his contemporary Hegesippus we learn that he was a deacon of the Roman Church under Pope Anicetus (c. 154–164), and evidently remained so under St. Soter, the following pope, whom he succeeded about 174. While the condition of Christians under Marcus Aurelius was distressing in various parts of the empire, the persecution in Rome itself does not seem to have been violent. De Rossi, it is true, dates the martyrdom of St. Cecilia towards the end of this emperor's reign; this date, however, is by no means certain. During the reign of Commodus (180–192) the Christians enjoyed a practically unbroken peace, although the martyrdom of St. Appollonius at Rome took place at this time (180–185). The Montanist movement, that originated in Asia Minor, made its way to Rome and Gaul in the second half of the second century, more particularly about the reign of Eleutherius; its peculiar nature made it difficult to take from the outset a decisive stand against it (see Montanism). During the violent persecution at Lyons, in 177, local confessors wrote from their prison concerning the new movement to the Asiatic and Phrygian brethren, also to Pope Eleutherius. The bearer of their letter to the pope was the presbyter Irenæus, soon afterwards Bishop of Lyons. It appears from statements of Eusebius concerning these letters that the faithful of Lyons, though opposed to the Montanist movement, advocated forbearance and pleaded for the preservation of ecclesiastical unity.

Just when the Roman Church took its definite stand against Montanism is not certainly known. It would seem from Tertullian's account (Adv. Praxeam, I) that a Roman bishop did at one time address to the Montanists some conciliatory letters, but these letters, says Tertullian, were recalled. He probably refers to Pope Eleutherius, who long hesitated, but, after a conscientious and thorough study of the situation, is supposed to have declared against the Montanists. At Rome heretical Gnostics and Marcionites continued to propagate their false teachings. The "Liber Pontificalis" ascribes to Pope Eleutherius a decree that no kind of food should be despised by Christians (Et hoc iterum firmavit ut nulla esca a Christianis repudiaretur, maxime fidelibus, quod Deus creavit, quæ tamen rationalis et humana est). Possibly he did issue such an edict against the Gnostics and Montanists; it is also possible that on his own responsibility the writer of the "Liber Pontificalis" attributed to this pope a similar decree current about the year 500. The same writer is responsible for a curious and interesting assertion concerning the early missionary activity of the Roman Church; indeed, the "Liber Pontificalis" contains no other statement equally remarkable. Pope Eleutherius, says this writer, received from Lucius, a British king, a letter in which the latter declared that by his behest he wishes to become a Chris-

tian (Hic accepit epistula a Lucio Brittanio rege, ut Christianus efficeretur per ejus mandatum). Whence the author of the first part of the "Liber Pontificalis" drew this information, it is now impossible to say. Historically speaking, the fact is quite improbable, and is rejected by all recent critics.

As at the end of the second century the Roman administration was so securely established in Britain, there could no longer have been in the island any real native kings. That some tribal chief, known as king, should have applied to the Roman bishop for instruction in the Christian faith seems improbable enough at that period. The unsupported assertion of the "Liber Pontificalis", a compilation of papal biographies that in its earliest form cannot antedate the first quarter of the sixth century, is not a sufficient basis for the acceptance of this statement. By some it is considered a story intended to demonstrate the Roman origin of the British Church, and consequently the latter's natural subjection to Rome. To make this clearer they locate the origin of the legend in the course of the seventh century, during the dissensions between the primitive British Church and the Anglo-Saxon Church recently established from Rome. But for this hypothesis all proof is lacking. It falls before the simple fact that the first part of the "Liber Pontificalis" was compiled long before these dissensions, most probably (Duchesne) by a Roman cleric in the reign of Pope Boniface II (530–532), or (Waitz and Mommsen) early in the seventh century. Moreover, during the entire conflict that centred around the peculiar customs of the Early British Church no reference is ever made to this alleged King Lucius. Saint Bede is the first English writer (673–735) to mention the story repeatedly (Hist. Eccl., I, V; V, 24, De temporum ratione, ad an. 161), and he took it, not from native sources, but from the "Liber Pontificalis". Harnack suggests a more plausible theory (Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie, 1904, I, 906–916). In the document, he holds, from which the compiler of the "Liber Pontificalis" drew his information the name found was not *Britanio*, but *Britio*. Now this is the name (*Birtha- Britium*) of the fortress of Edessa. The king in question is, therefore, Lucius Ælius Septimius Megas Abgar IX, of Edessa, a Christian king, as is well known. The original statement of the "Liber Pontificalis", in this hypothesis, had nothing to do with Britain. The reference was to Abgar IX of Edessa. But the compiler of the "Liber Pontificalis" changed Britio to Brittanio, and in this way made a British king of the Syrian Lucius.

The ninth-century "Historia Brittonum" sees in Lucius a translation of the Celtic name Llever Maur (Great Light), says that the envoys of Lucius were Fagan and Wervan, and tells us that with this king all the other island kings (reguli Britanniæ) were baptized (Hist. Brittonum, xviii). Thirteenth-century chronicles add other details. The "Liber Landavensis", for example (ed. Rees, 26, 65), makes known the names of Elfan and Medwy, the envoys sent by Lucius to the pope, and transfers the king's dominions to Wales. An echo of this legend penetrated even to Switzerland. In a homily preached at Chur and preserved in an eighth- or ninth-century manuscript, St. Timothy is represented as an apostle of Gaul, whence he came to Britain and baptized there a king named Lucius, who became a missionary, went to Gaul, and finally settled at Chur, where he preached the gospel with great success. In this way Lucius, the early missionary of the Swiss district of Chur, became identified with the alleged British king of the "Liber Pontificalis". The latter work is authority for the statement that Eleutherius died 24 May, and was buried on the Vatican Hill (in Vaticano) near the body of St. Peter. His feast is celebrated 26 May.

Acta SS., May, III, 363–364; *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, I, 136 and Introduction, cii–civ; Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristl. Literatur*, II, I, 144 sqq.; Idem, *Der Brief des britischen Königs Lucius an den Papst Eleutherus* (Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie, 1904), I, 906–916; Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche* (Bonn, 1881), I, 157 sqq.; Mayer, *Geschichte des Bistums Chur* (Stans, 1907), I, 11 sqq.; Cabrol, *L'Angleterre chrétienne avant les Normands* (Paris, 1909), 29–30; Duchesne, *Eleuthère et le roi breton Lucius*, in *Revue Celtique* (1883–85), VI, 491–493; Zimmer, *The Celtic Church in Britain and Scotland*, tr. Meyer (London, 1902); Smith and Wace, *Dict. of Christian Biography*, s. v.; also under *Lucius*.

J. P. Kirsch.

Eleutherius (Fr. Eleuthère), Saint, Bishop of Tournai at the beginning of the sixth century. Historically there is very little known about St. Eleutherius, but he was without doubt the first Bishop of Tournai. Theodore, whom some give as his immediate predecessor, was either a bishop of Tours, whose name was placed by mistake on the episcopal list of Tournai, or simply a missionary who ministered to the Christians scattered throughout the small Frankish Kingdom of Tournai. Before he became bishop, Eleutherius lived at court with his friend Medardus, who predicted that he would attain the dignity of a count and also be elevated to the episcopate. After Clovis, King of the Franks, had been converted to Christianity, in 496, with more than 3000 of his subjects, bishops took part in the royal councils. St. Remigius, Bishop of Reims, organized the Catholic hierarchy in Northern Gaul, and it is more than likely that St. Eleutherius was named Bishop of Tournai at this time.

The saint's biography in its present form was really an invention of Henri of Tournai in the twelfth century. According to this, Eleutherius was born at Tournai towards the end of the reign of Childeric, the father of Clovis, of a Christian family descended from Irenæus, who had been baptized by St. Piatus. His father's name was Terenus, and his mother's Blanda. Persecution by the tribune of the Scheldt obliged the Christians to flee from Tournai and take refuge in the village of Blandinium. The conversion of Clovis, however, enabled the small community to reassemble and build at Blandinium a church, which was dedicated to St. Peter. Theodore was made Bishop of Tournai, and Eleutherius succeeded him. Consulted by Pope Hormisdas as to the best means of eradicating the heresy which threatened nascent Christianity, Eleutherius convened a synod and publicly confounded the heretics. They vowed vengeance, and as he was on his way to the church, one day, they fell on him and, after beating him unmercifully, left him for dead. He recovered, however, but his days were numbered. On his death-bed (529) he confided his flock to his lifelong friend, St. Medardus.

The motive underlying this biography invented by Canon Henri (1141), was to prove the antiquity of the Church of Tournai, which from the end of the eleventh century had been trying to free itself from the jurisdiction of the bishops of Noyon. The sermons on the Trinity, Nativity, and the feast of the Annunciation (Bibliotheca Patrum, vol. XV), sometimes attributed to St. Eleutherius, are also of a more than doubtful authenticity. His cult, however, is well established; there is record of a recovery of his relics during the episcopate of Hedilo in 897 or 898, and a translation of them by Bishop Baudoin in 1064 or 1065, and another in 1247. Relics of this saint were also preserved in the monastery of St. Martin at Tournai, and in the cathedral at Bruges. His feast is given in martyrologies on 20 or 21 July, but is usually celebrated on the former date. The translation of his relics is commemorated 25 August.

Sources: *Vita S. Eleutherii I* and *Vita II* in *Acta SS. Belgii* (Brussels, 1783), I, 475–94; *Vita Medardi*, ii, in *Acta SS.*, June, II, 80. Works: Henschen, *De S. Eleutherio episcopo Tornacensi in Belgio commentarius prævius* in *Acta SS. Belgii*, loc. cit., 455–75; Fiévet, *Saint Eleuthère, évêque de Tournai* (Tournai, 1890); Kurth, *Clovis* (Paris, 1901), II, 164, 246–47; Warichez, *Les origines de l'église de Tournai* (Louvain, 1902), passim;

VAN DER ESSEN, *Etude critique et littéraire sur les Vitæ des Saints Mérovingiens de l'ancienne Belgique* (Louvain, 1907), 394-97.

L. VAN DER ESSEN.

Eleutheropolis, a titular see in Palæstina Prima. The former name of this city seems to have been Beth Gabra, "the house of the strong men", which later became Beît Djibrîn, "the house of Gabriel". Vespasian slaughtered almost all its inhabitants, according to Josephus, De Bell. Jud., IV., viii, 1, where its name is written Betaris. In A. D. 200 Septimius Severus, on his Syrian journey changed its name to Eleutheropolis, and it soon became one of the most important cities of Judea. Its special era, which figures on its coins and in many inscriptions, began 1 Jan., A.D. 200. (See Echos d'Orient, 1903, 310 sq.; 1904, 215 sq.) Its first known bishop is Macrinus (325); five others are mentioned in the fourth and two in the sixth century (Lequien, Or. Christ., III, 631). In 393, during the episcopate of Zebennus, the relics of the Prophets Habakuk and Micah were found at Ceila and Tell Zakariya near Eleutheropolis (Sozom., H. E., VII, xxix). At Eleutheropolis was born St. Epiphanius, the celebrated bishop of Salamis in Cyprus; at Ad in the neighbourhood he established a monastery which is often mentioned in the polemics of St. Jerome with Rufinus and John, Bishop of Jerusalem. The city was, moreover, an important monastic centre at least till the coming of the Arabs. The latter beheaded (638) at Eleutheropolis fifty soldiers of the garrison of Gaza who had refused to apostatize. They were buried in a church built in their honour. (See Anal. Bolland., 1904, 289 sq., and Echos d'Orient, 1905, 40 sq.) The city was destroyed by the Mussulmans in 796 in the civil wars. The Crusaders erected there a fortress, in 1134, under Fulco of Anjou; the Knights of St. John, to whom it was committed, restored at this time the beautiful Byzantine church at Sandahanna. The citadel was taken in 1187 by Saladin, conquered in 1191 by Richard Lion Heart, destroyed in 1264 by Sultan Bibars, and rebuilt in 1551 by the Turks. Today Beît Djibrîn is a village with about 1000 Mussulman inhabitants, on the road from Jerusalem to Gaza, in a fertile and very healthy region. The medieval fortress still stands, about 180 feet square; there are also remains of the walls, ruins of a cloister, and of a medieval church. In the neighbourhood are remarkable grottoes, which filled St. Jerome with wonderment. Some of these grottoes were used in early Christian times as places of worship; others bear Arabic inscriptions.

RELAND, *Palæstina* (Utrecht, 1714), 749–754; SMITH, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geogr.* (London, 1878) s. v. *Bethograbis.*

S. VAILHÉ.

Elevation, THE.—What we now know as *par excellence* the Elevation of the Mass is a rite of comparatively recent introduction. The Oriental liturgies, and notably the Byzantine, have indeed a showing of the consecrated Host to the people, with the words "Holy things to the holy", but this should rather be regarded as the counterpart of our "Ecce Agnus Dei" and as a preliminary to the Communion. Again, in the West, a lifting of the Host at the words "omnis honor et gloria", immediately before the Pater Noster, has taken place ever since the ninth century or earlier. This may very probably be looked upon as originally an invitation to adore when the great consecratory prayer of the canon extending from the Preface to the Pater Noster (see Cabrol in "Dict. d'Archéologie", I, 1558) had been brought to a conclusion. But the showing of the Sacred Host (and still more of the Chalice) to the people after the utterance of the words of Institution, "Hoc est corpus meum", is not known to have existed earlier than the close of the twelfth century. Eudes de Sully, Bishop of Paris from 1196 to 1208, seems to have been the first to direct in his episcopal statutes that after the consecratory words the Host should be "elevated so that it can be seen by all".

There has, however, been a good deal of confusion upon this point in the minds of some early liturgists, owing to the practice which prevailed of lifting the bread from the altar and holding it in the hands above the chalice while consecrating it. Some degree of lifting, at the words "accepit panem in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas", was unavoidable, and many priests carried it so far that liturgical commentators spoke of their act as "elevare hostiam" (cf. Migne, P. L., CLXXVII, 370, and CLXXI, 1186), but a careful examination of the evidence proves that this was quite a different thing from showing the Host to the people. Moreover, the motive of this latter showing has generally been misconceived. It has often been held to be a protest against the heresy of Berengarius; but Berengarius died a century before, and the statements of writers at the beginning of the thirteenth century make the whole development plain. The great centre of intellectual life at that period was Paris, and we learn that at Paris a curious theological view was then being defended by such eminent scholars as the chancellor Peter Manducator and the professor Peter Cantor, that transubstantiation of the bread only took place when the priest at Mass had pronounced the words of consecration over *both* bread and wine (see, e. g., Giraldus Cambrensis, Works, II, 124; Cæsarius of Heisterbach, "Dialogus", IX, xxvii, and "Libri Miraculorum", ed. Meister, pp. 16, 17). To quote the words of Peter of Poitiers "dicunt quidam . . . . quod non facta est transubstantiatio panis in corpus donec prolata sint hæc verba 'Hic est sanguis'" (Migne, P. L., CCXI, 1245; Pope Innocent III, "De sacro altaris mysterio", IV, 22, uses very similar language). This view, as may readily be understood, aroused considerable opposition, and notably on the part of Bishop Eudes de Sully and Stephen Langton, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury and cardinal. It seems clear that the theologians of this party, by way of protest against the teaching of Peter Cantor, adopted the custom of adoring the Host immediately after the words "Hoc est enim corpus meum" were spoken, and by a natural transition they encouraged the practice of showing it to the people for this purpose. The developments can be easily followed in the synodal decrees of France, England, and other countries during the thirteenth century. We find mention of a little bell of warning in the early years of that century, and before the end of the same century it was enjoined in many dioceses of the Continent and in England that one of the great bells of the church should be tolled at the moment of the Elevation, in order that those at work in the fields might kneel down and adore.

It will be readily understood from the above explanation that there was not the same motive at first for insisting on the elevation of the Chalice as well as the Host. No one at that period doubted that by the time the words of Institution had been spoken over the wine, transubstantiation had been effected in both species. We find accordingly that the elevation of the Chalice was introduced much more slowly. It was not adopted at St. Alban's Abbey until 1429, and we may say that it is not practised by the Carthusians even to this day. The elevation of the Host at Mass seems to have brought in its train a great idea of the special merit and virtue of looking upon the Body of Christ. Promises of an extravagant kind circulated freely among the people describing the privileges of him who had seen his Maker at Mass. Sudden death could not befall him. He was secure from hunger, infection, the danger of fire, etc. As a result, an extraordinary desire developed to see the Host when elevated at Mass, and this led to a variety of abuses which were rebuked by preachers and satirists. On the other hand, the same devout instinct undoubtedly fostered the introduction of processions of the Blessed Sacrament and

the practice of our familiar Exposition and Benediction (qq. v.).

All the usual authorities upon the liturgical history of the Mass are somewhat unsatisfactory owing to the neglect to note the important point as to the teaching of the Paris theologians of the twelfth century. See THURSTON, *The Elevation* in *The Tablet*, 19 Oct., 26 Oct., 2 Nov., 1907. But many useful facts may be gleaned from GIORGI, *De Liturgiâ Rom. Pont.* (Rome, 1744), III; LEBRUN, *Explication des prières et des cérémonies de la Messe* (Paris, 1726); GIHR, *Das heilige Messopfer* (tr. St. Louis, 1902); THALHOFER, *Liturgik* (Freiburg, 1893), II. DRURY, *Elevation in the Eucharist* (Cambridge, 1907), is of little value. See further the bibliography of the article CANON OF THE MASS.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Eleven Thousand Virgins, THE. See URSULA, SAINT.

Elhuyar y de Suvisa, FAUSTO DE, a distinguished mineralogist and chemist, b. at Logroño, Castile, 11 Oct., 1755; d. 6 Feb., 1833. He was professor in the School of Mines, Vergara, Biscay, from 1781 to 1785. His most celebrated work is the isolation of tungsten. Associated with his brother, Juan José, in 1783, two years after Scheele and Bergman had announced the probable existence of this metal, he isolated it, reducing it by carbon. At the present day when tungsten steel, known as high speed steel and self-hardening steel, is revolutionizing machine-shop practice, the work of Elhuyar is of particular interest. He named the metal Wolfram, a name which it still retains in the German language; the name, tungsten, meaning heavy stone, is generally used in other tongues. The Academy of Sciences of Toulouse, 4 March, 1784, received notice of this discovery. Elhuyar then spent three years in travelling, for the purpose of study, through Central Europe and went to Mexico, then called New Spain. Here he had general superintendence of the mines and founded a Royal School of Mines in 1792. Driven away by the Revolution, he returned to Spain, where he was appointed general director of mines and was busy reorganizing his department when he was seized with a fit of apoplexy and died. His works are numerous; he wrote on the theory of amalgamation, a system for the reduction of silver from its ore which received great development in Mexico. In 1818 he published memoirs on the mintage of coins. He was also the author of memoirs on the state of the mines of New Spain (now Mexico) and on the exploitation of the Spanish mines. At Madrid, in 1825, he published a work on the influence of mineralogy in agriculture and chemistry.

Biographies in *Dictionnaire Larousse*, *La Grande Encyclopédie*, and under *tungsten* and *Wolfram*. His work on the reduction of tungsten is described in WURTZ, *Dictionnaire de chimie;* WATTS, *Dictionary of Chemistry;* MUSPRATT, *Chimie.*

T. O'CONOR SLOANE.

Elias (Heb. *'Eliahu*, "Yahveh is God"; A.V., Elijah), the loftiest and most wonderful prophet of the O. T. What we know of his public life is sketched in a few popular narratives enshrined, for the most part, in the Third (Heb., First) Book of Kings. These narratives, which bear the stamp of an almost contemporary age, very likely took shape in Northern Israel, and are full of the most graphic and interesting details. Every part of the prophet's life therein narrated bears out the description of the writer of Ecclesiasticus: He was "as a fire, and his word burnt like a torch" (xlviii, 1). The times called for such a prophet. Under the baneful influence of his Tyrian wife Jezabel, Achab, though perhaps not intending to forsake altogether Yahveh's worship, had nevertheless erected in Samaria a temple to the Tyrian Baal (III K., xvi, 32) and introduced a multitude of foreign priests (xviii 19); doubtless he had occasionally offered sacrifices to the pagan deity, and, most of all, had allowed a bloody persecution of the prophets of Yahveh.

Of Elias's origin nothing is known, except that he was a Thesbite; whether from Thisbe of Nephtali (Tob., i, 2, Gr.) or from Thesbon of Galaad, as our texts have it, is not absolutely certain, although most scholars, on the authority of the Septuagint and of Josephus, prefer the latter opinion. Some Jewish legends, echoed in a few Christian writings, assert moreover that Elias was of priestly descent; but there is no other warrant for the statement than the fact that he offered sacrifices. His whole manner of life resembles somewhat that of the Nazarites and is a loud protest against his corrupt age. His skin garment and leather girdle (IV K., 1, 8), his swift foot (III K., xviii, 46), his habit of dwelling in the clefts of the torrents (xvii, 3) or in the caves of the mountains (xix, 9), of sleeping under a scanty shelter (xix, 5), betray the true son of the desert. He appears abruptly on the scene of history to announce to Achab that Yahveh had determined to avenge the apostasy of Israel and her king by bringing a long drought on the land. His message delivered, the prophet vanished as suddenly as he had appeared, and, guided by the spirit of Yahveh, betook himself by the brook Carith, to the east of the Jordan, and the ravens (some critics would translate, however improbable the rendering, "Arabs" or "merchants") "brought him bread and flesh in the morning, and bread and flesh in the evening, and he drank of the torrent" (xvii, 6).

After the brook had dried up, Elias, under Divine direction, crossed over to Sarepta, within the Tyrian dominion. There he was hospitably received by a poor widow whom the famine had reduced to her last meal (12); her charity he rewarded by increasing her store of meal and oil all the while the drought and famine prevailed, and later on by restoring her child to life (14–24). For three years there fell no rain or dew in Israel, and the land was utterly barren. Meanwhile Achab had made fruitless efforts and scoured the country in search of Elias. At length the latter resolved to confront the king once more, and, suddenly appearing before Abdias, bade him summon his master (xviii, 7, sq.). When they met, Achab bitterly upbraided the prophet as the cause of the misfortune of Israel. But the prophet flung back the charge: "I have not troubled Israel, but thou and thy father's house, who have forsaken the commandments of the Lord, and have followed Baalim" (xviii, 18). Taking advantage of the discountenanced spirits of the silenced king, Elias bids him to summon the prophets of Baal to Mount Carmel, for a decisive contest between their god and Yahveh. The ordeal took place before a great concourse of people (see CARMEL, MOUNT) whom Elias, in the most forcible terms, presses to choose: "How long do you halt between two sides? If Yahveh be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him" (xviii, 21). He then commanded the heathen prophets to invoke their deity; he himself would "call on the name of his Lord"; and the God who would answer by fire, "let him be God" (24). An altar had been erected by the Baal-worshippers and the victim laid upon it; but their cries, their wild dances and mad self-mutilations all the day long availed nothing: "there was no voice heard, nor did any one answer, nor regard them as they prayed" (29). Elias, having repaired the ruined altar of Yahveh which stood there, prepared thereon his sacrifice; then, when it was time to offer the evening oblation, as he was praying earnestly, "the fire of the Lord fell, and consumed the holocaust, and the wood, and the stones, and the dust, and licked up the water that was in the trench" (38). The issue was fought and won. The people, maddened by the success, fell at Elias's command on the pagan prophets and slew them at the brook Cison. That same evening the drought ceased with a heavy downpour of rain, in the midst of which the strange prophet ran before Achab to the entrance of Jezrael.

Elias's triumph was short. The anger of Jezabel, who had sworn to take his life (xix, 2), compelled him to flee without delay, and take his refuge beyond the desert of Juda, in the sanctuary of Mount Horeb. There, in the wilds of the sacred mountain, broken-

spirited, he poured out his complaint before the Lord, who strengthened him by a revelation and restored his faith. Three commands are laid upon him: to anoint Hazael to be King of Syria, Jehu to be King of Israel, and Eliseus to be his own successor. At once Elias sets out to accomplish this new burden. On his way to Damascus, he meets Eliseus at the plough, and throwing his mantle over him, makes him his faithful disciple and inseparable companion, to whom the completion of his task will be entrusted. The treacherous murder of Naboth was the occasion for a new reappearance of Elias at Jezrael, as a champion of the people's rights and of social order, and to announce to Achab his impending doom. Achab's house shall fall. In the place where the dogs licked the blood of Naboth will the dogs lick the king's blood; they shall eat Jezabel in Jezrael; their whole posterity shall perish and their bodies be given to the fowls of the air (xxi, 20–26). Conscience-stricken, Achab quailed before the man of God, and in view of his penance the threatened ruin of his house was delayed. The next time we hear of Elias, it is in connexion with Ochozias, Achab's son and successor. Having received severe injuries in a fall, this prince sent messengers to the shrine of Beelzebub, god of Accaron, to inquire whether he should recover. They were intercepted by the prophet, who sent them back to their master with the intimation that his injuries would prove fatal. Several bands of men sent by the king to capture Elias were stricken by fire from heaven; finally the man of God appeared in person before Ochozias to confirm his threatening message. Another episode recorded by the chronicler (II Par., xxi, 12) relates how Joram, King of Juda, who had indulged in Baal-worship, received from Elias a letter warning him that all his house would be smitten by a plague, and that he himself was doomed to an early death.

According to IV K., iii, Elias's career ended before the death of Josaphat. This statement is difficult—but not impossible—to harmonize with the preceding narrative. However this may be, Elias vanished still more mysteriously than he had appeared. Like Enoch, he was "translated", so that he should not taste death. As he was conversing with his spiritual son Eliseus on the hills of Moab, "a fiery chariot, and fiery horses parted them both asunder, and Elias went up by a whirlwind into heaven" (IV K., ii, 11), and all the efforts to find him made by the sceptic sons of the prophets disbelieving Eliseus's recital, availed nothing. The memory of Elias has ever remained living in the minds both of Jews and Christians. According to Malachias, God preserved the prophet alive to entrust him, at the end of time, with a glorious mission (iv, 5–6): at the New Testament period, this mission was believed to precede immediately the Messianic Advent (Matt., xvii, 10, 12; Mark, ix, 11); according to some Christian commentators, it would consist in converting the Jews (St. Jer., in Mal., iv, 5–6); the rabbis, finally, affirm that its object will be to give the explanations and answers hitherto kept back by them. I Mach., ii, 58, extols Elias's zeal for the Law, and Ben Sira entwines in a beautiful page the narration of his actions and the description of his future mission (Ecclus., xlviii, 1–12). Elias is still in the N. T. the personification of the servant of God (Matt., xvi, 14; Luke, i, 17; ix, 8; John, i, 21). No wonder, therefore, that with Moses he appeared at Jesus' side on the day of the Transfiguration.

Nor do we find only in the sacred literature and the commentaries thereof evidences of the conspicuous place Elias won for himself in the minds of after-ages. To this day the name of Jebel Mar Elyas, usually given by modern Arabs to Mount Carmel, perpetuates the memory of the man of God. Various places on the mountain: Elias's grotto; El-Khadr, the supposed school of the prophets; El-Muhraka, the traditional spot of Elias's sacrifice; Tell el-Kassis, or Mound of the priests—where he is said to have slain the priests of Baal—are still in great veneration both among the Christians of all denominations and among the Moslems. Every year the Druses assemble at El-Muhraka to hold a festival and offer a sacrifice in honour of Elias. All Mussulmans have the prophet in great reverence; no Druse, in particular, would dare break an oath made in the name of Elias. Not only among them, but to some extent also among the Jews and Christians, many legendary tales are associated with the prophet's memory. The Carmelite monks long cherished the belief that their order could be traced back in unbroken succession to Elias whom they hailed as their founder. Vigorously opposed by the Bollandists, especially by Papenbroeck, their claim was no less vigorously upheld by the Carmelites of Flanders, until Pope Innocent XII, in 1698, deemed it advisable to silence both contending parties. Elias is honoured by both the Greek and Latin Churches on 20 July.

The old stichometrical lists and ancient ecclesiastical writers (Const. Apost., VI, 16; Origen, Comm. in Matth., xxvii, 9; Euthalius; Epiphan., Hær., xliii) mention an apocryphal "Apocalypse of Elias", citations from which are said to be found in I Cor., ii, 9, and Eph., v, 14. Lost to view since the early Christian centuries, this work was partly recovered in a Coptic translation found (1893) by Maspéro in a monastery of Upper Egypt. Other scraps, likewise in Coptic, have since been also discovered. What we possess now of this Apocalypse—and it seems that we have by far the greater part of it—was published in 1899 by G. Steindorff; the passages cited in I Cor., ii, 9, and Eph., v, 14, do not appear there; the Apocalypse, on the other hand, has a striking analogy with the Jewish "Sepher Elia".

STEINDORFF, *Die Apokalypse des Elias, eine unbekannte Apokalypse und Bruchstucke der Sophonias Apokalypse* (Leipzig, 1899); SMITH, *The Prophets of Israel* (London, 1895); MEIGNAN, *Les Prophètes d'Israël* (Paris, 1892); CLEMEN, *Die Wunderberichte über Elia und Elisa in den Büchern der Könige* (Grimma, 1877).

CHARLES L. SOUVAY.

Elias, APOCALYPSE OF. See ELIAS; EGYPT, VI, *Coptic Literature.*

Elias of Cortona, Minister General of the Friars Minor, b., it is said, at Bevilia near Assisi, c. 1180; d. at Cortona, 22 April, 1253. In the writings of Elias that have come down to us he styles himself "Brother Elias, Sinner", and his contemporaries without exception call him simply "Brother Elias". The name of a town was first added to his name in the fourteenth century; in Franciscan compilations like the "Chronica XXIV generalium" and the "Liber Conformitatum" Elias is described as Helias de Assisio, whereas the name of Cortona does not appear in connexion with his before the seventeenth century. It is clear in any event that Elias did not belong to the noble family of Coppi as some have asserted. From Salimbene, who knew Elias well, we learn that his family name was Bonusbaro or Bonibarone, that his father was from the neighbourhood of Bologna, and his mother an Assisian; that before becoming a friar Elias worked at his father's trade of mattress-making and also taught the children of Assisi to read the Psalter. Later on, according to Eccleston, Elias was a *scriptor*, or notary, at Bologna, where no doubt he applied himself to study. But he was not a cleric and never became a priest. Elias appears to have been one of the earliest companions of St. Francis of Assisi. The time and place of his joining the saint are uncertain; it may have been at Cortona in 1211, as Wadding says. Certain it is, however, that he held a place of prominence among the friars from the first. After a short sojourn, as it seems, in Tuscany, Elias was sent in 1217 as head of a band of missionaries to Palestine, and two years later he became the first provincial of the then extensive province of Syria. It was in this

capacity that he received Cæsar of Speyer into the order. Although we are ignorant of the nature or extent of Elias's work in the East, it would seem that the three years he spent there made a deep impression upon him. In 1220–21 Elias returned to Italy with St. Francis, who showed further confidence in him by naming him to succeed Peter of Cataneo (d. 10 March, 1221) as vicar-general of the order. Elias had held this office for five years when Francis died (3 Oct., 1226), and he then became charged with the responsibilities of the moment and the provisional government of the Friars Minor. After announcing the death of Francis and the fact of the Stigmata to the order in a beautiful letter, and superintending the temporary burial of the saint at San Giorgio, Elias at once began to lay plans for the erection of a great basilica at Assisi, to enshrine the remains of the Poverello. To this end he obtained a donation, with the authority of the pope, of the so-called Collis Inferni at the western extremity of the town, and proceeded to collect money in various ways to meet the expenses of the building. Elias thus alienated the zealots in the order, who felt entirely with St. Francis upon the question of poverty, so that at the chapter held in May, 1227, Elias was rejected in spite of his prominence, and Giovanni Parenti, provincial of Spain, was elected second general of the order.

Thenceforth Elias devoted all his energies to raising the basilica in honour of St. Francis. The first stone was laid 17 July, 1228, the day following the saint's canonization, and the work advanced with such incredible speed that the lower church was finished within twenty-two months. It was consecrated 25 May, 1230, the hurried, secret, and still unexplained translation of St. Francis's body thither from San Giorgio planned by Elias having taken place a few days previously, before the general and other friars assembled for the purpose were present. Soon after this, though there is some difference of opinion as to the exact date, Elias attempted, as it seems by a kind of *coup de main*, to depose Parenti and seize the government of the order by force, but the attempt failed. He thereupon retired to a distant hermitage, where we are told he allowed his beard and hair to grow, wore the vilest habit, and to all appearances led a most penitential life. However this may be, Elias was elected to succeed Parenti as general at the chapter in 1232, *magis tumultuose quam canonice*, as a contemporary chronicler expresses it; and he continued to govern the Friars Minor for nearly seven years. During that period the order was passing through one of the crises of its earlier development. It is well known (see CONVENTUALS) that even during the lifetime of St. Francis a division had shown itself in the ranks of the friars, some being for relaxing the rigour of the rule, especially as regards the observance of poverty, and others for adhering to its literal strictness. The conduct of Elias after his election as general helped to widen this breach and fan the flames of discord in the order. In arbitrary fashion he refused to convene a chapter or to visit any of the provinces, but sent in his place "visitors", who acted rather as tax collectors—for Elias's chief need was money to complete the church and convent of S. Francesco—thus not only violating the rule himself, but causing others to do so also. In many other respects Elias abused his authority, receiving unworthy subjects into the order and confiding the most important offices to ignorant lay brothers, and when several of the early and most venerated companions of Francis withstood his high-handed methods, they were dealt with as mutineers, some being scourged, others exiled or imprisoned. Elias's manner of life made his despotism more intolerable. It seems to have been that of a powerful baron rather than of a mendicant friar. We are told that he gathered about him a household of great splendour, including secular lackies, dressed in the gayest liveries, that he kept "a most excellent cook" for his exclusive use, that he fared sumptuously, wore splendid garments, and made his journeys to different courts on fine palfreys with rich trappings. Because of these excesses, which threatened the complete destruction of the rule, the opposition to Elias became widespread. It was organized by Aymon of Faversham, who, in conjunction with other provincials from the North, determined to have him removed, and appealed to Gregory IX. Elias excommunicated the appellants and sought to prevent their reception by the pope. But Gregory received them and, in spite of Elias, summoned a chapter at Rome. Elias resisted to the utmost and strove to browbeat his accusers, but Gregory called on him to resign. He refused to do so, and was thereupon deposed by the pope, the English provincial, Albert of Pisa, being elected general in his stead. This was in 1239.

After his deposition, Elias, who still kept the titles of Custos of the Assisian Basilica and Master of the Works, seems to have busied himself anew for a time at the task of completing the church and convent of S. Francesco, but subsequently retired to Cortona. Refusing to obey either the general or the pope, Elias now openly transferred his allegiance to Frederick II, and we read of him in 1240 with the emperor's army, riding on a magnificent charger at the siege of Faenza and at that of Ravenna. Some two years before this Elias had been sent by Gregory IX as an ambassador to Frederick. He now became the supporter of the excommunicated emperor in his strife with Rome and was himself excommunicated by Gregory. It is said that Elias afterwards wrote a letter to the pope explaining his conduct and asking pardon, and that this letter was found in the tunic of Albert of Pisa after the latter's death. Aymon of Faversham, who had been the principal opponent of Elias, and who was elected general in succession to Albert, having died in 1244, a chapter was thereupon convened at Genoa. Elias was summoned by Innocent IV to attend it, but he failed to appear. Some say that the papal mandate never reached him. Be this as it may, Elias was excommunicated anew and expelled from the order. The news of his disgrace spread quickly "to the great scandal of the Church", and the very children might be heard singing in the streets:

ELIAS OF CORTONA
After a picture preserved at Assisi

"Hor attorna fratt' Helya
Ke pres' ha la mala via",

a couplet which met the friars at every turn, so that the very name of Elias became hateful to them. It was about this time that Elias was sent by Frederick II on an important diplomatic mission to Constantinople and Cyprus. When not employed by the emperor, Elias resided at Cortona with a few friars who had remained faithful to him. He dwelt for a time in a private house there, still known as the *casa di frate Elia*, but in January, 1245, the people of Cortona, for whom he had obtained sundry privileges in the past, presented him with a piece of ground called the *Bagno della Regina*, and helped him to erect thereon the splendid church and convent dedicated to St. Francis.

Soon after Blessed Giovanni da Parma became gen-

eral in 1247, he sent Fra Gerardo da Modena to Cortona to beg Elias to submit, promising that he would be treated with the utmost clemency. But Elias, who seems on the one hand to have feared imprisonment by the pope and on the other to have been unwilling to renounce the favour of Frederick II, declined. During Passiontide, 1253, the lonely old man,—for Elias had lost his protector by Frederick's death in 1250—fell seriously ill. We learn from the sworn testimony of several witnesses that Bencius, Archpriest of Cortona, recognizing at once the gravity of Elias's condition and the reality of his repentance, absolved him on Holy Saturday, 19 April; that two days later Elias received Holy Communion at the hands of Fra Diotefece, but that he could not be anointed, since, Cortona being then under interdict, no holy oil was to be found. On Easter Tuesday Elias died, reconciled indeed with the Church, but outside the order. He was buried at Cortona in the church he had built, which two years later—his followers having returned to obedience—passed into the hands of the order. But Elias's bones were not suffered to rest at S. Francesco, for a later guardian dug them up and flung them out.

Elias is perhaps the most difficult character to estimate in all Franciscan history. In the first place it is wellnigh impossible, with the documents at our disposal, to obtain even a clear idea of his chequered career. There is no contemporary life of Elias, and, with the exception of Celano's "Vita Prima", which is said to have been written under the influence of Elias, none of the early biographies of St. Francis make any allusion to him. In the second place, considerable bias has to be reckoned with in what is recorded of Elias in later works, especially in the writings of the Zelanti, which are often influenced less by historical considerations than by party spirit. Many stories have gathered around the life of Elias which are largely inventions. Yet these fictions have been indiscriminately reproduced by subsequent writers, with the result that Elias has come to be depicted by too many modern biographers of St. Francis as a traitor to his master's interests, as a mere tool of the Curia in transforming the order and destroying the manner of life intended by the Poverello. But if some have branded Elias as another Judas, others, going to the opposite extreme, have not hesitated to call him the St. Paul of St. Francis. Laying undue stress on some words of St. Antoninus, they have sought to exculpate Elias altogether, to justify his conduct at all hazards, even where it is wholly unjustifiable; they would fain make him appear as a second founder of the order, to whose ability its great success was mainly due. It is just because so few have written calmly about Elias that it becomes additionally difficult to form a just estimate of the real motives which guided him. He has been too much abused and too much lauded. Between the two extremes it seems necessary, if we would judge with fairness, to distinguish two periods in the life of Elias, namely, before the death of St. Francis and after it. In spite of the account of Elias's early pride and frowardness given by the "Fioretti"—which may be set aside as a picturesque slander introduced for artistic effect—there is nothing to show that Elias was other than a good religious during the lifetime of St. Francis, else it is hard to understand how the latter could have entrusted him with so much responsibility, and how he could have merited the special death-bed blessing of the Poverello. On the other hand that Elias really loved St. Francis there can be no doubt, and so far as we have means of ascertaining there never was any breach between them. At the same time it would be difficult to imagine two characters more widely different than Elias and St. Francis. Their religious ideals were as far apart as the poles. The heroic ideal of poverty and detachment which the Poverello conceived for his friars Elias regarded as exaggerated and unpractical. Hence, while St. Francis did not desire large *loci* for his friars, Elias multiplied spacious convents. Again, Elias's views with regard to learning among the friars were very far removed from those of St. Francis. "Hoc solum habuit bonum frater Helias", writes Salimbene, "quia Ordinem fratrum Minorum ad studium theologiæ promovit." But Elias did more than this. In particular the extension of the Franciscan missions among the infidels owes more to his work than is commonly admitted. For the rest, Elias was no doubt guided throughout by what he thought to be the glory of the order. On the other hand it would be idle to deny that Elias was utterly lacking in the true spirit of his master. Ambition was Elias's chief fault. So long as he remained under the influence of Francis his ambition was curbed, but when he came to govern, forgetting his own past life, the example of St. Francis, and the obligations of his office, Elias so far allowed ambition to dominate him that when it was thwarted he had not the humility to submit, but, reckless of consequences, plunged to his ruin.

It is no doubt owing to his fall and disgrace that in an order so prolific in early biographies Elias remained so long without a biographer. It would be difficult, however, to exaggerate the importance of his influence upon the history of the Franciscan Order. Even his opponents conceded that Elias possessed a remarkable mind, and none doubted his exceptional talents. "Who in the whole of Christendom", asks Eccleston, "was more gracious or more famous than Elias?" Matthew of Paris dwells on the eloquence of his preaching, and Bernard of Besse calls him one of the most erudite men in Italy. We know that good as well as great men sought the friendship of Elias, and, strange as it may seem, he appears to have retained the confidence of St. Clare and her companions.

Nothing that can really be called a portrait of Elias remains, Giunta Pisano's picture of him "taken from life" in 1236 having disappeared in 1624; but a seventeenth-century replica in the Municipio at Assisi is believed to have been more or less copied from it. In the latter, Elias is represented as a small, spare, dark-haired man, with a melancholy face and trim beard, and wearing an Armenian cap. With the exception of his letter to the order announcing the death of Francis, no writing of Elias has come down to us; several works dealing with alchemy, formerly circulated under his name, are undoubtedly supposititious. Whether or not Elias was himself the architect of S. Francesco, the fact remains that if the tomb of the Poverello has become the "cradle of the Renaissance", the "first flower and the fairest of Italian Gothic", and the glory of Assisi, it is to Elias we owe this, and it constitutes his best monument.

Biographies of Elias: Anonimo Cortonese (Venuti), *Vita di frate Elia* (2nd ed., Leghorn, 1763); Affo, *Vita di frate Elia* (2nd ed., Parma, 1819); Rybka, *Elias von Cortona* (Leipzig, 1874); these may still be read with interest, but they have been to a certain extent superseded by Lempp, *Frère Elie de Cortone* (Paris, 1901) in *Collection d'études et de documents sur l'histoire religieuse et littéraire du moyen âge*, Vol. III. Dr. Lempp has attempted to put order into the undigested mass of details handed down about Elias, and his monograph is thoroughly "documenté", but its objective value is greatly spoilt by the author's apparent anxiety to read a gospel of his own into the beginnings of Franciscan history. Those who wish to go behind these biographies to some of the original authorities from which our knowledge of Elias is derived, may consult: Celano, *Legenda Prima B. Francisci*, ed. d'Alençon (Rome, 1906), p. xxviii with references to text; Eccleston, *De Adventu Minorum in Angliam* in *Anal. Francis.*, I (Quaracchi, 1885), 230 and passim; *Chronica fr. Jordani*, *ibid.*, I, 18 sqq.; Besse, *Catalogus Generalium*, *ibid.*, III (1897), 695; Glassberger, *Chronica*, *ibid.*, I (1887), 15 sqq.; Salimbene, *Chronica* in *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script.*, XXXII; Clareno, *Historia Tribulationum*, ed. Döllinger in *Beiträge* (Munich, 1890), II, *Prima et secunda tribulationes; Chron. XXIV Generalium* in *Anal. Francis.*, III (1897), 297 sqq.; Pisanus, *Liber conformitatum*, *ibid.*, IV (1906), passim. See also Rodulphius, *Histor. Seraph. Religionis* (Venice, 1586), II, 177 sqq.; Wadding, *Annales Minor.*, I, ad an. 1221, n. 9, XI, an. 1253, n. 30; *Scriptores*, ed. Nardecchia (Rome, 1906), 72–73; Sbaralea, *Bullar. Francis.*, I

(Rome, 1759), 155 and *Supplementum*, ed. NARDECCHIA (Rome, 1908), 240; PANFILO, *Storia Compendiosa* (Rome, 1874), I, 510–37; CRISTOFANI, *Delle Storie d'Assisi* (3rd ed., Assisi, 1902), 93–97; GOLUBOVICH, *Biblioteca bio-bibliografica*, I (Quaracchi, 1906), 106–117; SABATIER, *Examen de la vie de Frère Elie* in *Opuscules de critique historique*, fasc. XI (Paris, 1904); VAN ORTROY in *Anal. Bolland.*, XXII (1903), 195, 202; MACDONELL, *Frate Elia* in *Sons of Francis* (London, 1902), 138–88.

PASCHAL ROBINSON.

Elias of Jerusalem, d. 518, one of the two Catholic bishops (with Flavian of Antioch) who resisted the attempt of the Emperor Anastasius I (491–518) to abolish the Council of Chalcedon (451). Anastasius spent the greater part of his reign in a vain attempt to impose Monophysitism on his subjects. Unlike his predecessors, who favoured Monophysitism merely as a political expedient whereby to conciliate Egypt and the great number of Monophysites in Syria, Anastasius carried on his propaganda apparently from religious conviction. His chief adviser, Marinus, a Syrian, was also a convinced Monophysite. At first the emperor tried to arrange a compromise. The population of Constantinople and nearly all the European provinces were too Chalcedonian for an open attack on that council to be safe. Macedonius II, Patriarch of Constantinople (469–511), submitted so far as to sign Zeno's Henotikon (482), but refused to condemn the council. Flavian of Antioch also for a time approved of a policy of compromise. The Acacian schism (484–519) still continued during the reign of Anastasius, but the emperor and his patriarch made advances to the Roman See—advances that came to nothing, since the pope always insisted on the removal of the names of former schismatics from the Byzantine diptychs. Gradually Anastasius went over completely to the Monophysites. Severus of Sozopolis, Xenaias of Tahal in Persia, and a great crowd of Syrian and Egyptian Monophysite monks overwhelmed him with petitions to have the courage of his convictions and to break openly with the Dyophysites. In the emperor's chapel the Trisagion was sung with the famous Monophysite addition ("who was crucified for us"). Macedonius of Constantinople was deposed (511), and an open Monophysite, Timothy I (511–518), took his place. Timothy began a fierce persecution of Catholics. Then the Government summoned a synod at Sidon in 512 that was to condemn the Council of Chalcedon. It was chiefly Elias of Jerusalem who prevented this result.

Elias was an Arab, by birth, who had been educated in a monastery in Egypt. In 457 he was driven out by the Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria, Timothy the Cat. He then came to Palestine and founded a laura at Jericho. Anastasius of Jerusalem ordained him priest. In 494 Elias succeeded Sallustius as Bishop of Jerusalem and governed the see until 513. He acknowledged Euphemius of Constantinople (see EUPHEMIUS) and refused the communion of Macedonius, the intruder. About 509 the Monophysite Xenaias of Hierapolis tried to make Elias sign a Monophysite formula, and the emperor ordered him to summon a synod that should condemn the Council of Chalcedon. Instead, Elias sent the emperor a Catholic profession that his enemies seem to have falsified on the way. Evagrius says: "He when he had written it sent it to the Emperor by the hands of Dioscorus' followers" (Monophysites). "And the profession that they then showed contained an anathema against those who speak of two natures in Christ. But the Bishop of Jerusalem, saying that it had been tampered with, sent another without that anathema. Nor is this surprising. For they often corrupted works of the holy Fathers" (H. E., III, xxxi). The Synod of Sidon in 512 was to condemn Chalcedon and depose Elias and Flavian. But they succeeded in persuading the Fathers to do neither (Labbe, Concil., IV, 1414). The Monophysites went on accusing these two of Nestorianism, and Anastasius deposed them, in spite of the protest of Elias' legate, Sabas. Flavian was deposed first and Severus, an open Monophysite, was intruded in his place. With this person Elias and the monks of Palestine would have no communion (Evagr., H. E., III, xxxiii). Then the Count of Palestine, Olympus, arrived at Jerusalem and offered Elias his choice of signing a Monophysite formula or being deposed. Elias refused to sign and was banished to Aila on the Red Sea (513). His monks remained faithful to him to the end.

Elias of Jerusalem was the founder of many monasteries in his patriarchate. The common presentation of him as a compromiser is unjust. He was steadfastly Catholic throughout and protested at once against the heretical formula brought to the emperor in his name. The Syrian Uniat Church keeps his feast, with St. Flavian of Antioch, on 18 Feb. (Nilles, Kalend. Man., I, 471). These two are named in the Roman Martyrology on 4 July.

Acta SS., July, II, 22–28; NICEPHOROS CALLISTUS, XVI, 26; LIBERATUS, *Brev. caus. Nest. et Eutych.*, XIX; EVAGRIUS, *H. E.*, III, xxx–xxxiii.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Elie de Beaumont, JEAN-BAPTISTE-ARMAND-LOUIS-LÉONCE, geologist, b. at Canon (Dép. Calvados), near Caen, France, 25 Sept., 1798; d. at Canon, 21 Sept., 1874. He made his preliminary studies at the Séminaire Henri IV in Paris, and after successfully completing the course at the Ecole Polytechnique devoted himself in 1819 to mineralogy at the Ecole des Mines. His professor of geology, Brochant de Villiers, in 1822, chose him and his fellow-student Dufrénoy as companions on a tour to England, to study the mines of the country and to become acquainted with the British methods of geological surveying. After their return, Elie de Beaumont published a series of papers in conjunction with Dufrénoy in the "Annales des Mines" (1824–1830) which were afterwards republished under the title "Voyage métallurgique en Angleterre", 2 vols. (Paris, 1837–39). In 1825 the two young geologists began the preparation of a geological map of France. This great work, carried on, first under the direction of de Villiers and afterwards independently, required eighteen years for its completion. Its publication was an event of much importance in the development of geology in France and established the reputation of its authors. Later and more complete editions were afterwards issued and Elie de Beaumont continued to direct the work of the special geological survey until his death.

In 1827 he was elected professor of geology at the Ecole des Mines and in 1832 was appointed to the same chair in the Collège de France. In 1833 he became chief engineer of mines and some years later succeeded de Villiers as general inspector of mines. He received many honours during his long career in recognition of his scientific achievements. He was admitted to the Académie des Sciences in 1835 and succeeded Arago in 1853 as its perpetual secretary. He served as President of the Geological Society of France and in 1861 became Vice-President of the Conseil Général des Mines. He was made a Senator of France in 1852 and during the Second Empire a Grand Officer of the Legion of Honour.

His fame extended throughout Europe. His extensive field observations, in connexion with his surveys and his epoch-making work on the age and origin of mountain systems, constitute his chief contributions to geology. A paper published by him, as early as 1829, in the "Annales" of the Academy, may be regarded as the starting-point of modern views on mountain structure. His observations and theories on the subject are developed in detail in his "Notice sur les systèmes des montagnes", 3 vols. (1852). Elie de Beaumont was a man of ardent faith and great integrity of life. In all his official positions he was

conspicuous for his fairness and consideration for his colleagues. He was also the author of "Observations sur les différentes formations dans le système des Vosges", Paris, 1829; "Mémoires pour servir à une description géologique de la France" (with Dufrénoy), 4 vols., Paris, 1830–38; "Recherches sur quelques-unes des révolutions de la surface du globe", Paris, 1834; "Explications de la carte géologique de la France", Paris, Part I, 1841; Part II–IV, 1848–78 (with Dufrénoy).

DEVILLE, *Coup-d'œil historique sur la géologie et sur les travaux d'Élie de Beaumont* (Paris, 1878); BERTRAND, *Éloges Académiques* (Paris, 1890), 77–103; VON ZITTEL, *History of Geology and Palæontology* (London, 1901).

H. M. BROCK.

Eligius (Fr. ELOI), SAINT, Bishop of Noyon-Tournai, b. at Chaptelat near Limoges, France, c. 590, of Roman parents, Eucherius and Terrigia; d. at Noyon, 1 December, 660. His father, recognizing unusual talent in his son, sent him to the noted goldsmith Abbo, master of the mint at Limoges. Later Eligius went to Neustria, where he worked under Babo, the royal treasurer, on whose recommendation Clotaire II commissioned him to make a throne of gold adorned with precious stones. His honesty in this so pleased the king that he appointed him master of the mint at Marseilles, besides taking him into his household. After the death of Clotaire (629), Dagobert appointed his father's friend his chief councillor. The fame of Eligius spread rapidly, and ambassadors first paid their respects to him before going to the king. His success in inducing the Breton King, Judicaïl, to submit to Frankish authority (636–37) increased his influence. Eligius took advantage of this to obtain alms for the poor and to ransom Roman, Gallic, Breton, Saxon, and Moorish captives, who were arriving daily at Marseilles. He founded several monasteries, and with the king's consent sent his servants through towns and villages to take down the bodies of malefactors who had been executed, and give them decent burial. Eligius was a source of edification at court, where he and his friend Dado (Audoenus) lived according to the Irish monastic rule, introduced into Gaul by St. Columbanus. Eligius introduced this rule, either entirely or in part, into the monastery of Solignac which he founded in 632, and into the convent at Paris where three hundred virgins were under the guidance of the Abbess Aurea. He also built the basilica of St. Paul, and restored that of St. Martial in Paris. He erected several fine churches in honour of the relics of St. Martin of Tours, the national saint of the Franks, and St. Denis, who was chosen patron saint by the king. On the death of Dagobert (639), Queen Nanthilde took the reins of government, and Eligius and Dado left the court and entered the priesthood. On the death of Acarius, Bishop of Noyon-Tournai, 13 May, 640, Eligius was made his successor with the unanimous approbation of clergy and people. The inhabitants of his diocese were pagans for the most part. He undertook the conversion of the Flemings, Antwerpians, Frisians, Suevi, and the barbarian tribes along the coast. In 654 he approved the famous privilege granted to the Abbey of Saint-Denis, Paris, exempting it from the jurisdiction of the ordinary. In his own episcopal city of Noyon he built and endowed a monastery for virgins. After the finding of the body of St. Quentin, Bishop Eligius erected in his honour a church to which was joined a monastery under the Irish rule. He also discovered the bodies of St. Piatus and companions, and in 654 removed the remains of St. Fursey, the celebrated Irish missionary (d. 650). Eligius was buried at Noyon. There is in existence a sermon written by Eligius, in which he combats the pagan practices of his time, a homily on the last judgment, also a letter written in 645, in which he begs for the prayers of Bishop Desiderius of Cahors. The fourteen other homilies attributed to him are of doubtful authenticity. His homilies have been edited by Krusch in "Mon. Germ. Hist." (loc. cit. infra).

St. Eligius is particularly honoured in Flanders, in the province of Antwerp, and at Tournai, Courtrai of Ghent, Bruges, and Douai. During the Middle Ages his relics were the object of special veneration, and were often transferred to other resting-places, thus in 881, 1066, 1137, 1255, and 1306. He is the patron of goldsmiths, blacksmiths, and all workers in metal. Cabmen have also put themselves under his protection. He is generally represented in Christian art in the garb of a bishop, a crosier in his right hand, on the open palm of his left a miniature church of chased gold.

Vita Eligii, ed. KRUSCH in *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script. Rerum Merovingicarum*, IV, 2, 635 sqq.; *Vita metrica Eligii* in *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum Bibliothecæ regiæ Bruxellensis*, ed. BOLLANDISTS, I, 470–83; *Inventio Sancti Quintini* in *Analecta Bollandiana*, VIII, 429 sqq.; DE LINAS, *Orfèvrerie mérovingienne, les œuvres de S. Eloi et la verroterie cloisonnée* (Arras, 1864); DE LAPORTE, *Un artiste du 7ème siècle, Eligius Aurifaber, S. Eloi, patron des ouvriers en métaux* (s. l., 1865); BAPST, *Tombeau et châsse de S. Germain, tombeau de Sainte Colombe, tombeau de S. Séverin* in *Revue archéologique*, Bk. III (1887); VAREMBERGH, *Saint Eloi* in *Biographie nationale de Belgique*, V, 555–58; HAUCK, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, I, 296 sqq.; DE VOS, *Leven van den heiligen Eligius, met aanteekeningen en bijzonderheden zopens eïjnen alouden eeredienst in Vlaanderen* (Bruges, 1900); VAN DER ESSEN, *Les relations entre les sermons de Saint Césaire d'Arles et la prédication de Saint Eloi* in *Bulletin bibliographique du musée Belge* (1903), VII; *Annuaire de l'Université de Louvain* (1904), 379–90; VAN DER ESSEN, *Etude critique et littéraire sur les Vitæ des saints mérovingiens de l'ancienne Belgique* (Louvain, 1907), 324–36; PARSY, *Saint Eloi* in *Les Saints* series (Paris, 1907); DE SMET, *Analecta Eligiana* in *Acta SS. Belgii* (Brussels, 1785), III, 311–31; KRUSCH, preface, in *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, loc. cit., 635 sqq.

L. VAN DER ESSEN.

Elijah. See ELIAS.

Elined (ALMEDHA), SAINT, virgin and martyr, flourished c. 490. According to Bishop Challoner (Britannia Sancta, London, 1745, II, 59), she was a daughter of Bragan (Brychan), a British prince, after whom the present province of Brecknock is named, and her memory was kept in Wales. Giraldus Cambrensis, in his "Itinerarium Cambr." (I, c. ii), the chief authority for Elined, speaks of the many churches throughout Wales named after the children of Bragan, and especially of one on the top of a hill, in the region of Brecknock, not far from the castle of Aberhodni, which is called the church of St. Almedha, "who, rejecting the marriage of an earthly prince, and espousing herself to the eternal King, consummated her course by a triumphant martyrdom". Her feast was celebrated 1 August, on which day throngs of pilgrims visited the church, and many miracles were wrought. William of Worcester says that she was buried at Usk. The church mentioned by Giraldus was called, says Rees, Slwch chapel. The Bollandists (1 August) express themselves satisfied with the evidence of her cultus. This saint is the Luned of the "Mabinogion" (Lady Guest, I, 113–14, II, 164) and the Lynette of Tennyson's "Gareth and Lynette". She is also supposed to be identical with the Enid of the "Mabinogion" and Tennyson's "Idylls".

ALFORD, *Annales Ecclesiastici Britannorum* (Liège, 1663); REES, *Essay on Welsh Saints* (London, 1836); STANTON, *Menology of England and Wales* (London, 1892).

G. E. PHILLIPS

Elipandus. See ADOPTIONISM.

Eliseus (ELISHA; Heb. אלישע, God is salvation), a Prophet of Israel —After learning, on Mount Horeb, that Eliseus, the son of Saphat, had been selected by God as his successor in the prophetic office, Elias set out to make known the Divine will. This he did by casting his mantle over the shoulders of Eliseus, whom he found "one of them that were ploughing with twelve yoke of oxen". Eliseus delayed only long enough to kill the yoke of oxen, whose flesh he boiled with the very wood of his plough. After he had shared this farewell repast with his father, mother, and

friends, the newly chosen Prophet "followed Elias, and ministered to him". (III Kings, xix, 8–21.) He went with his master from Galgal to Bethel, to Jericho, and thence to the eastern side of the Jordan, the waters of which, touched by the mantle, divided so as to permit both to pass over on dry ground. Eliseus then beheld Elias in a fiery chariot taken up by a whirlwind into heaven. By means of the mantle let fall from Elias, Eliseus miraculously recrossed the Jordan, and so won from the prophets at Jericho the recognition, that "the spirit of Elias hath rested upon Eliseus". (IV Kings, ii, 1–15.) He won the gratitude of the people of Jericho for healing with salt its barren ground and its waters. Eliseus also knew how to strike with salutary fear the adorers of the calf in Bethel, for forty-two little boys, probably encouraged to mock the Prophet, on being cursed in the name of the Lord, were torn by "two bears out of the forest". (IV Kings, ii, 19–24.) Before he settled in Samaria, the Prophet passed some time on Mount Carmel (IV Kings, ii, 25). When the armies of Juda, and Israel, and Edom, then allied against Mesa, the Moabite king, were being tortured by drought in the Idumæan desert, Eliseus consented to intervene. His double prediction regarding relief from drought and victory over the Moabites was fulfilled on the following morning. (IV Kings, iii, 4–24.)

That Eliseus inherited the wonder-working power of Elias is shown throughout the whole course of his life. To relieve the widow importuned by a hard creditor, Eliseus so multiplied a little oil as to enable her, not only to pay her indebtedness, but to provide for her family needs (IV Kings, iv, 1–7). To reward the rich lady of Sunam for her hospitality, he obtained for her from God, at first the birth of a son, and subsequently the resurrection of her child (IV Kings, iv, 8–37). To nourish the sons of the prophets pressed by famine, Eliseus changed into wholesome food the pottage made from poisonous gourds (IV Kings, iv, 38–41). By the cure of Naaman, who was afflicted with leprosy, Eliseus, little impressed by the possessions of the Syrian general, whilst willing to free King Joram from his perplexity, principally intended to show "that there is a prophet in Israel". Naaman, at first reluctant, obeyed the Prophet, and washed seven times in the Jordan. Finding his flesh "restored like the flesh of a little child", the general was so impressed by this evidence of God's power, and by the disinterestedness of His Prophet, as to express his deep conviction that "there is no other God in all the earth, but only in Israel". (IV Kings, v, 1–19.) It is to this Christ referred when He said: "And there were many lepers in Israel in the time of Eliseus the prophet: and none of them was cleansed but Naaman the Syrian" (Luke, iv, 27). In punishing the avarice of his servant Giezi (IV Kings, v, 20–27), in saving "not once nor twice" King Joram from the ambuscades planned by Benadad (IV Kings, vi, 8–12), in ordering the ancients to shut the door against the messenger of Israel's ungrateful king (IV Kings, vi, 25–32), in bewildering with a strange blindness the soldiers of the Syrian king (IV Kings, vi, 13–23), in making the iron swim to relieve from embarrassment a son of a prophet (IV Kings, vi, 1–7), in confidently predicting the sudden flight of the enemy and the consequent cessation of the famine (IV Kings, vii, 1–20), in unmasking the treachery of Hazael (IV Kings, viii, 7–15), Eliseus proved himself the Divinely appointed Prophet of the one true God, Whose knowledge and power he was privileged to share.

Mindful of the order given to Elias (III Kings, xix, 16), Eliseus delegated a son of one of the prophets to quietly anoint Jehu King of Israel, and to commission him to cut off the house of Achab (IV Kings, ix, 1–10). The death of Joram, pierced by an arrow from Jehu's bow, the ignominious end of Jezabel, the slaughter of Achab's seventy sons, proved how faithfully executed was the Divine command (IV Kings, ix, 11—x, 30). After predicting to Joas his victory over the Syrians at Aphec, as well as three other subsequent victories, ever bold before kings, ever kindly towards the lowly, "Eliseus died, and they buried him" (IV Kings, xiii, 14–20). The very touch of his corpse served to resuscitate a dead man (IV Kings, xiii, 20–21). "In his life he did great wonders, and in death he wrought miracles" (Ecclus., xlviii, 15).

MANGENOT in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible* (Paris, 1898), s. v. *Elisée;* STRACHAN in HAST., *Dict. of the Bible* (New York, 1898); FARRAR, *Books of Kings* (London, 1894); MEIGNAN, *Les Prophètes d' Israël* (Paris, 1892).

DANIEL P. DUFFY.

Elisha. See ELISEUS.

Elishé, a famous Armenian historian of the fifth century, place and date of birth unknown, d. 480. Some identify him with Elishé, Bishop of Amaduni, who took part in the Synod of Artashat (449). According to a different and more common tradition, he had been in his younger days a companion, as soldier or secretary, of the Armenian general Vartan, during the war of religious independence (449–451) against the Persian King, Yezdigerd II. Later he became a hermit and retired to the mountains, south of Lake Van, where he died. All ancient authorities speak of him as "vartabed" or "doctor". His most famous work is the "History of Vartan and of the wars of the Armenians [written] at the request of David the Mamigonian", in which he recounts the heroic struggle of the Armenians in union with the Iberians and the Albanians, for their common faith, against the Persians (449–451). It is considered one of the masterpieces of ancient Armenian literature and is almost entirely free from Greek words and expressions. A good edition of it was published at Venice (1826) by the Mechitarists of San Lazaro. One of the manuscripts on which it is based purports to be a faithful copy of another manuscript dated 616. The text of that edition was further improved in subsequent editions at the same place (1828, 1838, 1859, and 1864). Among other editions of value may be mentioned those of Theodosia (Crimea), 1861, and of Jerusalem, 1865. There is an English, but unfinished, translation by C. F. Neumann (London, 1830); one in Italian by G. Cappelletti (Venice, 1840); and one in French by V. Langlois in his "Collection des Historiens anciens et modernes de l'Arménie" (Paris, 1869), II, 177 sqq. In addition to the seven chapters mentioned by Elishé himself in his introductory remarks, all the editions contain an eighth chapter referring to the so-called Leontian martyrs (454) and others. The genuineness of that chapter has been called in question. It has been also remarked that in all manuscripts the fifth chapter is missing, while in the editions the original sixth chapter is cut in two so as to make up for the missing chapter. On the first point see Langlois, op. cit., II, p. 180; on the second see C. F. Neumann, "Versuch einer Geschichte der armenischen Literatur, nach den Werken der Mechitaristen frei gearbeitet" (Leipzig, 1836), pp. 64 sqq. See also Ter-Minassiantz, "Die armenische Kirche in ihren Beziehungen zu der syrischen Kirche" (Leipzig, 1904), p. 37. Elishé is also the author of a commentary on Joshua and Judges, an explanation of the Our Father, a letter to the Armenian monks, etc., all found in the Venice editions of the "History of Vartan".

FINCK, *Geschichte der armenischen Litteratur* in *Geschichte der christlichen Litteraturen des Orients* (Leipzig, 1907), 97 sqq.; BARDENHEWER, *Patrology*, tr. SHAHAN (Freiburg im Br., St. Louis, 1908), 594.

H. HYVERNAT.

Elizabeth (God is an oath—Ex., vi, 23), Zachary's wife and John the Baptist's mother, was "of the daughters of Aaron" (Luke, i, 5), and, at the same time, Mary's kinswoman (Luke, i, 36), although what their actual relationship was, is unknown. St.

Hippolytus (in Niceph. Call., Hist. Eccles., II, iii) explains that Sobe and Anna their mothers were sisters, and that Sobe had married a "son of Levi". Whether this indication, probably gathered from some apocryphal writings, and later on adopted by the compilers of the Greek Menologium, is correct, cannot be ascertained. Elizabeth, like Zachary, was "just before God, walking in all the commandments and justifications of the Lord without blame" (Luke, i, 6). She had been deprived, however, of the blessings of motherhood until, at an advanced age, a son was promised her by the Angel Gabriel (Luke, i, 8–20). When, five months later, Elizabeth was visited in her home by the Virgin Mary, not only was her son sanctified in her womb, but she herself was enlightened from on high to salute her cousin as "the mother of my Lord" (Luke, i, 43). According to some modern critics, we should even attribute to her the canticle "Magnificat". After the birth and circumcision of John the Baptist, the Gospels do not mention Elizabeth any more. Her feast is celebrated on 8 September by the Greeks, and 5 November in the Latin Church.

VIGOUROUX, *Dict. de la Bible* (Paris, 1898), s. v.; CALMET, *Dict. de la Bible; Real ency. prot. Theol.* (1903), XII, 71 sqq.; BURN in *Dict. of Christ and the Gospels* (New York, 1908), s. v. *Magnificat*, II, 101–103; BARDENHEWER, *Biblische Studien* (1901), VI, 187.

CHARLES L. SOUVAY

THE VISITATION
Titian, Royal Academy, Venice

Elizabeth, SISTERS OF SAINT, generally styled "Grey Nuns". They sprang from an association of young ladies established by Dorothea Klara Wolff, in connexion with the sisters, Mathilde and Maria Merkert, and Franziska Werner, 1842, in Neisse (Prussia), to tend in their own homes, without compensation, helpless sick persons who could not or would not be received into the hospitals. The members purposed to support the needy through the labour of their own hands. Without adopting any definite rule, they led a community life and wore a common dress, a brown woollen habit with a grey bonnet. For this reason they were soon called by the people the "Grey Nuns". As their work was soon recognized and praised everywhere, and as new members continually applied for admission, their spiritual advisers sought to give the association some sort of religious organization. They endeavoured, wherever possible, to affiliate it with already established confraternities having similar purposes. But their foremost desire was to educate the members for the care of the sick in hospitals. Great difficulties arose, and the attempt failed, principally through the resistance of the foundresses, who did not wish to abandon their original plan of itinerant nursing. Thus the association which had justified such bright hopes was dissolved, and many of the newly admitted members joined the Sisters of St. Charles Borromeo, while the foundresses left the novitiate which they had already entered. Klara Wolff and Mathilde Merkert died shortly after, in the service of charity. The other two began their work anew in 1850 and placed it under the especial patronage of St. Elizabeth. They speedily gained the sympathy of the sick of all classes and creeds, and also that of the physicians. New candidates applied for admission, and the sisters were soon able to extend the sphere of their activity beyond Neisse. Of especial importance was the foundation made at Breslau, where the work of the sisters came under the direct observation of the episcopal authorities. Soon after, 4 Sept., 1859, Prince-Bishop Heinrich Förster was prevailed upon by the favourable reports and testimonials to grant the association ecclesiastical approbation. As such a recognition presupposed a solid religious organization, a novitiate was established according to the statutes submitted. In the following year the twenty-four eldest sisters made the three religious vows. State recognition, with the grant of a corporation charter, was obtained by the confraternity 25 May, 1864, under the title, "Catholic Charitable Institute of St. Elizabeth", through the mediation of the Prussian Crown-Prince Frederick William, subsequent Emperor of Germany, who had observed the beneficent activity of the sisters on the battle-fields of Denmark. The approbation of the Holy See was granted for the congregation on 26 Jan., 1887, and for its constitutions on 26 April, 1898. The congregation has spread to Norway, Sweden, and Italy, and has (1908), dependent on the mother-house at Breslau, 305 filial houses, with 2565 sisters and about 100 postulants.

HEIMBUCHER, *Orden und Kongregationen* (Paderborn, 1908), III, 389; JUNGNITZ, *Die Kongr. der grauen Schwestern* (Breslau, 1892); KÖNIG in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Elisabetherinnen.*

Elizabethans. See THIRD ORDER OF ST. FRANCIS.

Elizabeth Associations (*Elisabethenvereine*), charitable associations of women in Germany which aim for the love of Christ to minister to the bodily and spiritual sufferings of the sick poor and of neglected children. On 10 December, 1842, eight ladies of Munich formed a society, of which the Princess Leopoldine von Löwenstein was the head, for the purpose of visiting and aiding the sick poor in their homes. In 1851 it was made a religious congregation to which many indulgences were granted by the Holy Father. In order to carry on better the visiting of the sick the first branch or conference of the association was founded in 1870. According to its statutes the members are divided into two classes: associate members,

or those who aid the organization by means of annual contributions, and active members who, besides contributing of their means, also visit the sick poor and perform other duties, as those of administration, at the direction of the president of the society. The branches are merely means of carrying on the affairs of the main society with which they are closely affiliated, but they are independent in administration. The Elizabeth Association of Munich, according to the financial report covering the year 1907, has 157 active and 3686 associate members; the receipts were 129.559.06 marks ($32,339.76), and disbursements, 123,422.77 marks ($30,855.69). During the year 1907 4345 poor persons were assisted, 195 children cared for in asylums and nurseries, and 18 old people were provided for in asylums and infirmaries.

Other Elizabeth Associations, although with some differences of organization, were formed on the model of that of Munich at Barmen and Trier in 1843, Cologne in 1848, etc. These societies are now found chiefly in the following sections of Germany: Bavaria, 36 societies, 24 of these being in the Palatinate; Diocese of Cologne, 110 societies with 1200 members, about 7000 contributors, and a total income of nearly 150,000 marks, families assisted 3500; Diocese of Paderborn, 120 societies with over 16,000 members and contributors, and an income of 175,000 marks, families assisted 3600. There are also Elizabeth Associations in the Dioceses of Freiburg, Münster, Trier, Limburg, Hildesheim, and the Vicariate Apostolic of Saxony; in the Diocese of Breslau, instead of Elizabeth Associations, there are about 130 women's conferences of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul. In Germany the Elizabeth Associations number altogether some 550 branches or conferences which aid annually 10,000 to 12,000 families.

MS. history of the Elizabeth Association of Munich; by-laws, annual and financial reports of the different associations, Munich, Freiburg, Cologne, etc.; *Regeln des Vereins von der hl. Elisabeth* (Cologne, 1900); *Regeln und Gebete des Vereins der hl. Elisabeth für die Diözese Paderborn* (Paderborn, 1903); short sketch of the associations in PLATTNER, *Die heilige Elisabeth von Thüringen* (München-Gladbach, 1907); statistics in KROSE, *Kirch. Handbuch, 1907–08* (Freiburg in Baden, 1908), 224–25.

GREGOR REINHOLD.

Elizabeth of Hungary, SAINT, also called SAINT ELIZABETH OF THURINGIA, b. in Hungary, probably at Pressburg, 1207; d. at Marburg, Hesse, 17 November (not 19 November), 1231. She was a daughter of King Andrew II of Hungary (1205–35) and his wife Gertrude, a member of the family of the Counts of Andechs-Meran; Elizabeth's brother succeeded his father on the throne of Hungary as Bela IV; the sister of her mother, Gertrude, was St. Hedwig, wife of Duke Heinrich I, the Bearded, of Silesia, while another saint, St. Elizabeth (Isabel) of Portugal (d. 1336), the wife of the tyrannical King Diniz of that country, was her great-niece. In 1211 a formal embassy was sent by Landgrave Hermann I of Thuringia to Hungary to arrange, as was customary in that age, a marriage between his eldest son Hermann and Elizabeth, who was then four years old. This plan of a marriage was the result of political considerations and was intended to be the ratification of a great alliance which in the political schemes of the time it was sought to form against the German Emperor Otto IV, a member of the house of Guelph, who had quarrelled with the Church. Not long after this the little girl was taken to the Thuringian court to be brought up with her future husband and, in the course of time, to be betrothed to him. The court of Thuringia was at this period famous for its magnificence. Its centre was the stately castle of the Wartburg, splendidly placed on a hill in the Thuringian Forest near Eisenach, where the Landgrave Hermann lived surrounded by poets and minnesingers, to whom he was a generous patron. Notwithstanding the turbulence and purely secular life of the court and the pomp of her surroundings, the little girl grew up a very religious child with an evident inclination to prayer and pious observances and small acts of self-mortification. These religious impulses were undoubtedly strengthened by the sorrowful experiences of her life. In 1213 Elizabeth's mother, Gertrude, was murdered by Hungarian nobles, probably out of hatred of the Germans. On 31 December, 1216, the oldest son of the landgrave, Hermann, whom Elizabeth was to marry, died; after this she was betrothed to Ludwig, the second son. It was probably in these years that Elizabeth had to suffer the hostility of the more frivolous members of the Thuringian court, to whom the contemplative and pious child was a constant rebuke. Ludwig, however, must have soon come to her protection against any ill-treatment. The legend that arose later is incorrect in making Elizabeth's mother-in-law, the Landgravine Sophia, a member of the reigning family of Bavaria, the leader of this court party. On the contrary, Sophia was a very religious and charitable woman and a kindly mother to the little Elizabeth. The political plans of the old Landgrave Hermann involved him in great difficulties and reverses; he was excommunicated, lost his mind towards the end of his life, and died, 25 April, 1217, unreconciled with the Church. He was succeeded by his son Ludwig IV, who, in 1221, was also made regent of Meissen and the East Mark. The same year (1221) Ludwig and Elizabeth were married, the groom being twenty-one years old and the bride fourteen. The marriage was in every regard a happy and exemplary one, and the couple were devotedly attached to each other. Ludwig proved himself worthy of his wife. He gave his protection to her acts of charity, penance, and her vigils and often held Elizabeth's hands as she knelt praying at night beside his bed. He was also a capable ruler and brave solider. The Germans call him St. Ludwig, an appellation given to him as one of the best men of his age and the pious husband of St. Elizabeth. They had three children: Hermann II (1222–41), who died young; Sophia (1224–84), who married Henry II, Duke of Brabant, and was the ancestress of the Landgraves of Hesse, as in the war of the Thuringian succession she won Hesse for her son Heinrich I, called the Child; Gertrude (1227–97), Elizabeth's third child, was born several weeks after the death of her father; in after-life she became abbess of the convent of Aldenburg near Wetzlar.

Shortly after their marriage Elizabeth and Ludwig made a journey to Hungary; Ludwig was often after this employed by the Emperor Frederick II, to whom he was much attached, in the affairs of the empire. In the spring of 1226, when floods, famine, and the pest wrought havoc in Thuringia, Ludwig was in Italy attending the Diet at Cremona on behalf of the emperor and the empire. Under these circumstances Elizabeth assumed control of affairs, distributed alms in all parts of the territory of her husband, giving even state robes and ornaments to the poor. In order to care personally for the unfortunate she built below the Wartburg a hospital with twenty-eight beds and visited the inmates daily to attend to their wants; at the same time she aided nine hundred poor daily. It is this period of her life that has preserved Elizabeth's fame to posterity as the gentle and charitable châtelaine of the Wartburg. Ludwig on his return confirmed all she had done. The next year (1227) he started with the Emperor Frederick II on a crusade to Palestine but died, 11 September of the same year at Otranto, from the pest. The news did not reach Elizabeth until October, just after she had given birth to her third child. On hearing the tidings Elizabeth, who was only twenty years old, cried out: "The world with all its joys is now dead to me."

The fact that in 1221 the followers of St. Francis of Assisi (d. 1226) made their first permanent settlement in Germany was one of great importance in the later

career of Elizabeth. Brother Rodeger, one of the first Germans whom the provincial for Germany, Cæsarius of Speier, received into the order, was for a time the spiritual instructor of Elizabeth at the Wartburg; in his teachings he unfolded to her the ideals of St. Francis, and these strongly appealed to her. With the aid of Elizabeth the Franciscans in 1225 founded a monastery in Eisenach; Brother Rodeger, as his fellow-companion in the order, Jordanus, reports, instructed Elizabeth, to observe, according to her state of life, chastity, humility, patience, the exercise of prayer, and charity. Her position prevented the attainment of the other ideal of St. Francis, voluntary and complete poverty. Various remarks of Elizabeth to her female attendants make it clear how ardently she desired the life of poverty. After a while the post Brother Rodeger had filled was assumed by Master Conrad of Marburg, who belonged to no order, but was a very ascetic and, it must be acknowledged, a somewhat rough and very severe man. He was well known as a preacher of the crusade and also as an inquisitor or judge in cases of heresy. On account of the latter activity he has been more severely judged than is just; at the present day, however, the estimate of him is a fairer one. Pope Gregory IX, who wrote at times to Elizabeth, recommended her himself to the God-fearing preacher. Conrad treated Elizabeth with inexorable severity, even using corporal means of correction; nevertheless, he brought her with a firm hand by the road of self-mortification to sanctity, and after her death was very active in her canonization. Although he forbade her to follow St. Francis in complete poverty as a beggar, yet, on the other hand, by the command to keep her dower she was enabled to perform works of charity and tenderness.

Up to 1888 it was believed, on account of the testimony of one of Elizabeth's servants in the process of canonization, that Elizabeth was driven from the Wartburg in the winter of 1227 by her brother-in-law, Heinrich Raspe, who acted as regent for her son, then only five years old. About 1888 various investigators (Börner, Mielke, Wenck, E. Michael, etc.) asserted that Elizabeth left the Wartburg voluntarily, the only compulsion being a moral one. She was not able at the castle to follow Conrad's command to eat only food obtained in a way that was certainly right and proper. Lately, however, Huyskens (1907) tried to prove that Elizabeth was driven from the castle at Marburg in Hesse, which was hers by dower right. Consequently, the Te Deum that she directed the Franciscans to sing on the night of her expulsion would have been sung in the Franciscan monastery at Marburg. Accompanied by two female attendants, Elizabeth left the castle that stands on a height commanding Marburg. The next day her children were brought to her, but they were soon taken elsewhere to be cared for. Elizabeth's aunt, Matilda, Abbess of the Benedictine nunnery of Kitzingen near Würzburg, took charge of the unfortunate landgravine and sent her to her uncle Eckbert, Bishop of Bamberg. The bishop, however, was intent on arranging another marriage for her, although during the lifetime of her husband Elizabeth had made a vow of continence in case of his death; the same vow had also been taken by her attendants. While Elizabeth was maintaining her position against her uncle the remains of her husband were brought to Bamberg by his faithful followers who had carried them from Italy. Weeping bitterly, she buried the body in the family vault of the landgraves of Thuringia in the monastery of Reinhardsbrunn. With the aid of Conrad she now received the value of her dower in money, namely two thousand marks; of this sum she divided five hundred marks in one day among the poor. On Good Friday, 1228, in the Franciscan house at Eisenach Elizabeth formally renounced the world; then going to Master Conrad at Marburg, she and her maids received from him the dress of the Third Order of St. Francis, thus being among the first tertiaries of Germany. In the summer of 1228 she built the Franciscan hospital at Marburg and on its completion devoted herself entirely to the care of the sick, especially to those afflicted with the most loathsome diseases. Conrad of Marburg still imposed many self-mortifications and spiritual renunciations, while at the same time he even took from Elizabeth her devoted domestics. Constant in her devotion to God, Elizabeth's strength was consumed by her charitable labours, and she passed away at the age of twenty-four, a time when life to most human beings is just opening.

Very soon after the death of Elizabeth miracles began to be worked at her grave in the church of the hospital, especially miracles of healing. Master Conrad showed great zeal in advancing the process of canonization. By papal command three examinations were held of those who had been healed: namely, in August, 1232, January, 1233, and January, 1235. Before the process reached its end, however, Conrad was murdered, 30 July, 1233. But the Teutonic Knights in 1233 founded a house at Marburg, and in November, 1234, Conrad, Landgrave of Thuringia, the brother-in-law of Elizabeth, entered the order. At Pentecost (28 May) of the year 1235, the solemn ceremony of canonization of the "greatest woman of the German Middle Ages" was celebrated by Gregory IX at Perugia, Landgrave Conrad being present. In August of the same year (1235) the corner-stone of the beautiful Gothic church of St. Elizabeth was laid at Marburg; on 1 May, 1236, Emperor Frederick II attended the taking-up of the body of the saint; in 1249 the remains were placed in the choir of the church of St. Elizabeth, which was not consecrated until 1283. Pilgrimages to the grave soon increased to such importance that at times they could be compared to those to the shrine of Santiago de Compostela. In 1539 Philip the Magnanimous, Landgrave of Hesse, who had become a Protestant, put an end to the pilgrimages by unjustifiable interference with the church that belonged to the Teutonic Order and by forcibly removing the relics and all that was sacred to Elizabeth. Nevertheless, the entire German people still honour the "dear St. Elizabeth" as she is called; in 1907 a new impulse was given to her veneration in Germany and Austria by the celebration of the seven hundredth anniversary of her birth. St. Elizabeth is generally represented as a princess graciously giving alms to the wretched poor or as holding roses in her lap; in the latter case she is portrayed either alone or as surprised by her husband, who, according to a legend, which is, however, related of other saints as well, met her unexpectedly as she went secretly on an errand of mercy, and, so the story runs, the bread she was trying to conceal was suddenly turned into roses.

The original materials for the life of St. Elizabeth are to be found in the letters sent by CONRAD OF MARBURG to Pope Gregory IX (1232) and in the testimony of her four female attendants (*Libellus de dictis quatuor ancillarum*) taken by the third papal commission (January, 1235). The best edition of the testimony is to be found in HUYSKENS, *Quellenstudien zur Geschichte der hl. Elisabeth, Landgräfin von Thüringen* (Marburg, 1908), 110–40. Pp. 1–150 of these *Quellenstudien* were first published in *Historisches Jahrbuch* of the Görres Society (Munich, 1907), XXVIII, 499–528, 729–848; previously the *Libellus*, ed. MENCKEN in *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum* (Leipzig, 1728–30), II, 2007–34; *Epistula Conradi* in HUYSKENS, *Quellenstudien*, 155–60, and in WYSS, *Hessisches Urkundenbuch*. I, *Urkundenbuch der Deutschordens Ballei Hessen* (Leipzig, 1879), 31–35, in the *Publikationen aus den preussischen Staatsarchiven*, III, formerly issued in ALLATIUS, Σύμμικτα, ed. NIHUSIUS (Cologne, 1653), 269 sqq. For bibliography of these and other sources see DOBENECKER, *Regesta diplomatica necnon epistolaria historiæ Thuringiæ*, I–III (Jena, 1896–1904), III, 280 sqq.; for the Acts of the process of canonization see HUYSKENS, *Quellenstudien*, 110–268; *Vita S. Elisabethæ des Cæsarius von Heisterbach O. Cist.* (1236), ed. HUYSKENS, in *Annalen des historischen Vereins für den Niederrhein* (Cologne, 1908), Pt. LXXXV; the hagiography of St. Elizabeth was greatly influenced by DIETRICH OF APOLDA, *Vita S. Elisabeth* (written 1289–97), published in CANISIUS, *Antiquæ lectionis* (Ingolstadt, 1605), V, Pt. II, 147–217, and in BASNAGE, *Thesaurus Monumentorum Ecclesiasticorum* (Amsterdam, 1723), IV, 115–152. For other

ST. ELIZABETH OF HUNGARY—SIMONE MARTINI
CHURCH OF S. FRANCESCO. ASSISI

CHURCH OF ST. ELIZABETH, MARBURG
XIII CENTURY, GOTHIC

SHRINE AND SARCOPHAGUS OF ST. ELIZABETH
CHURCH OF ST. ELIZABETH, MARBURG

sources, earlier bibliography, and numerous editions of her life see WALTHER, *Literarisches Handbuch für Geschichte und Landeskunde von Hessen* (Darmstadt, 1841), 35 sqq., Supp. II, 21 sqq.; POTTHAST, *Bibliotheca historica medii ævi* (2nd ed., Berlin, 1896), II, 1284–87; *Bibliotheca Hagiographica latina* (Brussels, 1898–99), I, 373–77. Later investigations: BÖRNER, *Zur Kritik der Quellen für die Geschichte der hl. Elisabeth* in *Neues Archiv. der Gesellschaft für ält. deutsche Gesch.* (Hanover, 1888), XIII, 433–515; MIELKE, *Zur Biographie der hl. Elisabeth* (Rostock, 1888); IDEM, *Die hl. Elisabeth* (Hamburg, 1891); WENCK, *Die hl. Elisabeth* in SYBEL, *Historische Zeitschrift*, new series, XXXIII (Munich and Berlin, 1892), (LXIX), 209–44; IDEM in *Die Wartburg* (Berlin, 1907), 181–210, 699–71; IDEM in *Hochland* (Kempten, 1907), 129–47, where an autotype facsimile of a letter of Gregory IX to Elizabeth is given; IDEM, *Die heilige Elisabeth* (Tübingen, 1908); MICHAEL, *Zur Geschichte der hl. Elisabeth* in *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* (Innsbruck, 1898), XXII, 565–83; IDEM, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes* (Freiburg im Br., 1899), II, 205–55; LEMMENS, *Zur Biographie der hl. Elisabeth* in *Mitteilungen des historischen Vereins der Diözese Fulda*, IV (Fulda, 1901), 1–24; HUYSKENS in *Historisch-politische Blätter* (Munich, 1907), CXL, 725–45, 810–22; ZURBONSEN, *Die hl. Elisabeth von Thüringen in der neueren Forschung* in *Frankfurter zeitgemässe Broschüren* (Hamm, 1907); SAUBIN, *Sainte Elisabeth de Hongrie* (Paris, 1902); HORN, *Sainte Elisabeth de Hongrie* (Paris, 1905). Protestant biographies: JUSTI, *Elisabeth die heilige* (Zurich, 1797, Marburg, 1835); VILMAR, *Die hl. Elisabeth* (Gütersloh, 1895); BÜCKING, *Leben der hl. Elisabeth* (Marburg, 1883). See also MONTALEMBERT, *Histoire de Sainte Elisabeth de Hongrie* (Paris, 1836), often reprinted, German tr. STÄDTLER (1863, revised ed., 1888), *Chronicle of the Life of Elizabeth of Hungary* (London, 1839); STOLZ, *Die hl. Elisabeth, ein Buch für Christen* (Freiburg im Br., 1865); WENCK in *Zeitschrift des Vereins für hessische Geschichte und Landeskunde*, XLI (Cassel, 1907), 313 sqq.; BIHL in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* (Quaracchi, 1908), I, 191 sqq.; LEMMENS, *Zum Rosenwunder der hl. Elisabeth von Thüringen* in *Katholik* (Mainz, 1902), I, 381–84; ZURBONSEN, *ibid.* (1899), II, 481–90; WENCK in *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ält. d. Gesch.*, XXXIV (Hanover, 1909), 465 sqq.; HENNIGES, *Vita S. Elisabeth* in *Archiv. Fran. Hist.* (Quaracchi, 1909), no. 2.

MICHAEL BIHL.

Elizabeth of Portugal, SAINT, Queen (sometimes known as THE PEACEMAKER); b. in 1271; d. in 1336. She was named after her great-aunt, the great Elizabeth of Hungary, but is known in Portuguese history by the Spanish form of that name, Isabel. The daughter of Pedro III, King of Aragon, and Constantia, grandchild of Emperor Frederick II, she was educated very piously, and led a life of strict regularity and self-denial from her childhood; she said the full Divine Office daily, fasted and did other penances, and gave up amusement. Elizabeth was married very early to Diniz (Denis), King of Portugal, a poet, and known as *Ré Lavrador*, or the "working king", from his hard work in his country's service. His morals, however, were extremely bad, and the court to which his young wife was brought consequently most corrupt. Nevertheless, Elizabeth quietly pursued the regular religious practices of her maidenhood, whilst doing her best to win her husband's affections by gentleness and extraordinary forbearance. She was devoted to the poor and sick, and gave every moment she could spare to helping them, even pressing her court ladies into their service. Naturally, such a life was a reproach to many around her, and caused ill will in some quarters. A popular story is told of how her husband's jealousy was roused by an evil-speaking page; of how he condemned the queen's supposed guilty accomplice to a cruel death; and was finally convinced of her innocence by the strange accidental substitution of her accuser for the intended victim.

Diniz does not appear to have reformed in morals till late in life, when we are told that the saint won him to repentance by her prayers and unfailing sweetness. They had two children, a daughter Constantia and a son Affonso. The latter so greatly resented the favours shown to the king's illegitimate sons that he rebelled, and in 1323 war was declared between him and his father. St. Elizabeth, however, rode in person between the opposing armies, and so reconciled her husband and son. Diniz died in 1325, his son succeeding him as Affonso IV. St. Elizabeth then retired to a convent of Poor Clares which she had founded at Coimbra, where she took the Franciscan Tertiary habit, wishing to devote the rest of her life to the poor and sick in obscurity. But she was called forth to act once more as peacemaker. In 1336 Affonso IV marched his troops against the King of Castile, to whom he had married his daughter Maria, and who had neglected and ill-treated her. In spite of age and weakness, the holy queen dowager insisted on hurrying to Estremoz, where the two kings' armies were drawn up. She again stopped the fighting and caused terms of peace to be arranged. But the exertion brought on her final illness; and as soon as her mission was fulfilled she died of a fever, full of heavenly joy, and exhorting her son to the love of holiness and peace. St. Elizabeth was buried at Coimbra, and miracles followed her death. She was canonized by Urban VIII in 1625, and her feast is kept on 8 July.

BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, 8 July, account taken from *Authentic Life* by a Franciscan friar, and from MARIANA and other Spanish historians; *Acta SS.*, 8 July; STEPHENS, *The Story of Portugal* (London and New York, 1891).

F. M. CAPES.

Elizabeth of Reute, BLESSED, of the Third Order of St. Francis, b. 25 Nov., 1386, at Waldsee in Swabia, of John and Anne Acheer; d. 25 Nov., 1420. From her earliest days "the good Betha", as she was called, showed a rare piety, and under the learned and devout Conrad Kügelin, her confessor, provost of the Canons Regular of St. Augustine at St. Peter's in Waldsee, she made extraordinary progress towards perfection. When fourteen she received the habit of the third order, but continued to live at home. Finding the life uncongenial, she secured the consent of her parents after long entreaties to leave home. Receiving no support from them she remained at the house of a pious tertiary, and the two worked at weaving; but the remuneration was small and they frequently suffered from hunger and other privations. After three years Conrad Kügelin established a house for tertiaries at Reute on the outskirts of Waldsee and Elizabeth entered it together with some others.

Here she took up her work in the kitchen, and now began her wonderful life of seclusion, fasting, and prayer. There was no *clausura* at the convent, still she led so retired a life that she was called "the Recluse." She spent many hours in a little garden, kneeling on a stone or prostrate on the ground in contemplation. So pure was her life that her confessor could scarcely find matter for absolution. She had much to suffer from attacks of the evil spirit, from suspicions of her sisters in religion, from leprosy, and other sicknesses, but in all her trials she showed a heavenly patience. This she learned from the Passion of Christ, which she made the continual subject of meditation, the object of her love, and the rule of her life. In consequence God permitted her to bear the marks of the Passion on her body; her head often showed the marks of the Thorns, and her body those of the Scourging. The stigmata appeared only now and then, but her pains never ceased. She was shown the happiness of the blessed and the souls in the state of purgation; the secrets of hearts and of the future were unveiled to her. She foretold the election of Martin V and the end of the Western Schism. Though so much favoured by Divine Providence she always preserved a great humility. After her death she was buried in the church of Reute. Her life was written by her confessor and sent to the Bishop of Constance, but it was only after 1623, when her tomb was opened by the provost of Waldsee, that her popular veneration spread in Swabia. After several miracles had been wrought through her intercession the Holy See was asked to ratify her cult. This was done 19 June, 1766, by Clement XIII. The Franciscans celebrate her feast on 25 November.

LEO, *Lives of the Saints and Blessed of the Three Orders of St. Francis* (Taunton, 1885); DUNBAR, *A Dictionary of Saintly Women* (London, 1904); DOLFINGER, *Die selige gute Betha von Reute* (Freiburg im Br., 1904).

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Elizabeth of Schönau, Saint, b. about 1129; d. 18 June, 1165.—Feast 18 June. She was born of an obscure family, entered the double-monastery of Schönau in Nassau at the age of twelve, received the Benedictine habit, made her profession in 1147, and in 1157 was made superioress of the nuns under the Abbot Hildelin. After her death she was buried in the abbey church of St. Florin. When her writings were published the name of saint was added. She was never formally canonized, but in 1584 her name was entered in the Roman Martyrology and has remained there.

Given to works of piety from her youth, much afflicted with bodily and mental suffering, a zealous observer of the Rule of St. Benedict and of the regulations of her convent, and devoted to practices of mortification, Elizabeth was favoured, from 1152, with ecstasies and visions of various kinds. These generally occurred on Sundays and Holy Days at Mass or Divine Office or after hearing or reading the lives of saints. Christ, His Blessed Mother, an angel, or the special saint of the day would appear to her and instruct her; or she would see quite realistic representations of the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension, or other scenes of the Old and New Testaments. What she saw and heard she put down on wax tablets. Her abbot, Hildelin, told her to relate these things to her brother Egbert (Eckebert), then priest at the church of Bonn. At first she hesitated, fearing lest she be deceived or be looked upon as a deceiver; but she obeyed. Egbert received the tablets and Elizabeth supplemented what she had written by oral explanations. Egbert (who became a monk of Schönau in 1155 and succeeded Hildelin as second abbot) put everything in writing, later arranged the material at leisure, and then published all under his sister's name.

Thus came into existence (1) three books of "Visions". Of these the first is written in language very simple and in unaffected style, so that it may easily pass as the work of Elizabeth. The other two are more elaborate and replete with theological terminology, so that they show more of the work of Egbert than of Elizabeth. (2) "Liber viarum Dei". This seems to be an imitation of the "Scivias" (*scire vias Domini*) of St. Hildegarde of Bingen, her friend and correspondent. It contains admonitions to all classes of society, to the clergy and laity, to the married and unmarried. Here the influence of Egbert is very plain. She utters prophetic threats of judgment against priests who are unfaithful shepherds of the flock of Christ, against the avarice and wordliness of the monks who only wear the garb of poverty and self-denial, against the vices of the laity, and against bishops and superiors delinquent in their duty; she urges all to combat earnestly the heresy of the Cathari; she declares Victor IV, the antipope supported by Frederick against Alexander III, as the one chosen of God. All of this appears in Egbert's own writings. (3) The revelation on the martyrdom of St. Ursula and her companions. This is full of fantastic exaggerations and anachronisms, but has become the foundation of the subsequent Ursula legends. There is a great diversity of opinion in regard to her revelations. The Church has never passed sentence upon them nor even examined them. Elizabeth herself was convinced of their supernatural character, as she states in a letter to Hildegarde; her brother held the same opinion; Trithemius considers them genuine; Eusebius Amort (De revelationibus visionibus et apparitionibus privatis regulæ tutæ, etc., Augsburg, 1744) holds them to be nothing more than what Elizabeth's own imagination could produce, or illusions of the devil, since in some things they disagree with history and with other revelations (Acta SS., Oct., IX, 81). A complete edition of her writings was made by F. W. E. Roth (Brünn, 1884); translations appeared in Italian (Venice, 1859), French (Tournai, 1864), and in Icelandic (1226–1254).

Butler, *Lives of the Saints;* Streber in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; Hauck, *Kirchengesch. Deutschl.*, IV, 244 sqq.; Preger, *Deutsche Mystik*, I, 37; *Acta SS.*, June, IV, 499; Roth, *Das Gebetbuch der Elisabeth von Schönau.*

Francis Mershman.

Ellis, Philip Michael, first Vicar Apostolic of the Western District, England, subsequently Bishop of Segni, Italy, b. in 1652; d. 16 Nov., 1726. He was the son of the Rev. John Ellis, Rector of Waddesdon, Buckinghamshire, a descendant of the Ellis family of Kiddall Hall, Yorkshire, and Susannah Welbore. Of six brothers, John, the eldest, became Under-Secretary of State to William III; William, a Jacobite Protestant, was Secretary of State to James II in exile; Philip became a Benedictine monk and Catholic bishop; Welbore became Protestant Bishop of Kildare and afterwards of Meath, Ireland; Samuel was Marshal of King's Bench; and Charles an Anglican clergyman. Philip, while still a Westminster schoolboy, was converted to the Catholic Faith, and when eighteen years old went to St. Gregory's, Douai, where he was professed, taking the name of Michael in religion (30 Nov., 1670). After ordination he returned in 1685 to the English mission where he became one of the royal chaplains. In 1688 he was appointed Vicar Apostolic of the newly created Western District and was consecrated by Mgr. d'Adda, the papal nuncio (6 May). At the revolution in 1688 he was imprisoned, but being soon liberated he retired to Saint-Germain and afterwards to Rome. In 1696 he was named assistant prelate at the pontifical throne; and in Rome his knowledge of English affairs made him so useful that his repeated petitions for leave to return to his vicariate were refused. In 1704 he resigned the vicariate, and in 1708 was made Bishop of Segni, being enthroned on 28 Oct. His first care was to rebuild the ruined monastery of S. Chiara and open it as a diocesan seminary. This he enriched with many gifts and a large legacy. A curious survival of his English title survives in an inscription at Segni to "Ph. M. Mylord Ellis". Eleven sermons preached in 1685 and 1686 before James II, Queen Mary of Modena, and Queen Henrietta Maria, were published in pamphlet form, some of which have been reprinted (London, 1741; 1772). The Acts of his synod at Segni in 1710 were also published by order of Clement XI.

Dodd, *Ch. Hist.* (Brussels, 1737–42), III, 467; Ellis, *Ellis Correspondence* (London, 1829), with portrait, letters and somewhat inaccurate biographical details; *The Rambler* (April, 1851), VII; Oliver, *Collections* (London, 1857), 294, 511; Brady, *Episcopal Succession*, etc. (Rome, 1877), III, 281; Weldon, *Chronological Notes on Eng. Benedictines* (London, 1881); Snow, *Benedictine Necrology* (London, 1883); Gillow, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.* (London, 1886), II, 161; Cooper in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (London, 1889), XVII.

Edwin Burton.

Ellwangen Abbey, the earliest Benedictine monastery established in the Duchy of Würtemberg, situated in the Diocese of Augsburg about thirty miles north-east of the town of Stuttgart. Hariolfus, Bishop of Langres, was the founder, and the date of foundation was about 764, though there are a few authorities for as early a date as 732. In later times it became a royal abbey, a privilege which seems to have been conferred in 1011 by the Emperor Henry II, and afterwards confirmed by the Emperor Charles IV, in 1347. Some authorities date the granting of this privilege as late as 1555. This cannot be correct, for it is known that the superior of Ellwangen took his seat in the Diet among the princes of the country in 1500. The Benedictine occupation of the abbey came to an end in the first half of the fifteenth century. In 1460 it was changed into a college of secular canons under the rule of a provost. Ellwangen had many men of renown connected with it: the Abbots Lindolf and Erfinan, whom Mabillon speaks of as famous authors; Abbot Gebhard began to write the life of St. Udalricus but died before completing it;

Abbot Ermenrich (c. 845), author of the life of St. Solus which may be found in the fourth volume of the "Acta Sanctorum" of Mabillon. Adalbero, a monk of this abbey, was made Bishop of Augsburg in 894. Abbot Lindebert became Archbishop of Mainz, as also did Abbot Hatto (891). St. Gebhard, Abbot of Ellwangen, became Bishop of Augsburg in 995. Abbot Milo about the middle of the tenth century was one of the visitors appointed for the visitation of the famous Abbey of St. Gall. Nothing is known of the property connected with Ellwangen during the period of its Benedictine history, but in the eighteenth century, after it had passed into the hands of the secular canons, its possessions included the court manor of Ellwangen, the manors of Taxstell, Neuler, Rothlein, Tannenburg, Wasseralfingen, Abts-Gmundt, Kockenburg near the town of Aalen, Henchlingen on the River Lein, and Lautern. Most of the ecclesiastical buildings still exist, though they are no longer used for religious purposes. Since the secularization they have been held by the State and used for state purposes.

MABILLON, *Annales O.S.B.* (Paris, 1704), II, 152, 204; III, 292; IV, 97; MABILLON, *Acta SS.* (Venice, 1734), IV; KUEN, *Collectio Scriptorum* (Ulm, 1755), 50; BUSCHING, *A new system of Geography* (London, 1752), V, 169; YEPES, *Coronica General de la Orden de S. Benito* (1609), index; BUSH in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.

G. E. HIND.

Elmo, SAINT. See PETER GONZALEZ, SAINT.

Elne, DIOCESE OF. See PERPIGNAN.

Elne, SYNOD OF. See PERPIGNAN.

Elohim (Sept., *θεός*; Vulg., *Deus*) is the common name for God. It is a plural form, but "the usage of the language gives no support to the supposition that we have in the plural form *'Ēlōhîm*, as applied to the God of Israel, the remains of an early polytheism, or at least a combination with the higher spiritual beings" (Kautzsch). Grammarians call it a plural of majesty or of rank, or of abstraction, or of magnitude (Gesenius, Grammatik, 27th ed., nn. 124 g, 132 h). The Ethiopic plural *amlāk* has become a proper name of God. Hoffmann has pointed out an analogous plural *ēlīm* in the Phœnician inscriptions (Ueber einige phön. Inschr., 1889, pp. 17 sqq.), and Barton has shown that in the tablets from El-Amarna the plural form *ilani* replaces the singular more than forty times (Proceedings of the American Oriental Society, 21–23 April, 1892, pp. cxcvi–cxcix).

Etymology.—*'Ēlōhîm* has been explained as a plural form of *'Ēlôáḥ* or as a plural derivative of *'Ēl*. Those who adhere to the former explanation do not agree as to the derivation of *'Ēlôáḥ*. There is no such verbal stem as *'āláḥ* in Hebrew; but the Arabist Fleischer, Franz Delitzsch, and others appeal to the Arabic *'aliha*, meaning "to be filled with dread", "anxiously to seek refuge", so that *'ilāh* (*'ĕlôáh*) would mean in the first place "dread", then the object of dread. Gen., xxxi, 42, 53, where God is called "the fear of Isaac", Is., viii, 13, and Ps. lxxv, 12, appear to support this view. But the fact that *'aliha* is probably not an independent verbal stem but only a denominative from *'ilāh*, signifying originally "possessed of God" (cf. *ἐνθουσιάζειν*, *δαιμονᾶν*) renders the explanation more than precarious. There is no more probability in the contention of Ewald, Dillmann, and others that the verbal stem, *'āláḥ* means "to be mighty", and is to be regarded as a by-form of the stem *'ālāḥ*; that, therefore, *'Ēlôáḥ* grows out of *'āláḥ* as *'Ēl* springs from *'ālāḥ*. Baethgen (Beiträge, 297) has pointed out that of the fifty-seven occurrences of *'Ēlôáḥ* forty-one belong to the Book of Job, and the others to late texts or poetic passages. Hence he agrees with Buhl in maintaining that the singular form *'Ēlôáḥ* came into existence only after the plural form *'Ēlōhîm* had been long in common use; in this case, a singular was supplied for its pre-existent plural. But even admitting *'Ĕlōhîm* to be the prior form, its etymology has not thus far been satisfactorily explained. The ancient Jewish and the early ecclesiastical writers agree with many modern scholars in deriving *'Ēlōhîm* from *'Ēl*, but there is a great difference of opinion as to the method of derivation. Nestle (Theol. Stud. aus Würt., 1882, pp. 243 sqq.) supposes that the plural has arisen by the insertion of an artificial *h*, like the Hebrew *'ămāhôth* (maidens) from *'āmāh*. Buhl (Gesenius' Hebräisches Handwörterbuch, 12th ed., 1895, pp. 41 sq.) considers *'Ēlōhîm* as a sort of augmentative form of *'Ēl;* but in spite of their disagreement as to the method of derivation, these writers are one in supposing that in early Hebrew the singular of the word signifying God was *'Ēl*, and its plural form *'Ēlōhîm;* and that only more recent times coined the singular form *'Ēlôáḥ*, thus giving *'Ēlōhîm* a grammatically correct correspondent. Lagrange, however, maintains that *'Ēlōhîm* and *'Ēlôáḥ* are derived collaterally and independently from *'Ēl*.

The Use of the Word.—The Hebrews had three common names for God, *'Ēl*, *'Ēlōhîm*, and *'Ēlôáḥ;* besides, they had the proper name *Yahweh*. Nestle is authority for the statement that *Yahweh* occurs about six thousand times in the Old Testament, while all the common names of God taken together do not occur half as often. The name *'Ēlōhîm* is found 2570 times; *'Ēlŏáḥ*, 57 times [41 in Job; 4 in Pss.; 4 in Dan.; 2 in Hab.; 2 in Canticle of Moses (Deut., xxxii); 1 in Prov.; 1 in Is.; 1 in Par.; 1 in Neh. (II Esd.)]; *'Ēl*, 226 times (*'Ēlîm*, 9 times). Lagrange (Etudes sur les religions sémitiques, Paris, 1905, p. 71) infers from Gen., xlvi, 3 (the most mighty God of thy father), Ex., vi, 3 (by the name of God Almighty), and from the fact that *'Ēl* replaces *Yah* in proper names, the conclusion that *'Ēl* was at first a proper and personal name of God. Its great age may be shown from its general occurrence among all the Semitic races, and this in its turn may be illustrated by its presence in the proper names found in Gen., iv, 18; xxv, 13; xxxvi, 43. *'Ēlōhîm* is not found among all the Semitic races; the Aramæans alone seem to have had an analogous form. It has been suggested that the name *'Ēlōhîm* must have been formed after the descendants of Sem had separated into distinct nations.

Meaning of the Word.—If *'Ĕlōhîm* be regarded as derived from *'Ēl*, its original meaning would be "the strong one" according to Wellhausen's derivation of *'Ēl* from *'ûl* (Skizzen, III, 169); or "the foremost one", according to Nöldeke's derivation of *Ēl* from *'ûl* or *'îl*, "to be in front" (Sitzungsberichte der berlinischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1880, pp. 760 sqq.; 1882, pp. 1175 sqq.); or "the mighty one", according to Dillmann's derivation of *'Ēl* from *'ālāh* or *'ālāy*, "to be mighty" (On Genesis, I, 1); or, finally "He after whom one strives", "who is the goal of all human aspiration and endeavour", "to whom one has recourse in distress or when one is in need of guidance", "to whom one attaches oneself closely", *coincidentibus interea bono et fine*, according to the derivation of *'Ēl* from the preposition *'ēl*, "to", advocated by La Place (cf. Lagarde, Uebersicht, etc., p. 167), Lagarde (op. cit., pp. 159 sqq.), Lagrange (Religions sémitiques, pp. 79 sqq.), and others. A discussion of the arguments which militate for and against each of the foregoing derivations would lead us too far.

If we have recourse to the use of the word *'Ēlōhîm* in the study of its meaning, we find that in its proper sense it denotes either the true God or false gods, and metaphorically it is applied to judges, angels, and kings; and even accompanies other nouns, giving them a superlative meaning. The presence of the article, the singular construction of the word, and its context show with sufficient clearness whether it must be taken in its proper or its metaphorical sense, and what is its precise meaning in each case. Kautzsch

(Encyclopædia Biblica, III, 3324, n. 2) endeavours to do away with the metaphorical sense of *'Ēlōhîm*. Instead of the rendering "judges" he suggests the translation "God", as witness of a lawsuit, as giver of decisions on points of law, or as dispenser of oracles; for the rendering "angels" he substitutes "the gods of the heathen", which, in later post-exilic times, fell to a lower rank. But this interpretation is not supported by solid proof.

According to Renan (Histoire du peuple d'Israël, I, p. 30) the Semites believed that the world is surrounded, penetrated, and governed by the *'Ēlōhîm*, myriads of active beings, analogous to the spirits of the savages, alive, but somehow inseparable from one another, not even distinguished by their proper names as the gods of the Aryans, so that they can be considered as a confused totality. Marti (Geschichte der israelitischen Religion, p. 26), too, finds in *'Ēlōhîm* a trace of the original Semitic polydemonism; he maintains that the word signified the sum of the divine beings that inhabited any given place. Baethgen (op. cit., p. 287), F. C. Baur (Symbolik und Mythologie, I, 304), and Hellmuth-Zimmermann (Elohim, Berlin, 1900) make *'Ēlōhîm* an expression of power, grandeur, and totality. Lagrange (op. cit., p. 78) urges against these views that even the Semitic races need distinct units before they have a sum, and distinct parts before they arrive at a totality. Moreover, the name *'Ēl* is prior to *'Ēlōhîm* (op. cit., p. 77 sq.), and *'Ēl* is both a proper and a common name of God. Originally it was either a proper name and has become a common name, or it was a common name and has become a proper name. In either case, *'Ēl*, and, therefore, also its derivative form *'Ēlōhîm*, must have denoted the one true God. This inference becomes clear after a little reflection. If *'Ēl* was, at first, the proper name of a false god, it could not become the common name for deity any more than *Jupiter* or *Juno* could; and if it was, at first, the common name for deity, it could become the proper name only of that God who combined in him all the attributes of deity, who was the one true God. This does not imply that all the Semitic races had from the beginning a clear concept of God's unity and Divine attributes, though all had originally the Divine name *'Ēl*.

VIGOUROUX in *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v.; KNABENBAUER, *Lexicon Biblicum* (Paris, 1907), II, 63; KAUTZSCH in *Encyclopædia Biblica* (New York, 1902), III, 3323 sq.; LAGRANGE, *Etudes sur les religions sémitiques* (Paris, 1905), 19, 71, 77 sqq.

A. J. MAAS.

Eloi (ELOY), SAINT. See ELIGIUS.

Elphege (or ALPHEGE), SAINT, b. 954; d. 1012; also called Godwine, martyred Archbishop of Canterbury, left his widowed mother and patrimony for the monastery of Deerhurst (Gloucestershire). After some years as an anchorite at Bath, he there became abbot, and (19 Oct., 984) was made Bishop of Winchester. In 994 Elphege administered confirmation to Olaf of Norway at Andover, and it is suggested that his patriotic spirit inspired the decrees of the Council of Enham. In 1006, on becoming Archbishop of Canterbury, he went to Rome for the pallium. At this period England was much harassed by the Danes, who, towards the end of September, 1011, having sacked and burned Canterbury, made Elphege a prisoner. On 19 April, 1012, at Greenwich, his captors, drunk with wine, and enraged at ransom being refused, pelted Elphege with bones of oxen and stones, till one Thurm dispatched him with an axe. Elphege's body, after resting eleven years in St. Paul's (London), was translated by King Canute to Canterbury. His principal feast is kept on the 19th of April; that of his translation on the 8th of June. He is sometimes represented with an axe cleaving his skull.

Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, ed. PLUMMER (Oxford, 1892–99); THIETMAR, *Chronicle*, in *P. L.*, CXXXIX, 1384; OSBERN, *Vita S. Elphegi* in WHARTON, *Anglia Sacra*, II, 122 sqq.; *Acta SS.*, April, II, 630; *Bibl. Hag. Lat.*, 377; CHEVALIER, *Répertoire*, I, 1313; FREEMAN, *Norman Conquest*, I, v; BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, 18 April; STANTON, *Menology*, 19 April; HUNT in *Dict. Nat. Biogr.*, s. v. *Ælfheah*.

PATRICK RYAN.

Elphin (ELPHINIUM), DIOCESE OF, suffragan of Tuam, Ireland, a see founded by St. Patrick. All the known facts respecting its first bishop are recorded in two important memorials of early Irish hagiography, the "Vita Tripartita" of St. Patrick, and the so-called "Patrician Documents" in the "Book of Armagh" (q. v.). On his missionary tour through Connaught, which he entered by crossing the Shannon at Drumboilan, near Battlebridge, in the parish of Ardcarne, in 434 or 435, St. Patrick came to the territory of Corcoghlan, in which was situated the place now called Elphin. The chief of that territory, a noble Druid named Ono, of the royal Connacian race of Hy-Briuin, gave land, and afterwards his castle or fort, to St. Patrick to found a church and monastery. The place, which had hitherto been called, from its owner's name, *Emlagh-Ono*, received the designation of Elphin, which signifies "rock of the clear spring", from a large stone raised by the saint from the well opened by him in this land and placed on its margin, and the copious stream of crystal water which flowed from it and still flows through the street of Elphin. There St. Patrick built a church called through centuries *Tempull Phadruig*, i. e. Patrick's church. He established here an episcopal see, and placed over it St. Assicus as bishop, and with him left Bite, a bishop, son of the brother of Assicus, and Cipia, mother of Bite. St. Patrick also founded at Elphin an episcopal monastery or college, one of the first monasteries founded by him, and placed Assicus over it, in which office he was succeeded by Bite. Both were buried at Racoon, in Donegal, where St. Patrick built a church and a habitation for seven bishops. The "Septem episcopi de Racoon" are invoked in the Festology of Ængus the Culdee (q. v.).

THE CATHEDRAL, SLIGO

The first bishop of Elphin is described in the "Book of Armagh" as the *cerd*, i. e. the wright or goldsmith of St. Patrick; and he made chalices, patens, and metal book-covers for the newly founded churches. Following the example of their masters, the successors and spiritual children of St. Assicus founded a school of art and produced beautiful objects of Celtic workmanship in the Diocese of Elphin. Some of these remain to the present day, objects of interest to all who see them. The famous Cross of Cong (see CROSS), undoubtedly one of the finest specimens of its age in Western Europe, was (as the inscription on it and the Annals of Innisfallen testify) the work of Mailisa MacEgan, successor of St. Finian of Clooncraff near Elphin, in the County Roscommon, and was made at Roscommon under the superintendence of Domhnall, son of Flanagan O'Duffy, successor of Coman and Kieran, abbots of Roscommon and Clonmacnoise, and Bishop of Elphin. It is held that the exquisite Ardagh Chalice, which was given to Clonmacnoise by Turlough O'Conor, and was stolen thence by the Danes, was made, if not by the same artist, at least in the same school at Roscommon. The Four Masters record (1166) that the shrine of Manchan

of Maothail (Mohill) was covered by Rory O'Conor, and an embroidery of gold placed over it by him in as good style as relic was ever covered in Ireland. It is, therefore, fair to conclude that this beautiful work was also executed in the school of art founded by St. Assicus in the Diocese of Elphin. Within four miles of the present town of Elphin is Ratherroghan, the famous palace of Queen Meave and the Connaught kings; Relig-na-Righ, the Kings' Burial Place; also the well of Ogulla, or the Virgin Monument, the scene of the famous conversion and baptism of Aithnea (Eithne) and Fidelm, the daughters of Leoghari, monarch of Ireland in the time of St. Patrick. Ware states that after the union with Elphin of the minor sees of Roscommon, Ardcarne, Drumcliffe, and other bishoprics of less note, finally effected by the Synod of Kells (1152), the see was esteemed one of the richest in all Ireland, and had about seventy-nine parish churches. The Four Masters describe its cathedral as the "Great Church" in 1235, and speak of the bishop's court in 1258. It had a dean and chapter at this time, as we learn from the mandate of Innocent IV, sent from Lyons, 3 July, 1245, to the Archbishop of Tuam, notifying him that the pope had annulled the election of the Provost of Roscommon to the See of Elphin, and ordering him to appoint and consecrate Archdeacon

Ruins of Cistercian Abbey (1161)
Boyle, County Roscommon, Ireland

John, postulated by the dean Malachy, the archdeacons John and Clare, and the treasurer Gilbert. Among the early bishops was Bron of Killaspugbrone, a favoured disciple of St. Patrick. He was also the friend and adviser of St. Brigid when she dwelt in the plain of Roscommon and founded monasteries there. According to Ware, of the successors of St. Assicus in the See of Elphin he found mention of only two before the coming of the English, Domhnall O'Dubhthaigh (O'Duffy), who died in 1036, and Flanachan O'Dubhthaigh, who died in 1168. There is reference to at least two other bishops of Elphin, in 640 and 1190. From St. Assicus to 1909 the names of at least fifty-four occupants of the see are enumerated in the ecclesiastical annals and public records of Ireland and Rome. Many of them were renowned for learning, wisdom and piety. During the Reformation and subsequent persecutions, there continued in Elphin an unfailing succession of canonically appointed Catholic bishops. They were faithful dispensers of the divine mysteries, like George Brann and John Max; confessors true to the Catholic Faith and the See of Peter, through years of persecution and exile like O'Higgins and O'Crean; martyrs sealing their testimony with their blood, like O'Healy and Galvirius.

The present Diocese of Elphin includes nearly the whole of the county of Roscommon, with large portions of Sligo and Galway. In the census of 1901 the population was: Catholics, 125,743; non-Catholics, 7661. The present chapter consists of a dean, archdeacon, treasurer, chancellor, theologian, penitentiary, and four prebendaries. The parishes number 33, parish priests and curates 100. There is a convent of Dominicans at Sligo. The female orders in the diocese are: Ursulines, Sligo; Sisters of Mercy, in various places; and Franciscan Missionaries of Mary, at Loughlynn. To the convents are attached primary schools attended by 2500 girls. Three of them have also industrial schools for orphan and homeless children. The Ursulines conduct a boarding-school for young ladies. The diocesan seminary is the college of the Immaculate Conception at Sligo. The Marist and Presentation Brothers teach large schools. The cathedral of the diocese at Sligo, an early Romanesque structure, simple and massive, was erected by Most Rev. Dr. Gillooly, and consecrated in 1897. He also built St. Mary's Presbytery, and the College of the Immaculate Conception, Sligo. These, with a Temperance Hall, form a group of ecclesiastical buildings worthy of their beautiful scenic surroundings.

Bishop Gillooly was succeeded, 24 March, 1895, by the Most Rev. John Joseph Clancy, born in the parish of Riverstown, County Sligo, in 1856. He was educated at the Marist College, Sligo, and Summerhill College, Athlone, and entered Maynooth in 1876, where he spent two years on the Dunboyne Establishment. In 1883 he was appointed professor in the Diocesan College, Sligo, and in 1887 professor of English Literature and French in Maynooth College, which office he held until he was made Bishop of Elphin.

Book of Armagh (Reeves-Gwynn, facsimile edition); Ware-Harris, *Bishops and Writers of Ireland* (Dublin, 1739–46); *Annals of the Four Masters*, ed. O'Donovan (Dublin, 1856); *Annals of Ulster*, ed. Hennessy and McCarthy (Dublin, 1887 sqq.); *Annals of Loch Cé* (1014–1590), ed. Hennessy; Brady, *Episcopal Succession in England and Ireland* (Rome, 1876).

J. J. Kelly.

Elusa, a titular see of Palæstina Tertia, suffragan of Petra. This city is called Χελλούς in the Greek text of Judith, i, 9. It is also mentioned by Ptolemy, V, xv, 10 (in Idumæa), Peutinger's "Table", Stephanus Byzantius (as being formerly in Arabia, now in Palæstina Tertia), St. Jerome (In Isaiam, V, xv, 4), the pilgrim Theodosius, Antoninus of Piacenza, and Joannes Moschus (Pratum Spirituale, clxiv). In the fourth century, as is to be learned from St. Jerome's life of St. Hilarion, there was at Elusa a great temple of Aphrodite; the saint seems to have introduced Christianity there ("Vita Hilarionis" in P. G., XXIII, 41). Early in the following century a Bishop of Elusa after redeeming the son of St. Nilus, who had been carried off from Mount Sinai by the Arabs, ordained both him and his father (P. G., LXXIX, 373–93). Other bishops known are Theodulus, 431; Aretas, 451; Peter, 518; and Zenobius, 536 (Lequien, Or. christ., III, 735). Today the ruins of the city are seen at El-Khalaṣā (Khalaṣah), about nineteen miles south of Bersabee, in a large plain belonging to nomad tribes. Many inscriptions have been found there (Revue Biblique, 1905, 246–48, 253–55). In the vicinity, according to the Targums, was the desert of Sur with the well at which the angel found Agar (Gen., xvi, 7). (See Revue Biblique, 1906, 597).

The ancient See of Elusa (Eauze) in Gaul was united with that of Auch (q. v.) probably in the ninth century.

Reland, *Palæstina* (Utrecht, 1714), II, 717, 755–757; Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine* (London, 1856), I, 201-202; Palmer, *The Desert of the Exodus* (Cambridge, 1871), II, 385; Gelzer, *Georgii Cyprii descriptio orbis Romani* (Leipzig, 1890), 199.

S. Vailhé.

Elvira, Council of, held early in the fourth century at Elliberis, or Illiberis, in Spain, a city now in ruins not far from Granada. It was, so far as we know, the first council held in Spain, and was attended by nineteen bishops from all parts of the Pen-

insula. The exact year in which it was held is a matter of controversy upon which much has been written. Some copies of its Acts contain a date which corresponds with the year 324 of our reckoning; by some writers the council has accordingly been assigned to that year. Hardouin suggests 313, Mansi 309, and Hefele 305 or 306. Recent opinion (Duchesne, see below) would put the date considerably earlier, from 300 to 303, consequently previous to the persecution of Diocletian. The principal bishop attending the council was the famous Hosius of Cordova. Twenty-six priests are also recorded as sitting with the bishops. Its eighty-one canons were, however, subscribed only by the bishops. These canons, all disciplinary, throw much light on the religious and ecclesiastical life of Spanish Christians on the eve of the triumph of Christianity. They deal with marriage, baptism, idolatry, fasting, excommunication, the cemeteries, usury, vigils, frequentation of Mass, the relations of Christians with pagans, Jews, heretics, etc. In canon xxxiii we have, says Hefele (op. cit. below), the oldest positive ecclesiastical ordinance concerning the celibacy of the clergy. Canon xiii exhibits the institution of nuns (*virgines Deo sacratæ*) as long familiar to Spain. Canon xxxvi (placuit picturas in ecclesiâ esse non debere ne quod colitur et adoratur in parietibus depingatur) has often been urged against the veneration of images as practised in the Catholic Church. Binterim, De Rossi, and Hefele interpret this prohibition as directed against the use of images in over-ground churches only, lest the pagans should caricature sacred scenes and ideas; Von Funk, Turmel, and Dom Leclercq opine that the council did not pronounce as to the liceity or non-liceity of the use of images, but as an administrative measure simply forbade them, lest new and weak converts from paganism should incur thereby any danger of relapse into idolatry, or be scandalized by certain superstitious excesses in no way approved by the ecclesiastical authority. (See Von Funk in "Tübingen Quartalschrift", 1883, 270–78; Nolte in "Rev. des Sciences ecclésiastiques", 1877, 482–84; Turmel in "Rev. du clergé français", 1906, XLV, 508.) Several other canons of this council offer much interest to students of Christian archæology. (See text and commentary in Hefele-Leclercq, "Hist. des Conciles," I, 212 sqq.)

MANSI, *Coll. Conc.*, II, 1 sqq.; BARONIUS, *Annales*, ad an. 305; ROUTH, *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, III, 253; DALE, *The Synod of Elvira and Christian Life in the Fourth Century* (London, 1882); LECLERCQ, *L'Espagne chrétienne* (Paris, 1907); HARNACK, *Chronologie der altchr. Litt.*, II, 450; DUCHESNE, *Le concile d'Elvire et les flamines chrétiens* in *Mélanges Renier* (Paris, 1886); HEFELE-LECLERCQ, *Hist. des Conciles*, new French tr. (Paris, 1907), 212–64.

ARTHUR S. BARNES.

Ely (ELIA or ELYS), ANCIENT DIOCESE OF (ELIENSIS), in England. The earliest historical notice of Ely is given by Venerable Bede who writes (Hist. Eccl., IV, xix): "Ely is in the province of the East-Angles, a country of about six hundred families, in the nature of an island, enclosed either with marshes or waters, and therefore it has its name from the great abundance of eels which are taken in those marshes." This district was assigned in 649 to Etheldreda, or Audrey, daughter of Anna, King of the East Angles, as a dowry on her marriage with Tonbert of the South Girvii. After her second marriage to Egfrid, King of Northumbria, she became a nun, and in 673 returned to Ely and founded a monastery on the site of the present cathedral. As endowment she gave it her entire principality of the isle, from which subsequent Bishops of Ely derived their temporal power. St. Etheldreda died in 679, and her shrine became a place of pilgrimage. In 870 the monastery was destroyed by the Danes, having already given to the Church four sainted abbesses, Sts. Etheldreda, Sexburga, Ermenilda, and Werburga. Probably under their rule there was a community of monks as well as a convent of nuns, but when in 970 the monastery was restored by King Edgar and Bishop Ethelwold it was a foundation for monks only. For more than a century the monastery flourished, till about the year 1105 Abbot Richard suggested the creation of the See of Ely, to relieve the enormous Diocese of Lincoln. The pope's brief erecting the new bishopric was issued 21 Nov., 1108, and in Oct., 1109, the king granted his charter, the first bishop being Harvey, formerly Bishop of Bangor. The monastery church thus became one of the "conventual" cathedrals. Of this building the transepts and two bays of the nave already existed, and in 1170 the nave as it stands to-day (a complete and perfect specimen of late Norman work) was finished. As the bishops succeeded to the principality of St. Etheldreda they enjoyed palatine power and great resources. Much of their wealth they spent on their cathedral, with the result that Ely can show beautiful examples of Gothic architecture of every period, including two unique features, the unrivalled Galilee porch (1198–1215) and the central octagon (1322–1328) which rises from the whole breadth of the building and towers up until its roof forms the only Gothic dome in existence. The western tower (215 feet) was built between 1174 and 1197, and the octagon was added to it in 1400. Of the cathedral as a whole it is true that "a more vast, magnificent and beautiful display of ecclesiastical architecture and especially of the different periods of the pointed style can scarcely be conceived" (Winkles, English Cathedrals, II, 46). It is fortunate in having perfect specimens of each of the successive styles of Gothic architecture: the Early English Galilee porch, the Decorated lady-chapel (1321–1349), and the Perpendicular chantry of Bishop Alcock (c. 1500).

INTERIOR OF ELY CATHEDRAL, LOOKING WEST FROM CHOIR
Showing famous octagon and lantern

The original Catholic diocese was much smaller than the present Anglican see and consisted of Cambridgeshire alone, while even of this county a small part belonged to Norwich diocese. The bishops of Ely usually held high office in the State and the roll includes many names of famous statesmen, including eight lord chancellors (marked *) and six lord treasurers (marked †). Two bishops—John de Fontibus and Hugh Belsham—were reputed as saints, but never received formal cultus; the former was commemorated on 19 June. The following is the list of bishops:—

Harvey, 1109
Nigel, 1133†
Geoffrey Riddell, 1174
William Longchamp, 1189*
Eustace, 1198*
John de Fontibus, 1220†
Geoffrey de Burgh, 1225
Hugh Norwold, 1229
William de Kilkenny, 1255*
Hugh Belsham, 1257
John Kirkby, 1286†
William de Louth, 1290
Ralph Walpole, 1299
Robert Orford, 1302
John Keeton, 1310
John Hotham, 1316*†
Simon Montacute, 1337
Thomas de Lisle, 1345
Simon Langham, 1362*
John Barnet, 1366†

ELY CATHEDRAL

Thomas Fitz-Alan (or Arundel), 1374*
John Fordham, 1388
Philip Morgan, 1426
Vacancy (Cardinal Louis of Luxemburg, administrator), 1435
Thomas Bourchier, 1444
William Gray, 1454†
John Morton, 1479*
John Alcock, founder of Jesus College, Cambridge, 1486
Richard Redman, 1501
James Stanley, 1506
Nicholas West, 1515
Thomas Goodrich, 1533*
Thomas Thirlby, 1554–1559

Bishop Goodrich showed reforming tendencies and during his pontificate the monastery with all its dependencies was suppressed. The last Catholic bishop was Thomas Thirlby, who was one of the eleven confessor-bishops imprisoned by Elizabeth and who died at Lambeth in 1570. In the diocese there were one archdeaconry and 141 parishes. The arms of the see were: gules, three ducal crowns, or.

Liber Eliensis (one vol. only published, London, 1848); *Inquisitio Eliensis* (published by Royal Society of Lit. (London, 1876); BENTHAM, *Hist. and Antiq. of the Conventual and Cathedral Church of Ely* (Cambridge, 1771); WINKLES, *Cathedrals of England and Wales* (1860); STEWART, *Architectural History of Ely* (1868); STUBBS, *Memorials of Ely* (London, 1897); HILLS, *Handbook to the Cathedral Church of Ely* (Ely, 1852), largely rewritten and edited by Dean Stubbs (20th edition, Ely, 1898); FARVEN, *Cathedral Cities of Ely and Norwich* (introd. by Prof. Freeman); SWEETING, *Ely: the Cathedral and See* (London, 1901); GIBBONS, *Ely Episcopal Records*.

EDWIN BURTON.

Elymos. See BARJESUS.

Elzéar of Sabran, SAINT, Baron of Ansouis, Count of Ariano, b. in the castle of Saint-Jean de Robians, in Provence, 1285; d. at Paris, 27 September, 1323. After a thorough training in piety and the sciences under his uncle William of Sabran, Abbot of St. Victor at Marseilles, he acceded to the wish of Charles II of Naples and married the virtuous Delphine of the house of Glandèves. He respected her desire to live in virginity and joined the Third Order of St. Francis, vying with her in the practice of prayer, mortification, and charity towards the unfortunate. At the age of twenty he moved from Ansouis to Puy-Michel for greater solitude, and formulated for his servants rules of conduct that made his household a model of Christian virtue. On the death of his father, in 1309, he went to Italy and, after subduing by kindness his subjects who despised the French, he went to Rome at the head of an army and aided in expelling the Emperor Henry VII. Returning to Provence, he made a vow of chastity with his spouse, and in 1317 went back to Naples to become the tutor of Duke Charles and later his prime minister when he became regent. In 1323 he was sent as ambassador to France to obtain Marie of Valois in marriage for Charles, edifying a worldly court by his heroic virtues. He was buried in the Franciscan habit in the church of the Minor Conventuals at Apt. The decree of his canonization was signed by his godson Urban V and published by Gregory XI. His feast is kept by the Friars Minor and Conventuals on the 27th of September, and by the Capuchins on the 20th of October.

WADDING, *Annales Minorum*, VI, 247 sqq.; *Acta SS.*, Sept., VII, 494 sqq.; BOZE, *Histoire de S. Elzéar et de Ste Delphine, suivie de leur éloge* (Lyons, 1862); LEO, *Lives of the Saints and Blessed of the Three Orders of St. Francis* (Taunton, 1886), III, 232–40; BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, 27 Sept.

GREGORY CARR.

Emanationism, the doctrine that emanation (Lat. *emanare*, "to flow from") is the mode by which all things are derived from the First Reality, or Principle.

I. The term *emanation*, being itself a metaphor, has been, and is still, used in many senses, and frequently by writers who are not emanationists. Others, without using the word, really hold the doctrine of emanation. Furthermore, emanationism is always interwoven with different opinions on various subjects; to separate it from these so as to assign its fundamental elements is more or less arbitrary. Taking *emanationism* in the sense commonly received to-day, it is not primarily a theological, but rather a cosmogonic system, not a direct answer to the question of the nature of God, but to that of the mode of origin of things from God. In general it holds that all things proceed from the same Divine substance, some immediately, others mediately. All beings form a series the beginning of which is God. The second reality is an emanation from the first, the third from the second, and so on. At every step the derived being is less perfect than its source; but, by giving rise to other beings, the source itself loses none of its perfections. The first source, then, from which everything flows, remains unchanged; its perfection is neither exhausted nor lessened.

Emanationism is frequently referred to as a form of pantheism; but while this latter is primarily a system of reality, identifying all things as modes or appearances of the one substance, emanationism is concerned chiefly with the mode of derivation. Nor does it necessarily affirm the substantial identity of all things; it may assert the distinct, though dependent, substantiality of emanated realities. It is true that emanation is conceived by some in a pantheistic sense, as an immanent process, an expansion of the Divine substance within itself. But by many it is understood as implying a separation of the derived beings from their source. Hence, not only some forms of pantheism are not emanationistic, but also many emanationists—with more or less consistency—reject pantheism. For those who admit that matter is eternal and exists independently of God, God cannot be more than an architect, who arranges pre-existing materials. In the doctrine of complete emanationism, all things, from the highest spiritual substances to the lowest forms of matter, come from God as their first origin, matter being the last and therefore most imperfect emanation. Some views, however, combine the theory of the eternity of matter with the theory of emanation.

The doctrine of creation teaches that all things are distinct from God, but that God is their efficient cause. God does not produce things from His own substance nor from any pre-existing reality, but by an act of His will brings them out of nothing. According to emanationism, on the contrary, the Divine substance is the reality from which all things are derived, not by any voluntary determination, but by a necessity of nature. And God does not produce all things immediately; the lower are more distant, and are separated from Him by necessary intermediaries. (It may be noted, however, that sometimes the word *emanation* is used in a broader sense including also *creation*. Thus St. Thomas: "Quæritur de modo emanationis rerum a primo principio qui dicitur creatio".—Summa, I, Q. xlv, a. 1.)

Evolution implies the change of one thing into something else, whereas a reality from which another emanates remains identical with itself. The process of evolution—at least in its totality—is generally considered as an ascent, a movement upwards towards a greater perfection. Emanation is a descent; it begins with the infinitely perfect, and at every step the emanating beings are less pure, less perfect, less divine. The Infinite is postulated as a starting-point, instead of being the goal which the universe is ever striving to realize. Some comparisons used by emanationists, though only metaphors, and consequently misleading if taken literally, may give a clearer idea of the system. Things proceed from God as water from a spring or an overflowing vessel; as the stem, branches, leaves, etc., from the roots; as the web from the spider; as light or heat from the sun or a fire; as the doctrine from the teacher. It is easy to see that all such comparisons are deficient in many points. They are intended simply to illustrate that which is above human comprehension.

II. Vague indications of emanationism are found in ancient mythologies and religions, especially those of

India, Egypt, and Persia. Thus in the Upanishads things are said to issue from their eternal principle as the web from the spider, the plant from the earth, the hair from the skin. But, while these and other comparisons and expressions may be interpreted in the sense of emanationism, they are not sufficiently explicit to serve as a basis for the assertion that such systems of philosophy or religion are emanationistic. Philo's teaching on this point is not much clearer. His thought was influenced by two distinct currents: Greek philosophy, especially Platonism, and Judaism. In his endeavour to reconcile them, he sometimes falls into inconsistencies, and his real position is doubtful. According to him, God, infinitely perfect, cannot act on the world immediately, but only through powers or forces (δυνάμεις) which are not identical with Him, but proceed from Him. The primitive Divine force is the Logos. Whether the Logos is a substance or only an attribute, remains an obscure point. From the Logos the Spirit (πνεῦμα) proceeds. It is the soul, or vivifying principle, of the world. Sometimes God is looked upon as the efficient and active cause of the world, sometimes also as immanent, as the one and the whole (εἷς καὶ τὸ πᾶν αὐτός ἐστιν).

The first clear and systematic expression of emanationism is found in the Alexandrian school of Neo-Platonism. According to Plotinus, the most important representative of this school, the first principle of all things is the One. Absolute unity and simplicity is the best expression by which God can be designated. The One is a totally indetermined essence, for any attribute or determination would introduce both limitation and multiplicity. Even intelligence and will cannot belong to this Primal Reality, for they imply the duality of subject and object, and duality presupposes a higher unity. The One, however, is also described as the First, the Good, the Light, the Universal Cause. From the One all things proceed; not by creation, which would be an act of the will, and therefore incompatible with unity; nor by a spreading of the Divine substance as pantheism teaches, since this would do away with the essential oneness. The One is not all things, but before all things. Emanation is the process by which all things are derived from the One. The infinite goodness and perfection "overflows", and, while remaining within itself and losing nothing of its own perfection, it generates other beings, sending them forth from its own superabundance. Or again, as brightness is produced by the rays of the sun so everything is a radiation (περίλαμψις) from the Infinite Light. The various emanations form a series every successive step of which is an image of the preceding one, though inferior to it. The first reality that emanates from the One is the *Nous* (Νοῦς), a pure intelligence, an immanent and changeless thought, putting forth no activity outside of itself. The Nous is an image of the One, and, coming to recognize itself as an image, introduces the first duality, that of subject and object. The Nous includes in itself the intellectual world, or world of ideas, the κόσμος νοητός of Plato. From the Nous emanates the Soul of the world, which forms the transition between the world of ideas and the world of the senses. It is intelligent and, in this respect, similar to the ideal world. But it also tends to realize the ideas in the material world. The World-Soul generates particular souls, or rather plastic forces, which are the "forms" of all things. Finally, the soul and its particular forces beget matter, which is of itself indetermined and becomes determined by its union with the form. With a few variations in the details, the same essential doctrine of emanation is taught by Iamblichus and Proclus. With Plotinus, Iamblichus identifies the One with the Good, but assumes an absolutely first One, anterior to the One, and utterly ineffable. From it emanates the One; from the One, the intelligible world (ideas); and from the intelligible world, the intellectual world (thinking beings). According to Proclus, from the One come the unities (ἑνάδες), which alone are related to the world. From the unities emanate the triads of the intelligible essences (being), the intelligible-intellectual essences (life), and the intellectual essences (thought). These again are further differentiated. Matter comes directly from one of the intelligible triads.

Gnostics teach that from God, the Father, emanated numberless Divine, supra-mundane Æons, less and less perfect, which, taken all together, constitute the fullness (πλήρωμα) of Divine life. Wisdom, the last of these, produced an inferior wisdom named Achamoth, and also the psychical and material worlds. To denote the mode according to which an inferior is derived from a superior degree, Basilides uses the term ἀπόρροια ("flowing from", "efflux"), and Valentinus, the term προβολή (throwing forth, projection). The Fathers of the Church and Christian writers, especially when they treat of the divine exemplarism or of the relations of the three Divine Persons in the Trinity, and even when they speak of the origin of the world, may use expressions that remind one of the theory of emanation. But such expressions must be interpreted according to the doctrine of creation to which they adhere. Pseudo-Dionysius follows Plotinus and the later Neo-Platonists, especially Proclus, frequently borrowing their terminology. Yet he endeavours to adapt their views to the teachings of Christianity. God is primarily goodness and love, and other beings are emanations from His goodness, as light is an emanation from the sun. John Scotus Eriugena takes his doctrine from Pseudo-Dionysius and interprets it in the sense of pantheistic emanationism. There is only one Being who, by a series of substantial emanations, produces all things. Nature has four divisions, or rather there are four stages of the one nature: (1) The nature which creates, but is not created, i. e. God in His primordial, incomprehensible reality, unknown and unknowable for all beings, even for Himself. God alone truly is, and He is the essence of all things. (2) The created and creating nature, i. e. God considered as containing the ideas, prototypes, or, to use Eriugena's expression, the primordial causes of things. It is the ideal world. (3) The nature which is created, but does not create, is the world of things existing in time and space. All flow, proceed, or emanate from the first principle of being. Creation is a "procession". Creatures and God are one and the same reality. In creatures God manifests Himself. Hence the name *theophania* which Eriugena gives to this process. (4) Nature, which neither creates nor is created, i. e. God as the term towards which everything ultimately returns.

Arabian philosophy—not to speak here of the various forms of Arabian mysticism—is in many points influenced by Neo-Platonism, and generally holds some form of emanationism, the emanation of the different spheres to which all things celestial and terrestrial belong. According to Alfarabi, from the First Being, conceived as intelligent (in this Alfarabi departs from Plotinus), the intellect emanates; from the intellect, the cosmic soul; and from the cosmic soul, matter. Avicenna teaches that matter is eternal and uncreated. From the First Cause comes the *intelligentia prima*, from which follows a series of processions and emanations of the various celestial spheres down to our own earthly sphere. For Averroes the intellect is not individual, but identical with the universal spirit, which is an emanation from God. Interesting is a comparison found in one of the later mystics, Ibn Arabi. Water that flows from a vessel becomes separated from it; hence this comparison is defective, for things that issue from God are not separated from Him. Emanation is illustrated by the comparison with a mirror, which receives the features of a man, although the man and his features remain united.

In Jewish philosophy, influences of Neo-Platonism

are apparent in Avicebron and Maimonides. In the Cabbala the famous doctrine of the Sephiroth is essentially a doctrine of emanations. It was developed and systematized especially in the thirteenth century. The Sephiroth are the necessary intermediaries between God and the universe, between the intellectual and the material world. They are divided into three groups, the first group of three forming the world of thought, the second group, also of three, the world of soul, and the last group, of four, the world of matter.

III. Philosophically the discussion of emanationism supposes the discussion of the whole problem of the nature of God, especially of His simplicity and infinity. The doctrine of the Catholic Church is contained in the definition of the dogma of the *creatio ex nihilo* by the Fourth Lateran Council and, especially, the Council of the Vatican. The latter expressly condemns emanationism (I. De Deo rerum omnium creatore, can. iv), and anathematizes those "asserting that finite things, both corporeal and spiritual, or at least spiritual, have emanated from the Divine substance".

The literature on this subject includes the works of the authors mentioned in the course of the article, works on history of philosophy, both general and of special schools and philosophers. HEINZE in *Realencyk. für prot. Theol.*, V, 329; HAGEMANN in *Kirchenlex.*, IV, 431.

C. A. DUBRAY.

Emancipation, CATHOLIC. See ENGLAND; ROMAN CATHOLIC RELIEF BILL.

Emancipation, ECCLESIASTICAL.—In ancient Rome emancipation was a process of law by which a slave released from the control of his master, or a son liberated from the authority of his father (*patria potestas*), was declared legally independent. The earliest ecclesiastical employment of this process was in the freeing of slaves. The Church, unable to change at once the sad condition of the slave, was able, however, to gradually substitute for slavery the milder institution of serfdom, and to introduce in place of the elaborate formalities of the *emancipatio* the simpler form of the *manumissio in ecclesiâ* (Cod., De his, qui in ecclesiâ manumittuntur, i, 13), in which a simple statement to that effect by the master before the bishop and the congregation sufficed. The emancipation of a slave was especially necessary as a preliminary to his ordination [c. i (Synod of Poitiers, 1078, can. viii), X, De filiis presbyterorum ordinandis vel non, I, xvii; c. iii (Fourth Synod of Toledo, 633, can. lxxiv), X, De servis non ordinandis et eorum manumissione, I, xviii]. Similarly, the entrance of a son into a religious order, i. e. the taking of solemn vows, or the *professio religiosa*, carries with it in canon law his emancipation from the legal authority (*patria potestas*) of the father. No positive law, however, can be quoted on this point, nor does modern civil legislation recognize this consequence of religious profession. The canon law recognizes another, purely imitative form of emancipation. This was the release of a pupil of a cathedral school, a *domicellaris*, from subjection to the authority of the *scholasticus*, or head of the school. This emancipation took place with certain well-defined ceremonies, known in the old German cathedral schools as *Kappengang*.

The term *emancipation* is also applied to the release of a secular ecclesiastic from his diocese, or of a regular from obedience and submission to his former superior, because of election to the episcopate. The petition requesting release from the former condition of service or submission, which the collegiate electoral body, or the newly elected person, must present to the former superior, is called *postulatio simplex*, in contradistinction to the *postulatio sollemnis*, or petition to be laid before the pope, in case some canonical impediment prevents the elected person from assuming the episcopal office. The document granting the dismissal from the former relations is called *litteræ dimissoriæ* or *emancipatoriæ*. It is not customary to use the term *emancipation* for that form of dismissal by which a church is released from parochial jurisdiction, a bishop from subordination to his metropolitan, a monastery or order from the jurisdiction of the bishop, for the purpose of placing such person or body under the ecclesiastical authority next higher in rank, or under the pope himself. This act is universally known as exemption (q. v.).

FERRARIS, *Bibliotheca prompta* (Paris, 1884), s. v.; CAMBUZAT, *De l'émancipation des mineurs dans l'ancienne France* in *Revue cath. des institutions et du droit* (Paris, 1887), XXIX, 151–174.

JOHANNES BAPTIST SÄGMÜLLER.

Emancipation of Jews. See JEWS.

Emard, JOSEPH. See VALLEYFIELD.

Ember-days (corruption from Lat. *Quatuor Tempora*, four times) are the days at the beginning of the seasons ordered by the Church as days of fast and abstinence. They were definitely arranged and prescribed for the entire Church by Pope Gregory VII (1073–1085) for the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday after 13 December (S. Lucia), after Ash-Wednesday, after Whitsunday, and after 14 September (Exaltation of the Cross). The purpose of their introduction, besides the general one intended by all prayer and fasting, was to thank God for the gifts of nature, to teach men to make use of them in moderation, and to assist the needy. The immediate occasion was the practice of the heathens of Rome. The Romans were originally given to agriculture, and their native gods belonged to the same class. At the beginning of the time for seeding and harvesting religious ceremonies were performed to implore the help of their deities: in June for a bountiful harvest, in September for a rich vintage, and in December for the seeding; hence their *feriæ sementivæ*, *feriæ messis*, and *feriæ vindemiales*. The Church, when converting heathen nations, has always tried to sanctify any practices which could be utilized for a good purpose. At first the Church in Rome had fasts in June, September, and December; the exact days were not fixed but were announced by the priests. The "Liber Pontificalis" ascribes to Pope Callistus (217–222) a law ordering the fast, but probably it is older. Leo the Great (440–461) considers it an Apostolic institution. When the fourth season was added cannot be ascertained, but Gelasius (492–496) speaks of all four. This pope also permitted the conferring of priesthood and deaconship on the Saturdays of ember week—these were formerly given only at Easter. Before Gelasius the ember-days were known only in Rome, but after his time their observance spread. They were brought into England by St. Augustine; into Gaul and Germany by the Carlovingians. Spain adopted them with the Roman Liturgy in the eleventh century. They were introduced by St. Charles Borromeo into Milan. The Eastern Church does not know them. The present Roman Missal, in the formulary for the Ember-days, retains in part the old practice of lessons from Scripture in addition to the ordinary two: for the Wednesdays three, for the Saturdays six, and seven for the Saturday in December. Some of these lessons contain promises of a bountiful harvest for those that serve God.

DUCHESNE, *Christian Worship* (London, 1904), 232; BINTERIM, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, V, 2, 133; KELLNER, *Heortologie* (Freiburg im Br., 1906), 137; *Revue Bénédictine* (1897), XIV, 337.

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Emblems of the Saints. See ICONOGRAPHY.

Embolism (Greek: ἐμβολισμός, from the verb, ἐμβάλλειν, "to throw in"), an insertion, addition, interpretation. The word has two specific uses in the language of the Church:—

I. The prayer which, in the Mass, is inserted between the Our Father and the Fraction of the Bread: "Libera nos, quæsumus, Domine, ab omnibus malis", etc. It is an interpretation of the last petition. The

embolism may date back to the first centuries, since, under various forms, it is found in all the Occidental and in a great many Oriental, particularly Syrian, Liturgies. The Greek Liturgies of St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom, however, do not contain it. In the Mozarabic Rite this prayer is very beautiful and is recited not only in the Mass, but also after the Our Father at Lauds and Vespers. The Roman Church connects with it a petition for peace in which she inserts the names of the Mother of God, Sts. Peter and Paul, and St. Andrew. The name of St. Andrew is found in the Gelasian Sacramentary, so that its insertion in the Embolismus would seem to have been anterior to the time of St. Gregory. During the Middle Ages the provincial churches and religious orders added the names of other saints, their founders, patrons, etc., according to the discretion of the celebrant (see MICROLOGUS)

II. In the calendar this term signifies the difference of days between the lunar year of only 354 days and the solar year of 365.2922 days. In the Alexandrian lunar cycle of 19 years, therefore, seven months were added, one each in the second, fifth, eighth, eleventh, thirteenth, sixteenth, and nineteenth (the embolistic) years. Each embolistic year had 13 lunar months, or 384 days. The lunar calendar was called Dionysian, because Dionysius Exiguus, in the sixth century, recommended the introduction of the Alexandrian Easter cycle of 19 years and computed it for 95 years in advance.

LERCH, *Einleitung in die Chronologie* (Freiburg, 1899), II, 26 sqq.; GROTEFEND, *Zeitrechnung* (Leipzig, 1898); *Liturgia Mozarabica* (Paris, 1862); EBNER, *Quellen und Forschungen zum Missale Romanum* (Freiburg, 1896), 425 sqq.; MASKELL, *The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England* (Oxford, 1882).

F. G. HOLWECK.

Embroidery, ECCLESIASTICAL.—That in Christian worship embroidery was used from early times to ornament vestments, is confirmed by numerous notices, especially the statements of the "Liber Pontificalis". For the period before the tenth century no account, even partially satisfactory, has come down to us, either of the methods of producing the embroidery or of the manner and extent of its use. What is incidentally said is not sufficient to make the matter clear, and no embroidery of this period for ecclesiastical purposes has been preserved. The oldest extant examples are the remains of a maniple and of a stole dating from the beginning of the tenth century, in the museum of Durham cathedral, and fragments of an altar-cover of the same century in the National Museum at Ravenna. Vestments magnificently embroidered appeared at the beginning of the eleventh century, such as the chasuble completely covered with pictures embroidered in pure gold, which is preserved in the Bamberg cathedral; the coronation mantle of Hungary, originally also a chasuble; and other specimens of the highest importance not only on account of their costly material and the skill shown in their execution, but even more on account of the deep significance of the pictures. Up to the thirteenth century embroidery in gold thread was the ornamentation mainly used for ecclesiastical purposes. To a certain degree gold embroidery was intended to take the place of figured materials woven with gold thread. Consequently, this embroidery so closely resembles fabrics woven with gold that on superficial examination it could easily be taken for such. At the same time, however, embroidery with silk threads was also practised, as is shown by the splendid copes preserved at St. Paul in Carinthia.

Ecclesiastical embroidery reached its fullest development in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and the first half of the fifteenth centuries. In this period whatever bore the name of vestment, wherever means allowed, was more or less richly embroidered. The working materials were gold, silver, and silk threads, small disks and spangles cut with a stamp from silver, plain or gilded, spangles and small disks of enamel, real pearls, precious stones, paste diamonds, and coral. The embroidery of figures was the branch of the art most pursued, purely ornamental embroidery being regarded as of subordinate importance. The copes and chasubles covered with pictorial embroidery of a deeply religious character, the *aurifrisia* (bands) magnificently ornamented with embroidered figures, that were laid on the liturgical clothing and other vestments, the covers and wall-hangings embroidered in striking pictorial designs, the stoles covered with wonderful needlework, all these examples of the art of the needle of that era, still found in large numbers in the church treasuries and museums, show that ecclesiastical embroidery then reached a height never since regained. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries Sicily was famous for its ecclesiastical embroidery; in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the workshops of England were more noted than all others. In this latter period mention of English embroidery, called *opus anglicanum*, is found in almost all inventories of the more important churches of the Continent, even in Italy. The vestment most frequently sent from England into other parts of Western Europe was a cope completely covered with a rich embroidery of figures on a background of vine arabesques or elaborate architecture, the background being worked in gold thread; examples of these copes are still preserved at St. John Lateran at Rome, at Pienza, Vich, and Daroca in Spain, Salzburg, Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges in France, and elsewhere. A large amount of superb ecclesiastical needlework, splendid specimens of which still exist, was also produced in Germany, France, and Italy; in the last-named country the work of Florence, Siena, Lucca, and Venice was especially noted. In the fifteenth century the finest ecclesiastical embroidery was done in Flanders, where the work most largely produced was of that kind in which couched gold thread was worked over with coloured silks. The best examples of this are the mass-vestments of the Order of the Golden Fleece preserved in the Hofburg at Vienna. With the close of the Middle Ages ecclesiastical embroidery began to decline. Instead of the flat stitch, use was now made of the more striking raised embroidery, which frequently degenerated into a purely formal high relief totally unsuited in character to ecclesiastical embroidery. There was a continually growing tendency to aim at brilliant effects and a stately magnificence. At the same time pictorial needlework was less and less in use, owing to the influence of secular embroidery. Needlework for church vestments was limited more and more to purely ornamental designs, taken chiefly from the plant world, and to certain symbolic designs. The art sank to its lowest depths both in design and technic at the commencement of the nineteenth century, during the so-called *Biedermaier* (honest citizen) period.

Ecclesiastical embroidery flourished in the various provinces of the Byzantine Empire. While the costly needlework produced there was naturally used mainly in the services of the Greek Church, still many pieces were brought into Western Europe. This Byzantine needlework did not fail to influence Western ecclesiastical embroidery. One of the finest examples of art needlework of the Byzantine Empire of the Middle Ages is the imperial dalmatic in the treasury of St. Peter's at Rome, erroneously attributed to the eleventh century; it is, in reality, a Greek *saccòs* (vestment of a Greek bishop or patriarch) worked, probably, in the latter half of the fourteenth century.

At no period has ecclesiastical differed in its technic from secular embroidery. The same varieties of stitches and other art resources have been employed in both cases. No special ordinances have

ever been issued by the Church in regard to embroidery for vestments, either as to material, colour, use, or design. Good taste, however, requires that the embroidery should harmonize with the character and colour-effect of the vestment, and that it should not be too heavy, too crowded, or too stiff.

Bock, *Geschichte der liturgischen Gewänder des Mittelalters* (Bonn, 1869), I; Rock, *Textile Fabrics* (London, 1876); F. and H. Marshall, *Old English Embroidery* (London, 1894); de Farcy, *Le produit du XI^e siècle jusqu'à nos jours* (Angers, 1890; supplement, 1900); Braun, *Die liturgische Gewandung im Occident und Orient* (Freiburg, 1907); Idem, *Winke für die Anfertigung und Verzierung der Paramente* (Freiburg, 1904); Dreger, *Künstlerische Entwicklung der europäischen Weberei und Stickerei* (Vienna, 1904).

Joseph Braun.

Embroidery in Scripture.—It is probable that the Israelites learned the art of embroidery during their sojourn in Egypt. The ornamentation of woven fabrics, especially of linen, by needlework in threads of different colours, spun or drawn from various materials, such as wool, flax, or gold, was known to ancient nations. The Greek and Romans acquired the art from the East. The monuments of Assyria and Babylon represent the garments of kings and officials as highly ornamented with what are commonly regarded as embroideries, and specimens of embroidered work have been found in Egyptian tombs. In Ezech., xxvii, 7, mention is made of the "fine broidered linen" used for sails on the ship of Tyre. The first reference to embroidery in Scripture is found in the Book of Exodus (xxvi, 1, 31, 36) in the directions given to Moses concerning the curtains of the Tabernacle, the veil for the Ark, and the hanging in the entrance to the Holy of Holies. The Douay, following the Vulgate, does not distinguish between the two Hebrew expressions מעשה (Ex., xxvi, 1, 31) and מעשה רקם (Ex., xxvi, 36). The former is translated in the Revised Version by "the work of a cunning workman" and seems to refer to the weaving of figured designs from different coloured threads; the latter may have been real embroidery, or needlework, called in the later books רקמה.

Besides the hanging at the entrance of the Tabernacle (Ex., xxvi, 36), the hanging in the entrance of the court (Ex., xxvi, 16) and the girdle of the high-priest (Ex., xxviii, 39; xxxix, 28) were the work of the embroiderer (רקם), whereas in regard to the ephod (Ex., xxviii, 6; xxxix, 3) and the rational (Ex., xxviii, 15; xxxix, 8) the word רקמה is employed. Beseleel and Ooliab were endowed with skill in both kinds of work (Ex., xxxv, 35; xxxviii, 22, 23). The word is used of the embroidered garments or scarfs mentioned in the Canticle of Debbora (Judges, v, 30), and of the bride's apparel in Ps. xliv (Heb., xlv), 15, where according to the Hebrew text she is said to be arrayed in embroiderings of gold and raiment of needlework. The garments of the faithless spouse, the figure of Israel (Ezech., xvi, 10, 13, 18), were likewise embroidered. In Ezech., xxvi, 16, it is foretold that the princes of the sea shall put off their broidered garments, and broidered stuffs are mentioned among the merchandise of Tyre (Ezech., xxvii, 7, 16, 24).

In the Authorized or King James Version (Ex., xxviii, 4) one of the high-priest's garments is called "a broidered coat"; the Revised Version changed it to "a coat of chequer work". The Douay has "a strait linen garment" (*lineam strictam* in the Vulgate). The Hebrew word תבשץ used here is not found elsewhere in Scripture. It is believed by some to indicate "a surface device of lustre upon one colour", similar to work still done in Damascus. Even in regard to the nature of רקמה which is translated "embroidery", authorities are not agreed. Some regard it as painting on cloth, others as an ornamentation produced by sewing on to a stuff pieces of materials of other colours, others again as a fabric woven from threads of different colours.

Levesque in Vig., *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v. *Broderie*; Mackie in Hastings, *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v.

John Corbett.

Embrun. See Aix, Gap.

Embryotomy. See Abortion.

Emerentiana, Saint, virgin and martyr, d. at Rome in the third century. The old Itineraries to the graves of the Roman martyrs, after giving the place of burial on the Via Nomentana of St. Agnes, speak of St. Emerentiana. Over the grave of St. Emerentiana a church was built which, according to the Itineraries, was near the church erected over the place of burial of St. Agnes, and somewhat farther from the city wall. In reality Emerentiana was interred in the *cœmeterium majus* located in this vicinity not far from the *cœmeterium Agnetis*. Armellini believed that he had found the original burial chamber of St. Emerentiana in the former *cœmeterium*. According to the legend of St. Agnes Emerentiana was her foster-sister. Some days after the burial of St. Agnes Emerentiana, who was still a catechumen, went to the grave to pray, and while praying she was suddenly attacked by the pagans and killed with stones. Her feast is kept on 23 January. In the "Martyrologium Hieronymianum" she is mentioned under 16 September, with the statement: *In cœmeterio maiore*. She is represented with stones in her lap, also with a palm or lily.

De Rossi, *Roma sotterranea*, I, 178–79; *Acta SS.*, January, II, 351–54, 458; Armellini, *Scoperta della cripta di S. Emerenziana e di una memoria relativa alla cattedra di S. Pietro nel Cemeterio Ostriano* (Rome, 1877); Marucchi, *Le catacombe romane* (Rome, 1903), 306 sqq.; Le Bourgeois, *Sainte Emérentienne, vierge et martyre* (Paris, 1895).

J. P. Kirsch.

Emeric. See Eymeric, Nicholas.

Emeritus of Julia Cæsarea. See Donatists.

Emery, Jacques-André, Superior of the Society of St-Sulpice during the French Revolution, b. 26 Aug., 1732, at Gex; d. at Paris, 28 April, 1811. After his preliminary studies with the Carmelites of his native town and the Jesuits of Mâcon, he passed to the Seminary of St. Irenæus at Lyons and completed his studies at St-Sulpice, Paris, where he became a member of the society of that name and was ordained priest (1758). He taught with distinction in the seminaries of Orléans and Lyons; at Lyons, too, he sustained the rights of the Holy See with firmness and ability, yet with due courtesy, before the archbishop, Mgr. de Montazet, a prelate of Jansenistic tendencies. Partly on the recommendation of the archbishop, he was made superior of the seminary at Angers (1776), and later became vicar-general of the diocese, displaying in both capacities marked powers of governing. In 1782 he was elected Superior-General of the Seminary and Society of St-Sulpice. His rule began in the lax days preceding the French Revolution, and Father Emery showed himself indefatigable in his zeal for the reform of the seminaries and for the training of a clergy fit to cope with existing evils and prepared for the troublous times which, to some extent, he foresaw. After the Revolution broke forth, he watched its terrible progress without despair; he was, perhaps, during that period, the coolest head among the churchmen of France. His wide acquaintance among the priests and bishops, many of whom, in the course of his thirty years of teaching and ruling in the seminaries, had been under his authority, and his position as administrator of the Diocese of Paris during the absence of the exiled archbishop, and as superior of St-Sulpice, brought many to him for advice. He was, says the historian Sicard, "the head and the arm" of the party whose counsels were marked by moderation and good sense; "a man who was rarely endowed in breadth of learning, in knowledge of his time, in the clearness of his views, in the calmness and energy of his decisions; the oracle of the clergy, consulted on all sides less by

reason of his high position than of his superior wisdom. M. Emery was called by Providence to be the guide throughout the long interregnum of the episcopate during the revolution" (L'Ancien Clergé, III, 549). And Cardinal de Bausset declares that he was the "real moderator of the clergy during twenty years of the most violent storms".

The decisions of the Archiepiscopal Council at Paris concerning the several oaths demanded of the clergy, inspired by Emery, were accepted by large numbers of priests and violently assailed by others. To their acceptance was due whatever practice of cult remained in France during the Revolution; to their rejection was due, in large part, the cessation of worship and the opinion which came to regard the clergy as "the irreconcilable enemies of the republic". Emery did not, like many others, mistake purely political projects for vital questions of religion. He felt free to take the "Oath of Liberty and Equality", but only as concerning the civil and political order; he upheld the lawfulness of declaring submission to the laws of the Republic (30 May, 1795), and of promising fidelity to the Constitution (28 Dec., 1799). He lent his influence to Mgr. Spina in his efforts to obtain the resignation of the French bishops, according to the will of Pius VII (15 Aug., 1801). While ready, for the good of religion, to go as far as the rights of the Church permitted, he was stanch in his opposition to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy (1790). Public religious services were suspended during the Revolution, and the seminaries closed; St-Sulpice was taken over by the revolutionists, and Father Emery was imprisoned and several times narrowly escaped execution. His faith, courage, and good humour sustained many of his fellow-prisoners and prepared them to meet death in a brave and Christian spirit; the gaolers, in fact, came to value his presence because it saved them annoyance from prisoners condemned to death. The closing of the seminaries in France led Father Emery, on the request of Bishop Carroll, to send some Sulpicians to the United States to found the first American seminary at Baltimore (St. Mary's, 18 July, 1791). The future religion of the country, he wrote to Father Nagot, the first superior, depended on the formation of a native clergy, which alone would be adequate and fit for the work before it. Despite the discouragements of the first years, he continued the supporter of the institution and welcomed the foundation of the college at Pigeon Hill, and later at Emmitsburg, for young aspirants to the priesthood. At one time, however, Bishop Carroll feared the withdrawal of the Sulpicians, but his arguments and above all the advice of Pius VII convinced Father Emery that the good of religion in America required their presence.

After Napoleon came into supreme control, Father Emery re-established the Seminary of St-Sulpice. His defence of the pope against the emperor caused Napoleon to expel the Sulpicians from the seminary; this, however, did not daunt Father Emery, who defended the papal rights in the presence of Napoleon (17 March, 1811) and gained the emperor's admiration, if not his good will. "He was", remarks Sicard, "the only one among the clergy from whom Napoleon would take the truth." The death of Father Emery occurred a month later. He left many writings which have been published by Migne in his collection of theological works. They deal chiefly with the politico-religious questions of the day. He is best remembered, perhaps, by his dissertation on the mitigation of the sufferings of the damned. He wrote also on Descartes, Leibniz, and Bacon, and published from their works extracts in defence of religion. While clearly perceiving the intellectual evils of his day and the necessary remedies, he did not himself possess the fertility and originality of intellect, or the peculiar genius needed to counteract the influence of the powerful minds which then ruled France and Europe.

GOSSELIN, *Vie de M. Emery*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1861–1862); MÉRIC, *Histoire de M. Emery et de l'église de France pendant la révolution et pendant l'empire*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1895); SICARD, *L'Ancien Clergé de France* (Paris, 1903), III.

JOHN F. FENLON.

Emesa, a titular see of Phœnicia Secunda, suffragan of Damascus, and the seat of two Uniat archdioceses (Greek Melchite and Syrian). Emesa was renowned for its temple of the sun, adored here in the shape of a black stone, whose priests formed a powerful aristocracy. One of them, Bassianus, became Roman emperor under the name of Elagabalus (A. D. 218). A native Arab dynasty ruled over the city between 65 B. C. and A. D. 73, from which period the series of Emesa coins dates. Emesa was the birthplace of the philosopher Longinus (C. A. D. 210), the friend of Queen Zenobia, and St. Romanos, the great Byzantine hymnographer (in the sixth century). Among twelve Greek bishops, known from the fourth to the eighth century, are: St. Silvanus, a martyr under Maximinus in company with the physician Julian (c. 312); Eusebius, a famous rhetorician suspected of Arianism; Nemesius (fourth century) and Paul, writers and friends of St. Basil and St. Cyril of Alexandria (Lequien, Or. christ., II, 837). Another, whose name is unknown, was burned by the Arabs in 666 (Lammens in "Mélanges de la faculté orientale de Beyrouth", 1906, 3–14). The diocese was never suppressed and still exists for the Greek Melchites, both non-Catholic and Uniat (Echos d'Orient, 1907, 223, 226). It was raised to the rank of an autocephalous archbishopric in 452, when the supposed head of St. John the Baptist was found at the monastery of the Spelæon, and it was made a metropolitan see with four suffragan sees in 761, when the relic was transferred to the cathedral (Echos d'Orient, 1907, 93–96, 142, 368). Sozomen (Hist. eccl., III, xvii) speaks of this church as a marvel; the Arabs on capturing the city in 636 took over half of it; later it was changed into a mosque. In 1110 Emesa was taken by the Crusaders, and in 1157 suffered severely from an earthquake. The modern city, which the Arabs call Homs (Hems, Hums), built on the Orontes in sand-coloured basalt, is the chief town of a caza, in the sanjak of Hamah, vilayet of Damascus. The population is about 50,000 including some 30,000 weavers. There are 33,000 Mussulmans, 14,500 Greeks, 1000 Jacobites, 500 Greek Catholics, 350 Maronites, and a few Catholics of other rites. The Orthodox Greek metropolitan and the Jacobite bishop live at Homs. (For lists of ancient Jacobite bishops see Lequien, op. cit., II, 1141, and "Revue de l'Orient chrétien", 1901, 196, 199.) The Greek Melchite metropolitan resides at Iabroud; he has jurisdiction over 8000 faithful, 20 priests, 12 churches, 7 schools, and 2 monasteries of Shooerites. The Syrian Catholic archbishop resides at Damascus; his diocese includes 2000 faithful, with 4 parishes and 5 churches. The Jesuits have a residence and school at Homs, and native Mariamet Sisters conduct a school for girls.

PAULY-WISSOWA, *Real-Encyc.*, s. v.; DUSSAUD, *Histoire et religion des Nosaïris* (Paris, 1900), passim; IDEM, *Voyage en Syrie* (Paris, 1896); LAMMENS, *Notes épigraphiques et topographiques sur l'Emésène* (Louvain, 1902); KALINKA in *Jahreshefte des österr. arch. Instituts in Wien* (1900), III; CUINET, *Syrie, Liban et Palestine* (Paris, 1898), 447 sqq.; JULLIEN, *Sinaï et Syrie* (Lille, 1893), 186 sqq.; IDEM, *La nouvelle mission de la Compagnie de Jésus en Syrie* (Paris, 1899), II, 189 sqq.; *Missiones catholicæ* (Rome, 1907), 781, 804; SMITH, *Dict. Greek and Roman Geogr.* (London, 1878) 824.

S. VAILHÉ.

Emigrant Aid Societies.—Records of the early immigration to the North American colonies are indefinite and unsatisfactory. The first legislation on immigration enacted by the United States was on 2 March, 1819, when Congress provided that a record be kept of the number of the immigrants arriving from abroad, their ages, sex, occupations, and nativity. Ireland has always supplied a large proportion of those landed at American ports, the steady stream

commencing in the first years of the eighteenth century. These immigrants were then nearly all Presbyterians, few Catholics being among those taking passage prior to the Revolution. Arthur Young, in his "Tour in Ireland" (1776–79), declares that "the spirit of emigrating in Ireland appears to be confined to two circumstances, the Presbyterian religion and the linen manufacture. I heard of very few emigrants except among manufacturers of that persuasion. The Catholics never went; they seemed not only tied to the country, but almost to the parish in which their ancestors lived." In a message to the "Representatives of the Freemen of the Province of Pennsylvania and the Three Lower Counties", Lieutenant Governor Patrick Gordon declared, on 17 December, 1728, that he had "positive orders from Britain to provide by proper law against these crowds of Foreigners who are yearly powr'd upon us. It may also require thoughts to prevent the importation of Irish Papists and convicts, of whom some of the most notorious, I am creditably informed, have of late been landed in this River."

The earliest American organization for the care of immigrants was the Charitable Irish Society of Boston, Massachusetts, founded 17 March, 1737. Says its charter: "Several Gentlemen, Merchants and Others of the Irish Nation residing in Boston in New England from an Affectionate and Compassionate concern for their countrymen in these Parts, who may be reduced by Sickness, Shipwrack, Old age and other Infirmities and unforseen Accidents, Have thought fitt to form themselves into a Charitable Society for the relief of such of their poor and indigent Countrymen". The Managers, according to the rules, were to be "Natives of Ireland, or Natives of any other part of the British Dominions of Irish Extraction being Protestants and inhabitants of Boston". This anti-Catholic rule did not last long, for representatives of the Faith were members of the Society in 1742, and to-day they are in the majority on its roll.

In Philadelphia the Hibernian Society for the Relief of Emigrants from Ireland was organized on 3 March, 1790. Mathew Carey was its secretary, and Commodore John Barry, Jasper Moylan, George Meade, and other Catholics prominent in those days were among its first members. The Hibernian Society for "the aid of distressed Irishmen and their descendants" was started at Savannah, Georgia, in March, 1812, and emigration from Ireland being constantly on the increase, other societies were formed in New York, notably the Emigrant Assistance Society in 1825, with Dr. William James Macneven, one of the United Irishmen of 1798, at its head. It was the canal- and railroad-building era, and the aim of this society was to take care of the new arrivals and direct them where to find employment. It was the predecessor of the Irish Emigrant Society founded, also in New York, in 1841, through the efforts of Bishop Hughes, with Gregory Dillon as its first president. Out of this organization ten years later came the Emigrant Industrial Savings Bank, which in subsequent years developed into one of the greatest financial institutions in the country.

As New York was the great entrepôt for aliens, the Legislature, by act of 5 May, 1847, created the Board of Emigration of the State of New York to protect from fraud and imposition alien passengers arriving at New York, and to care and provide for the helpless among them. The president of the Irish Emigrant Society was ex-officio a member of this commission, and at Castle Garden, which became the official landing depot, its agents were recognized officially in their arrangements for the care of the incoming immigrant. In addition to looking out for the welfare of the immigrants, a banking department was organized by the society to transmit money to Europe, to secure passage tickets over the ocean and the railways, to exchange the money brought in by the immigrants, and safeguard their material interests generally. In this way many millions of dollars, as well as several millions of immigrants, have been safely cared for through the instrumentality of this society. The discounts and commissions in these financial transactions paid its expenses and left a surplus which is given in charity, so that it will benefit either the immigrants or their descendants. The law by which the State of New York established the Commissioners of Emigration was declared by the Supreme Court, in May, 1876, an unconstitutional regulation of commerce, and an usurpation of the powers of Congress. In the twenty-nine years of its existence it had collected by a head-tax from the immigrants the sum of $11,239,329. The responsibility of caring for the immigrants was then taken over by the Federal Government, in July, 1891. The State commission was abolished, Castle Garden abandoned, and the United States landing station established on Ellis Island under the supervision of the Treasury Department. Here, as under the State control, the representatives of the Emigrant Aid Societies are accorded all facilities for protecting and assisting those who need their help in starting out in the New World.

For the protection of Irish immigrant girls the Mission of Our Lady of the Rosary was founded in New York in 1881, through the efforts of Charlotte Grace O'Brien, daughter of William Smith O'Brien, the Irish patriot of 1848. At her solicitation—she was not until several years later a Catholic—Cardinal McCloskey appointed the Rev. John J. Riordan chaplain at Castle Garden, and he began there the work of the mission which exercises a moral influence over the steamship companies to protect the girls on board their vessels, and watches over and assists the girls at the landing depot. From its opening to the end of 1908, fully 100,000 girls were cared for by the mission, all free of charge. It is supported by voluntary contributions.

The increase of immigration having thus been recognized as a fact calling for charitable action, the German Society of New York offered advice and systematic assistance to German immigrants, but took no interest in their religious welfare. Its president was *ex officio* a member of the State Emigration Commission. In 1866, at the Catholic Congress held at Trier, Peter Paul Cahensly, a prominent merchant of Limburg, Prussia, suggested the establishment of the St. Raphael Society for the systematic protection of German emigrants, both at the point of departure and the port of landing. Three years later the plan was adopted at the Congress which met at Bamberg in Bavaria, and was taken up with much energy throughout Germany. Connexion with the United States was established through the Central Verein, which, at its convention in New York, in 1868, created a committee of five for emigrant affairs. The agents of this body looked after the affairs of the immigrants at New York, but received only a waning support from their fellow Germans. In 1883 Peter Paul Cahensly crossed the ocean to New York, travelling, as Miss O'Brien had done, in the steerage, so that he might learn by personal experience the wants and hardships of the immigrant. At his suggestion a branch of the St. Raphael Society was formed in New York, with Bishop Winand M. Wigger of Newark as its president. Not much progress was made by this society until 1882, when the Rev. John Reuland was sent over from Germany to manage its bureau at New York. As an adjunct to it, a hospice called the Leo House was established under a separate corporation in 1889. It cost $95,000. The Sisters of St. Agnes have charge of the Leo House, which is the residence of the chaplain in attendance on the German immigrants. From 1889 to 1 November, 1908, there were 51,719 immigrants cared for by the St. Raphael Society. Since the decline of German immigration after 1895, the Leo House has also enter-

tained natives of France, Poland, Bohemia, and other Slavonic sections of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. The St. Raphael Society has its agents at Bremen, Hamburg, Antwerp, Rotterdam, Havre, Liverpool, and London, representatives in every diocese in Germany, and correspondents in all the large cities of the United States and of South America.

The Austrian Society of New York was founded in 1898 by a number of former Austrians to aid the newly arrived immigrants at Ellis Island, and to maintain a home under its supervision for the purpose of boarding them free of charge. Those who can afford it pay a nominal fee. Advice and help to employment is given free not only to the newcomers, but also to Austrians who have been in the country for any length of time. The Society is supported by the dues of the members and by donations including an annual subsidy of $5000 from the Austrian Government. Among the members are twenty-one priests. The Austrian Society employs three agents at Ellis Island; one of them is the missionary who pleads before the board of inquiry for the unfortunate detained, cares for the sick, and looks after the spiritual needs of all. In the ten years of its existence 721,631 persons were entertained at its immigrant house. To maintain the Catholic character of the home and of the Austrian Society at large, as originally intended by the Emperor of Austria, it has from the start been chiefly interested in the Catholic immigrants, but all others are welcome to its care and facilities.

Polish priests ministering in the Eastern section of the United States established at New York, in 1893, the St. Joseph's Society, for the aid and care of the immigrants of that nationality. Its chaplain and agents work on the same lines as those of other societies of the Government landing station. Its home is in charge of the Filician Sisters, and its accommodations are free. Its support is derived from voluntary contributions and a yearly grant of $1000 from the Austrian Government on account of the Poles from Galicia who may seek the assistance of the home.

Under the auspices of the Fathers of Mercy the Jeanne d'Arc Home for the protection of French immigrant women was opened in 1895, in New York. It was founded through the generosity of Miss C. T. Smith, who gave the home as a memorial of her mother Mrs. Jeanne Durand Smith. Two years later the Sisters of Divine Providence took charge of it, and they have since managed its affairs. Since its establishment 6800 women have received its care. It is supported by voluntary contributions. The inmates pay if they can, most of them are taken care of gratuitously. Employment is found for them and they are taught useful domestic arts.

As part of the great work in behalf of Italian immigrants undertaken by Bishop Scalabrini of Piacenza, Italy, members of his Congregation of St. Charles Borromeo established the Society of St. Raphael for Italian Immigrants at New York in 1891. Its home is managed by the Sisters of Charity (Pallottine). Only women and children are kept there; men are given meals and advice, but lodge elsewhere. The chaplain and agent meet the immigrants at Ellis Island. A branch of this society was organized at Boston, in 1902. In December, 1908, Archbishop Blenk of New Orleans appointed an Italian priest as chaplain to look after immigrants from Italy and open a home for them. Work here is carried on by the St. Vincent de Paul Society.

The Society for Italian Immigrants is a secular corporation organized in New York in 1901 for the aid and protection of immigrants. It has no religious affiliations. The Italian government makes it an annual appropriation equal to the amount received from all other sources, and its income is derived from the subscriptions of those interested in philanthropic work. Its home has accommodations for 200. It has founded four schools in Italian labour camps to prevent the demoralization usually attending those communities. The enormous volume of Italian immigration during recent years may be realized from the fact that from 1880 to 1908 it amounted to 2,500,000. In 1857 it was about 1000; in 1880 it was 12,000; in 1907, 286,000. It is estimated that 250,000 aliens arrived in the United States between 1789 and 1820. From 1820, when the official records begin, to the end of the fiscal year, 30 June, 1907, the number of immigrants arriving was 25,985,237.

The Association for the Protection of Belgian and Dutch Immigrants was organized 4 June, 1907, at Chicago, Illinois, by priests in charge of congregations in various sections of the United States, made up of those nationalities. Other priests interested in the spiritual and temporal welfare of the Catholic immigrants from Belgium and Holland assisted in its progress.

U. S. Cath. Hist. Soc., *Records and Studies* (New York, Jan. 1899), I, pt. I: *The Am. Catholic Hist. Researches* (Philadelphia, July, 1901); Crimmins, *Early Celebrations of St. Patrick's Day* (New York, 1902); Schwenninger, *Katholikentag, Central Verein, Raphael's Verein, Leo Haus* (New York, 1890); *Annual Reports* of the various Emigrant Aid Societies; *Reports* of the U. S. Industrial Commission on Immigration; Walker, *Restriction of Immigration* in *The Atlantic Monthly*, LXXVII, 23; McNicholas, *The Need of American Priests for the Italian Missions* in *Eccles. Review* (Philadelphia, Dec., 1908); Lynch, *In the Italian Quarter of New York* in *The Messenger* (New York, 1901), 115–126.

Thomas F. Meehan.

Emiliani, Girolamo, Saint. See Jerome Emilian, Saint.

Emly, Diocese of. See Cashel.

Emly, Lord. See Monsell, William.

Emmanuel (Sept., Ἐμμανουήλ; Heb. עמנואל; A. V., Immanuel) signifies "God with us" (Matt., i, 23), and is the name of the child predicted in Is., vii, 14: "Behold a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and his name shall be called Emmanuel". The various views advanced as to the identity of the child cannot be fully explained and discussed here; the following observations must suffice: (1) The child is not a merely ideal or metaphorical person; he cannot be identified with the regenerate people of Israel (Hoffmann), nor with religious faith (Porter), for "he shall eat butter and honey". (2) The Prophet does not refer to a child in general, but points to an individual (cf. Roorda, Kuenen, W. R. Smith, Smend, Duhm, Cheyne, Marti); both text and context require this. (3) The child is not a son of the Prophet Isaias (cf. Hitzig, Reuss); Is. viii, 1–4, shows that the Prophet's son has a name different from that of Emmanuel. (4) The child is not a son of Achaz (cf. Lagarde, McCurdy); for Ezechias did not possess the most essential characteristics of Emmanuel as described by Isaias. (5) The Emmanuel is the Messias foretold in the other prophecies of Isaias. In Is., viii, 8, Palestine is called the land of Emmanuel, though in other passages it is termed the land or the inheritance of Yahweh (Is., xiv, 2, 25; xlvii, 6; Osee, ix, 3; Jer., ii, 7; xii, 14; etc.), so that Emmanuel and Yahweh are identified. Again, in the Hebrew text of Is., viii, 9, 10, the Prophet predicts the futility of all the enemies' schemes against Palestine, because of Emmanuel. In ix, 6, 7, the characteristics of the child Emmanuel are so clearly described that we can doubt no longer of his Messianic mission. The eleventh chapter pictures the Messianic blessings which the child Emmanuel will bring upon the earth. Moreover, St. Matthew (i, 23) expressly identifies the Emmanuel with Jesus the Messias, and Christian tradition has constantly taught the same doctrine.

The question why the Messias was called Emmanuel, or "God with us", admits of a double answer: the name is a pledge of Divine help, and also a description of the nature of the Messias. King Achaz had not believed the Prophet's first promise of deliverance from

his enemies, Rasin, King of Syria, and Phacee, King of Israel (Is., vii, 1–9). And when the Prophet tried a second time to restore his confidence, Achaz refused to ask for the sign which God was ready to grant in confirmation of the prophetic promise (vii, 10–12). The Prophet, therefore, forces, in a way, King Achaz to confide in God, showing that the Messias, the hope of Israel and the glory of the house of David, implies by his very name "Emmanuel", or "God with us", the Divine presence among his people. A number of the Fathers, e. g. St. Irenæus, Lactantius, St. Epiphanius, St. Chrysostom, and Theodoret, regard the name "Emmanuel", not merely as a pledge of Divine assistance, but also as an expression of the mystery of the Incarnation by virtue of which the Messias will be "God with us" in very deed.

HAGEN, *Lexicon Biblicum* (Paris, 1907), II, 170; MANGENOT in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v.; CONDAMIN, *Le Livre d'Isaie* (Paris, 1905), pp. 62–67; SEISENBERGER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; KNABENBAUER, *Erklärung des Propheten Isaias* (Freiburg, 1881), p. 125; IDEM, *Commentarius in Isaiam prophetam* (Paris, 1887), I, 185 sqq.; CHEYNE in *Encyclopædia Biblica* (New York, 1905), II, 2162 sqq.

A. J. MAAS.

THE SUPPER AT EMMAUS
Carpaccio, San Salvatore, Venice

Emmaus, a titular see in Palæstina Prima, suffragan of Cæsarea. It is mentioned for the first time in 166–165 B.C., when Judas Machabeus defeated there the army of Gorgias (I Mach., iii, 40, iv, 25). A little later the Syrian general Bacchides fortified and garrisoned it (Josephus, Ant. Jud., XIII, i, 3). In A.D. 4, during the rebellion of Athrongius against the Romans, the inhabitants left their city, which was, nevertheless, destroyed by Varus (Josephus, "Ant. Jud." XVII, x, 7–9; Idem, "Bel. Jud.", II, iv, 3). It soon rose again, for Josephus (Bel. Jud., III, iii, 5) and Pliny (Hist. nat., V, xiv) rank it amongst the "toparchies" of the country. Vespasian took it at the beginning of his campaign against the Jews, stationed a legion in the neighbourhood, and named it Nicopolis (Sozom., Hist. eccl., V, xxi). According to Eusebius and St. Jerome, this name was given to it only in 223, by Julius Africanus, its governor and most illustrious son, and this is the name commonly used by Christian writers. Here a spring in which Christ is said to have washed His feet, and which was reputed to cure all diseases, was closed up by order of Julian the Apostate (Sozom., Hist. eccl., V, xxi). Four Greek bishops are known, from the fourth to the sixth century (Lequien, Or. christ., III, 593). At the beginning of the Arab conquest the plague broke out in the city, and the inhabitants fled; they must have soon returned, however, for Emmaus remained a very important town. It was the last station of the Crusaders on their way to Jerusalem in June, 1099. Eubel (Hierarch. cath., II, 223) has a list of eleven Latin titular bishops, but only for the fifteenth century. To-day 'Am'was (the native name) is a Mussulman village about eighteen miles from Jerusalem, on the road to Jaffa. There are still visible ruins of a beautiful basilica built in the fourth or the fifth century, and repaired by the Crusaders. Near 'Am'was, at El-Atroun, the Trappists founded a priory in 1890.

In the opinion of many 'Am'was is the Emmaus of the Gospel (Luke, xxiv, 13–35), where Christ manifested Himself to two of His Disciples. Such is, indeed, the tradition of the Church of Jerusalem, attested as early as the fourth century by Eusebius of Cæsarea, Titus of Bostra, and St. Jerome, a tradition confirmed by all pilgrims, at least to the time of the Crusades; it may even date back to the third century, to Julius Africanus and Origen. It is also supported by many Biblical commentaries, some of which are as old as the fourth or the fifth century; in these the Emmaus of the Gospel is said to have stood at 160 stadia from Jerusalem, the modern 'Am'was being at 176 stadia. In spite of its antiquity, this tradition does not seem to be well founded. Most manuscripts and versions place Emmaus at only sixty stadia from Jerusalem, and they are more numerous and generally more ancient than those of the former group. It seems, therefore, very probable that the number 160 is a correction of Origen and his school to make the Gospel text agree with the Palestinian tradition of their time. Moreover, the distance of 160 stadia would imply about six hours' walk, which is inadmissible, for the Disciples had only gone out to the country and could return to Jersualem before the gates were shut (Mark, xvi, 12; Luke, xxiv, 33). Finally, the Emmaus of the Gospel is said to be a village, while 'Am'was was the flourishing capital of a "toparchy". Josephus (Ant. Jud., VII, vi, 6) mentions at sixty stadia from Jerusalem a village called Ammaus, where Vespasian and Titus stationed 800 veterans. This is evidently the Emmaus of the Gospel. But it must have been destroyed at the time of the revolt of Bar-Cocheba (A. D. 132–35) under Hadrian, and its site was unknown as early as the third century. Origen and his friends merely placed the Gospel Emmaus at Nicopolis, the only Emmaus known at their time. The identifications of Koubeibeh, Abou Gosh, Koulonieh, Beit Mizzeh, etc. with Emmaus, as proposed by some modern scholars, are inadmissible.

RELAND, *Palæstina* (Utrecht, 1714), 425–30, 758–60; *Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement*, 1876, 1879, 1881, 1883, 1884, 1885, etc.; BASSI, *Emmaüs, città della Palestina* (Turin, 1888); BUSSELLI, *L'Emmaüs evangelico* (Milan, 1885); DOMENICHELLI, *L'Emmaüs della Palestina* (Leghorn, 1889); GUILLEMOT, *Emmaüs-Nicopolis* (Paris, 1886); SCHIFFERS, *Amwas, das Emmaüs des hl. Lucas, 160 Stadien von Jerusalem* (Freiburg im Br., 1890); *Revue biblique* (1893), 26–40; VAN KASTEREN, *Emmaüs-Nicopolis et les auteurs arabes, ibid.* (1892), 80–99, 645–649; HEIDET in *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v.; MEISTERMANN, *L'église d'Amouas, l'Emmaüs-Nicopolis et l'église de Qoubeibeh, l'Emmaüs de saint Luc* (Jerusalem, 1902); VAILHÉ in *Echos d'Orient* (1902), 407–409; VINCENT, *Les ruines d'Amwas* in *Revue biblique* (1903), 571–99.

S. VAILHÉ.

Emmeram, SAINT, Bishop of Poitiers and missionary to Bavaria, b. at Poitiers in the first half of the seventh century; martyred at Ascheim (Bavaria) towards the end of the same century. Of a noble family of Aquitaine, he received a good education and was ordained priest. According to some authors Emmeram occupied the See of Poitiers, but this cannot be verified, for his name does not appear among the Bishops of Poitiers. He probably held the see for a short time, from the death of Dido (date unknown) to the episcopate

of Ansoaldus (674). Having heard that the inhabitants of Bavaria were still idolaters, he determined to carry the light of the Faith to them. Ascending the Loire, crossing the Black Forest, and going down the Danube, he reached Ratisbon in a region then governed by the Duke Theodo. For three years he laboured in Bavaria, preaching and converting the people, acquiring also a renown for holiness. He then turned his steps towards Rome, to visit the tombs of Sts. Peter and Paul, but after a five days' journey, at a place now called Kleinhelfendorf, south of Munich, he was set upon by envoys of the Duke of Bavaria who tortured him cruelly. He died shortly afterwards at Ascheim, about fifteen miles distant. The cause of this attack and the circumstances attending his death are not known. According to the legend related by Aribo, Bishop of Freising, the first to write a life of St. Emmeram, Ota, daughter of the Duke of Bavaria, who had been seduced by Sigipaldus, an important personage of her father's court, fearing her father's wrath, confessed her fault to the bishop. Moved with compassion, he advised her to name himself, whom every one respected, as her seducer, and it was in consequence of this accusation that Theodo ordered him to be followed and put to death. The improbability of the tale, the details of the saint's martyrdom, which are certainly untrue, and the fantastic account of the prodigies attending his death show that the writer, infected by the pious mania of his time, simply added to the facts imaginary details supposed to redound to the glory of the martyr.

All that is known as to the date of the saint's death is that it took place on 22 September, some time before St. Rupert's arrival in Bavaria (696). At Kleinhelfendorf, where he was tortured, there stands to-day a chapel of St. Emmeram, and at Ascheim, where he died, is also a martyr's chapel built in his honour. His remains were removed to Ratisbon and interred in the church of St. George, from which they were transferred about the middle of the eighth century by Bishop Gawibaldus to a church dedicated to the saint. This church having been destroyed by fire in 1642, the saint's body was found under the altar in 1645 and was encased in a magnificent reliquary. The relics, which were canonically recognized by Bishop Ignaz de Senestrez in 1833, are exposed for the veneration of the faithful every year on 22 September. It is impossible to prove that Emmeram occupied the See of Ratisbon, for the official episcopal list begins with the above-mentioned Gawibaldus, who was consecrated by St. Boniface in 739 and died in 764.

SUYSKENS, *Comment præv.* in *Acta SS.* (1757), Sept., VI, 454–74; *Die neuentdeckte Confessio des hl. Emmeram zu Regensburg*, in *Röm. Quartalschr.*, IX (1895), 1–55; SEPP, *Aribonis episcopi Frisingensis vita S. Emmerammi authentica*, in *Anal. Bolland.* (Brussels), VII (1889), 211–55.

LÉON CLUGNET.

Emmeram, ABBEY OF SAINT, a Benedictine monastery at Ratisbon (Regensburg), named after its traditional founder, the patron saint of the city. The exact date of foundation is unknown. St. Emmeram flourished in the middle of the seventh century and 652 is given by most authorities as the approximate date of the establishment of this monastery. Its beginnings were connected with a chapel in which certain much venerated relics were preserved, and which, in 697, was enlarged and beautified by Theodo, Duke of Bavaria, who built at the same time a new monastery for Benedictine monks, of which Appollonius was first abbot. It was still further enlarged by Charlemagne about the year 800 and endowed with extensive possessions and many privileges. When St. Boniface, in 739, divided Bavaria into four dioceses, the first Bishop of Ratisbon fixed his see at the Abbey of St. Emmeram, but later on it was removed by a subsequent bishop to the old Cathedral of St. Stephen, which stands beside the present one. In 830, the then bishop obtained from Louis, King of Bavaria, the administration of the abbey for himself and his successors, and for upwards of a hundred years the Bishops of Ratisbon ruled the monastery as well as the diocese, but in 968 St. Wolfgang restored its independence and from that time forward it enjoyed the rule of its own abbots. For some centuries it was customary to elect as bishop a canon of St. Stephen's and a monk of St. Emmeram's alternately. Many of the early bishops of Ratisbon were buried in the abbey church and their tombs are still to be seen there, as also is that of the Emperor Arnulph (d. 899). The abbots held the rank of princes of the Empire, and as such had a seat in the Imperial Diets. The present church, which is a Romanesque basilica, dates from the thirteenth century, but was restored in a somewhat debased style in the eighteenth. It is one of the few German churches with a detached bell-tower. The cloisters date from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and are in a fair state of preservation. The monastery was suppressed early in the nineteenth century and in 1809 the conventual buildings became the palace of the Prince of Thurn and Taxis, hereditary postmaster-general of the old German Empire, whose family still (1909) reside there. The cloister garth, in the centre of which is a modern mortuary chapel, is now used as the family burial-place.

MIGNE, *Dict. des Abbayes* (Paris, 1856).

G. CYPRIAN ALSTON.

Emmerich, ANNE CATHERINE, an Augustinian nun, stigmatic, and ecstatic, b. 8 September, 1774, at Flamsche, near Coesfeld, in the Diocese of Münster, Westphalia, Germany; d. at Dülmen, 9 February, 1824. Her parents, both peasants, were very poor and pious. At twelve she was bound out to a farmer, and later was a seamstress for several years. Very delicate all the time, she was sent to study music, but finding the organist's family very poor she gave them the little she had saved to enter a convent, and actually waited on them as a servant for several years. Moreover, she was at times so pressed for something to eat that her mother brought her bread at intervals, parts of which went to her master's family. In her twenty-eight, year (1802) she entered the Augustinian convent at Agnetenberg, Dülmen. Here she was content to be regarded as the lowest in the house. Her zeal, however, disturbed the tepid sisters, who were puzzled and annoyed at her strange powers and her weak health, and notwithstanding her ecstasies in church, cell, or at work, treated her with some antipathy. Despite her excessive frailty, she discharged her duties cheerfully and faithfully. When Jerome Bonaparte closed the convent in 1812 she was compelled to find refuge in a poor widow's house. In 1813 she became bedridden. She foresaw the downfall of Napoleon twelve years in advance, and counselled in a mysterious way the successor of St. Peter. Even in her childhood the supernatural was so ordinary to her that in her innocent ignorance she thought all other children enjoyed the same favours as she herself did, i. e. to converse familiarly with the Child Jesus, etc. She displayed a marvellous knowledge when the sick and poor came to the "bright little sister" seeking aid; she knew their diseases and prescribed remedies that did not fail. By nature she was quick and lively and easily moved to great sympathy by the sight of the sufferings of others. This feeling passed into her spiritual being with the result that she prayed and suffered much for the souls of Purgatory whom she often saw, and for the salvation of sinners whose miseries were known to her even when far away. Soon after she was confined to bed (1813) the stigmata came externally, even to the marks of the thorns. All this she unsuccessfully tried to conceal as she had concealed the crosses impressed upon her breast.

Then followed what she dreaded on account of its publicity, an episcopal commission to inquire into her life and the reality of these wonderful signs. The examination was very strict, as the utmost care was necessary to furnish no pretext for ridicule and insult on the part of the enemies of the Church. The vicar-general, the famous Overberg, and three physicians conducted the investigation with scrupulous care and became convinced of the sanctity of the "pious Beguine", as she was called, and the genuineness of her stigmata. At the end of 1818 God granted partially her earnest prayer to be relieved of the stigmata, and the wounds in her hands and feet closed, but the others remained, and on Good Friday were all wont to reopen. In 1819 the government sent a committee of investigation which discharged its commission most brutally. Sick unto death as she was, she was forcibly removed to a large room in another house and kept under the strictest surveillance day and night for three weeks, away from all her friends except her confessor. She was insulted, threatened, and even flattered, but in vain. The commission departed without finding anything suspicious, and remained silent until its president, taunted about his reticence, declared that there was fraud, to which the obvious reply was: In what respect? and why delay in publishing it? About this time Klemens Brentano, the famous poet, was induced to visit her; to his great amazement she recognized him, and told him he had been pointed out to her as the man who was to enable her to fulfil God's command, namely, to write down for the good of innumerable souls the revelations made to her. He took down briefly in writing the main points, and, as she spoke the Westphalian dialect, he immediately rewrote them in ordinary German. He would read what he wrote to her, and change and efface until she gave her complete approval. Like so many others, he was won by her evident purity, her exceeding humility and patience under sufferings indescribable. With Overberg, Sailer of Ratisbon, Clement Augustus of Cologne, Stolberg, Louisa Hensel, etc. he reverenced her as a chosen bride of Christ.

In 1833 appeared the first-fruits of Brentano's toil, "The Dolorous Passion of Our Lord Jesus Christ according to the Meditations of Anne Catherine Emmerich" (Sulzbach). Brentano prepared for publication "The Life of The Blessed Virgin Mary", but this appeared at Munich only in 1852. From the MS. of Brentano Father Schmoeger published in three volumes "The Life of Our Lord" (Ratisbon, 1858–80), and in 1881 a large illustrated edition of the same. The latter also wrote her life in two volumes (Freiburg, 1867–70, new edition, 1884). Her visions go into details, often slight, which give them a vividness that strongly holds the reader's interest as one graphic scene follows another in rapid succession as if visible to the physical eye. Other mystics are more concerned with ideas, she with events; others stop to meditate aloud and to guide the reader's thoughts, she lets the facts speak for themselves with the simplicity, brevity, and security of a Gospel narrative. Her treatment of that difficult subject, the twofold nature of Christ, is admirable. His humanity stands out clear and distinct, but through it shines always a gleam of the Divine. The rapid and silent spread of her works through Germany, France, Italy, and elsewhere speaks well for their merit. Strangely enough they produced no controversy. Dom Guéranger extolls their merits in the highest terms (Le Monde, 15 April, 1860).

Sister Emmerich lived during one of the saddest and least glorious periods of the Church's history, when revolution triumphed, impiety flourished, and several of the fairest provinces of its domain were overrun by infidels and cast into such ruinous confusion that the Faith seemed about to be completely extinguished. Her mission in part seems to have been by her prayers and sufferings to aid in restoring Church discipline, especially in Westphalia, and at the same time to strengthen at least the little ones of the flock in their belief. Besides all this she saved many souls and recalled to the Christian world that the supernatural is around about it to a degree sometimes forgotten. A rumour that the body was stolen caused her grave to be opened six weeks after her death. The body was found fresh, without any sign of corruption. In 1892 the process of her beatification was introduced by the Bishop of Münster.

WEGENER, tr. MCGOWAN, *Sister Anne Katharine Emmerich* (New York, 1907); DE CAZALES, *Life of A. C. Emmerich* prefixed to the 2d ed. of *The Dolorous Passion of Our Lord* (London, 1907); URBANY in *Kirchenlexikon*, s. v.; MIGNE, *Dict. de mystique chrétienne* (Paris, 1858).

E. P. GRAHAM.

Empiricism (Lat. *empirismus*, the standpoint of a system based on experience).—Primarily, and in its psychological application, the term signifies the theory that the phenomena of consciousness are simply the product of sensuous experience, i. e. of sensations variously associated and arranged. It is thus distinguished from Nativism or Innatism. Secondarily, and in its logical (epistemological) usage, it designates the theory that all human knowledge is derived exclusively from experience, the latter term meaning, either explicitly or implicitly, external sense-percepts and internal representations and inferences exclusive of any superorganic (immaterial) intellectual factor. In this connexion it is opposed to Intellectualism, Rationalism, Apriorism. The two usages evidently designate but two inseparable aspects of one and the same theory, the epistemological being the application of the psychological to the problem of knowledge.

Empiricism appears in the history of philosophy in three principal forms: (1) Materialism, (2) Sensism, and (3) Positivism.

(1) *Materialism* in its crudest shape was taught by the ancient atomists (Democritus, Leucippus, Epicurus, Lucretius), who, reducing the sum of all reality to atoms and motion, taught that experience, whereof they held knowledge to be constituted, is generated by images reflected from material objects through the sensory organs into the soul. The soul, a mere complexus of the finest atoms, perceives not the objects but their effluent images. With modern materialists (Helvetius, d'Holbach, Diderot, Feuerbach, Moleschott, Büchner, Vogt, etc.), knowledge is accounted for either by cerebral secretion or by motion; while Häckel looks on it as a physiological process effected by certain brain cells. Avenarius, Willy, Mach, etc. subtilize this process so far as to reduce all experience to internal (empirio-criticism).

(2) *Sensism.*—All materialists are of course sensists. Though the converse is not the case, nevertheless, by denying any essential difference between sensations and ideas (intellectual states), sensism logically involves materialism. Sensism, which is found with Empedocles and Protagoras amongst the ancients, was given its first systematic form by Locke (d. 1704), though Bacon (d. 1626) and Hobbes (d. 1679) had prepared the data. Locke derives all simple ideas from external experience (sensations), all compound ideas (modes, substances, relations) from internal experience (reflection). Substance and cause are simply associations of subjective phenomena; universal ideas are mere mental figments. Locke admits the existence, though he denies the demonstrability, in man of an immaterial and immortal principle, the soul. Berkeley (d. 1753), accepting the teaching of Locke that ideas are only transfigured sensations, subjectivizes not only the sensible or secondary qualities of matter (*sensibilia propria*, e. g. colour and sound) as his predecessor had done, but also the primary qualities (*sensibilia communia*, extension, space, etc.), which Locke held to be objective. Berkeley denies the objective basis of universal ideas and indeed of the

whole material universe. The reality of things he places in their being perceived (*esse rei est percipi*), and this "perceivedness" is effected in the mind by God, not by the object or subject. He still retains the substance-reality of the human soul and of spirits generally, God included. Hume (d. 1776) agrees with his two empiricist predecessors in teaching that the mind knows only its own subjective organic impressions, whereof ideas are but the images. The supersensible is therefore unknowable; the principle of causality is resolved into a mere feeling of successiveness of phenomena; its necessity is reduced to a subjective feeling resulting from uniform association experienced in consciousness, and the spiritual essence or substantial being of the soul is dissipated into a series of conscious states. Locke's sensism was taken up by Condillac (d. 1780), who eliminated entirely the subjective factor (Locke's "reflection") and sought to explain all cognitional states by a mere mechanical, passive transformation of external sensations. The French sensist retained the spiritual soul, but his followers disposed of it as Hume had done with the Berkeleian soul relic. The Herbartians confound the image with the idea, nor does Wundt make a clear distinction between primitive concepts (*empirische Begriffe*, representations of individual objects) and the image: "Denken ist Phantasieren in Begriffen und Phantasieren ist Denken in Bildern".

(3) *Positivism.*—Positivists, following Comte (d. 1857), do not deny the supersensible; they declare it unknowable; the one source of cognition, they claim, is sense-experience, experiment, and induction from phenomena. John Stuart Mill (d. 1870), following Hume, reduces all knowledge to series of conscious states linked by empirical associations and enlarged by inductive processes. The mind has no certitude of an external world, but only of "a permanent possibility of sensations" and antecedent and anticipated feelings. Spencer (d. 1903) makes all knowledge relative. The actual existence of things is their persistence in consciousness. Consciousness contains only subjective feelings. The relative supposes the absolute, but the latter is unknowable to us; it is the object of faith and religion (Agnosticism). All things, mind included, have resulted from a cosmical process of mechanical evolution wherein they are still involved; hence all concepts and principles are in a continuous flux.

The Teaching of Catholic Philosophy is that sense-experience is a source, and indeed the primary source, of human knowledge, but it holds that there are other sources beyond sensations. There is nothing in the intellect that had not its birth in sense; this is one of the generalizations of the School. Moreover, though every intellectual act is accompanied by sensory motion, and especially by some sense representation (phantasma) evoked in the imagination, nevertheless sensation and sensuous representation (phantasma, image) differ essentially from the idea produced in and by the intellect, which is an immaterial, supersensuous and superorganic power or faculty. The theory here proposed may be called empirico-intellectualism since it conjoins a sensuous factor with the purely intellectual or immaterial agency in the genesis of knowledge. Its bases are as follows: (a) Ideas represent the natures or essences of things, not the mere sensuous qualities, the phenomena of things, but the underlying subject and cause thereof, e. g. substance, life, cause, truth, etc.; while ideas of sensuous qualities as such represent them in the abstract and as universal, e. g. light. (b) The mind possesses ideas of things (substances and accidents) immaterial, invisible, possible, and impossible, etc., e. g. ideas of God, spirit, etc.—ideas which cannot be formed from purely sensuous presentations or images. (c) We make clear-cut distinctions between the essential and accidental or contingent properties and attributes of things. (d) Every predicate idea represents not a congeries of sensuous qualities, but what the subject is (its essence), under some particular aspect. Now none of these peculiarities of the idea can be discovered in any sensation or image, which always represents sensuous phenomena, existent and concrete. Locke's "reflection" and Condillac's "processes of association" will not suffice to transmute sensations into ideas, since these two states are essentially, because objectively (representatively), different. Positivists inadvertently slip in an immaterial agency, whereby indeed they beg the question when they appeal to induction to explain the genesis of knowledge; the inductive process involves universal abstract principles and logical laws which are constituted of ideas that essentially transcend sensations. The supersensuous character of ideas follows equally from their "extension" or range of applicability. Ideas as representative of essences, are available as predicates, and are the terms whereof absolutely universal principles are constituted. Hence ideas are universal, whereas sensations and images can represent only objects that affect the sensory organs, i. e. individual, physically existing objects. Moreover, ideas represent objects as abstract—*physically* abstract, e. g. individual sensible qualities; *mathematically* abstract, e. g. extension and number; *metaphysically* abstract, e. g. nature, entity, substance, truth, etc. And indeed unless ideas were of the abstract there could be no science, physical, mathematical, or philosophical; all these sciences consider their objects apart from concrete individual determinations. No intellectual judgment whatsoever would be possible, since every predicate is a generalized term and hence in some degree abstract. Sensation cannot represent an abstract object; for though the sight, e. g., perceives colour apart from sound, nevertheless (a) no sense can abstract from the subject-matter—from the existence and individuality of its proper object; the eye does not see colour as such and abstracted, but the coloured object physically and individually existing—(b) no sense can abstract from its proper object (its appropriate stimulus or object-quality), nor from its common object (quantity, the extended object), (c) a fortiori, no sense can perceive one dimension of extension or a mathematical point, or things non-existent, or abstract forms like man and humanity.

Nor does the common image suffice to explain the universal idea as Locke and the Herbartians suppose, for the common image, though indistinct, remains always in some way concrete and sensible; since the imagination as primarily reproductive can represent only what the senses have reported. Consciousness attests this; for if the imagination represent e. g. a triangle, it is always of some certain size and shape; it cannot represent a triangle which is neither rectangular, obtuse, nor acute; while the idea of a triangle prescinds from every size or shape. Besides the image there is therefore the thought, the intellectual concept, the latter differing essentially from the former. Hence the common image is not predicable of the individuals distributively, because it is still somehow concrete, singular, sensible, material, and represents only quality. Nor can it be predicated as confusedly blending all its inferiors, because the predicate of a judgment is attributed according to comprehension rather than extension. At best, moreover, the image is *like* to things; the concept is *identical* with the subject of which it is predicated. According to the empiricists the common image results from a comparison of representations, so that what is common to them, i. e. some pre-eminent quality, stands as the concept. But the intellect would thus have to immediately perceive and compare the images, which is impossible; nor could it form a concept unless a number of sense perceptions and representations of a thing or things of the same species had preceded. We know, however, that we

immediately form a concept of a thing, even though perceived but once. Furthermore, in order to form the common image a concept of the object must have preceded; for in order to compare similar things we must previously have perceived their likeness. Now, to perceive their likeness means to perceive some common objective aspect wherein the similar things agree, while differing in other aspects. But this the senses cannot perceive; hence there must precede an intellectual perception of the note of agreement common to the objects represented by the images, i. e. a universal idea must precede the common image. The common image therefore does not precede but follows the common concept, whereof it is a sort of shadow. This is specially so in the case of the productive imagination, which re-arranges in new forms previously compared images and hence supposes reflection and judgment, operations which no sense can perform.

Sensism implies scepticism. (a) For if we do not immediately perceive external objects but only our subjective sensuous modifications, then, since these differ with different individuals (e. g. the varying judgments of distance, heat, cold, etc., which varying judgments require intellectual correction whereof the senses are incapable), there could be no certain and objective truth, each individual would be the measure of truth, there would be no objective criterion of certitude, no universal truths. (b) In order to pass from a subjective affection to a knowledge of its object we must employ the principle of causality. Now, in sensism, either the concept of cause is not objective or cause is not perceived at all; therefore the principle of causality is either rejected or is pronounced doubtful. Hence there can be no certitude of the objective existence of things. Hume was but logical when he deduced universal scepticism from the theory of Locke.

Sensism involves the destruction of all science. (a) Science is the knowledge of things in and by their causes; but the senses cannot perceive causes. (b) Positivists claim that by their method the sciences have made wonderful progress, that by employing observation and induction the laws of nature have been discovered. Now, observation of phenomena entails universal ideas whereby the phenomena are classified under groups or species, while induction, to be legitimate and certain, postulates the principle of causality. Therefore the physical sciences suppose physical abstraction; the mathematical, mathematical abstraction, the metaphysical, metaphysical abstraction (primitive, i. e. direct, and reflective; ontological, logical, psychological). The negation of universal, necessary, immutable ideas essentially different from sensations means the destruction of even physical science, a fortiori of mathematical and philosophical sciences.

Sensism destroys the foundations of morality and religion. For, as sensists and positivists admit, their theories leave no proof of the soul's spirituality and immortality; of the existence of moral law, its obligation and sanction in a future life; of the existence of God and His relation to man. Now, history bears witness that these truths are fundamental for man's religious and moral life.

BALMES, *Fundamental Philosophy* (New York, 1864); MAHER, *Psychology* (New York, 1903); LADD, *Philosophy of Knowledge* (New York, 1897); DE BROGLIE, *Le positivisme et la science expérimentale* (Paris, 1880); MERCIER, *Critériologie* (Louvain, 1906); SCHMID, *Erkentnisslehre* (Freiburg im Br., 1890); KLEUTGEN, *Philosophie der Vorzeit* (Innsbruck, 1878); WILLEMS, *Institutiones philosophiæ* (Trier, 1906).

F. P. SIEGFRIED.

Ems, CONGRESS OF, a meeting of the representatives of the German Archbishops Friedrich Karl von Erthal of Mainz, Maximilian Franz of Cologne, Clemens Wenceslaus of Trier, and Hieronymus von Colloredo of Salzburg, at the little town of Bad-Ems, near Coblenz, in August, 1786, for the purpose of protesting against papal interference in the exercise of episcopal powers and fixing the future relations between these archbishops and the Roman pontiff.

The Gallican principles concerning the relation between the bishops and the pope, which had been disseminated in Germany by Hontheim, the Auxiliary Bishop of Trier (1748–1790), in his treatise "De statu ecclesiæ et legitimâ potestate Rom. Pontificis" (1763) under the pseudonym "Febronius", were shared by some of the most influential archbishops of Germany. The archbishops became confirmed in the position which they took towards the pope by the encouragement and support of Emperor Joseph II, who arrogated to himself both temporal and spiritual jurisdiction. As early as 1769 the representatives of the Elector-Archbishops of Mainz, Cologne, and Trier, at a meeting held in Coblenz, had drawn up a list of thirty-one articles, most of which were directed against the Roman Curia. The proximate occasion of the Congress of Ems was the erection of an Apostolic nunciature in Munich (27 Feb., 1785) and the appointment of Zoglio, titular Archbishop of Athens, as nuncio (27 June), with jurisdiction over the entire territory of the Elector Karl Theodor, which then comprised Bavaria with the Rhine Palatinate and the former Duchies of Jülich and Berg. Pius VI erected this nunciature upon the urgent request of the Elector of Bavaria, who was loath to have parts of his territory under the spiritual jurisdiction of bishops who, being electors like himself, were rather his equals than his subordinates. He had previously suggested to the Elector-Archbishops of Mainz, Cologne, and Trier to appoint special vicars-general for their districts in his territory. Upon their refusal he requested Pius VI to erect separate dioceses for his territory, but in deference to the wishes of the three elector-archbishops, the pope also refused. Finally the Elector of Bavaria asked for the above-mentioned nunciature, and despite the protests of the archbishops his wish was granted.

Meanwhile Bellisomi, the nuncio at Cologne, was transferred to Lisbon, and Pacca, the titular Archbishop of Damietta was appointed to succeed him at Cologne. Maximilian Franz, Archbishop of Cologne (a brother of Emperor Joseph II), refused to see him, and none of the three elector-archbishops honoured his credentials. Despite protests, both Pacca and Zoglio began to exercise their powers as nuncios. Relying on the support which Emperor Joseph II had promised, the three elector-archbishops and the Archbishop of Salzburg planned concerted action against Rome and sent their representatives to Ems to hold a congress. Von Erthal of Mainz, who was the soul of the opposition, was represented by his auxiliary bishop Valentine Heimes; Maximilian Franz of Cologne, by his privy councillor Heinrich von Tautphäus; Clemens Wenceslaus of Trier, by his privy councillor and official representative in temporal matters, Joseph Ludwig Beck; Colloredo of Salzburg, by his consistorial councillor, Johann Michael Bönicke. On 25 August, 1786, these archiepiscopal representatives signed the notorious "Punctation of Ems", consisting of twenty-three articles which aimed at making the German archbishops practically independent of Rome. For the text of the articles see Münch, "Sammlung aller älteren und neueren Concordate" (Leipzig, 1831), I, 404–423.

Assuming that Christ gave unlimited power of binding and loosing to the Apostles and their successors, the bishops, the "Punctation" maintains that all prerogatives and reservations which were not actually connected with the primacy during the first three centuries owe their origin to the Pseudo-Isidore decretals, universally acknowledged as false, and, hence, that the bishops must look upon all interference of the Roman Curia with the exercise of their episcopal functions in their own dioceses as encroachments on their rights. Upon these schismatic principles the four archbishops

based their demands, which may be summarized as follows: all direct appeals to Rome must be discontinued; all exempt monasteries must become subject to the bishops in whose districts the monasteries are situated; no German monasteries must have generals, provincials, or other superiors who do not reside in Germany; the bishops need not obtain quinquennial faculties from Rome, because by virtue of their office they can dispense from abstinence, from matrimonial impediments, including the second degree of consanguinity and the second and first degrees of affinity, from solemn religious vows and the obligations resulting from Holy orders; papal Bulls and ordinances of the Roman Curia are binding in each diocese only after the respective bishop has given his *placet;* all Apostolic nunciatures must be abolished; the manner of conferring benefices and the procedure in ecclesiastical lawsuits must be changed in favour of the bishops; the episcopal oath must be changed so that it shall not appear to be the oath of a vassal, etc.

It may easily be seen that the articles of the "Punctation" lower the papal primacy to a merely honorary one and advocate an independence of the archbishops in regard to the pope which is entirely incompatible with the Unity and Catholicity of the Church of Christ. Still the "Punctation" was immediately ratified by the four archbishops and sent to Emperor Joseph II with an humble request for his support. The emperor was pleased with the articles and would have pledged his unqualified support if his councillors, especially Kaunitz, had not for political reasons advised him otherwise. In his reply of 16 Nov., 1786, the emperor wisely makes his support dependent on the condition that the archbishops gain the consent of their suffragan bishops, the superiors of the exempt monasteries, and the estates into whose districts their spiritual jurisdiction extends. The suffragan bishops, especially the pious and learned prince-bishops August von Styrum of Speier and Franz Ludwig von Erthal of Würzburg-Bamberg (a brother of the Archbishop of Mainz), protested against the schismatic tendency of the "Punctation" and saw in the anti-papal procedure of the archbishops merely an attempt to increase their own power to the detriment of their suffragans. The Elector of Bavaria likewise remained a zealous defender of the pope and his nuncio at Munich, and even the Protestant King Frederick II of Prussia was an opponent of the "Punctation" and favoured the nuncio Pacca at Cologne.

Still the archbishops insisted on their demands. When the nuncio at Cologne by authority of the pope granted a matrimonial dispensation from the second degree of consanguinity to Prince von Hohenlohe-Bartenstein and Countess Blankenheim, Archbishop Maximilian Franz of Cologne addressed to him a strong protest forbidding him for the future the exercise of all jurisdiction in the Archdiocese of Cologne. The archbishops themselves now began to grant dispensations from such degrees of relationship as were not contained in their ordinary quinquennial faculties, just as if the "Punctation of Ems" were in full force. When the nuncio at Cologne, by order of the pope, informed the pastors that all marriages contracted by virtue of such dispensations were invalid, the archbishops ordered their pastors to return the circular to the nuncio and to obtain all future dispensations directly from their ordinary, the archbishop. The Church in Germany was now near to a schism. Fortunately, von Erthal of Mainz needed the services of Rome. He desired Karl Theodor von Dalberg as coadjutor, and, to obtain the consent of Rome, he withdrew, at least apparently, from the "Punctation" and obtained a renewal of his quinquennial faculties from Rome on 9 Aug., 1787. Similarly the Archbishop of Trier asked for quinquennial faculties as Bishop of Augsburg, but not as Archbishop of Trier. Von Erthal's submission to Rome was only a pretended one. He continued his opposition and on 2 June, 1788, requested Emperor Joseph II, in the name of himself and the three other archbishops, to bring the affair concerning the German nuncios before a diet. But soon the archbishops discovered that all the estates were opposed to the "Punctation" and that a diet would rather retard than accelerate the fulfilment of their wishes. For this reason they addressed a letter to Rome (1 Dec., 1788) asking the pope to put an end to the unedifying ecclesiastical dissensions in Germany by withdrawing the faculties from the nuncios and by sending representatives to the German estates with authority to come to an amicable agreement regarding the other demands of the archbishops. In answer to this request appeared the publication of a memorable document composed by order of the pope and entitled: "Sanctissimi Dom. nostri Pii Papæ VI responsio ad Metropolitanos Moguntinum, Trevirensem, Coloniensem et Salisburgensem super Nunciaturis Apostolicis" (Rome, 1789). It was a masterpiece in form and contents of Apostolic firmness and paternal reproof. After presenting a dispassionate and objective view of the whole litigation, the document refutes all the arguments of the archbishops against papal nunciatures, shows how wrong it was for the archbishops to rebel against papal authority, explains that the pope cannot send representatives to worldly estates who have no right to pass judgment on ecclesiastical affairs, and admonishes the archbishops to give up their untenable position towards the Holy See.

The papal writing was not without effect. Archbishop Wenceslaus of Trier, who had long desired an amicable settlement of the odious affair, into which, it appears, he was drawn against his will, publicly withdrew from the "Punctation" on 20 Feb., 1790, and admonished his colleagues to follow his example. They, however, continued their opposition and on occasion of the imperial capitulation of Leopold II (1790) and that of Francis II (1792) obtained the promise that their complaints concerning the nunciatures would be attended to as soon as possible by a decree of the diet. The threatening progress of the French Revolution finally changed the attitude of the Archbishops of Cologne and Salzburg, but the Archbishop of Mainz clung to the "Punctation" until the victorious French army invaded his electorate, and he was deprived of all his possessions west of the Rhine, at the Peace of Campo Formio, in 1797.

Stigloher, *Die Errichtung der päpstl. Nuntiatur in München und der Emser Congress* (Ratisbon, 1867); Brück, *Die rationalistischen Bestrebungen im kath. Deutschland bes. in den drei rhein. Erzbisth. in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrh.* (Mainz, 1865); Idem in *Kirchenlex.* s. v.; Pacca, *Memorie storiche sul di lui soggiorno in Germania dal anno 1786 al 1794* (Rome, 1832), German tr. (Augsburg, 1832); Feller, *Coup-d'œil sur le Congrès d'Ems* (Düsseldorf, 1777), German tr. (Düsseldorf, 1788).

Michael Ott.

Emser, Hieronymus, the most ardent literary opponent of Luther, b. of a prominent family at Ulm, 20 March, 1477; d. 8 Nov., 1527 at Dresden. At the University of Tübingen, whither he went in 1493, he acquired a thorough knowledge of Greek and Latin, but in 1497 he began the study of law and theology at the University of Basle. Through the good offices of Christopher, later Bishop of Utenheim, he barely escaped imprisonment at Basle for having inscribed some satirical verses of his countryman, Bebel, in a volume which was circulated among the students. The legate, Cardinal Raymond Peraudi of Gurk, who seems to have been the judge in this trial, shortly after engaged him as secretary. In 1500 he published a mediocre work on the miraculous crosses which were generally supposed to have fallen from heaven. Four years later he began a series of brilliant lectures at Erfurt on Reuchlin's "Sergius vel Caput Capitis" and numbered Martin Luther among his hearers. On account of his triumphs at Erfurt he always claimed the

distinction of having been one of the pioneers of classical humanism in Germany. Despite his renown and brilliant manner of teaching, Emser's lectures at Leipzig on the classics, in 1505, aroused little admiration. Disgusted at his failure he turned to the study of theology and won the degree of bachelor. George of Saxony befriended him in a financial way during these and subsequent years. Dissatisfied with the methods of teaching theology then prevalent, Emser applied himself earnestly to canon law, and on the completion of his studies served George of Saxony as secretary. At the request of the latter he composed a Latin ode in honour of St. Benno of Meissen, who had just been canonized. This canonization was largely due to the efforts of Emser at Rome, whither he went in 1510 at the express wish of George of Saxony, who saw in this solemn act a source of glory for his realm. The life of the new saint, which Emser wrote in faultless Latin on his return in 1512, is worthless from a critical point of view.

About this time Emser received Holy orders and two prebends at Dresden and Meissen. While preaching by command of George of Dresden, he became better acquainted with Luther. Emser admired the fiery Augustinian; Luther, the accomplished *littérateur*. But in 1519 they parted. At the disputation in Leipzig, Luther, to the express dissatisfaction of George of Saxony, who was present with Emser, gave utterance to Hussite opinions of a radical sort regarding the pope. Emser was deeply pained at this; and on learning that the Bohemians, in two semi-public letters, hailed a second Hus in Luther, he declared in a letter to John Zack that Luther had reprimanded the Bohemians for their attitude towards the pope, and had upheld the papal supremacy as a necessary means to prevent division. Emser added a very lucid explanation based on Scripture in proof of the primacy, and in a subjoined poem dealt a severe blow to the calumnies against the pope. Luther soon learned the contents of this letter and, regarding it as an attempt to discredit him among the Bohemians, replied in his "Ad ægocerotem Emseranum M. Luther additio", where abuse of all kind was heaped upon the Church. Emser answered with an equally violent though not scurrilous work: "A venatione lutherianâ ægocerotis Assertio", in which he portrayed the certain scandal arising from the words and conduct of a refractory monk. He defended the Scriptures in a very personal way against the arbitrary interpretation of Luther. The letter closes with a history of his life, which was intended to offset the aspersions cast on his probity by his opponent. Luther replied by burning at Wittenberg this letter and other writings of Emser, together with the Bull of excommunication and the "Corpus juris canonici" (10 Dec., 1520). This insult did not provoke Emser. But as Luther displayed an incredible literary activity in 1520, Emser wrote eight polemical works in 1520 and 1521 which abound in personalities and invective, yet defend the Faith in a masterly way and clearly point out the logical results of the new teaching. In 1522 he translated the address which the Englishman, John Clark, delivered on handing over to Pope Leo X the book written by Henry VIII against Luther. (O'Donovan, The Defence of the Seven Sacraments by Henry VIII, New York, 1908, pp. 110–17.) Among other works may be mentioned his German translation of the New Testament with a laudatory preface by George of Saxony. Emser showed in this work the liberties taken by Luther with the Scriptures and refuted his errors.

WALTAN, *Nachricht von H. Emser's Leben und Schriften* (Anspach, 1783); JANSSEN, *Gesch. des deutschen Volkes* (1893), III, 466 sq.; SCHARFF in *Kirchenlex.*, IV, 479.—The following are non-Catholic: KAWERAU, *Hieronymus Emser* (Halle, 1898); MOSEN, *H. Emser der Vorkämpfer Roms gegen die Reformation* (Halle, 1890); KEFERSTEIN, *Der Lautstand in den Bibelübersetzungen von Emser und Eck* (Jena, 1888). EMSER'S polemical writings of 1521 against Luther were edited in two small volumes by ENDERS (Halle, 1890–92).

THOS. M. SCHWERTNER.

Encina (or ENZINA), JUAN DE LA, Spanish dramatic poet, called by Ticknor the father of the Spanish secular drama; b. in the village of Encina near Salamanca, 7 Aug., 1468; d. in Salamanca, 1534. He was educated at the University of Salamanca, whence he proceeded to Madrid, where at the age of twenty-five he became a member of the household of Fadrique de Toledo, first Duke of Alba. Later, Encina went to Rome, where he took orders, and owing to his skill in music attracted the attention of Leo X who made him *maestro di capella*, which was a signal honour. In 1519 he accompanied Fadrique Afan de Ribera, Marquis of Tarifa, on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, where he remained two years, and upon his return in 1521 he published a poetical account of his travels, rather devoid of literary merit, under the title "Trabagia ó Via Sagrada de Hierusalem". At a more advanced age, he was appointed prior of Leon and returned to Spain, where he died. He was buried in the cathedral of that city.

Encina published the first edition of his works under the title of "El Cancionero". This was reprinted five times during the sixteenth century, showing that he enjoyed great popularity. Although he wrote lyrical poems, songs, and *villancicos* in the old Spanish style, his most important works were his dramatic compositions which he himself calls *representaciones*, and which fill the fourth division of his "Cancionero". They are eleven in number, all in the nature of eclogues, and written in some form of old Spanish verse; in all there is singing, and in one of them a dance. They therefore have several elements of the secular drama, the origin of which, according to Ticknor, can be traced no further back by any existing authentic monument. Two things must be considered, however, in connexion with these compositions as the foundation of the secular drama. One is that they are eclogues in form and name but not in substance; the second, that they were really acted before an audience. The date of these performances has been given as early as 1492. The *representaciones* have not much dramatic merit. They are crude and slight, and there is no pretension to a plot. Some of the most important works of Encina are: "The Triumph of Love", "The Knight who turns Shepherd", and "The Shepherds who turn Courtiers". He was also the author of a prose work on the condition of the poetic art in Spain entitled "Arte de Poesia Castellana", published about 1497.

TICKNOR, *History of Spanish Literature* (Boston, 1866); ENCINA, *Teatro Completo . . . edición de la Real Academia Española* (Madrid, 1893); COTARELO Y MORI, *Estudios de Historia Literaria de España* (1901).

VENTURA FUENTES.

Enciso, DIEGO XIMENEZ DE, dramatic poet, b. in Andalusia, Spain, c. 1585; date of death unknown. All trace of him is lost after 1632. He was much admired and praised by Cervantes, Lope de Vega and Montalván; the last considers him a "model for those who wish to write great comedies". Although he enjoyed some fame, as his frequent mention by his contemporaries would show, he has shared the fate of many other Spanish dramatists of his day, and his works have undeservedly been consigned to oblivion. In his catalogue of the Spanish theatre, Cayetano Barrera gives a list of eleven plays by Enciso, but most of them are scattered throughout the great libraries of Europe, and only three have reached several editions, namely, "El Príncipe Don Cárlos", "La Mayor Hazaña del Emperador Cárlos Quinto", and "Los Médicis de Florencia". To the average reader, however, only the last named is easily accessible. It is to be found in "La Biblioteca de Autores Españoles". These three plays were probably chosen for repeated editions because they show Enciso at his best. Enciso's idea of the historical drama is thoroughly unique for a Spanish dramatist, for he alone of all his contemporaries seems to regard the historical

drama as being capable of adhering closely to facts. He does not, however, adhere slavishly to history, but rather uses it as did Shakespeare, that is, he uses recognized sources in such a way as to give to his plot the appearance of probability. In his versification Enciso shows great variety, but the eleven-syllabled verse seems to predominate. His work as a whole is characterized by the elevated tone which pervades it, the simplicity and interest of the plots, and its sonorous language.

SCHWILL, *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* (Baltimore, 1903), XVIII; *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles* (Madrid, 1848–86).

VENTURA FUENTES.

Enciso, MARTÍN FERNÁNDEZ DE, navigator and geographer, b. at Seville, Spain, c. 1470; d. probably about 1528 at Seville. It is not known when, why, or with whom he went to America, but in 1508 he was living on the island of Santo Domingo, where he had accumulated a fortune in the practice of law. In 1509 Alonzo de Ojeda (or Hojeda) had been granted the government of Terra Firme (the region about the Isthmus of Darien), but he lacked the funds necessary to colonize the country. He then applied to Enciso, who had the reputation of being rich, able, and adventurous, and the latter agreed to provide a vessel with men and provisions. Ojeda set out in advance in 1509, and it was agreed that Enciso was to equip his vessel and follow him in 1510. When the latter arrived, he found that Ojeda, having been beset by hostile Indians, and having exhausted his supplies and ammunition, had returned in search of him. Taking the survivors of Ojeda's expedition, Enciso founded the town of Santa María la Antigua del Darien (1510). Among his followers was one Vasco Nuñez de Balboa who afterwards became famous for his discovery of the Pacific Ocean, then called the South Sea (Mar del Sur), and who had joined the expedition without Enciso's knowledge or authority, seeking to escape his creditors. Soon after the founding of the new city, Balboa stirred up rebellion among the men, and was able to depose Enciso, whom he banished to Spain. Here, the latter complained to the king of Balboa's arbitrary conduct and injustice, and the king, partly owing to these accusations, sent Pedrarias Dávila to America in 1514 as Governor of Darien, with instructions to have the wrongs of Enciso righted. Enciso accompanied the expedition as "alguacil mayor" and continued to oppose Balboa until the latter's execution by Dávila in 1517. He soon afterwards returned to Spain where he published his "Suma de Geografía que trata de todas las partidas del mundo", the first account in Spanish of the discoveries in the New World. The work was published in 1519 at Seville and was reprinted in 1530 and in 1549. It is dedicated to the Emperor Charles V, and in it, according to Navarrete, Enciso has embodied all that was then known of the theory and practice of navigation. The geographical portion is given with great care, and contains the first descriptions of the lands discovered in the western seas, that is, the results of the explorations of the Spaniards up to 1519. It is, on the whole, a more accurate work than the other early works of its kind.

MICHAUD, *Biog. Univ.* (Paris, 1855); HELPS, *History of Spanish Conquest in America* (1855–1861).

VENTURA FUENTES.

Enclosure. See CLOISTER.

Encolpion (Gr. *εγκόλπιον*, that which is worn on the breast), the name given in early Christian times to a species of reliquary worn round the neck, in which were enclosed such relics as fragments of cloth stained with the blood of a martyr, small pieces of parchment with texts from the Holy Scriptures, particles of the True Cross, etc. The custom of bearing on the person objects of this character was evidently derived from the pagan practice of wearing *bullæ*, containing amulets, round the neck as a protection against enchantment; the Church endeavoured to purify this usage from superstition by substituting objects venerated by Christians for those to which they had been accustomed before conversion. According to St. Jerome, however (in Matt., c. xxiii), some of the faithful in his day attached a superstitious importance to these aids to piety; he censures certain classes of women who seem to have, in some degree, identified sanctity with an exaggerated veneration for sacred relics: "Hoc quod apud nos superstitiosæ mulierculæ in parvulis evangeliis et in crucis ligno et istiusmodi rebus, quæ habent quidem zelum Dei, sed non secundum scientiam, factitant" (That which superstitious women amongst us, who have a certain zeal for God but not of right knowledge, do in regard to little copies of the Gospels, the wood of the cross, and things of that kind). Encolpia were of various forms, oval, round, four-cornered, and of various materials ranging from gold to glass. In 1571 two gold encolpia, square in form, were found in tombs of the ancient Vatican cemetery, engraved on one side with the monogram of Christ between the Alpha and Omega, and on the other with a dove. Another, now lost, was found in the tomb of Maria, wife of the Emperor Honorius, bearing the names of the imperial couple with the legend VIVATIS and the monogram. The famous treasure of Monza contains the *theca persica*, enclosing a text from the Gospel of St. John, sent by Pope St. Gregory the Great (590–604) to Queen Theodolinda for her son Adalaold. Another of the gifts of this pope to the Lombard queen was a cruciform encolpion containing a portion of the True Cross. Probably the most interesting reliquary of this form is a gold pectoral cross discovered at Rome in 1863, in the basilica of S. Lorenzo (*fuori le mura*), on the breast of a corpse. On one side it bears the inscription: EMMANOTHA NOBISCUM DEUS (Emmanuel, God with us), and on the other: CRUX EST VITA MIHI, MORS INIMICE TIBI (To me the Cross is life; to thee, O enemy, it is death). To the category of encolpia belong also the vials or vessels of clay in which were preserved such esteemed relics as oil from the lamps that burned before the Holy Sepulchre and the golden keys with filings from St. Peter's chains, one of which was sent by St. Gregory the Great to the Frankish King Childebert.

DE WAAL in KRAUS, *Real-Encyklopädie* (Freiburg, 1882), s. v. *Enkolpion;* KRAUS, *Gesch. der christl. Kunst* (Freiburg, 1896); SMITH AND CHEETHAM, *Dict. Christ. Antiq.*, I, 611 (London, 1875).

MAURICE M. HASSETT.

Encratites ['Εγκρατεῖς (Irenæus) 'Εγκρατηταί (Clement Alex., Hippolytus)], literally, "abstainers" or "persons who practised continency", because they refrained from the use of wine, animal food, and marriage. The name was given to an early Christian sect, or rather to a tendency common to several sects, chiefly Gnostic, whose asceticism was based on heretical views regarding the origin of matter.

I. HISTORY.—Abstinence from the use of some creatures, because they were thought to be intrinsically evil, is much older than Christianity. Pythagorism, Essenism, Indian asceticism betrayed this erroneous tendency, and the Indian ascetics are actually quoted by Clement of Alexandria as the forerunners of the Encratites (Strom., I, xv). Although St. Paul refers to people, even in his days, "forbidding to marry and abstaining from meats" (I Tim., iv, 1–5), the first mention of a Christian sect of this name occurs in Irenæus (I, xxviii). He connects their origin with Saturninus and Marcion. Rejecting marriage, they implicitly accuse the Creator, Who made both male and female. Refraining from all *ἔμψυχα* (animal food and intoxicants), they are ungrateful to Him Who created all things. "And now", continues Irenæus, "they reject the salvation of the first man [Adam]; an opinion recently introduced among them

by Tatian, a disciple of Justin. As long as he was with Justin he gave no sign of these things, but after his martyrdom Tatian separated himself from the Church. Elated and puffed up by his professorship, he established some teaching of his own. He fabled about some invisible æons, as the Valentinians do; and proclaimed marriage to be corruption and fornication, as Marcion and Saturninus do, but he made the denial of Adam's salvation a specialty of his own." The Encratites are next mentioned by Clement Alex. (Pæd., II, ii, 33; Strom., I, xv; VII, xvii). The whole of the third book of the Stromata is devoted to combating a false *encrateia*, or continency, though a special sect of Encratites is not there mentioned. Hippolytus (Philos., VIII, xiii) refers to them as "acknowledging what concerns God and Christ in like manner with the Church; in respect, however, of their mode of life, passing their days inflated with pride"; "abstaining from animal food, being water-drinkers and forbidding to marry"; "estimated Cynics rather than Christians". On the strength of this passage it is supposed that some Encratites were perfectly orthodox in doctrine, and erred only in practice, but τὰ περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ need not include the whole of Christian doctrine. Somewhat later this sect received new life and strength by the accession of a certain Severus (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., IV, xxix), after whom Encratites were often called Severians. These Severian Encratites accepted the Law, the Prophets, and the Gospels, but rejected the Book of the Acts and cursed St. Paul and his Epistles. But the account given by Epiphanius of the Severians rather betrays Syrian Gnosticism than Judaistic tendencies. In their hatred of marriage they declared woman the work of Satan, and in their hatred of intoxicants they called wine drops of venom from the great Serpent, etc. (Hær., xlv). Epiphanius states that in his day Encratites were very numerous throughout Asia Minor, in Pisidia, in the Adustan district of Phrygia, in Isauria, Pamphylia, Cilicia, and Galatia. In the Roman Province and in Antioch of Syria they were found scattered here and there. They split up into a number of smaller sects, of whom the Apostolici (q. v.) were remarkable for their condemnation of private property, the Hydroparastatæ for their use of water instead of wine in the Eucharist. In the Edict of 382, Theodosius pronounced sentence of death on all those who took the name of Encratites, Saccophori, or Hydroparastatæ, and commanded Florus, the *Magister Officiorum*, to make strict search for these heretics, who were Manichæans in disguise. Sozomen (Hist. Eccl., V, xi) tells of an Encratite of Ancyra in Galatia, called Busiris, who bravely submitted to torments in the Julian persecution, and who under Theodosius abjured his heresy and returned to the Catholic Church. On the other hand, we learn from Macarius Magnes (about 403—Apocr., III, xliii) of a certain Dositheus, a Cilician, who about the same time wrote a work in eight books in defence of Encratite errors. About the middle of the fifth century they disappear from history, absorbed, probably, by the Manichæans, with whom they had so much in common from the first.

II. WRITINGS.—The Encratites developed a considerable literary activity. The earliest writer in their defence probably was Tatian in his book "Concerning Perfection according to the Saviour", which Clement of Alexandria quotes and refutes in Strom., III, xii. Almost contemporary with him (about A.D. 150) was Julius Cassianus, known as the founder of Docetism (see DOCETÆ). He wrote a work "Concerning Self-restraint and Continency", of which Clement and St. Jerome have preserved some passages (Strom., I, xxi; Euseb., Praep. Ev., X, xii; Strom., III, xiii; Jerome, ad Gal., VI, viii). Concerning the eight books of Dositheus we know only that he maintained that, as the world had its beginning by sexual intercourse, so by continency (*encrateia*) it would have its end; and that he inveighed against wine-drinkers and flesh-eaters. Among the apocryphal works which originated in Encratite circles must be mentioned: The Gospel according to the Egyptians, referred to by Clement (Strom., III, ix, 13), Origen (Hom. in i Luc.), Hippolytus (Philos., V, vii), which contained a dialogue between Jesus and Salome specially appealed to by the Encratites in condemnation of marriage (to this Gospel the recently discovered "Logia" probably belong); the Gospel of Philip, of Thomas, the Acts of Peter, of Andrew, of Thomas, and other Apocrypha, furthering Gnostic-Encratite views.

Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., IV, xxi, 28) says that Musanus (A.D. 170 or 210) wrote a most elegant book addressed to some brethren who had fallen into the heresy of the Encratites. Theodoret (Hær. Fab., I, xxi) says that Apollinaris of Hierapolis in Phrygia (about 171) wrote against the Severian Encratites.

SALMON in *Dict. Chr. Biogr.*, s. vv., *Encratites*, *Apostolici*, *Hydroparastatai*, *Tatian*, *Cassian*; HARNACK, *History of Dogma.*, tr., I; CRUTTWELL, *A Literary Hist. of Early Christianity* (1893), I; HILGENFELD, *Ketzergesch. des Urch.* (1884); HARNACK, *Gesch. der altchr. Lit.* (Leipzig, 1893–97), I, 201 sqq., II, 1, 408, 535; BARDENHEWER, *Gesch. der altkirchl. Lit.* (Freiburg, 1902), I, 243–5, 346, 386–391; IDEM, *Patrology*, SHAHAN tr. (Freiburg im Br., St. Louis, 1908), 81, 92. J. P. ARENDZEN.

Encyclical (Lat. *Litteræ Encyclicæ*).—According to its etymology, an encyclical (from the Greek ἐγκύκλιος, κύκλος meaning a circle) is nothing more than a circular letter. In modern times, usage has confined the term almost exclusively to certain papal documents which differ in their technical form from the ordinary style of either Bulls or Briefs, and which in their superscription are explicitly addressed to the patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops of the Universal Church in communion with the Apostolic See. By exception, encyclicals are also sometimes addressed to the archbishops and bishops of a particular country. Thus this name is given to the letter of Pius X (6 Jan., 1907) to the bishops of France, in spite of the fact that it was published, not in Latin, but in French; while, on the other hand, the letter "Longinqua Oceani" (5 Jan., 1895) addressed by Leo XIII to the archbishops and bishops of the United States, is not styled an encyclical, although in all other respects it exactly observes the forms of one. From this and a number of similar facts we may probably infer that the precise designation used is not intended to be of any great significance. From the nature of the case encyclicals addressed to the bishops of the world are generally concerned with matters which affect the welfare of the Church at large. They condemn some prevalent form of error, point out dangers which threaten faith or morals, exhort the faithful to constancy, or prescribe remedies for evils foreseen or already existent. In form an encyclical at the present day begins thus—we may take the encyclical "Pascendi" on Modernism as a specimen:—

"Sanctissimi Domini Nostri Pii Divinâ Providentiâ Papæ X Litteræ Encyclicæ ad Patriarchas, Primates, Archiepiscopos, Episcopos aliosque locorum Ordinarios pacem et communionem cum Apostolicâ Sede habentes de Modernistarum Doctrinis. Ad Patriarchas, Primates, Archiepiscopos, Episcopos aliosque locorum Ordinarios, pacem et communionem cum Apostolicâ Sede habentes, Pius PP. X., Venerabiles Fratres, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Pascendi dominici gregis mandatum", etc.

The conclusion takes the following form:—"Nos vero, pignus caritatis Nostræ divinique in adversis solatii, Apostolicam Benedictionem vobis, cleris, populisque vestris amantissime impertimus. Datum Romæ, apud Sanctum Petrum, die VIII Septembris MCMVII, Pontificatus Nostri anno quinto. Pius PP. X."

Although it is only during the last three pontificates that the most important utterances of the Holy See have been given to the world in the shape of encyclicals, this form of Apostolic Letter has long been in

occasional use. Almost the first document published by Benedict XIV after his election was an "Epistola encyclica et commonitoria" on the duties of the episcopal office (3 Dec., 1740). Under Pius IX many momentous utterances were presented in this shape. The famous pronouncement "Quanta cura" (8 Dec., 1864), which was accompanied by a Syllabus (q. v.) of eighty anathematized errors, was an encyclical. Another important encyclical of Pius IX, described as an "Encyclical of the Holy Office", was that beginning "Supremæ" (4 Aug., 1856) in condemnation of Spiritualism. Leo XIII published a series of encyclicals on social and other questions which attracted universal attention. We may mention especially "Inscrutabilis" (21 April, 1878) on the evils of modern society; "Æterni Patris" (4 Aug., 1879) on St. Thomas Aquinas and Scholastic philosophy; "Arcanum divinæ sapientiæ" (10 Feb., 1880) on Christian marriage and family life; "Diuturnum illud" (29 June, 1881) on the origin of civil authority; "Immortale Dei" (1 Nov., 1885) on the Christian constitution of states; "Libertas præstantissimum" (20 June, 1888) on true liberty; "Rerum novarum" (16 May, 1891) on the labour question; "Providentissimus Deus" (18 Nov., 1893) on Holy Scripture; "Satis cognitum" (29 June, 1896) on religious unity. Pius X has shown the same favour for this form of document, e. g. in his earnest commendation of catechetical instruction "Acerbo nimis" (15 April, 1906) his address on the centenary of St. Gregory the Great (12 March, 1904), his first letter to the clergy and faithful of France, "Vehementer nos" (11 Feb., 1906), his instructions on intervention in politics to the people of Italy, and in the pronouncement on Modernism already mentioned.

Two officials presiding over separate bureaux still count it among their duties to aid the Holy Father in the drafting of his encyclical letters. These are the "Segretario dei brevi ai Principi" assisted by two *minutanti*, and the "Segretario delle lettere Latine" also with a minutante. But it was undoubtedly the habit of Leo XIII to write his own encyclicals, and it is plainly within the competence of the sovereign pontiff to dispense with the services of any subordinates.

As for the binding force of these documents it is generally admitted that the mere fact that the pope should have given to any of his utterances the form of an encyclical does not necessarily constitute it an ex-cathedra pronouncement and invest it with infallible authority. The degree in which the infallible magisterium of the Holy See is committed must be judged from the circumstances, and from the language used in the particular case. In the early centuries the term *encyclical* was applied, not only to papal letters, but to certain letters emanating from bishops or archbishops and directed to their own flocks or to other bishops. Such letters addressed by a bishop to all his subjects in general are now commonly called pastorals. Amongst Anglicans, however, the name *encyclical* has recently been revived and applied, in imitation of papal usage, to circular letters issued by the English primates. Thus the reply of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to the papal condemnation of Anglican Orders (this condemnation, "Apostolicæ Curæ", took the form of a Bull) was styled by its authors the Encyclical "Sæpius officio".

Little has been written professedly on the subject of encyclicals, which in treatises on canon law are generally grouped with other Apostolic Letters. The work of BENCINI, *De Literis Encyclicis Dissertatio* (Turin, 1728), deals almost exclusively with the early church documents which were so styled; see, however, HILGENREINER in *Kirchliches Handlexikon* (Munich, 1907), I, 1310; and GOYAU, *Le Vatican* (Paris, 1898), p. 336; WYNNE, *The Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII* (New York, 1903); EYRE, *The Pope and the People* (London, 1897); and D' ARROS, *Léon XIII d'après ses Encycliques* (Paris, 1902). On the authority of encyclicals and similar papal documents, see especially the very useful book of CHOUPIN, *Valeur des Décisions Doctrinales et Disciplinaires du Saint-Siège* (Paris, 1907); cf. BAINVEL, *De Magisterio vivo et Traditione* (Paris, 1905).

HERBERT THURSTON.

Encyclopedia, an abridgment of human knowledge in general or a considerable department thereof, treated from a uniform point of view or in a systematized summary. Although the word, used technically, dates only from the sixteenth century, encyclopedic treatment of human science reaches back to antiquity, growing out of the needs of general culture, necessities arising from the extent of the great empires of antiquity. The general culture which every free-born Greek and Roman had to acquire, comprised the practical and theoretical sciences, grammar, music, geometry, astronomy, and gymnastics, and was termed *ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία*, *orbis doctrinæ* (cycle of the sciences), and, beginning with the Middle Ages, *artes liberales* (see ARTS, THE SEVEN LIBERAL).

According to their form, systematic encyclopedias are divided into two classes: (a) those which present all branches of knowledge, arranged uniformly and organically according to some fixed system of connexion, and (b) the lexicographical encyclopedias, which treat of the same matter arranged according to an alphabetical system. Suidas, in the tenth century, compiled an encyclopedia of the latter type, which became common only in the seventeenth century after the appearance of encyclopedic dictionaries dealing with particular sciences. Aristotle was the first in ancient times to attempt a summary of human knowledge in encyclopedic form. Compared with Aristotle's work, which is built up on a philosophic basis, the compilations along this line by Marcus Porcius Cato (234–149 B. C.), Marcus Terentius Varro (116–27 B. C.), in his "Disciplinarum libri IX", Pliny (A. D. 23–79), in his "Historia naturalis", and Martianus Capella (fifth century), in his "Satiricon", or "De Nuptiis Philologiæ et Mercurii", used during the Middle Ages as a textbook for the liberal arts, were merely collections of materials. Besides general encyclopedias, the ancients also had special encyclopedias, e. g. a lost work of Plato's pupil, Speusippus, and later Varro's "Rerum divinarum et humanarum antiquitates", which has also perished. This group comprises also the medieval *summæ* and *specula*. The lack of a philosophic basis and the mechanical stringing together of facts without organic principle give to most of these works an unsatisfactory and tentative character.

The first attempt to compile an encyclopedia in the real sense of the word is evident in the "Etymologiæ sive origines" of Isidore of Seville (c. 560–636), the materials of which were re-arranged and more or less independently supplemented by Rabanus Maurus (776–856) in his "De Universo", by Honorius Augustodunensis in his "Imago Mundi", and by others. The most astonishing of these compilations, from the viewpoint of wealth of material and complexity of detail, is the work of Vincent of Beauvais (died c. 1264), which groups the entire knowledge of the Middle Ages under three heads: "Speculum naturale", "Speculum doctrinale", and "Speculum historiale"; later an anonymous writer published, as a supplement, the "Speculum morale". The following are also examples of encyclopedic works in the later Middle Ages: "Liber de naturâ rerum" of Conrad of Megenberg (d. 1374); the "Imago Mundi" of Pierre d'Ailly (died c. 1420); the "Margarita philosophica" of Gregor Reisch, O. Cart. (Freiburg, 1503), and at a later date the encyclopedias of Ringelberg, "Lucubrationes vel potius absolutissima *κυκλοπαιδεία*" (Basle, 1541), Paul Scalich, "Encyclopædia seu Orbis Disciplinarum tum sacrarum tum profanarum" (Basle, 1559); Martini, "Idea methodicæ et brevis encyclopædiæ sive adumbratio universitatis" (Herborn, 1606); Alsted's "Scientiarum omnium encyclopædiæ tomi VII" (Herborn, 1620; 2nd ed., 1630). All the above-mentioned works are simply collections of facts showing no mastery of the material by the writer, much less any critical research or an organic system of compilation.

The first to attempt a work founded on the philoso-

phy and interrelation of sciences was Francis Bacon, Lord Verulam, in his incomplete "Instauratio Magna", the second part of which was the "Novum organum" (London, 1620), and his "De dignitate et augmentis scientiarum" (1623). His immediate successors, however, who had not mastered their materials, did not rise above the old-fashioned compilation of dry facts suited only for general instruction or as works of reference for scholars, e. g. the "Pera librorum juvenilium" of Wagenseil (Altdorf, 1695), Chevigny's "La science de l'homme de cour d'épée et de robe" (18 vols., Amsterdam, 1752), and Daniel Morhof's "Polyhistor" (Lübeck, 1688 and 1747). A clearer idea of the proper organic construction of an encyclopedic work is first apparent in J. M. Gesner's "Primæ lineæ isagoges in eruditionem universalem" (3rd ed., Göttingen, 1786), and J. G. Sulzer's "Kurzer Begriff aller Wissenschaften" (Leipzig, 1745; Eisenach, 1778). The way had been prepared, however, by two earlier works, which mark an important advance in the conception of what is proper to an encyclopedia. Both works, but especially the second, exerted a far-reaching influence on the whole intellectual life of the time. These were: Bayle's "Dictionnaire historique et critique" (Rotterdam, 1696), and "Encyclopédie ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers", compiled by Diderot and d'Alembert (28 vols., Paris, 1751–72, with 7 supplementary vols., 1776–80). While in these works the matter is arranged on an alphabetical system, a number of Sulzer's imitators essayed a systematic presentation of sciences on the old plan, e. g. Adelung, "Kurzer Begriff menschlicher Fertigkeiten und Kentnisse" (Leipzig, 1778); Reimarus, "Encyklopädie" (Hamburg, 1775); Büsch, "Encyk. der mathematischen Wissenschaften" (Hamburg, 1795); Reuss, "Encyclopädie" (Tübingen, 1783); Buhle, "Encyclopädie" (Lemgo, 1790). A successful attempt in this direction, based on Kantian principles, was made by J. J. Eschenburg in his "Lehrbuch der Wissenschaftskunde" (Berlin, 1792; 3rd ed., 1808). In competition with this, Krug's introduction of a new method in "Versuch einer systematischen Encyklopädie der Wissenschaften" (Leipzig, 1796–97; Züllichau, 1804–19) was unsuccessful. Not to mention Habel, Rüf, and Strass, the following imitators of Eschenburg gained no little reputation: Heffter, "Philosophische Darstellung eines Systems aller Wissenschaften" (Leipzig, 1806); Burdach, "Organismus der menschlichen Wissenschaften und Kunst" (Leipzig, 1809); Kraus, "Encyklopädische Ansichten" (Königsberg, 1809); and the followers of Kant, E. Schmidt, "Allgemeine Encyklopädie und Methodologie der Wissenschaften" (Jena, 1810), and K. A. Schaller, "Encyk. und Methodologie" (Magdeburg, 1812). The increase in knowledge and the demands for specialization which are noticeable from the beginning of the nineteenth century, destroyed even the possibility of presenting completely all the departments of human knowledge or even a single branch of any great extent. The last attempts made in this direction (and they deserve some attention) were Kirchner's "Akademische Propädeutik" (Leipzig, 1842) and "Hodegetik" (1852), also Schleiermacher's "Bibliographisches System der gesamten Wissenschaftskunde" (Brunswick, 1852).

The increasing specialization of sciences has resulted in the production of special encyclopedias, which in the course of time have gradually come to cover every department of science and art and every phase of human life. Thus there have appeared, for instance, Böckh, "Encyk. und Methodologie der philolog. Wissenschaften" (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1886); Hommel, "Semitische Völker und Sprachen" (Leipzig, 1883—); Schmitz's work on the modern languages; Körting's works on English and Romance philology (Heilbronn, 1884—); Gröber, "Grundriss der roman. Philol." (Strasburg, 1888—); Paul, "Grundriss der german. Philol." (Strasburg, 1889–93); Elze, "Grundriss der engl. Philol." (Halle, 1887); Geiger-Kuhn, "Grundriss der iranischen Philologie" (Strasburg, 1896—); Bühler-Kielhorn, "Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie" (Strasburg, 1896—); Jagic, "Grundriss der slavischen Philologie" (1908). The province of jurisprudence has also been covered in a similar manner in the course of the nineteenth century, especially by Arndt, "Jurist. Encyk. u. Methodologie" (Stuttgart, 1843; 10th ed., 1901); Bluhme, "Encyk. der in Deutschland geltenden Rechte" (Bonn, 1847–58); Merkel, "Juristische Encyk." (Berlin, 1885; 3rd ed., 1904). Theology was also summarized by the Catholics: Staudenmaier, "Encyk. der theolog. Wissenschaften" (2nd ed., Mainz, 1840); Wirthmüller, "Encyk. der kath. Theologie" (1874); Klee, "Encyk. der Theologie" (1832); Kihn, "Encyk. und Methodologie der Theologie" (1892); Krieg, "Encyk. der theolog. Wissenschaften" (1899); by Protestants: Zöckler, "Handbuch der theolog. Wissenschaften" (Munich, 1882–85); Hagenbach, "Encyk. und Methodologie der theolog. Wissenschaften" (12th ed., Leipzig, 1889); Heinrici, "Theolog. encyk." (1893); Kähler, "Wissenschaft der christl. Lehre" (1893); Räbiger, "Theologik" (1880); Achelis-Baumgarten, "Grundriss der theol. Wissenschaften" (1892). Pedagogy is treated in the "Encykl. der Pädagogie" of Stoy (1861; 2nd ed., 1878); political science by Baumstark, "Kameralistische Encyk." (1835); and von Mohl, "Encyk. der Staatswissenschaft" (1859; 2nd ed., 1872); the progress of civilization by Dünkelberg, "Encyk. und Methodologie der Kulturtechnik" (1883); forestry by Dombrowski, "Allg. Encykl. der ges. Forst- und Jagdwissenschaften" (1886–94); physics by Lardner, "Cabinet Cyclopædia" (132 vols., London, 1829–46; 2d ed., 1854); "Allgemeine Encykl. der Physik", ed. Lamont, Helmholtz, and others; and chemistry by Frémy, "Encycl. chim." (Paris, 1886). The "Encyclopædia Metropolitana" of S. Taylor Coleridge is of a more general scope, as also the vast undertaking of Iwan Müller, which embraces every branch of classical learning, treated by specialists, "Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft" (Munich, 1885; vols. since republished separately). Among the various attempts to treat history in this manner may be mentioned Oncken's "Allgemeine Gesch. in Einzeldarstellungen" (45 vols., Berlin, 1879–93). Nearly every branch may boast of some encyclopedic work to facilitate a rapid general survey of the subject, its history, aim, and object, and, above all, to present the results of special investigation in the several departments of the science. An important contribution along these lines, now in the course of publication, which will give the general reader an outlook upon the various branches of knowledge, is "Die Kultur der Gegenwart", ed. Hinneberg (Leipzig, 1906—).

The first to arrange encyclopedic matter according to an alphabetical system was Suidas, during whose time (tenth and eleventh centuries) the necessity of general information on Byzantine culture made itself felt, especially during the reign of Constantine VII, Porphyrogenitus (913–59). The lexicon of Suidas was first imitated by Furetière (Rotterdam, 1690); Thomas Corneille (Paris, 1694); Ephraim Chambers in his "Cyclopædia" (London, 1728); Jablonski, "Lexikon der Künste und Wissenschaften" (Leipzig, 1721); Moréri, "Grand dict. historique" (Lyons, 1674); and Hübner, "Reales-Staats-Zeitungs- und Konversations-Lexikon" (1704; 31st ed., Leipzig, 1824–28). As to contents the encyclopedias of this period may likewise be divided into general encyclopedias (*Konversationslexikon*), and technical encyclopedias or dictionaries (*Realwörterbuch* or *Realencyklopädie*). The most important work for the popularization of the results of scientific research was Bayle's "Dict. historique et critique" (Rotterdam, 1695–97). The am-

bitious "Biblioteca universale" of Coronelli (7 vols., Venice, 1701) remained incomplete; the immense "Grosses, vollständiges Universal-Lexikon aller Wissenschaften und Künste", edited by J. P. von Ludewig, Frankenstein, Longolius, and others and published by Zedler (64 vols. and 4 suppl. vols., Leipzig, 1731–54), was brought to completion. About the same time there appeared in France the great encyclopedia of Diderot and d'Alembert who were assisted in their work by numerous champions of rationalism, e. g. Voltaire, d'Holbach, Rousseau, and Grimm: "Encyclopédie ou Dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers" (28 vols., Paris, 1751–72, with 5 supplementary volumes, Amsterdam, 1776–77, and 2 vols. of analytical index, Paris, 1780). This resembles the German work in breadth of scope, but had much greater influence on European thought, popularizing as it did the empiricism, sensism, and materialism of Locke. The first edition of 30,000 copies was followed by many later editions.

The encyclopedia of Diderot paved the way for the alphabetic encyclopedia. It was not only frequently reprinted but was re-arranged as a system of separate dictionaries by Panckoucke and Agasse in the "Encyclopédie méthodique ou par ordre des matières" (166 vols. of text and 51 vols. of illustrations; Paris, 1782–1832). In Germany the first encyclopedia modelled on Diderot's, by Köster and Roos, only reached *Kinol* (23 vols., Frankfort, 1778–1804); the next attempt, however, made on a large scale by Ersch and Gruber, proved a success. This is considered the most scientific German encyclopedia, "Allgemeine Encyklopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste", begun by Professor Johann Samuel Ersch in 1813 and continued by Professors Hufeland, Gruber, Meier, Brockhaus, Müller, and Hoffmann. The work is divided into three sections: Section I, A to G, 99 vols. (1818–82); Section II, H to N, 43 vols. (1827–90); Section III, O to Z, 25 vols. (1830–50). Equally ambitious in scope is the "Oekonomisch-technolog. Encykl." (242 vols., Berlin, 1773–1858), planned by Krünitz as a dictionary of economics and technology, but gradually enlarged by his successors Flörke, Korth, and C. O. Hoffmann into a general encyclopedia. Outside of the encyclopedia of Ersch and Gruber, the most ambitious encyclopedic work of the nineteenth century, the model of encyclopedic presentation, is the Brockhaus "Konversationslexikon", which took its name from Hübner, and from Bayle's "Dictionnaire" its arrangement and plan of presenting the results of scientific research and discovery in a popular form. Hübner gave as the reason for naming his work "Reales-Staats-Zeitungs- und Konversations-Lexikon" the fact that "it was to contain no professorial learning but all items of refined learning needed in daily intercourse with educated people". As it was printed chiefly to satisfy people of a curious turn of mind, it was confined principally to geography, while history was excluded as a special science. The first encyclopedia according to modern ideas was begun by Löbel in 1796 (6 vols., Amsterdam, 1808; 2 supplementary vols., 1810). In 1800 the publishing rights were acquired by Friedrich Arnold Brockhaus; the firm of Brockhaus completely altered the original plan and is still engaged on the work (14th ed., 1901—abridged ed., 2 vols., 4th ed., 1888). Constructed on the same lines as the encyclopedia of Brockhaus is Pierer's "Universallexikon" (26 vols., 1824–36; 7th ed., 12 vols., 1888–93), to which were added the Pierer "Jahrbücher der Wissenschaften, Künste und Gewerbe" (1865–73); similar works are Meyer's "Konversations-Lexikon" (37 vols., Leipzig, 1840–52; 6th ed., 20 vols., 1902; 7th ed., abridged, 6 vols., 1907) and Spamer's "Illustriertes Konversationslexikon" (8 vols., 1869–79; 2 supplementary vols., 1879–82; 2nd ed., 1884–91). These works were inspired by a superficial rationalism, if not by conscious hostility to everything Catholic. Early attempts were made to counteract this propaganda of religious indifferentism by the publication of encyclopedias from the Catholic point of view, such as the "Allgemeine Realencyklopädie oder Konversations-Lexikon für das katholische Deutschland" (13 vols., 1846–49; 4th ed., 1880–90); and Herder's "Konversationslexikon" (5 vols., Freiburg, 1853–57); neither proved a thorough success. The third edition of the latter (8 vols., 1901–08), through its preservation of Catholic interests, by its impartiality, thoroughness, and comprehensiveness, gained general approval.

Encyclopedias have since been compiled in all civilized countries. In France were published the "Encyclopédie des gens du monde" (22 vols., 1833–45); "Encyclopédie du XIX^{eme} siècle" (75 vols., 1837–59; 3rd ed., 1867–72; continued as "Annuaire encyc."); "Encyclopédie moderne" (1846–51; new ed., 30 vols., 12 suppl. vols., atlas, 2 vols., 1856–62); "Dictionnaire de la conversation et de la lecture" (16 vols., 1851–58); "La Grande Encyclopédie", compiled by Bertholet, Derenbourg, and others (31 vols., 1885–1903); "Dict. univ.", ed. Larousse (17 vols., 1865–90; new ed., 1895); "Nouveau Larousse illustré", ed. Claude Augé (1898–1904); Larousse, "Dict. complet illustré" (129th ed., 1903). The chief Spanish encyclopedias are "Enciclopedia moderna", ed. Mellados (34 vols., 3 vols. of charts, Madrid, 1848–51); "Diccionario encic. Hispano-Americano", ed. Montaner y Simon (25 vols., Barcelona, 1887–99); and the "Enciclopedia universal ilustrada europeo-americana" (Barcelona, 1907—), edited along Catholic lines; Portugal: "Diccionario popular hist. geogr. mytholog. biograph." (16 vols., Lisbon, 1876–90); "Diccionario universal portuguez", ed. Costa; "Enciclopedia portugueza illustrada", ed. Lemos (254 nos. to 1903). Italy: "Nuova Encic. popolare italiana" (14 vols., Turin, 1841–51; 6th ed., 25 vols., 1875–89; suppl., 1889–99); "Enciclopedia popolare economica", ed. Berri (Milan, 1871); "Dizionario universale di scienze, lettere ed arti", ed. Lessona and Valle (Milan, 1874–1883); "Piccola Enciclopedia" (Milan, 1891). Rumania: "Enciclop. Română" (3 vols., Hermannstadt, 1896–1903). England: "Encyclopædia Britannica" (1771; 9th ed., 24 vols. and index, 1875–89, suppl., 11 vols., index and atlas, 1902–03); "New Encyclopædia" of Rees (45 vols., London, 1802–20); "Encyclopædia Metropolitana", ed. Smedley (30 vols., 1818–45); "English Cyclopedia", ed. Knight (27 vols., 4 suppl., London, 1854–73); "Chambers's Encyclopædia" (10 vols., London, 1860–68; new ed., 1901); "Encyclopædic Dictionary", ed. Hunter (7 vols., London, New York, 1879–88). United States: "The American Cyclopædia" (16 vols., New York, 1858–63; new ed., 1873–76); "Deutsch-Amerikanisches Konversations-Lex.", ed. Schem (New York, 1870–74); "Johnson's New Universal Encyc." (4 vols., New York, 1874–8; new ed., 8 vols., 1893–5); "The Encyclopedia Americana" (New York, 1903–06); "The New International Encyclopædia" (17 vols., New York, 1902–04); "The Jewish Encyclopedia" (1906—). The Netherlands: "Nieuwenhuis' Woordenboek van kunsten en wetenschapen" (Leyden, 1851–68); "De algemeene Nederlandsche Encyclopedie" (15 vols., Zütphen, 1865–68); "Geïllustreerde Encyclopædie", ed. Winkler Prins (15 vols., 1868–82); "Woordenboek voor kennis en kunst", ed. Sijthoff (Leyden, 1891). Denmark and other northern countries: "Nordisk Konversationsleksikon", ed. Mollerup (3rd ed., Copenhagen, 1883–94); "Store illustrerede Konversationsleksikon", ed. Blangstrup (12 vols., Copenhagen, 1891–1901); "Norsk haandbog", ed. Johnsen (1879–88); "Nordisk Familjebog" (Stockholm, 1879–94); "Konversationsleksikon", ed. Meijer (1889–94). Russia: "Entciklopedicheskij Slovaŕ", ed. Brockhaus and Efron (35

vols., St. Petersburg, 1890–1902); "Boljšaja Enciklopedija", ed. Jushakow (St. Petersburg. 1899). Poland: "Encjklopedya powszechna", ed. Orgelbrand (28 vols., Warsaw, 1859–68), Sikorski (Warsaw, 1890). Bohemia: "Slovník Naučný", ed. Kober (12 vols., Prague, 1860–87); "Ottův Slovník Naučný, ed. Otto (17 vols., Prague, 1888–1901). Hungary: "Pallas Nagy Lexikona" (16 vols., Budapest, 1893–97; suppl., 1900); an Arabian encyclopedia was discontinued when it reached the ninth volume (Beirut, 1876–87).

In addition to these works, which were prepared for general reference, technical encyclopedias reached great perfection during the nineteenth century. There is hardly a science or department of knowledge which is not fully covered in some work of this kind. In the province of general theology Migne has published in his "Encycl. théologique" (Paris, 1844–75), a series of over 100 special lexicons treating the different branches of theology: dogmas, heresies, liturgy, symbolism, archæology, councils, cardinals, etc. Another comprehensive encyclopedia, dealing especially with theology and church history, is the "Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica" of Gaetano Moroni (103 vols., 6 index vols., Venice, 1840–79). The "Handlexikon der kath. Theologie", ed. Schaffer (3 vols., from A to Rèservationen, Ratisbon, 1881–91) and Aschbach's "Kirchenlexikon" (4 vols., 1846–51) remained unfinished. The most important Catholic encyclopedia of Germany is Wetzer and Welte's "Kirchenlexikon" (13 vols., Freiburg, 1847–60; 2nd ed., 1880–91; index vol., 1903). A short but comprehensive encyclopedia is Buchberger's "Kirchliches Handlexikon" (Munich, 1907—). Similar undertakings are "Dictionnaire de théologie catholique", ed. Vacant and Mangenot (Paris, 1903—) and THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA, ed. Herbermann, Pace, Pallen, Shahan, and Wynne (15 vols., New York, 1906—), which deals with the constitution, doctrine, discipline, and history of the Church, and whatever is connected with the interests of the Church. Among distinctively Protestant encyclopedias may be mentioned: "Lexikon für Theologie und Kirchenwesen", ed. H. Holtzmann and Zöpffel (2nd ed., Brunswick, 1888); "Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche", ed. Herzog (21 vols., 1853–68; 3rd ed., 21 vols., ed. Hauck, 1896–1908; tr. New York, 1908—); "Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart", ed. Schiele (5 vols., Tübingen, 1909—), on the same plan as Buchberger's "Handlexikon". There are a large number of Biblical dictionaries; the earliest is the "Grand dictionnaire de la Bible ou explication littérale et historique de tous les mots propres du vieux et nouveau Test.", ed. Richard Simon (Lyons, 1693). Soon after appeared Calmet's "Dict. historique, critique, chronologique, géographique et littéral de la Bible" (Paris, 1719). A work which is still useful is the "Biblisches Realwörterbuch", ed. G. B. Winers (2 vols., 3rd ed., 1847–48). D. Schenkel's "Bibellexikon" is pronouncedly rationalistic; the Jewish point of view is found in Hamburger's "Realencyklopädie für Bibel und Talmud" (2 vols., 4 suppl. vols.; new ed., 1896–97); "The Jewish Encyclopedia", ed. Singer (New York, 1906—). Among Protestant Biblical dictionaries are the "Handwörterbuch des biblischen Altertums", ed. Riehm and Bäthgen (2 vols., Bielefeld, 1893–94); "Kurzes Bibelwörterbuch", ed. H. Guthe (1903); "Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature", ed. Kitto (3rd ed., ed. Alexander, 3 vols., Edinburgh, 1862–65); "Dictionary of the Bible", ed. Smith (London, 1860–63, 3 vols.; 2nd ed., Smith and Fuller, 1893); "Dictionary of the Bible", ed. Hastings (4 vols., Edinburgh, 1898–1902, suppl. vol., 1904); the well-known rationalistic "Encyclopædia biblica", ed. Cheyne and Black (4 vols.; London, 1899–1903). There are only two Catholic Biblical encyclopedias: Vigouroux, "Dictionnaire de la bible contenant tous les noms de personnes, de lieux, de plantes, d'animaux mentionnés dans les Ecritures" (Paris, 1895—), and the "Lexicon biblicum" of M. Hagen (4 vols., Paris, 1905—). The following encyclopedias deal with Christian archæology: "Dictionnaire des antiquités chrétiennes", ed. Martigny (2nd ed., Paris, 1877); "Dictionary of Christian Antiquities", ed. Smith and Cheetham (London, 1875); Kraus, "Real-Encyklopädie der christlichen Alterthümer" (2 vols., Freiburg im Br., 1882–86); Cabrol, "Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie" (Paris, 1907—). Hagiography and the veneration of relics, besides the volume in Migne's "Encyclopédie théologique", "Heiligenlexikon", ed. Stadler and Heim (5 vols., 1858–82); on church music: "Lexikon der kirchlichen Tonkunst", ed. Kornmüller (2nd ed., 2 vols., Ratisbon, 1891–95).

Medicine is treated in "Medizinisch-chirurgische Encyk.", ed. Prosch and Ploss (4 vols., Leipzig, 1867); "Realencyklop. der gesamten Heilkunde", ed. Eulenburg (3rd ed., Vienna, 1893); "Handwörterbuch der gesamten Medizin" (2nd ed., Stuttgart, 1899–1900). Jurisprudence and sociology: "Encyklopädie der Rechtswissenschaft", ed. F. v. Holtzendorff (1870–73; 6th ed., 1903—); "Encykl. der Rechtswissenschaft", ed. Birkmeyer (Berlin, 1901); "Staats- und Gesellschafts-Lex.", ed. H. Wagener (26 vols., Berlin, 1859–68); "Staatslex.", ed. Rotteck and Welcker (15 vols., Altona, 1835–44; 3rd ed. 14 vols., 1856–66); the Catholic "Staats-Lexikon" of the Görres Society, ed. Bruder (5 vols., Freiburg im Br., 1889–97; 4th ed., ed. Bachem, 1908—); "Deutsches Staatswörterbuch", ed. Bluntschli (2 vols., 1857–70; new ed., 3 vols., 1869–74); "Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften", ed. Conrad, Elster, Lexis, and Loening (6 vols., 2 suppl. vols., 1889–98); "Nouveau dict. d'économie politique", ed. Fay and Chailley (2 vols., Paris, 1891–92); "Wörterbuch der Volkswirtschaft", ed. Elster (2 vols., 1808; 2nd ed., 1907); "Handwörterbuch der Schweizer Volkswirtschaft", ed. Reichesberg (1901—); "Cyclopædia of Political Science, Political Economy, and Political History of the United States", ed. Lalor (Chicago, 1881); "Handwörterbuch der gesamten Militärwissenschaften", ed. Poten (Bielefeld, 1877–80). Philosophy: "Dictionnaire des sciences philosophiques", ed. Frank (3rd ed., 1885). Natural science: "Encyklopädie der Naturwissenschaften" (Breslau, 1879—); "Encyclopédie d'histoire naturelle", ed. Chenu (22 vols. of text, 9 vols. of illustrations, Paris, 1850–61). Antiquity: "Realencyk. der klass. Altertumswissenschaft", ed. Pauly (6 vols., Stuttgart, 1842–66; ed. Wissowa, 1894—); "Reallexikon des klassischen Altertums", ed. Lübker (1853—; 7th ed., 1890); "Reallexicon der deutschen Altertümer", ed. Götzinger (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1885). History and biography: "Encyklopädie der neuern Gesch.", ed. Herbst (5 vols., Gotha, 1880–90); "Allgemeine deutsche Biographie" (47 vols., 1875–1903; suppl., 1905—), and, supplementary, Bettelheim's "Jahrbuch für Biographie und Necrologie" (1903—); "Dictionnaire encyclopédique d'histoire, de biographie, de mythologie et de géographie", ed. Grégoire (Paris, 1894); "Dictionnaire des contemporains", ed. Vapereau (Paris, 1858; 6th ed., 1893; suppl., 1895); "Dictionnaire des littérateurs", ed. Vapereau (1876; 2nd ed., 1884); "Dictionary of National Biography" (63 vols., London, 1863–1903; new ed., 1908); "Nouvelle biographie générale" (46 vols., Paris, 1855–66); "Dizionario biografico degli scrittori contemporanei", ed. de Gubernatis (3 vols., Florence, 1890–91); "Men and Women" (5th ed., 1899); "Who's Who" (1857—); "Who's Who in America" (1899—); "Wer ist's?", ed. Degener (1905—). "The Catholic Who's Who" (London, 2nd ed., 1909). Geography: "Geographisch-statistisches Lexikon", ed. Ritter (2 vols., 1835; 8th ed., 1895); "Dictionnaire universelle d'histoire et de géographie", ed. Bouillet (Paris, 1842; 32nd ed., 1901; "Nouveau dictionnaire de géographie uni-

verselle", ed. Vivien de Saint-Martin (7 vols. and suppl., 1879–97); "General Dictionary of Geography", ed. Johnston (Edinburgh, 1877); "Dizionario universale di geografia e storia", ed. Strafforello and Grimaldi-Costa (Milan, 1873–77, suppl., 1888). Pedagogy: "Encyk. des ges. Erziehungs- und Unterrichtswesens", ed. K. A. Schmid (10 vols., 1857–78; 2nd ed., Gotha, 1876–88); "Katholische Encyk. für Pädagogik" (Freiburg im Br., 1909—); "Cyclopædia of Education", ed. Kiddle and Schem (New York, 1877). Mathematics: "Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften", ed. Burkhardt and Meyer. Chemistry: "Handwörterbuch der Chemie", ed. Liebig and Poggendorff (1836–64; new ed., 1870). Art and music: "Encyclopédie historique et archéologique des beaux-arts plastiques", ed. Demmin (3 vols., Paris, 1865–70); "Dictionary of Arts, Manufactures and Mines", ed. Ure (4th ed., London, 1875–78); Gwilt, "Encyclopædia of Architecture (new ed., London, 1894); "Dict. raisonné de l'architecture française", ed. Viollet-le-Duc (10 vols., and suppl., Paris, 1875–89); "Allgemeines Künstlerlexikon", ed. Füssli (1763–77); "Neues allgemeines Künstlerlexikon", ed. Nagler (22 vols., Munich, 1835–52); "Allgemeines Künstlerlex.", ed. Müller and Singer (3rd ed., 5 vols., 1895–1901; suppl. 1906); Allgemeines Künstlerlex.", ed. Seubert (3 vols., Frankfort, 1879); "Künsterlexikon", ed. Thieme (Leipzig, 1907—); "Musikalisches Konversations-Lexikon", ed. Mendel and Reissmann (2 vols. and suppl., Berlin, 1870–83); "Musik-Lexikon", ed. Riemann (4th ed., 1894); "Biographie universelle des musiciens", ed. Fétis and Pougin (2nd ed., 8 vols., 1860–65; 2 suppl. vols., 1878–81); "Dictionary of Music", ed. Grove (4 vols. and suppl., London, 1878–89; 2nd ed., 1905—); "Quellen-Lexikon für Musik", ed. Eitner (10 vols., 1900).

Besides these general encyclopedias dealing with different arts and sciences, there are also special technical dictionaries devoted to departments of each science, often treating recondite subjects, but in the hands of scholars facilitating acquaintance with the details of these sciences.

JOSEPH SAUER.

Encyclopedists.—(1) The writers of the eighteenth century who edited or contributed articles to the "Encyclopédie". (2) Those among them especially who belonged to the "philosophic" party, joined in the "illumination" movement, and may be grouped together because of a certain community of opinions on philosophical, religious, moral, and social questions.

I. THE ENCYCLOPÉDIE AND THE ENCYCLOPEDISTS.—The "Encyclopédie, ou Dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers, par une société de gens de lettres, mis en ordre et publié par M. Diderot . . . et quant à la partie mathématique par M. d'Alembert . . ." in the complete original edition comprises 35 folio volumes as follows: 17 vols. of text (Paris, 1751–1765); 11 vols. of plates (Paris, 1762–1772); 5 vols. of supplement, i. e. 4 of text and 1 of plates (Amsterdam and Paris, 1776–1777); 2 vols. of analytical index prepared by Pierre Mouchon (Amsterdam and Paris, 1780). In 1745, a French translation of Chambers's "Cyclopædia", prepared by John Mills with the assistance of Gottfried Sellius, was to be published in Paris by the king's printer, Le Breton. After the necessary royal privilege had been obtained, a number of difficulties between Mills and Le Breton caused the failure of the enterprise, and Mills returned to England. Le Breton asked Jean-Paul de Gua, professor in the Collège de France, to assume the editorship and revise the manuscripts. But again misunderstandings and disputes obliged de Gua to resign. Diderot was then called upon to complete the preparation of the manuscripts. At his suggestion, however, it was decided to undertake a more original and more comprehensive work. Diderot's friend, d'Alembert, agreed to edit the mathematical sciences. Diderot (1713–84) had not yet written any original work except the "Pensées philosophiques" (1746), in which the foundations of Christianity are examined and undermined, revelation rejected, and reason proclaimed independent. The Parliament had ordered the book to be burnt. The "Promenade d'un sceptique" was written in 1747, but not published before the author's death. Diderot had also published a translation of Stanyan's "Grecian History" (1743) and an adaptation of Shaftesbury's "Inquiry concerning Virtue and Merit" under the title "Principes de la philosophie, ou Essai sur le mérite et la vertu" (1745). His main recommendation as editor of the new Encyclopédie, however, was the "Dictionnaire universel de médecine" (1746–1748), a translation of Dr. Robert James's "Medical Dictionary". D'Alembert (1717–83) was already famous as a mathematician. At the age of twenty-two he had presented two studies to the Académie des Sciences, "Sur la réfraction des corps solides" (1739), and "Sur le calcul intégral" (1740). The following year he was elected a member of the Académie. He had acquired a still greater reputation by his "Traité de dynamique" (1743) and the "Mémoire sur la cause générale des vents" (1747), the latter winning for its author the prize offered by the Berlin Academy and membership in that body.

While the articles were being printed Diderot was imprisoned at Vincennes, 29 July, 1749, for his "Lettre sur les aveugles à l'usage de ceux qui voient", or rather for a passage in it which had displeased Madame Dupré de Saint-Maur. After four months his publishers obtained his release; in November, 1750, the Encyclopédie was announced in a prospectus by Diderot, and, in July, 1751, the first volume was published. It opened with a "Discours préliminaire" by d'Alembert, in which the problem of the origin of ideas is solved according to Locke's sensualism, and a classification of sciences is proposed which, except in a few minor points, is that of Bacon. In the prospectus Diderot had already said: "If we succeed in this vast enterprise our principal debt will be to Chancellor Bacon who sketched the plan of a universal dictionary of sciences and arts at a time when there were, so to say, neither sciences nor arts." D'Alembert acknowledges the same indebtedness. Thus, British influence was considerable both in shaping the doctrine of the "Encyclopédie" and in bringing about its publication. The second volume appeared in January, 1752. In consequence of many protests against the spirit of the work, its sale was stopped, and later an *arrêt* of the King's Council suppressed both volumes as injurious to religion and royal authority (7 February, 1752). Three months later, however, Diderot and d'Alembert were asked to continue the work, a fact which they announce with pride in the preface to the third volume (October, 1753). The following volumes were published without any interruption until after the publication of the seventh volume (1757), when new difficulties arose. In his article on Geneva, d'Alembert had stated that the ministers of that city were Socinians, and praised them for their unbelief. They protested strongly, and this was the occasion for bitter discussions in which Voltaire and Rousseau took a prominent part. The outcome was that d'Alembert, tired of vexations, resigned the editorship. Rousseau also ceased to have anything to do with the Encyclopédie, and thenceforth showed a vehement hostility to it. On the other hand, there were so many denunciations that finally an *arrêt* of the Council (8 March, 1759) revoked the privilege granted in 1746, and forbade the sale of the volumes already printed and the printing of any future volume. And yet, under the secret protection of Choiseul, Madame de Pompadour, Malesherbes, then director-general of the Librairie, and Sartine, the chief of police, work was resumed almost immediately. The ten remaining volumes

were to be published together. After Diderot had corrected the proof-sheets, Le Breton, fearing new vexations, suppressed passages likely to be objectionable and to cause friction with the authorities. Diderot noticed the changes too late to prevent them. The articles were mutilated to an extent which it is now impossible to determine, as all manuscripts and proof-sheets were immediately destroyed. At last, in 1765, volumes VIII–XVII were published, completing the text of the Encyclopédie.

It is not possible to mention here all the contributors (about 160) to the work. Diderot himself wrote 990 articles on almost every subject, philosophical, religious, and moral, but especially on the arts and trades. Great care was taken in the treatment of the mechanical arts. No trouble was spared to obtain minute descriptions of various machines and the means of using them. All this was explained in the text and illustrated in the plates. D'Alembert's articles, with few exceptions, are on the mathematical and physical sciences. From the beginning Rousseau (1712–1778), then known as the author of several musical works and compositions, agreed to write the articles on music. He also wrote the article, "Economie politique". The collaboration of Buffon (1707–88) who had promised to write on "Nature" is announced in the second volume, but it is doubtful if that article, as printed, is from him. Most of the topics in natural history were treated by Daubenton (1716–99). Articles by d'Holbach (1723–89), Marmontel, Bordeu, are announced in the third volume. The fourth introduces Voltaire (1694–1778) as the author of some literary articles, and says of him: "The Encyclopédie, on account of the justice which it has rendered and will always continue to render him, was worthy of the interest which he now takes in it." In the "Discours préliminaire", d'Alembert had praised him as occupying "a distinguished place in the very small number of great poets", and extolled him for his qualities as a prose writer. Condorcet, Grimm, Quesnay, Turgot, Necker also contributed articles or memoirs. De Jaucourt furthered the cause of the Encyclopédie not only by his numerous articles and his constant interest, but also by his attitude and reputation. Far from sharing the materialistic and atheistic tendencies of many of his co-workers, he was at the same time friendly to the Encyclopedists and to some of their enemies. Montesquieu at his death (1755) left an unfinished article on Taste (Goût); but his "Lettres persanes" (1721) and "Esprit des lois" (1748) inspired many of the social and political articles in the Encyclopédie.

II. The Spirit and Influence of the Encyclopédie.—The expression *spirit of the Encyclopédie* may at first seem to be a misnomer. In that vast compilation is found the greatest diversity of subjects and even of views on the same subjects. The writers of the articles belong to all professions and to all classes of society. Names of military men, lawyers, physicians, artists, clergymen, scientists, philosophers, theologians, statesmen, etc. appear on the lists of contributors given at the beginning of each volume. The articles are of unequal value; proportion is lacking, each contributor apparently writing as he thinks fit. Verbosity is a prominent defect, and, at times, the authors indulge in endless digressions. Voltaire repeatedly asked for brevity and better method. (See Letters to d'Alembert, esp. in 1756.)

The articles seem to have been gathered together from various sources without any preconceived plan, without any unity or sufficient supervision. Under these conditions the spirit of the Encyclopédie might denote merely one special tendency, or one group of tendencies, which, at first manifested along with many others, gradually became important and finally predominant. To some extent it is that, but it is also more than that. The Encyclopédie was not intended only as a great monument to record the progress realized in sciences, arts, civil and religious institutions, industry, commerce, and all other lines of human endeavour; the Encyclopedists purposed moreover to prepare the future and indicate the way to further progress. The Encyclopédie would be a record, but it would also be a standard; not a mere onlooker, but a leader. In fact, appearing as it did in the third quarter of the eighteenth century, it is a mirror in which the events of the whole century are focused.

At the time of the publication of the Encyclopédie, the French Government was, owing to many causes and influences, already considerably weakened, and still weakening. Dissatisfaction and unrest, though not yet well defined, were spreading among the people. Existing institutions and customs, both religious and political, had recently been denounced in several publications. The "philosophers" were favourably received in the salons of the aristocracy. On the other hand, Jansenism, with the endless discussions of which it had been the source or the occasion, and also with the lack of knowledge and looseness of morals among some members of the clergy, had prepared the way for a reaction in the sense of unbelief. There were other causes less direct, perhaps, and more remote, yet influential in bringing about a break with the past. In Descartes one may find unequivocal germs of the neglect, contempt even, of tradition in philosophy, especially when immediate evidence, the *idée claire*, is made the sole valid criterion of truth. The influence of British philosophers was far from tending to check the growth of rationalism. Nor can we overlook the influence of the famous "Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes", as it is known in the history of French literature. In the last two decades of the seventeenth century it was one of the main centres of attention. To this discussion, which resulted in a victory for those who favoured the "modern", Brunetière traces back three important consequences: first, the meaning of tradition becomes gradually identified with that of superstition; second, progress is conceived as an emancipation from, and an abjuration of, the past; finally, and this is still more important, education in all its stages consists more and more in derision of the past. True, recent times everywhere offered masterpieces in art, literature, and science. Whatever side we may take in the old quarrel to-day, and however much less radical and more impartial our views may be, we can at least understand the attitude of those who succeeded the great men of the age of Louis XIV.

Another important factor was scientific progress. After being too frequently confined to idle a priori controversies, science was asserting its rights, and these it soon came to exaggerate, while it failed to recognize the rights of others. Reason gradually freed itself from the superstition of the past and claimed absolute independence. Ancient, or rather Christian, conceptions of God and the world were not even deemed worthy of the serious consideration of a "thinker". Efficient causes alone were recognized, final causes proscribed. In nature science always dealt with immutable laws; soon the possibility of miracles and revelation was denied, while mysteries were regarded as absurd. Thus, in the place of traditional beliefs, new ideas were introduced, tending to rationalism, materialism, naturalism, and deism. On positive points there was but little agreement; the tendency was primarily negative. It was an opposition to received dogmas and institutions, an effort to establish a new theoretical and practical philosophy on the basis of merely naturalistic principles. Nothing is truer than d'Alembert's statement, in the "Discours préliminaire", that "our century believes itself destined to change all kinds of laws". Towards the middle of the eighteenth century the representatives of this movement were the "philosophers", and they were about to centralize their efforts in the Encyclopédie. Great prudence

was necessary, and it was used. Some men who were known for their conservative opinions were asked to contribute articles, and the Encyclopédie contained some unexceptionable doctrines and moderate views on religious, ethical, and social problems; moreover, the editors themselves and those who shared their views frequently concealed or disguised their true convictions. As Voltaire says, they were in the sad necessity of "printing the contrary of what they believed" (Letter to d'Alembert, 9 October, 1756). More was insinuated than was clearly expressed, and at times a sarcastic remark was used with better effect than a definite statement or argument. When the main article to which one would naturally turn for information contained nothing objectionable, other articles, less likely to attract attention, expressed different and more "philosophic" views. That such was the condition of affairs is attested by a significant passage in a letter of d'Alembert to Voltaire (21 July, 1757). To the latter's criticism of certain articles he replies: "No doubt we have bad articles in theology and metaphysics; but with theologians for censors, and a privilege, I defy you to make them any better. There are other articles less exposed to the daylight in which all is repaired. Time will enable people to distinguish what we have thought from what we have said." Hence, although the Encyclopédie itself contains many articles in which anti-Christian principles are openly professed, the true, unrestrained encyclopedic spirit was found in the meetings of the "philosophers" and in the salons, where they were looked upon as oracles. To-day it is to be found in the later works of the Encyclopedists and chiefly their letters and memoirs. In the impious and cynical d'Alembert, for instance, as known from his correspondence with Voltaire, one would fail to recognize the prudent and reserved d'Alembert of the Encyclopédie. "You were born with the firmest and most virile genius", Voltaire wrote to him (4 June, 1769), "but you are free only with your friends, when the doors are closed". This last remark applies also to Diderot and the other Encyclopedists. Their private letters reveal their true spirit and intentions, and prove that the apparent moderation and tolerance shown in their public writings were dictated by fear and not by conviction.

It is difficult to estimate the influence which the Encyclopédie exerted on the events that followed its publication, especially the French Revolution. To a large extent undoubtedly it was not the source, but only the reflection, of the religious and social views of the time. Not the Encyclopédie so much as the Encyclopedists exerted a real influence. Since their spirit was antagonistic to the Church and, in many respects, also to the State, one may ask why its manifestations were not suppressed; why in particular its organ, the Encyclopédie, was allowed to proceed, notwithstanding the warnings of its adversaries and its repeated condemnation by the civil authorities. In a word, what was done to check its influence or to oppose its doctrines? In general, it may be answered that little was done, and, under the circumstances, perhaps little could be done. The defenders of the Faith were not idle; they wrote books and articles in refutation of the "philosophers"; but their voice was not heard, and their scattered efforts were of little avail against the organized forces and the powerful protectors of their adversaries. The Jesuits, the secular clergy, especially Archbishop Christophe de Beaumont, of Paris, and Bishop Le Franc de Pompignan, of Le Puy, who wrote pastorals on the subject, and several other writers and preachers denounced the Encyclopédie. We have seen that they succeeded more than once in having its publication and sale prohibited by the Government. The suspensions were only temporary. The Encyclopedists were under the patronage of high personages at the Court; they were protected especially by Malesherbes, the director of the Librairie, who controlled, among other things, the granting of privileges for new publications and the censuring of books, and by Sartine, the chief of police, on whom depended the enforcement of laws and ordinances concerning the printing and sale of books. Malesherbes always showed himself the friend not only of the Encyclopédie, but also of the Encyclopedists. Owing to this friendship, many works were published notwithstanding the official opposition of the Government. In 1759, after the decision of the council had revoked the privilege formerly granted, it was Malesherbes who warned Diderot that his papers were to be seized the next day. As it was too late to look for a place of safety where they could be taken, Malesherbes had them sent to his own house.

Thus the Government secretly favoured an enterprise which it officially censured, and, under this protection the Encyclopédie was begun and completed. Partly for the same reason, partly also for deeper reasons concerning the religious and civil conditions in France, the efforts to combat the Encyclopédie were not rewarded with much success. Moreau in the "Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des Cacouacs" (1757), Palissot, in his "Petites lettres sur de grands philosophes" (1757) and in his comedy "Les philosophes" (1760), tried to use the weapons of ridicule and satire which some of the "philosophers", especially Voltaire, wielded with greater skill. Fréron, in the "Année littéraire", was at times sarcastic, and always ready to give and take blows. Constantly at war with the Encyclopedists, he was at a great disadvantage, for they enjoyed Malesherbes's protection, whereas for him the censure was always very severe. Thus he was hardly allowed to write on Voltaire's "Ecossaise" (1760), in which he had been publicly insulted on the stage. The Jansenists, in the "Nouvelles ecclésiastiques", did little more than insult the Encyclopedists. In the "Journal de Trévoux", the Jesuits, and among them especially Berthier (1704–82), who was director of the Journal from 1745 till the suppression of the Society of Jesus, wrote frequent criticisms. But notwithstanding all this opposition the spirit of irreligion was steadily gaining. Too often the criticism was weak, the attack unskilful. In some cases even, the anti-Encyclopedists, instead of harming their opponents, rather contributed to their success by giving them notoriety and affording them an opportunity for using their influence. The Jesuits were expelled from France in 1762; this gave a new victory and a new prestige to the "philosophers". D'Alembert, who wrote "La destruction des Jésuites en France" (1765), looks upon this expulsion as the just punishment of their hostility towards the Encyclopédie. Gradually the people were becoming accustomed to the new spirit, and thus it was that, whereas the first volumes had created a great stir in France, the appearance of the last volumes was scarcely noticed.

Unknown or little known in 1750, the "philosophers" had now won their battle, and were the recognized victors. Their success made them bolder in declaring openly what fear had frequently obliged them to veil in their former works and in the Encyclopédie. These doctrines had also been made more familiar by the publication of several works before the completion of the Encyclopédie, the most important being Diderot's "Pensées sur l'interprétation de la nature" (1754); Helvétius's "De l'esprit" (1758); Rousseau's "Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité parmi les hommes" (1753), "Contrat social" (1762), and "Emile" (1762); Voltaire's "Dictionnaire philosophique" (1765); d'Holbach's "Système de la nature" (1770). Hence, on 8 July, 1765, Voltaire could write to d'Alembert: "They clamour against the philosophers, and are right; for, if opinion is the ruler of the world, this ruler is governed by the philosophers. You can hardly imagine how their empire is spreading."

Steadily the new current of thought gained in volume and power, until nothing could stop its destructive course. The French Revolution, following closely upon the publication of the Encyclopédie and the other works of the Encyclopedists, was the practical result of the general spirit which these represented.

BRUNETIÈRE, *Etudes critiques sur l'histoire de la littérature française* (Paris, 1896——); in these *Etudes* are found several essays on men and events related to the Encyclopédie; ID., *Manuel de l'histoire de la littérature française* (2d ed., Paris, 1899) and the sources indicated in it, especially the *Mémoires* and the *Correspondances* of the ENCYCLOPEDISTS; ID., *Les origines de l'esprit encyclopédique* in *Revue hebdomadaire* (November, 1907), 141, 281, 421; DAMIRON, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la philosophie au XVIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1858–1864); DUCROS, *Diderot* (Paris, 1894); ID., *Les Encyclopédistes* (Paris, 1900); DUPRAT, *Encyclopédistes* (Paris, 1866); LANFREY, *L'Eglise et les philosophes au dix-huitième siècle* (Paris, 1879); LÉVY BRUHL, *The Encyclopedists* in *Open Court*, XIII (1899), 129; MORLEY, *Diderot and the Encyclopedists* (2d ed., London, 1886); ROSENKRANZ, *Diderots Leben und Werke* (Leipzig, 1866); WADIA, *The Philosophers and the French Revolution* (London, 1904); WINDELBAND, *Geschichte der neueren Philosophie* (4th ed., Leipzig, 1907); LYONS in *Encyclopædia Britannica* (9th ed.), VIII, 197; RIAUX in FRANCK, *Dictionnaire des sciences philosophiques* (2d ed., Paris, 1885), 445.

C. A. DUBRAY.

Enda, SAINT. See ARAN, THE MONASTIC SCHOOL OF.

Endlicher, STEPHAN LADISLAUS, Austrian botanist (botanical abbreviation, *Endl.*), linguist, and historian, b. at Pressburg, Hungary, 24 June, 1804; d. at Vienna, 28 March, 1849. The son of a physician, he studied philosophy at Pesth and Vienna, and theology from 1823 to 1826 at Vienna; he did not, however, enter the priesthood. From 1826 at Pressburg he turned his attention to languages, studying especially Chinese, a knowledge of which is shown in some of his later works: "Anfangsgründe der chinesischen Grammatik" (Vienna, 1844), and "Atlas von China nach der Aufnahme der Jesuiten" (Vienna, 1843). Urged by his father, Endlicher took up the study of botany in 1826, and devoted all his spare time to it during the years 1828–36, when he had charge of the MSS. in the Imperial Library of Vienna. In this same period he issued as librarian, in addition to a number of works on the ancient classical, German, and Hungarian literatures, the first volume (Vienna, 1836) of the MS. catalogue of the Imperial Library. In 1836, he was made curator of the botanical department of the Royal Natural History Museum, and in 1840, professor of botany at the University of Vienna, and director of the Botanical Garden of the University. In 1830, he had issued his first botanical treatise, that on the flora of Pressburg. As curator of the botanical department he united the various distinct herbaria into one scientifically arranged general herbarium, to which he added, as a gift, his own containing 30,000 species of plants; the classification adopted by Endlicher remained unchanged until 1885. On his appointment as curator he began at once to develop his botanical system, which is explained in his well-known and most important work: "Genera plantarum secundum ordines naturales disposita" (Vienna, 1836–50), a work regarded as one of the fundamental writings of systematized botany.

As early as 1835 he founded the first periodical in Austria for the natural sciences, the "Annalen des Wiener Museums der Naturgeschichte". His numerous other writings on botanical subjects show an independent critical judgment, acute observation, and comprehensive knowledge. Endlicher also collaborated in a number of publications with other botanists; with Schott, Fenzl, and especially with Unger in "Grundzüge der Botanik" (Vienna, 1843); with Pöppig in a work on the plants of Chile, Peru, and the region of the Amazon (Leipzig, 1835–45); also in conjunction with the American Asa Gray, and with George Bentham and Robert Brown of Great Britain. Up to the time of his death Endlicher aided von Martius in editing the latter's great work "Flora Brasiliensis" (Munich and Leipzig, 1840–1906); the work, a folio costing 6000 marks, was finally completed in 130 parts of 20,733 pages in all, and containing 3811 plates. It was through Endlicher's exertions that von Martius was enabled to begin the bringing out of this work under the patronage, and with the financial aid, of the Emperor Ferdinand I. Endlicher's botanical MSS. and correspondence belong to the botanical department of the Royal Museum at Vienna; his correspondence with Unger was published by the botanist Haberlandt (Berlin, 1899). In addition to his other labours, he had a large share in founding (1846–47) the Imperial Academy of Sciences of Vienna, and was one of its first forty members. Endlicher became involved in the political movement of 1848; he was elected a member both of the German and the Austrian parliaments, but his political activities were not successful. Botanists have, on three occasions, sought to use his name as a designation of species of plants (*Endlichera*, *Endlicheria*), but according to the rules of the botanical nomenclature, such appellations express synonyms which should be avoided.

VON BECK in *Botan. Centralblatt* (Cassel, 1888), XXXIII, 249; NEILREICH in *Verhandl. des zool.-bot. Vereins* (Vienna, 1855), V, 51; SACHS, *Geschichte der Botanik* (Munich, 1875); WURZBACH in *Biograph. Lexicon des Kaisertums Oesterreich* (Vienna, 1858), IV, contains a list of his writings; *Die botanischen Anstalten Wiens* (Vienna, 1894); *Botanik und Zoologie in Oesterreich* (Vienna, 1901) contains a portrait of Endlicher.

JOSEPH ROMPEL.

End of Man. See MAN.

Endowment (Ger. *Stiftung*, Fr. *fondation*, It. *fondazione*, Lat. *fundatio*), a property, fund, or revenue permanently appropriated for the support of any person, institution, or object, as a student, professorship, school, hospital. The term is more frequently applied to the establishment of eleemosynary corporations by private endowment. In ecclesiastical circles the word is employed also in a more restricted sense, signifying a conditional donation or legacy, i. e. the establishment of a fund, by the provisions of a last will or otherwise, in order to secure permanently, or at least for a long time, some spiritual benefit, as, for instance, the offering and application of a monthly or annual Mass.

The early Christians were lavish in their support of religion, and frequently turned their possessions over to the Church [Lallemand, "Hist. de la charité" (Paris, 1903), II; Uhlhorn, "Hist. of Christ. Charity"; Hefele, "Christenthum u. Wohlthätigkeit" in his "Beiträge", I, 175]. The Emperor Justinian (Novella lxvii) compelled those who built churches to endow them; and about the same time, ecclesiastical legislation prescribed that no cleric was to be ordained for a church without proper provision for his maintenance (Counc. of Epaon, 517, c. xxv). Whoever desired to have a parish church on his estate was obliged to set aside a sufficient landed endowment for its clerics (IV Counc. of Arles, 541, c. xxxiii); while a bishop was forbidden to consecrate a church till the endowment had been properly secured by a deed or charter (II Counc. of Braga, 572, c. v). If one who held a fief from the king built and endowed churches, the bishop was required to procure the royal confirmation of the gift (III Counc. of Toledo, 589, c. xv). Ancient and noble Roman families, as well as others of less means, inspired by feelings of love and gratitude, made large bequests to the Church. In the fifth century, in countries inhabited by German tribes, the Church was endowed especially with lands. These possessions were lost during the political and social upheaval that followed the Germanic invasions, known as the Wanderings of Nations. Towards the end of Charlemagne's reign the regenerated peoples contributed once more voluntarily and generously to the support of ecclesiastical institutions.

In England, both under Saxon and Norman domination the generous zeal of the faithful prompted them to secure by endowments a permanent priesthood, and to provide for the dignity and even splendour of Divine worship. A considerable portion of the foundations thus established in England was squandered or confiscated during the Reformation of Henry VIII and Queen Elizabeth, while the remainder, by virtue of the Acts of Uniformity and Supremacy, was transferred to the Anglican Church, which still retains it. The conditions of the Catholics of England since the Reformation in temporal matters has not permitted to any extent the re-establishment of endowments, though instances have not been wanting and are on the increase. In Ireland and Scotland likewise the old foundations of the Church have been lost or diverted from their purpose. In Ireland the Protestant Church, which had received during the Reformation the lands and moneys of the Catholic Church, was disestablished and nominally disendowed by the Act of 1869, but so liberal were the compensations allowed that they amounted practically almost to a re-endowment. In Scotland the Presbyterians of the Established Church, owing to the immense influence of Knox in the sixteenth century, still possess what is left of the ancient endowments of the Catholic Church. Ecclesiastical endowments in France have undergone many vicissitudes, particularly from the year 1789, when a yearly income of about $14,000,000 was suddenly and unjustly confiscated. The influence of the French Revolution was felt elsewhere, especially in Germany, where by the fifty-fifth article of the Resolutions of the Deputation of the Empire (1803) "all property belonging to the foundations, abbeys and monasteries was committed to the free and full disposal of the respective rulers, who were to provide for the expense of public worship, of instruction, of founding useful public institutions, and of *lightening their own financial embarrassments*". In Italy the annexation of the States of the Church in 1859, 1860, and 1870 by the "King of United Italy" was also followed by the introduction of anti-ecclesiastical laws, the robbery of the Church, and the spoliation of her institutions. The endowments that remain are for the most part administered by the Government. Foundations in America are not numerous and merit no special mention.

Canon law lays down strict regulations regarding the acceptance and management of endowments as well as the observance of the obligation arising therefrom. They are to be accepted only by those whose interests are at stake, as, for instance, the rector of a church, the administrator of an institution. The consent of the ordinary, if they are presented to a diocesan institution, or of the competent religious superior, if given to regulars, is requisite. The superior in question should assure himself that the income accruing from the investment is a sufficient recompense for the service demanded. Once the conditions of acceptance have been established, they are unchangeable, and it is incumbent on the bishop or religious superior, as above, to procure the fulfilment of the obligation imposed. A catalogue or table of these obligations assumed by a church is to be posted conspicuously in the sacristy—a general one for the diocese is reserved in the chancery office—while among the parochial books is one in which the satisfaction of these obligations is noted. The supreme law to be observed in this matter is the will of the founder of an endowment, to fulfil which the zealous vigilance of the Church is ever directed. If, however, the property or invested funds of an endowment entirely disappear through no fault of the church, the latter is exempt from its part of the contract. If a disproportion arise between the service required and the recompense, a proportionate reduction of the obligation entailed is permitted, under certain conditions, by the Holy See. Bishops are not allowed to lessen the original obligation, e. g. to reduce the number of Masses to be offered annually, though where the mind of the donor is not sufficiently clear, they may determine minor details, such as the hour of the service, or the altar at which it is to take place. Founders of churches frequently reserved to themselves, with the approbation of Rome, the right to administer the temporal concerns of such foundations and to suggest candidates for vacant benefices in said churches (see PATRONAGE), though ordinarily these trusts are under the supervision of a corporation or board of trustees.

ADDIS AND ARNOLD, *A Catholic Dictionary* (London, 1903), s. v.; PERMANEDER AND STEIN in *Kirchenlex.*, s. vv. *Dotalgut, Armenpflege;* DUCANGE, *Gloss. med. et inf. Lat.*, s. v. *Dos Ecclesiæ;* HERGENRÖTHER-HOLLWECK, *Lehrb. des kath. Kirchenr.* (Freiburg, 1905), 875–77; MEURER, *Begriff and Eigenth. der kirchl. Sachen* (Düsseldorf); WERNZ, *Jus Decretal.*, III, 218–26; manuals of canon law, e. g. VERING, *Lehrb. des kath. orient. und prot. Kirchenr.* (Freiburg, 1893), s. v. *Stiftung*, which treats of special conditions and questions in Germany, Austria, and Hungary.

ANDREW B. MEEHAN.

Energumeni. See DEMONIACS.

Energy, THE LAW OF THE CONSERVATION OF.— Amongst the gravest objections raised by the progress of modern science against Theism, the possibility of miracles, free-will, the immateriality of the human soul, its creation and immortality, are, according to many thoughtful men, those based on the Law of the Conservation of Energy. Consequently, as full a treatment of this topic in its philosophical aspects as the limits of space will allow, is here attempted.

EXPLANATION OF THE DOCTRINE.—The word *energy* comes from the Greek *ἐνέργεια*, "operation", "actuality". This term is itself a compound of *ἐν* and *ἔργον*, "work". In modern physical science the notion of energy is associated with mechanical work. It is commonly defined as "the capacity of an agent for doing work". By "work" scientists understand the production of motion against resistance. Such energy, whilst existing in many forms, is considered especially in two generically distinct states known as kinetic energy, or energy of motion, and potential energy, or energy of position. The power of doing work in the former case is due to the actual motion possessed by the body, e. g. a cannon-ball on its course, or a swinging pendulum. Potential energy, on the other hand, is exemplified by a wound-up spring, or by the bob of a pendulum when at its highest point; as the bob swings upwards its velocity and kinetic energy continuously diminish, whilst its potential energy is increasing. When at its highest point its potential energy is at a maximum, and its kinetic is nil. Conversely, when, moving downwards, it reaches its lowest point, it will have recovered its maximum kinetic energy, whilst its potential will have vanished. Energy is also recognized in the heat of a furnace, or the fuel of the same, in explosives, in an electric current, in the radiations of the ether which illuminates and warms the earth. Now, it has been found that these different forms of energy can be changed into one another. Further, the amount of a sum of energy in different forms can be measured by the quantity of work it can accomplish. A weight suspended over a pulley can be employed to do work as it sinks to a lower level; likewise a steel spring as it expands, heat as it passes to a cooler body, electric current as it is expended, and chemical compounds in the course of decomposition. On the other hand, a corresponding amount of work will be required in order to restore the original condition of the agents. Perhaps the greatest and most fruitful achievement of modern physical science during the past century has been the establishment of a law of quantitative equivalence between these diverse forms of energy measured in terms of work. Thus a certain amount of heat will produce a definite amount of motion in a body, and conversely this quantity of motion may be made to

reproduce the original amount of heat—assuming that in the actual process of transformation there were no waste. In other words, it is now accepted as established that, in any "conservative" or completely isolated system of energies, whatever changes or transformations take place among them, so long as no external agent intervenes, the sum of the energies will always remain constant. The Principle or Law of the Conservation of Energy has been thus formulated by Clerk Maxwell: "The total energy of any body or system of bodies is a quantity which can neither be increased nor diminished by any mutual action of these bodies, though it may be transformed into any of the forms of which energy is susceptible" (Theory of Heat, p. 93). Thus stated, the law may be admitted to hold the position of a fundamental axiom in modern physics; the nature of the evidence for it, we shall consider later. But there is a further generalization, advancing a considerable way beyond the frontiers of positive science, which affirms that the total sum of such energy in the universe is a fixed amount "immutable in quantity from eternity to eternity" (Von Helmholtz). This is a proposition of a very different character; and to it also we shall return. But first a brief historical account of the doctrine.

History.—The doctrine of the Conservation of Energy was long preceded by that of the Constancy of Matter. This was held vaguely as a metaphysical postulate by the ancient materialists and positively formulated as a philosophical principle by Telesius, Galileo, and Francis Bacon. Descartes assumed in a somewhat similar a priori fashion that the total amount of motion (MV) in the universe is fixed—*certam tamen et determinatam habet quantitatem* (Princip. Philos., II, 36). But the effort to establish such assumptions by accurate experiment begins later. According to many we have the principle of the conservation of energy virtually formulated for the first time in Newton's Scholion developing his third law of motion (action and reaction are equal and opposite), though his participation in the current erroneous conception of heat as a "caloric", or independent substance, prevented his clearly apprehending and explicitly formulating the principle. Others would connect it with his second law. Huyghens, in the seventeenth century, seems to have grasped, though somewhat vaguely, the notion of momentum, or *vis viva* (MV^2). This was clearly enunciated by Leibniz later. The fundamental obstacle, however, to the recognition of the constancy of energy lay in the prevalent "caloric theory". Assuming heat to be some sort of substance, its origin and disappearance in connexion with friction, percussion, and the like seemed a standing contradiction with any hypothesis of the constancy of energy. As early as 1780, Lavoisier and Laplace, in their "Mémoire sur la chaleur", show signs of approaching the modern doctrine, though Laplace subsequently committed himself more deeply to the caloric theory. Count Rumford's famous experiments in measuring the amount of heat generated by the boring of cannon and Sir Humphry Davy's analogous observations (1799) on the heat caused by the friction of ice, proved the death-blow to the caloric theory. For the view was now beginning to receive wide acceptance among scientists, that heat was "probably a vibration of the corpuscles of bodies tending to separate them". Dr. Thomas Young, in 1807, employed the term *energy* to designate the *vis viva* or active force of a moving body, which is measured by its mass or weight multiplied by the square of its velocity (MV^2). Sadi Carnot (1824), though still labouring under the caloric theory, advanced the problem substantially in his remarkable paper, "Réflexions sur la puissance motrice du feu", by considering the question of the relation of quantity of heat to amount of work done, and by introducing the conception of a machine with a reversible cycle of operations. The great epoch, however, in the history of the doctrine occurred in 1842, when Julius Robert Mayer, a German physician, published his "Remarks on the Forces of Inanimate Nature", originally written in a series of letters to a friend. In this little work, "contemptuously rejected by the leading journals of physics of that day" (Poincaré), Mayer clearly enunciated the principle of the conservation of energy in its widest generality. His statement of the law was, however, in advance of the existing experimental evidence, and he was led to it partly by philosophical reasoning, partly by consideration of physiological questions. At the same time, Joule, in Manchester, was engaged in determining by accurate experiments the dynamical equivalent of heat—the amount of work a unit of heat could accomplish, and vice versa; and "Colding was contributing important papers on the same subject to the Royal Scientific Society of Copenhagen, so that no particular man can be described as the Father of the doctrine of the Conservation of Energy" (Preston). Between 1848 and 1851, Lord Kelvin (then Sir William Thomson), Clausius, and Rankine developed the application of the doctrine to sundry important problems in the science of heat. About the same time Helmholtz, approaching the subject from the mathematical side, and starting from Newton's Laws of Motion, with certain other assumptions as to the constitution of matter, deduced the same principle, which he termed the "Conservation of Forces". Subsequently, Faraday and Grove illustrated in greater detail the extent and variety of the transformation and correlation of forces, not only heat being changed into work, but light occasioning chemical action, and this generating heat, and heat producing electricity, capable of being again converted into motion, and so on round the cycle. But it further became evident that in such a series there inevitably occurs a waste in the usableness of energy. Though the total energy of a system may remain a constant quantity, since work can be done by heat only in its transition from a warmer to a cooler body, in proportion as such heat gets diffused throughout the whole system it becomes less utilizable, and the total capacity for work diminishes owing to this dissipation or degradation of energy. This general fact is formulated in what has been called the principle of Carnot or of Clausius. It is also styled the second law of thermodynamics and has been made the basis of very important conclusions as to the finite duration of the universe by Lord Kelvin. He thus enunciates the law: "It is impossible by means of inanimate material agency to derive a mechanical effect from a portion of matter by cooling it below the temperature of the coldest surrounding bodies."

Living Organisms.—The successful determination of the quantitative equivalent of one form of energy in some other form, obviously becomes a far more difficult problem when the subject of the experiment is not inanimate matter in the chemical or physical laboratory, but the consumption of substances in the living organism. Scientific research has, however, made some essays in this direction, endeavouring to establish by experiment that the principle of the constancy of energy holds also in vital processes. By the nature of the case the experimental evidence is of a rougher and less accurate character. Still it tends to show at all events approximate equivalence in the case of some organic functions. Among the best investigations so far seem to be those of Rubner, who kept dogs in a calorimeter, measuring carefully the quantity of food received and the heat developed by them. The chemical energy of the substances consumed manifests itself in heat and motion, and the heat generated in the consumption of different substances by the animals seems to have corresponded rather closely to that resulting in laboratory experiments; hence it is affirmed that the observations all point to the conclusion that "the sole cause of animal heat is a chemical process"

(Schäfer). This, however, is a long way from experimental proof that the conservation of energy holds in all vital processes with such rigid accuracy that every faintest change in the motor or sensory nerve-cells of the brain must have been completely determined by a preceding physical stimulus. Whether this proposition be true or not, there is not as yet even a remote approach to experimental proof of it (cf. Ladd).

The Law Considered.—*Character and Range.*—About the character and range of the law, and its bearing on sundry philosophical problems, there has been and still is much dispute. As a rule, however, the most eminent scientists, e. g. men like Clerk Maxwell and Lord Kelvin, are most cautious and guarded in their enunciation of the law. Be it noted that, when strictly stated, this proposition, "The sum of the kinetic and potential energies of a conservative system amid all changes remains constant", first applies only to an isolated or closed system. But such systems are hypothetical or ideal. As a matter of fact, no group of agents in the present universe is or can be thus isolated. Next, the proposition may be stated, as a legitimate generalization, only of inanimate bodies and material energies. The law affords no justification for the assertion that the *only* energies in any particular system, still less in the universe as a whole, are material energies. Clerk Maxwell himself explicitly reminds us that "we cannot assert that all energy must be either potential or kinetic, though we may not be able to conceive of any other form". Again, many physicists insist that this concept of *energy* contained in the formula proves, when examined closely, to be vague and elusive. H. Poincaré asks: "What exactly remains constant?" And he concludes a searching analysis with the statement that "of the principle nothing is left but an enunciation: There is *something* which remains constant" (Science and Hypothesis, p. 127). As eminent a physicist as George F. Fitzgerald tells us that "the doctrine of the conservation of energy is most valuable, but it only goes a very little way in explaining phenomena" (Scientific Writings, p. 391). Helmholtz's extension of the principle in the statement, that "the total quantity of all the forces capable of work in the whole universe remains eternal and unchanged throughout all their changes", is a hazardous leap from positive science into very speculative metaphysics. This should be recognized. For even supposing the proposition true, it cannot be demonstrated a priori. It is not self-evident. It is obviously beyond the possibility of experimental proof. It assumes the present universe to be a closed system into which new agents or beings capable of adding to its energy have never entered. Lucien Poincaré's contention is just: "It behooves us not to receive without a certain distrust the extension by certain philosophers to the whole Universe of a property demonstrated for those restricted systems which observation can alone reach. We know nothing of the Universe as a whole and every generalization of this kind outruns in singular fashion the limit of experiment." James Ward's account of its character is much the same: "Methodologically, in other words as a formal and regulative principle, it means much, really it means very little." It furnishes very little information about the past, present, or future of the universe.

Proof of the Law.—On what evidence precisely, then, does the principle rest? Here again we find considerable disagreement. E. Mach tells us: "Many deduce the principle from the impossibility of perpetual motion, which again they either derive from experience or deem self-evident. . . Others frankly claim only an experimental foundation for the principle." He himself considers the justification of the law to be in part experimental, in part a logical or formal postulate of the intellect. We have already alluded to the view that it is implicit in Newton's laws of motion. The principle of causality, according to others, is its parent. Mayer himself quotes *ex nihilo nil fit*, and argues that creation or annihilation of a force lies beyond human power. Even Joule, who laboured so diligently to establish an experimental proof, would reinforce the latter with the proposition, that "it is manifestly absurd to suppose that the powers with which God has endowed matter can be destroyed". Preston judiciously observes: "The general principle of the conservation of energy is not to be proved by mathematical formulæ. A law of nature must be founded on experiment and observation, and the general agreement of the law with facts leads to a general belief in its probable truth. Further, the conservation of energy cannot be absolutely *proved* even by experiment, for the proof of a law requires a universal experience. On the other hand, the law cannot be said to be untrue, even though it may seem to be contradicted by certain experiments, for in these cases energy may be dissipated in modes of which we are as yet unaware" (p. 90). In view of the extravagant conclusions some writers have attempted to deduce from the doctrine, it is useful to note these serious divergencies of opinion as to what is its true justification among those who have a real claim to speak with authority on the subject.

We shall best approximate to the truth by distinguishing three different parts of the doctrine of energy: the law of constancy; the law of transformation; and the law of dissipation or degradation. The law of transformation, that all known forms of material energy may be transmuted into each other, and are reconvertible, is a general fact which can only be ascertained and proved by experience. There is no a priori reason requiring it. The law of dissipation, that, as a matter of fact, in the course of the changes which take place in the present universe there is a constant tendency for portions of energy to become unusable, owing to the equal diffusion of heat through all parts of the system—this truth similarly seems to us to rest entirely on experience. Finally, with respect to the principle of quantitative constancy, the main proof must be experience—but experience in a broad sense. It has been shown by positive experiments with portions of inanimate matter that the more perfectly we can isolate a group of material agents from external interference, and the more accurately we can calculate the total quantity of energy possessed by the system at the beginning and end of a series of qualitative changes, the more perfectly our results agree. Further, modern physics constantly assumes this principle in most complex and elaborate calculations, and the agreement of its deductions with observed results verifies the assumption in a manner which would seem to be impossible were the principle not true. In fact, we may say that the assumption of the truth of the law, when correctly formulated, lies now at the basis of all modern physical and chemical theories, just as the assumption of inertia or the constancy of mass is fundamental to mechanics. At the same time we must not forget the hypothetical character of the conditions postulated, and the limitations in its application to particular concrete problems. Bearing this in mind, even if there occurs some novel experience, as, e. g., the fact that radium seemed capable of sustaining itself at a higher temperature than surrounding objects and of emitting a constant supply of heat without any observable diminution of its own store of energy, science does not therefore immediately abandon its fundamental principle. Instead, it rightly seeks for some hypothesis by which this apparently rebellious fact can be reconciled with so widely ranging a general law—as, for example, the hypothesis that this eccentric substance possesses a peculiar power of constantly collecting energy from the neighbouring ether and then dispensing it in the form of heat; or, that the high complexity of the molecular constitution of

radium enables it, while slowly breaking down into simpler substances, to continue expending itself in heat for an extraordinarily long time. Such an exception, however, is a useful reminder of the unwarranted rashness of those who, ignoring the true character and limitations of the law, would, in virtue of its alleged universal supremacy, rule out of existence, whether in living beings or in the universe as a whole, every agent or agency which may condition, control, or modify in any way the working of the law in the concrete. As we have before indicated in regard to some changes of a chemical and mechanical character in the living being, the principle of conservation *may* hold in much the same way as in non-living matter; whilst, in regard to other physiological or psycho-physical processes, the necessary qualifications and limitations may be of a different order. The kind of evidence most cogent in regard to inanimate matter—both direct experiment and verified deduction—is wanting here; and many of the vital processes, especially those connected with consciousness, are so unlike mechanical changes in many respects that it would be scientifically unjustifiable to extend the generalization so as to include them. The possibility of reversion, for instance, applicable in a cycle of changes in inanimate matter, is here unthinkable. We could conceivably recover the gaseous and solid products of exploded gunpowder and convert them into their original condition, but the effort to imagine the reversion of the process of the growth of a man or a nation brings us face to face with an absurdity.

Philosophical Deductions.—The philosophical conclusions which some writers have attempted to deduce from the law affect the question of God's existence and action in the world, the possibility of Divine interference in the form of miracles, the nature of the human soul, its origin and relation to the body, and its moral freedom.

The Materialistic Mechanical Theory, which seeks to conceive the world as a vast self-moving machine, self-existing from all eternity, devoid of all freedom or purpose, perpetually going through a series of changes, each new state necessarily emerging out of the previous and passing into the subsequent state, claims to find its justification in this law of the conservation of energy. To this it may be replied in general, as in the case of the old objections to Theism based on the indestructibility of matter, that the constancy of the total quantity of energy in the world or the convertibility of different forms of material energy, does not affect the arguments from the evidences of intelligent design in the world, the existence of self-conscious human minds, and the moral law. These things are realities of the first importance which every philosophical creed that pretends to be a rational system of thought must attempt to explain. But the mere fact that the sum of material energies, kinetic and potential, in any isolated system of bodies, or even in the physical universe as a whole, remains constant, if it be a fact, affords no rational account or explanation whatever of these realities.

Herbert Spencer's Doctrines.—As Spencer is the best-known writer who attempts to deduce a philosophy of the universe from the doctrine of energy, we shall take him as representative of the school. Though the term *force* is confined by physicists to a narrower and well-defined meaning—the rate of change of energy per distance—Spencer identifies it with energy, and styles the conservation or constancy of energy the "Persistence of Force". To this general principle, he tells us, an ultimate analysis of all our sensible experience brings us down, and on this a rational synthesis must build up. Consequently, from this principle his "Synthetic Philosophy" seeks to deduce all the phenomena of the evolution of the universe. With respect to its proof he assures us that "the principle is deeper than demonstration, deeper than definite cognition, deep as the very nature of the mind. Its authority transcends all other whatever, for not only is it given in the constitution of our consciousness, but it is impossible to imagine a consciousness so constituted as not to give it" (First Principles, p. 162). The value of this assertion may be gauged from the fact that Newton and all the ablest scientists down to the middle of last century were ignorant of the principle, and that it required the labour of Mayer, Joule, Helmholtz, and others to convince the scientific world of its truth. "Evolution is an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion during which matter passes from an indefinite incoherent homogeneity to a definite heterogeneity, and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation. Owing to the ultimate principles the transformation among all kinds of existence cannot be other than we see it to be. The redistribution of matter and motion must everywhere take place in those ways and produce those traits which celestial bodies, organisms, societies alike display, and it has to be shown that this universality of process results from the same necessity which determines each simplest movement around us. . . In other words the phenomena of evolution have to be deduced from the Persistence of 'Force'." Spencer's proof is merely a description of the changes which have taken place. He does not show, and it is impossible to show, from the mere fact that the *quantity* of energy has to remain constant, that the particular forms in which it has appeared—the Roman Empire, Shakespeare's plays, and Mr. Spencer's philosophy—*must* have appeared. The principle can only tell us that a constant quantitative relation has been preserved amid all the qualitative transformations of the physical universe, and that it will be preserved in the future. But it furnishes no reason for the order and seemingly intelligent design which abounds, and it offers not the faintest suggestion of an explanation *why* the primitive nebulæ should have evolved into life, minds, art, literature, and science. To *describe* the process of building a cathedral is not to *deduce* a masterpiece of architecture from so many tons of stone and mortar. To show even that the law of gravitation prevailed during every event in the history of England would not be a deduction of the history of England from the law of gravitation. Yet this is precisely the sort of undertaking Spencer's "Synthetic Philosophy" is committed to in seeking to deduce the present world from the conservation of energy, and so to dispense with an intelligent Creator. The same holds for every other project of a similar kind. A more remarkable feature still in Spencer's handling of the present subject is that he seats this "Persistence of Force" in the Absolute itself. It really "means the persistence of some Power which transcends our knowledge and conception. . . the Unknown Cause of the phenomenal manifestations" of our ordinary experience. This is a complete misconception, misrepresentation, and misuse of the principle of conservation, as known to science. Mayer and Joule never attempted to establish that some noumenal power or unknown cause behind the phenomena of the universe has a constant quantity of energy in itself. Nor is it a self-evident datum of our consciousness that, if there be such an unknown cause, its phenomenal manifestations must be always quantitatively the same "throughout all past and future time". The scientific principle merely affirms constant quantitative equivalence amid the actual transmutations of certain known and knowable realities, heat, mechanical work, and the rest. This, however, would afford no help towards an explanation of the universe. Consequently, it had to be transformed into something very different to serve as the basis of the Synthetic Philosophy.

Professor Ostwald, on the other hand, apparently opposed to mechanical theories, carries us little farther

by his special doctrine of energy. Matter, the supposed vehicle or support of energy, he rejects as a useless hypothesis. Every object in the universe is merely some manifestation of energy of which the total amount retains a constant value. Energy itself is work, or what arises out of work, or is converted back into work. It is the universal substance of the process of change in the world. Mass is merely capacity for energy of movement, density is volume-energy. All we can know of the universe may be expressed in terms of energy. To accomplish this is the business of the savant. Hypotheses are to be abandoned as worthless crutches; and the aim of science is to catalogue objects as forms of energy. But surely this is merely to abandon all attempt at explanation. The mere application of a generic common name to diverse objects furnishes no real account of their qualitative differences. We do not advance knowledge by the easy process of assigning new properties to energy, any more than the ancients did by the liberal allotment of occult qualities. The simple truth is that the quantitative law of constancy supplies not the faintest clue to the fundamental problem, how and why the present infinitely varied allotropic forms of reality have come into existence.

THE LAW AND ITS CONSEQUENCES.—Not only does the modern scientific doctrine of energy fail to provide a foundation for a materialistic theory of a mechanical self-existing universe, but a most important part of that doctrine—the second law of thermodynamics and its consequences—presents us with the materials for a very powerful argument against that theory. Lord Kelvin, the most eminent authority on this point, working from data established by Carnot and Clausius, has shown that "although mechanical energy is indestructible, there is a universal tendency to its dissipation, which produces throughout the system a gradual augmentation and diffusion of heat, cessation of motion and exhaustion of the potential energy of the material Universe" (Lectures, vol. II, p. 356). The heat becoming thus diffused at an equally low temperature throughout the entire universe, all living organisms will perish of cold. In fact, the conclusion which Kelvin deduces from the modern scientific doctrine of energy is that the physical world, so far from being a self-existing machine endowed with perpetual motion, much more closely resembles a clock which has been put together and wound up at some definite date in the past and will run down to a point at which it will stop dead in the future.

CONSERVATION OF ENERGY AND THE HUMAN SOUL.—According to the ordinary Catholic doctrine, philosophical and theological, the soul is a spiritual principle, distinct from matter, yet, by its union with the organism constituting one substantial being, the living man. It is the source of spiritual activities, thought, and volition. It is endowed with free-will. It originates and controls bodily movements. In its origin it has been created; at death it is separated from the body and passes away from the material universe. Now if the soul or mind, though itself not a form of material energy, acts on the body, originates, checks, or modifies bodily movements, then it seems to perform work and so to interfere with the constancy of the sum of energy. Moreover, if thus being sources of energy individual souls are created and introduced into this material universe and subsequently pass out of it, then their irruptions seem to constitute a continuous infringement of the law. For clearness we will handle the subject under separate heads.

I. Does the soul or mind initiate or modify in any way movements of matter, or changes in the forms of energies of the material world? Yes, assuredly; the soul through its activities, does thus act on matter—Clifford, Huxley, Hodgson notwithstanding. The thoughts, feelings, and volitions of men have had some influence on the physical events which have constituted human history. All the movements of every material particle in the world would not have been precisely the same if there had been no sensation or thought. Art, literature, science, invention have had their origin in ideas, and they involve movements of material bodies. The mental states called feelings and desires have really influenced war and trade. If these feelings and ideas had been different, war, trade, art, literature, and invention would have been different. The movements of some portions of matter would have been other than they have been. The mind or soul, therefore, does really act on the body.

II. Is the soul, or the activities by which it acts on the body, for instance its conscious states, merely a particular form of energy interconvertible with the other material forms of heat, motion, electricity, and the rest? Or is the soul and psychic activity something distinct in *kind*, not interchangeable with any form of material energy? Yes. That mental or psychical states and activities are realities, utterly distinct in kind from material energy, is the judgment of philosophers and scientists alike. These states are subjective phenomena perceptible only by the internal consciousness of the individual to whom they belong. Their existence depends on their being perceived. In fact, their *esse* is *percipi*. They are not transmutable into so much material energy. As Tyndall says, "the chasm between the two orders of reality is intellectually impassable". The phenomena of consciousness are not a fixed sum; though incapable of proper quantitative measurement they seem to grow extensively and intensively and to rise in quality in the world. Wundt, indeed, embodies this fact in his contrasted "principle of the increase of psychical energy", a law of qualitative value, which he attaches as the reverse or subjective side of the quantitative constancy of physical energy. The psychical increase, being indefinite, holds only under the condition that the psychical processes are continuous. Mental states or activities are thus proved on the one hand to exert a real influence on the movements of matter, whilst on the other hand they are different in nature from all material energies and unconvertible with any of the latter. The soul, mind, or whatever we call the subject or source of these immaterial states or activities, must be therefore some kind of hyperphysical agent or power.

III. This brings us to the central crux of the subject. If the soul, or mind, or any of its activities, causes or modifies the movement of any particle of matter, then it seems to have produced an effect equivalent to that of a material agent, to have performed "work", and thereby to have augmented or diminished the previously existing quantity of energy in the area within which the disturbance took place. The vital question then arises: Can this real influence of the soul, or of its activities, on matter be squared with the law of conservation? At all events, if it cannot, then so much the worse for the law. The law is a generalization from experience. If its present formulation conflicts with any established fact, we may not deny the fact; we must instead reformulate the law in more qualified terms. If our experience of radium seems to contradict the law of conservation, we are not at liberty to deny the existence of radium, or the fact that it emits heat. We must either give up the universality of the law, or devise some hypothesis by which the law and the new fact may be reconciled. Now we are certain that volition and thought do modify the working of some material agents. Consequently, we must devise some hypothesis by which this fact may be reconciled with the law, or else alter the expression of the law.

Diverse solutions, however, have been advanced. (1) Some writers simply deny the application of the law to *living* beings, or at least its rigid accuracy, if referred to the entire collection of vital and psychical phenomena. They urge with much force that

the living, conscious organism, endowed with the power of self-direction, differs fundamentally in nature from a mere machine, and that it is therefore illegitimate to extend the application of the law to organisms in precisely the same sense as to inanimate matter until this extension is rigidly justified by experimental evidence. But evidence of this quantitative accuracy is not forthcoming—nor at all likely to be. As a consequence, scientists of the first rank, such as Clerk Maxwell and Lord Kelvin, have always been careful to exclude living beings from their formulation of the law. Moreover, they remind us that, in certain respects, the animal structure resembles a very delicate mechanism in which an extremely minute force may liberate or transform a relatively large store of latent energy preserved in a very unstable condition, as, e. g., the pressure of a hair-trigger may explode a powder magazine.

(2) Again, many physicists of high rank (Clerk Maxwell, Tait, Balfour Stewart, Lodge, Poynting), who suppose, for sake of argument, the strict application of the law even to living beings, claim to harmonize the real action of the soul on the body with the law by conceiving this action as exercised merely in the form of a guiding or directing force. They generally do so, moreover, in connexion with the established truth of physics that an agent may modify the direction of a force, or of a moving particle, without altering the quantity of its energy, or adding to the work done. Thus, a force acting at right angles to another force can alter the direction of the latter without affecting its intensity. The pressure of the rail on the side of the wheel guides the tram-car; the tension of gravitation keeps the earth in its elliptical course round the sun without affecting the quantity of energy possessed by the moving mass. If the enormous force of gravitation were suddenly extinguished, say, by the annihilation of the sun, the earth would fly away at a tangent with the same energy as before. The axiom of physics, that a deflecting force may do no work, is undoubtedly helpful towards conceiving a reconciliation, even if it does not go the whole way to meet the difficulty.

(3) At the same time, the philosophy of Aristotle and St. Thomas provides us with a clue which assists us farther than any modern theory towards the complete solution of the problem. For this, four distinct factors must be kept in mind:—

(a) The entire *quantity* of the work done by the living being must in this view be accounted for by the material energies—mechanical, chemical, electrical, etc.—stored in the bodily organism. The soul, or mind, or vital power merely administers these, but does not increase or diminish them. The living organism is an extremely complex collection of chemical compounds stored in blood and cellular tissue. Many of these are in very unstable condition. A multitude of qualitative changes are constantly going on, but the quantity of the work done is always merely the result of the using up of the material energies of the organism. The soul, within limits, regulates the qualitative transformation of some of these material energies without altering the sum total.

(b) The action of the soul, whether through its conscious or its merely vegetative activities, must be conceived as primarily *directive*.

(c) But this is not all. The soul not only guides but *initiates* and *checks* movements. The most delicate hair-trigger, it is urged, requires *some* pressure to move it, and this is *work* done, and so an addition to that of the machine. The trigger, too, presses with equal reactive force against the finger, and through this emits some of its energy back to another part of the universe. Consequently, any action of the soul upon the body, even if the pressure or tension be relatively small, involves, it is said, a double difficulty: the pressure communicated by the soul to the body and that returned by the body to the soul. In reply: First, what is needed in order to originate, guide, or even inhibit a bodily movement is a transformation of the *quality* of some of the energy located in certain cells of the living organism. Whilst physics, which seeks to reduce the universe to mass-points in motion, is primarily interested in quantity, qualitative differences cannot be ignored or ultimately resolved into quantitative differences. Direction is the qualitative element in simple movement, and it is as important as velocity or duration. Now, although the initiation of movement, or the origination of a change in the quality of the material energy located in particles of inanimate matter, needs a stimulus involving the expenditure of some energy, however small, it does not seem necessary, and there is no proof, that every transformation of energy in living beings requires a similar expenditure of energy to occasion the change. Be it noted also that the energy of the stimulus often bears no relation to the magnitude of the change and that in many cases it is not incorporated in the main transformation. Indeed, the explosive materials of the earth might conceivably be so collocated that the action of an infinitesimal force would suffice to blow up a continent and effect a qualitative transformation of energy vaster than the sum total of all the changes that have gone on in all living beings since the beginning of the world. This should be remembered when it is alleged that any action of the human mind on the body would constitute a serious interference with the constancy of the sum total of energy.

However, as a matter of fact, some qualitative changes of energy in the living organism which result in movement at least appear not to be excited by anything of the nature of physical impact. Psychophysics teaches that concentration of thought on certain projected movements, and the fostering of certain feelings, are speedily followed by qualitative changes in organic fluids with vascular and neuromotor processes. States of consciousness becoming intense seem to seek expression and find an outlet in bodily movement, however this is actually realized. This brings us to the further step in the solution of the problem which the Aristotelico-Scholastic conception of the relation of body and mind, as "matter" and "form", contributes. In that theory the soul or vital principle is the "form" or determining principle of the living being. Coalescing with the material factor, it constitutes the living being. It gives to that being its specific nature. It unifies the material elements into one individual. It makes them and holds them a single living being of a certain kind. Biology reveals that the living organism is a mass of chemical compounds, many of them most complex and in very unstable equilibrium, constantly undergoing change and tending to dissolution into simpler and more stable substances. When life ceases, the process of disintegration sets in with great rapidity. The function, then, of this active informing principle is of a unifying, conserving, restraining character, holding back, as it were, and sustaining the potential energies of the organism in their unstable condition. From this view of the relation of the soul to the material constituents of the body, it would follow that the transformation of the potential energies of the living organism is accomplished in vital processes not by anything akin to positive physical pressure, but by some sort of liberative act. It would in this case suffice simply to unloose, to "let go", to cease the act of restraining, and the unstable forms of energy released will thereby issue of themselves into other forms. In a sack of gas or liquid, for instance, the covering membrane determines the contents to a particular shape, and conserves them in a particular space. Somewhat analogously, in the Scholastic theory the soul, as "form", determines the qualitative character of the material with which it coalesces, while it con-

serves the living being in its specific nature. A "form" endowed with consciousness exerts a control, partly voluntary, partly involuntary, over the qualitative character of the constituents of the organism, and in this view it would occasion qualitative changes in some of these by a merely liberative act, without adding to or taking from the quantity of physical energy contained in the material constituents of the organism. The illustration is of course imperfect, like all such analogies. It is given merely to aid towards a conception of the relations of mind and body in the Aristotelean theory.

(d) Finally, in this theory, the action of the soul, or vital principle, upon the material energies of the living organism, must be conceived not as that of a foreign agent, but as of a co-principle uniting with the former to constitute one specific being. This most important factor in the solution is not sufficiently emphasized, or indeed realized, by many physicists who seek to harmonize the law with the real action of the soul. Accepting the philosophy of Descartes, many of these adopt a very exaggerated view of the separateness and mutual independence of soul and body. In that philosophy soul and body are conceived as two distinct beings merely accidentally conjoined or connected. The action of either upon the other is that of an extrinsic agent. If an angel or a demon set a barrel rolling down a hill by even a slight push, the action of such a spirit would involve the invasion of the system of the material universe by a foreign energy. But this is not the way the soul acts, according to the philosophy of St. Thomas and Aristotle. Here the soul is part of the living being, a component principle capable of liberating and guiding the transformation of energies stored up in the constituents of the material organism, which along with itself combines to form a single complete individual being. This point is a vital element in the solution, whether the basis of the difficulty be the conservation of energy, the conservation of momentum, or Newton's third law. The directing influence is not exercised as the pressure of one material particle on another outside of it. The soul is *in* the body which it animates and in every part of it. Neither is "outside" the other.

This solution obviously provides an answer at the same time to the objections deduced from the conservation of energy against the creation of human souls or the freedom of the will. If the soul were a fount of energy distinct from and added to the material energies of the organism, and if the freedom of the will involved incursions of a foreign physical force into the midst of existing material energies, then infringement of the law of constancy would seem inevitable. But if the soul merely directs the transformation of existing reserves of energy in the manner indicated, no violation of the law seems necessary. Similarly, the departure of such an immortal soul from the physical universe would not involve any withdrawal of material energy from the total sum. Finally, if human thought and volition can interfere in any degree with the movements of matter, and exercise a guiding influence on any of the processes of the bodily organism, a fortiori must it be possible for an Infinite Intelligence to intervene and regulate the course of events in the material universe; and if the human mind can effect its purposes without infringement of the law of conservation of energy, assuredly this ought to be still more within the powers of a Divine Mind, which, according to the Scholastic philosophy, sustains all beings in existence and continuously co-operates with their activity.

The extensive literature of the subject may roughly be distinguished as scientific and philosophic, though the two grade into each other.

Among those of mainly scientific character are:—*The Correlation and Conservation of Forces*, ed. YOUMANS (New York, 1865). This is a collection of the original papers of HELMHOLTZ, MAYER, GROVE, FARADAY, LIEBIG, and CARPENTER on the subject. JOULE, *Scientific Papers* (2 vols., London, 1884, 1887); HELMHOLTZ, *Popular Lectures on Scientific Subjects* (tr. London, 1873); KELVIN, *Popular Lectures and Addresses* (3 vols., New York and London, 1894), see especially II; GROVE, *The Correlation of Physical Forces* (London, 1867); also TAIT, *Recent Advances in Physical Science* (London, 1876); MAXWELL, ed. RAYLEIGH, *Theory of Heat* (London and New York, 1902); STEWART, *The Conservation of Energy* in *Internat. Sc. Series* (London, 1900); TAIT AND STEWART, *The Unseen Universe* (London, 1875); PRESTON, *The Theory of Heat* (London and New York, 1904), I; FITZGERALD, ed. LARMOR, *Scientific Writings* (Dublin and London, 1902); LUCIEN POINCARÉ, *The New Physics* (tr., London, 1907), III; H. POINCARÉ, *Science and Hypothesis* (tr., London and New York, 1905); MACH, *Die Gesch. und die Würzel des Satzes von der Erhaltung der Arbeit* (Prague, 1871); IDEM, *Populär-wissenschaftliche Vorlesungen* (Leipzig, 1896); CARPENTER, *The Correlation of Physical and Vital Forces* in *Quar. Jour. of Science* (1865); IDEM, *Mutual Relations of the Vital and Physical Forces* in *Transactions of the Royal Society* (London, 1850); SCHÄFER, *Text-Book of Physiology* (Edinburgh and London, 1898), I; MOSSO, *Fatigue* (New York and London, 1904), frequently referred to, but contributes little to the question.

Among the philosophical works on the subject are: COUAILHAC, *La Liberté et la conservation de l'énergie* (Paris, 1897); MERCIER, *La Pensée et la loi de la conservation de l'énergie* (Louvain, 1900); DE MUNNYNCK in *Revue Thomiste* (May, 1897), useful article; WINDLE, *What is Life* (London and St. Louis, 1908); LADD, *Philosophy of Mind* (London and New York, 1895), vii; MAHER, *Psychology* (London and New York, 1905), xxiii; WARD, *Naturalism and Agnosticism* (London, 1906); LODGE, *Life and Matter* (London, 1905); see also very interesting controversy on the subject in *Nature* (1903), in which SIR OLIVER LODGE, G. MINCHIN, E. W. HOBSON, J. W. SHARPE, W. PEDDIE, J. H. MUIRHEAD, C. T. PREECE, E. P. CULVERWELL, and others took part; GUTBERLET, *Das Gesetz von der Erhaltung der Kraft* (Münster, 1882); SPENCER, *First Principles* (London and Edinburgh, 1900); HÖFFDING, *Outlines of Psychology* (New York and London, 1896); WUNDT deals with the subject in papers in *Philosophische Studien* (1898); also for brief treatment, see his *Outlines of Psychology* (tr., 3rd ed., New York, 1907); OSTWALD, *Vorlesungen über Naturphilosophie* (Leipzig, 1902); see also EISLER, *Philosophisches Wörterbuch* (Berlin, 1904).

MICHAEL MAHER.

Engaddi (Sept., usually Ἐγγαδί; Hebr. 'En Gédhi, "Fountain of the Kid") is the name of a warm spring near the centre of the west shore of the Dead Sea, and also of a town situated in the same place. In II Par., xx, 2, it is identified with Asasonthamar (Cutting of the Palm), the city of the Amorrhean, smitten by Chodorlahomor (Gen., xiv, 7) in his war against the cities of the plain. Jos., xv, 62, enumerates Engaddi among the cities of Juda in the desert Betharaba, but Ezech., xlvii, 10, shows that it was also a fisherman's town. Later on, David hides in the desert of Engaddi (I Kings, xxiv, 1, 2), and Saul seeks him "even upon the most craggy rocks, which are accessible only to wild goats" (ibid., 3). Again, it is in Engaddi that the Moabites and Ammonites gather in order to fight against Josaphat (II Par., xx, 1, 2) and to advance against Jerusalem "by the ascent named Sis" (ibid., 16). Finally, Cant., i, 13, speaks of the "vineyards of Engaddi"; the words, "I was exalted like a palm tree in Cades" (ἐν αἰγιαλοῖς), which occur in Ecclus., xxiv, 18, may perhaps be understood of the palm trees of Engaddi.

To these strictly Biblical data concerning Engaddi the following notes taken from profane sources may be added. Josephus (Antiq., IX, i, 2) connects Engaddi with the growth of beautiful palm trees and the production of opobalsam. Pliny (Nat. Hist., V, xxvii, 73) places Engaddi only second to Jerusalem as far as fertility and the cultivation of the palm tree are concerned. Eusebius and St. Jerome (Onomastica sacra, Göttingen, 1870, pp. 119, 254) testify that at their time there still existed on the shore of the Dead Sea a large Jewish borough called Engaddi which furnished opobalsam. The name still lives in the Arabic form 'Ain Jedi, which is now applied to a mere oasis enclosed by two streams, the Wady Sudeir and Wady el-'Areyeh, and bounded by nearly vertical walls of rock. The former vineyards and palm groves have given place to a few bushes of acacia and tamarisk, and the site of the ancient town is now occupied by a few Arabs.

HAGEN, *Lexicon Biblicum* (Paris, 1907), II, 177 sq.; HULL in *Dictionary of the Bible* (New York, 1900), I, 703; LEGENDRE in

Dictionnaire de la Bible (Paris, 1899), II, 1796 sqq.; BAEDEKER-BENZIGER, *Palestina und Syrien* (5th ed.), 198; *Survey of Western Palestine; Memoirs* (London, 1881–83), III, 384–86; NEUBAUER, *La géographie du Talmud* (Paris, 1868), 160.

A. J. MAAS.

Engel, LUDWIG, canonist, b. at Castle Wagrein, Austria; d. at Grillenberg, 22 April, 1674. He became a Benedictine in the monastery of Mölk (Melk), 10 September, 1654, and, at the order of his abbot, applied himself to the study of law at the University of Salzburg, where theological studies were committed to the care of the Benedictines. He was proclaimed doctor of civil and canon law in 1657, ordained priest in the following year, and was soon professor of canon law at this university. His profound knowledge and personal qualities procured for him the most honourable functions. In 1669 he was unanimously chosen vice-chancellor of the university. He left Salzburg in 1674 at the invitation of the Abbot of Mölk, who was desirous that Engel should be known and appreciated by the religious of this monastery, in order to be chosen as his successor. The death of Engel, which occurred in the same year, prevented this plan from being realized. His principal works are: "Manuale parochorum" (Salzburg, 1661); "Forum competens" (Salzburg, 1663); "Tractatus de privilegiis et juribus monasteriorum" (Salzburg, 1664); and especially his "Collegium universi juris canonici", etc. (Salzburg, 1671–1674), a work remarkable for its conciseness, clearness, and solidity. It has placed its author in the first rank among Benedictine canonists. The fifteenth edition appeared in 1770. A compendium or summary of this work was published in 1720 by Mainardus Schwartz.

ZIEGELBAUER, *Historia litteraria ordinis Sancti Benedicti* (Augsburg, 1754), III, 401, IV, 231, 238, 593; SCHULTE, *Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des canonischen Rechts* (Stuttgart, 1875–80), III, 150; EBERL in *Kirchenlex*, s. v.; KEIBLINGER, *Gesch. von Melk* (1867), I, 899.

A. VAN HOVE.

Engelberg, ABBEY OF, a Benedictine monastery in Switzerland, formerly in the Diocese of Constance, but now in that of Chur. It is dedicated to Our Lady of the Angels and occupies a commanding position at the head of the Nidwalden valley in the Canton Unterwalden. It was founded in 1082 by Blessed Conrad, Count of Seldenbüren, the first abbot being Blessed Adelhelm, a monk of the Abbey of St. Blasien in the Black Forest, under whom the founder himself received the habit and ended his days there as a monk. Numerous and extensive rights and privileges were granted to the new monastery by various popes and emperors, amongst the earliest being Pope Callistus II, in 1124, and the Emperor Henry IV. The abbey was placed under the immediate jurisdiction of the Holy See, which condition continued until the formation of the Swiss Congregation in 1602, when Engelberg united with the other monasteries of Switzerland and became subject to a president and general chapter. In spiritual matters the abbots of Engelberg exercised quasi-episcopal jurisdiction over all their vassals and dependents, including the town which sprang up around the walls of the abbey, and also enjoyed the right of collation to all the parishes of the Canton. In temporal matters they had supreme and absolute authority over a large territory, embracing one hundred and fifteen towns and villages, which were incorporated under the abbatial rule by a Bull of Pope Gregory IX in 1236. These and other rights they enjoyed until the French Revolution, in 1798, when most of them were taken away. The prominent position in Switzerland which the abbey occupied for so many centuries was seriously threatened by the religious and political disturbances of the Reformation period, especially by the rapid spread of the Zwinglian heresy, and for a time its privileges suffered some curtailment. The troubles and vicissitudes, however, through which it passed, were happily brought to an end by the wise rule of Abbot Benedict Sigrist, in the seventeenth century, who is justly called the restorer of his monastery. Alienated possessions and rights were recovered by him and the good work he began was continued by his successors, under whom monastic discipline and learning have flourished with renewed vigour. The library, which is said to have contained over twenty thousand volumes and two hundred choice MSS., was unfortunately pillaged by the French in 1798. The abbey buildings were almost entirely destroyed by fire

ENGELBERG AND THE JUCHLI PASS

in 1729 but were rebuilt in a substantial, if not very beautiful style and so remain to the present day. The monastery is now (1909) in a very flourishing state, having a community of about fifty and a school of over a hundred boys. The monks have charge of the parish of two thousand souls attached to the abbey and also minister to the needs of seven convents of nuns in the vicinity. In 1873 a colony from Engelberg founded the Abbey of New Engelberg, at Conception, Missouri, U. S. A. Abbot Leodegar Scherer, elected in 1901, was the fifty-third abbot of the monastery.

SAINTE-MARTHE, *Gallia Christiana* (Paris, 1781), V; MIGNE, *Dict. des abbayes* (Paris, 1856); BRUNNER, *Ein Benediktinerbuch* (Würzburg, 1880); *Album Benedictinum* (St. Vincent's, Pennsylvania, 1880).

G. CYPRIAN ALSTON.

Engelbert of Cologne, SAINT, archbishop of that city (1216–1225); b. at Berg, about 1185; d. near Schwelm, 7 November, 1225. His father was Engelbert, Count of Berg, his mother, Margaret, daughter of the Count of Gelderland. He studied at the cathedral school of Cologne and while still a boy was, according to an abuse of that time, made provost of the churches of St. George and St. Severin at Cologne, and of St. Mary's at Aachen. In 1199 he was elected provost of the cathedral at Cologne. He led a worldly life and in the conflict between Archbishops Adolf and Bruno sided with his cousin Adolf, and waged war for him. He was in consequence excommunicated by the pope together with his cousin and deposed in 1206. After his submission he was reinstated in 1208 and, to atone for his sin, joined the crusade against the Albigenses in 1212. On 29 Feb., 1216, the chapter of the cathedral elected him archbishop by a unanimous vote. In appearance he was tall and handsome. He possessed a penetrating mind and keen discernment, was kind and condescending and loved justice and peace, but he was also ambitious and self-willed. His archiepiscopal see had passed through severe struggles and suffered heavily, and he worked strenuously to repair the damage and to restore order. He took care of its possessions and revenues and was on that account compelled to resort to arms. He defeated the Duke of Limburg and the Count of Cleves and defended against them also the Countship of Berg, which he had inherited in 1218 on the death of his brother. He

restrained the impetuous citizens of Cologne, broke the stubborness of the nobility, and erected strongholds for the defence of his territories. He did not spare even his own relations when guilty. In this way he gained the universal veneration of his people and increased the number of his vassals from year to year. Although in exterior bearing a sovereign rather than a bishop, for which he was blamed by pious persons, he did not disregard his duties to the Church, but strove to uplift the religious life of his people. The mendicant orders, which had been founded shortly before his accession, settled in Cologne during his administration, the Franciscans in 1219, the Dominicans in 1221. He was well disposed towards the monasteries and insisted on strict religious observance in them. Ecclesiastical affairs were regulated in provincial synods. Blameless in his own life, he was a friend of the clergy and a helper of the poor.

In the affairs of the empire Engelbert exerted a strong influence. Emperor Frederick II, who had taken up his residence permanently in Sicily, gave Germany to his son, Henry VII, then still a minor, and in 1221 appointed Engelbert guardian of the king and administrator of the empire. When the young king reached the age of twelve he was crowned at Aachen, 8 May, 1222, by Engelbert, who loved him as his own son and honoured him as his sovereign. He watched over the king's education and governed the empire in his name, careful above all to secure peace both within and without the realm. At the Diet of Nordhausen (24 Sept., 1223) he made an important treaty with Denmark; in the rupture between England and France, he sided with England and broke off relations with France. The poet Walther von der Vogelweide extols him as "Master of sovereigns", and "True guardian of the king, thy exalted traits do honour to our emperor; chancellor whose like has never been".—Engelbert's devotion to duty, and his obedience to the pope and to the emperor were eventually the cause of his ruin. Many of the nobility feared rather than loved him, and he was obliged to surround himself with a body-guard. The greatest danger threatened him from among his relations. His cousin, Count Frederick of Isenberg, the secular administrator for the nuns of Essen, had grievously oppressed that abbey. Honorius III and the emperor urged Engelbert to protect the nuns in their rights. Frederick wished to forestall the archbishop, and his wife incited him to murder. Even his two brothers, the Bishops of Münster and Osnabrück, were suspected as privy to the matter. Engelbert was warned, commended himself to the protection of Divine Providence, and amid tears made a confession of his whole life to the Bishop of Minden. On 7 Nov., 1225, as he was journeying from Soest to Schwelm to consecrate a church, he was attacked on a dark evening by Frederick and his associates in a narrow defile, was wounded in the thigh, torn from his horse and killed. His body was covered with forty-seven wounds. It was placed on a dung-cart and brought to Cologne on the fourth day. King Henry wept bitterly over the remains, put the murderer under the ban of the empire, and saw him broken on the wheel a year later at Cologne. He died contrite, having acknowledged and confessed his guilt. His associates also perished miserably within a short time. The crime, moreover, was disastrous for the German Empire, for the young king had now lost his best adviser and soon met a very sad fate, to the misfortune of his house and country.

Engelbert, by his martyrdom made amends for his human weaknesses. His body was placed in the old cathedral of Cologne, 24 Feb., 1226, by Cardinal Conrad von Urach. The latter also declared him a martyr; a formal canonization did not take place. In 1618 Archbishop Ferdinand ordered that his feast be celebrated on 7 November and solemnly raised his remains in 1622. In the martyrology Engelbert is commemorated on 7 Nov. as a martyr. A convent for nuns was erected at the place of his death. By order of Engelbert's successor, Henry I, Cæsarius of Heisterbach, who possessed good information and a ready pen, wrote in 1226 the life of the saint in two books and added a third about his miracles. (See Surius, "Vitæ Sanctorum", 7 Nov.)

BÖHMER, *Fontes rerum Germanicarum* (Stuttgart, 1854), II, in which the third book of the *Vitæ* is omitted; FICKER, *Engelbert d. hl. Erzbischof* (Cologne, 1853); WINKELMANN, *Kaiser Friedr. II.* in *Jahrbücher d. deutsch. Gesch.* (Leipzig, 1889), I.

GABRIEL MEIER.

Engelbert, Abbot of the Benedictine monastery of Admont in Styria, b. of noble parents at Völkersdorf in Styria, c. 1250; d. 12 May, 1331. He entered the monastery of Admont about 1267. Four years later he was sent to Prague to study grammar and logic. After devoting himself for two years to these studies he spent nine years at the University of Padua studying philosophy and theology. In 1297 he was elected Abbot of Admont, and after ruling thirty years he resigned this dignity when he was almost eighty years old, in order to spend the remainder of his life in prayer and study. Engelbert was one of the most learned men of his times, and there was scarcely any branch of knowledge to which his versatile pen did not contribute its share. His literary productions include works on moral and dogmatic theology, philosophy, history, political science, Holy Scripture, the natural sciences, pedagogy, and music. The Benedictine, Bernard Pez, mentions thirty-eight works, many of which he published partly in his "Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus" (Augsburg, 1721), partly in his "Bibliotheca ascetica antiquo-nova" (Ratisbon, 1723–5). The best known of Engelbert's works is his historico-political treatise "De ortu, progressu et fine Romani imperii", which was written during the reign of Henry VII (1308–1313). It puts forth the following political principles: a ruler must be a learned man; his sole aim must be the welfare of his subjects; an unjust ruler may be justly deposed; emperor and pope are, each in his sphere, independent rulers; the Holy Roman Empire is a Christian continuation of the pagan empire of ancient Rome; there should be only one supreme temporal ruler, the emperor, to whom all other temporal rulers should be subject. He bewails the gradual decline of both imperial and papal authority, prophesies the early coming of Antichrist and with it the ruin of the Holy Roman Empire and a wholesale desertion of the Holy See. The work was published repeatedly, first according to the revision of Cluten (Offenbach, 1610); finally it was re-edited by Schott and printed in the Supplement to the "Bibliotheca Patrum" (Cologne, 1622) and in "Maxima Bibliotheca veterum Patrum" (Lyons, 1677). Following are the most important of the other works of Engelbert which have been printed: "De gratiis et virtutibus beatæ et gloriosæ semper V. Mariæ" (Pez, "Thesaurus", I, pt. 1, 503–762); "De libero arbitrio" (ib., IV, pt. 2, 121–147); "De causâ longævitatis hominum ante diluvium" (ib., I, pt. 1, 437–502); "De providentiâ Dei" (Pez, Bibliotheca ascetica, VI, 51–150); "De statu defunctorum" (ib., IX, 113–195); "Speculum virtutis pro Alberto et Ottone Austriæ ducibus" (ib., III, entire); "Super passionem secundum Matthæum" (ib., VII, 67–112); "De regimine principum", a work on political science, containing sound suggestions on education in general, edited by Hufnagel (Ratisbon, 1725); "De summo bono hominis in hâc vitâ", "Dialogus concupiscentiæ et rationis", "Utrum sapienti competat ducere uxorem" (the last three valuable works on ethics were edited by John Conrad Pez in "Opuscula philosophica celeberrimi Engelberti", Ratisbon, 1725); "De musicâ tractatus", a very interesting treatise on music, illustrating the great difficulties with which teachers of music were beset in consequence of the complicated system of the hexachord with its solmization and mu-

tation. The treatise was inserted by Gerbert in his "Scriptores ecclesiastici de musicâ sacrâ" (St. Blasien, 1784, anastatic reprint, Graz, 1905), II, 287 sqq.

WIECHNER, *Geschichte des Benediktiner Stiftes-Admont* (Graz, 1874–1880), III, 1–30, 511–545; IDEM, *Kloster Admont und seine Beziehungen zur Wissenschaft und zum Unterricht* (Graz, 1892), 37–47; FUCHS, *Abt Engelberg von Admont* in *Mittheilungen des hist. Vereins für Steiermark* (Graz, 1862), XI, 90–130; MICHAEL, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes vom 13. Jahrh. bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Freiburg im Br., 1903), III, 125, 248–251, 274–278; ZIEGELBAUER, *Historia Rei Litterariæ O.S.B.* (Augsburg and Würzburg, 1754), III, 175–180.

MICHAEL OTT.

Engelbert of Saint-Riquier. See ANGILBERT.

Engelbrechtsen, CORNELIS (also called ENGELBERTS and ENGELBRECHT, and now more usually spelt ENGELBRECHTSZ), Dutch painter, b. at Leyden, 1468; d. there 1533; is believed to have been identical with a certain Cornelis de Hollandere who was a member of the Guild of St. Luke at Antwerp in 1492. He is said to have been the first artist in Holland who painted in oils, and to have been a profound student of the works of Jan Van Eyck. His principal paintings were executed in Leyden and for a long time preserved in that city, which still possesses in its picture gallery his large "Crucifixion", with wings representing the Sacrifice of Abraham and the Brazen Serpent, and a "Pietà" containing six scenes from the Life of Christ. There is an important "Crucifixon" by him at Amsterdam, removed from the convent of St. Bridget at Utrecht, a "Madonna and Child" in the London National Gallery, and a "Crucifixion" in the Munich Gallery, and there are two double pictures at Antwerp. However, most of his religious works were destroyed in Holland during the iconoclastic movement in the sixteenth century. He has been declared to have been the master of Lucas Van Leyden, but nothing very definite is known on this matter. Many of his pictures are signed with a curious mark resembling a figure 4 supported upon two swords, and others with a sort of star. He had two sons: Cornelis, known as Kunst (1493–1544), and Luke, known as Kok, born 1495. The latter came over to England during the reign of Henry VIII, and a picture signed by him is in Lord De L' Isle's collection at Penshurst.

Catalogues of Pictures at Leyden, Amsterdam, and Munich; CONWAY, *Dutch Painters;* various articles in the Leyden papers; BRYAN, *Dictionary of Painters* (New York, 1903); *Allgemeines Künstlerlexikon* (Berlin, 1870).

GEORGE C. WILLIAMSON.

England.—This term is here restricted to one constituent, the largest and most populous, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. Thus understood, England (taken at the same time as including the Principality of Wales) is all that part of the Island of Great Britain which lies south of the Solway Firth, the River Liddell, the Cheviot Hills, and the River Tweed; its area is 57,668 square miles, i. e. 10,048 sq. m. greater than that of the State of New York, but 11,067 sq. m. less than that of Missouri; its total resident population in 1901 was 23,386,593, or 78·2 per cent of the population of the United Kingdom. The history of England will be considered in the present article chiefly in its relations with the Catholic Church—I. BEFORE THE REFORMATION; II. SINCE THE REFORMATION. The concluding section will be III. ENGLISH LITERATURE.

BEFORE THE REFORMATION.—For the history of England down to the Norman Conquest the reader may be referred to the article ANGLO-SAXON CHURCH (in Vol. I, 505–12). We begin our present account of pre-Reformation England with the new order of things created by William the Conqueror.

Although the picture of the degradation of the English Church in the first half of the eleventh century which has been drawn by some authorities (notably by H. Boehmer, "Kirche und Staat", 79) is very exaggerated, it is nevertheless certain that even King Edward the Confessor, with all his saintliness, had not been able to repair the damage caused partly by the anarchy of the last ten years of Danish rule, but not less surely, if remotely, by the disorders which for many generations past had existed at the centre of Christendom. Of the prevalence of simoniacal practices, of a scandalous and widespread neglect of the canons enjoining clerical celibacy, and of a general subordination of the ecclesiastical order to secular influences, there is no room for doubt. These evils were at that time almost universal. In 1065, the year of St. Edward's death, things were no better in England than on the Continent of Europe. Probably they were rather worse. But the forces which were to purify and renovate the Church were already at work. The monastic reform begun in the tenth century at Cluny had spread to many religious houses of France and among other places had been cordially taken up in the Norman Abbey of Fécamp, and later at Bec. On the other hand this same ascetical discipline had done much to form the character both of Brun, Bishop of Toul, who in 1049 became pope, and is known as St. Leo IX, and of Hildebrand his chief counsellor, afterwards still more famous as St. Gregory VII. Under the auspices of these two popes a new era dawned for the Church. Effective action was at last taken to restrain clerical incontinence and avarice, while a great struggle began to rescue the bishops from the imminent danger of becoming mere feudatories to the emperor and other secular princes. William the Conqueror had established intimate relations with the Holy See. He came to England armed with the direct authorization of a papal Bull, and his expedition, in the eyes of many earnest men, and probably even his own, was identified with the cause of ecclesiastical reform. The behaviour of Normans and Saxons on the night preceding the battle of Hastings, when the former prayed and prepared for Communion while the latter caroused, was in a measure significant of the spirit of the two parties. Taken as a whole, the Conqueror's dealings with the English Church were worthy of a great mission. All the best elements in the Saxon hierarchy he retained and supported. St. Wulstan was confirmed in the possession of the See of Worcester. Leofric of Exeter and Siward of Rochester, both Englishmen, as well as some half-dozen prelates of foreign birth who had been appointed in Edward's reign, were not interfered with. On the other hand, Stigand, the intriguing Archbishop of Canterbury, and one or two other bishops, probably his supporters, were deposed. But in this there was no indecent haste. It was done at the great Council of Winchester (Easter, 1070), at which three papal legates were present. Shortly afterwards the vacant sees were filled up, and, in procuring Lanfranc for Canterbury and Thomas of Bayeux for York, William gave to his new kingdom the very best prelates that were then available. The results were undoubtedly beneficial to the Church. The king himself directly enjoined the separation of the civil and ecclesiastical courts, for these jurisdictions in the old shiremoots and hundredmoots had hardly been distinguished. It was probably partly as a consequence of this division that ecclesiastical synods now began to be held regularly by Lanfranc, with no small profit to discipline and piety. Strong legislation was adopted (e. g. at Winchester in 1176) to secure celibacy among the clergy, though not without some temporary mitigation for the old rural priests, a mitigation which proves perhaps better than anything else that in the existing generation a sudden and complete reform seemed hopeless. Further, several episcopal sees were removed from what were then mere villages to more populous centres. Thus bishops were transferred from Sherborne to Salisbury, from Selsey to Chichester, from Lichfield to Chester, and not many years after from Dorchester to Lincoln, and from Thetford to Norwich. These and the like changes, and, not perhaps least of all, the drafting of Lanfranc's new constitutions for the Christ Church

monks, were all significant of the improvement introduced by the new ecclesiastical regime. With regard to Rome, the Conqueror seems never to have been wanting in respect for the Holy See, and nothing like a breach with the pope ever took place during his lifetime. The two archbishops went to Rome in 1071 to receive their pallia, and when (c. 1078) a demand was made through the papal legate, Hubert, for the payment of arrears of Peter's-pence, the claim was admitted, and the contribution was duly sent. Gregory, however, seems at the same time to have called upon the King of England to do homage for his kingdom, regarding the payment of Romescot as an acknowledgment of vassalage, as in some cases, e. g. that of the Normans in Apulia (See Jensen, "Der englische Peterspfennig", p. 37), it undoubtedly was. But on this point William's reply was clear. "One claim [Peter's-pence] I admit," he wrote, "the other I do not admit. To do fealty I have not been willing in the past, nor am I willing now, inasmuch as I have never promised it, nor do I discover that my predecessors ever did it to your predecessors." It is plain that all this had nothing whatever to do with the recognition of the pope's spiritual supremacy, and in fact the king says in the concluding sentence of the letter: "Pray for us and for the good estate of our realm, for we have loved your predecessors and desire to love you sincerely and to hear you obediently before all" (et vos præ omnibus sincere diligere et obedienter audire desideramus). Possibly the incident led to some slight coolness, reflected, for example, in the rather negative attitude of Lanfranc towards the antipope Wibert at a later date (see Liebermann in "Eng. Hist. Rev.", 1901, p. 328), but it is also likely that William and his archbishop were only careful not to get entangled in the strife between Gregory and the Emperor Henry IV. In any case, the more strictly ecclesiastical policy of the great pontiff was cordially furthered by them, so that St. Gregory, writing to Hugh, Bishop of Die, remarked that although the King of England does not bear himself in all things as religiously as might be wished, still, inasmuch as he does not destroy or sell the churches, rules peaceably and justly, refuses to enter into alliance with the enemies of the Cross of Christ (the partisans of Henry IV), and has compelled the priests to give up their wives and laymen to pay arrears of tithe, he has proved himself worthy of special consideration. As has been recently pointed out by an impartial authority (Davis, "England under Normans and Angevins", p. 54) "Lanfranc's correspondence and career prove that he and his master conceded important powers to the Pope not only in matters of conscience and faith but also in administrative questions. They admitted for example the necessity of obtaining the pallium for an archbishop and the Pope's power to invalidate episcopal elections. They were scrupulous in obtaining the Pope's consent when the deposition or resignation of a bishop was in question and they submitted the time-honoured quarrel of York and Canterbury to his decision."

No doubt a strong centralized government was then specially needed in Church as well as State, and we need not too readily condemn Lanfranc as guilty of personal ambition because he insisted on the primacy of his own see and exacted a profession of obedience from the Archbishop of York. The recent attempt that has been made to fasten a charge of forgery upon Lanfranc in connexion with this incident (see Boehmer, "Falschungen Erzbischof Lanfranks") breaks down at the point where the personal responsibility of the great archbishop is involved. Undoubtedly many of the documents upon which Canterbury's claims to supremacy was based were forgeries, and forgeries of that precise period, but there is no proof that Lanfranc was the forger or that he acted otherwise than in good faith (see Walter in "Götting. gelehrte Anzeigen", 1905, 582; and Saltet in "Revue des Sciences Ecclés.", 1907, p. 423).

Well was it for England that William and Lanfranc, without any violent overthrow of the existing order of things, either in Church or State, had nevertheless introduced systematic reforms and had provided the country with good bishops. A struggle was now at hand which ecclesiastically speaking was probably more momentous than any other event in history down to the time of the Reformation. The struggle is known as that about Investitures, and we may note that it had already been going on in Central Europe for some years before the question, through the action of William II and Henry I, sons of the Conqueror, reached an acute phase in England. Down to the eleventh century it may be said that, though the election of bishops always supposed the free choice, or at least the acceptance, of their flocks, the procedure was very variable. In these earlier ages bishops were normally chosen by an assembly of the clergy and people, the neighbouring bishops and the king or civil magnates exercising more or less of influence in the selection of a suitable candidate (see Imbart de la Tour, "Les élections épiscopales"). But from the seventh and eighth century onwards it became increasingly common for the local Churches to find themselves in some measure of bondage. From the ancient principle of "no land without a lord" it was easy to pass to that of "no church without a lord", and whether the bishopric was situated upon the royal domain or within the sphere of influence of one of the great feudatories, men came to regard each episcopal see as a mere fief which the lord was free to bestow upon whom he would, and for which he duly exacted homage. This development was no doubt much helped by the fact that as the parochial system grew up, it was the oratory of the local magnate which in rural districts became the parish church, and it was his private chaplain who was transformed into the parish priest. Thus the great landowner became the *patronus ecclesiæ*, claiming the right to present for ordination any cleric of his own choice. Now the relation of a sovereign towards his bishops came in time to be regarded as precisely analogous. The king was held to be the lord of the lands from which the bishop derived his revenues. Instead of the possession of these lands being regarded as the apanage of the spiritual office, the acceptance of episcopal consecration was looked upon as the special condition or service upon which these lands were held from the king. Thus the temporal sovereign claimed to make the bishop, and, to show that he did so, he "invested" the new spiritual vassal with his fief by presenting to him the episcopal ring and crosier. The episcopal consecration was a subordinate matter which the king's nominee was left to arrange for himself with his metropolitan and the neighbouring bishops. Now, as long as the supreme authority was wielded by religiously-minded men, princes who took thought for the spiritual well-being of their kingdoms, no great harm necessarily resulted from this perversion of right order. But when, as too often happened during the iron age, the monarch was godless and unprincipled, he either kept the see vacant, in order to enjoy the revenues, or else sold the office to the highest bidder. It must be obvious that such a system, if allowed to develop unchecked could only lead in the course of a few generations to the utter demoralization of the Church. When the bishops, the shepherds of the flock, were themselves licentious and corrupt, it would have been a moral miracle if the rank and file of the clergy had not degenerated in an equal or even greater degree. Upon the bishop depended ultimately the admission of candidates to ordination, and he also was ultimately responsible for their education and for the maintenance of ecclesiastical discipline.

Now the fact cannot be disputed that in the tenth century a very terrible laxity had come to prevail almost everywhere throughout Western Christendom.

The great monastic reform of Cluny and many individual saints like Ulric, at Augsburg, and Dunstan and Æthelwold, in England, did much to stem the tide, but the times were very evil. Worldly minded men, often morally corrupt, were promoted by sovereigns and territorial magnates to some of the most important sees of the Church, many of them obtaining that promotion by the payment of money or by simoniacal compacts. The lower clergy as a rule were grossly ignorant and in many cases unchaste, but under such bishops they enjoyed almost complete immunity from punishment. No doubt the corruptions of the age have been exaggerated by writers of the stamp of H. C. Lea, Michelet, and Gregorovius, but nothing could more conclusively prove the gravity of the evil than the fact that for two centuries the Church had to struggle with the abuse by which benefices threatened to become hereditary, descending from the priest to his children. Happily help was at hand. Many individual reformers strove to introduce higher religious ideals and met with partial success, but it was the merit of the great pontiff, St. Gregory VII, to go straight to the root of the evil. It was useless to fulminate decrees against the concubinage of priests and against their neglect of their spiritual functions if the great feudal lords could still nominate unworthy bishops, bestowing investiture by ring and crosier and enforcing their consecration at the hands of other bishops as unworthy as the candidates. Gregory saw that no permanent good could be effected until this system of lay investitures was utterly overthrown. Those who have accused Gregory of insufferable arrogance, of a desire to exalt without measure the spiritual authority of the Church and to humble all secular rulers to the dust, make little allowance for the gravity of the evils he was combating and for the desperate nature of the struggle. When feudalism seemed on the point of so completely swallowing up all ecclesiastical organization, it was pardonable that St. Gregory should have believed that the remedy lay not in any compromise or balance of power, but in the unqualified acceptance of the principle that the Church was above the State. If, on the one hand, he considered that it was the function of the Vicar of Christ to direct and, if need be, chastise the princes of the earth, it is also clear from the history of his life that he designed to use that power impartially and well.

In England the struggle over investitures developed somewhat later than on the Continent. If, in the matter of the election of bishops, Gregory VII forbore to press the claims of the Church to extremities under such a ruler as William the Conqueror, this was surely not to be attributed to pusillanimity. The pope's forbearance was due quite as much to the fact that he was satisfied that the king made good appointments, as to the circumstance that his own energies were for the time absorbed in the greater struggle with the emperor. Even under the rule of William Rufus no great abuses declared themselves before the death of Lanfranc (1089). It is very noteworthy that William of St. Calais, Bishop of Durham, in 1088, having been accused of treason before the King's Court, questioned the competence of the Court and appealed to the pope. Practically speaking, his appeal was allowed, and he was granted a safe-conduct out of the kingdom, though only after the surrender of his fief. This was virtually an admission that a bishop held only the temporalities of his see from the crown, and that as a spiritual person he was free to challenge the decision of any national tribunal. Such an incident can with difficulty be reconciled with those theories of the independence of the English Church which commonly prevail among modern Anglicans.

With the death of Lanfranc, however, all that was evil in the nature of William Rufus seems to have come to the surface. Under the influence of the man who was his evil genius, Ralph Flambard, a cleric whom he eventually made Bishop of Durham, the king during nearly the whole of his reign set himself to undo the good effected by his father and Lanfranc. In the words of the chronicler, "God's Church was brought very low". Whenever a bishop or abbot died, one of the king's clerks was sent to take possession of all the rents for the use of the crown, leaving but a bare pittance to the monks or canons. The prelacies whose revenues were thus confiscated were long kept vacant, and no new appointment was made except upon payment of a large sum of money by way of a "relief". For the credit of one or two really good men like Ralph Luffa and Herbert Losinga, who during these bad times became respectively Bishops of Chichester and Norwich (the latter paying a thousand pounds for his nomination), it should be pointed out that a certain pretext of feudal custom lent a decent veil to the simony involved in these transactions. The obsolete doctrine that a fief was a precarious estate, and granted only for a lifetime, was revived by Flambard, and, as a corollary, large sums of money, as "reliefs" (from *relevare*, "to take up again"), were demanded, when any fief, lay or spiritual, was conceded to a new possessor. But bishops and abbots were made to pay proportionately more than earls or barons, and a relief was exacted in some cases even from all the subordinate tenants of episcopal sees the moment the estate came into the king's hands (see Round, "Feudal England", p. 309). All this only illustrates further the evils inherent in the system of regarding a spiritual office as a fief held from the king. In the case of the metropolitan See of Canterbury, no successor was appointed until four years after Lanfranc's death. Even then William Rufus only yielded to the solicitations made to him because he had fallen grievously ill and was lying at the point of death. Most providentially, this illness coincided with the presence in England of Anselm, Abbot of Bec, whom all men regarded as marked out for the primacy alike by his learning and his holiness of life. The king summoned Anselm to his bedside, and the latter extorted a solemn promise of radical reform in the administration of both Church and State. Shortly afterwards, in spite of all his protests, Anselm himself was invested, literally by force, with the insignia of the primacy, and he was consecrated archbishop before the end of the year. But though the saint's firmness secured the restoration of all the possessions which belonged to the See of Canterbury at the time of Lanfranc's death, the king soon returned to his evil ways. In particular he still clung to the theory that by accepting investiture Anselm had become his liege man (*ligeus homo*), liable to all the incidents of vassalage. When an aid was demanded for the war in Normandy, Anselm at first refused. Then, not wantonly to provoke a conflict, he offered 500 marks; but when this sum was rejected as insufficient, he distributed the money to the poor. Early in 1095 the archbishop asked permission to go to the pope to receive the pallium. Rufus objected that, while the antipope Clement III was still disputing the title, it was for him and his Great Council to decide which pope should be recognized. When asked to recognize the jurisdiction of this council, Anselm replied: "In the things that are God's I will tender obedience to the Vicar of St. Peter; in things touching the earthly dignity of my lord the King I will to the best of my ability give him faithful counsel and help." The other bishops seem to have been cowed by Rufus and to have supported the king's claim to decide which of the rival popes he should recognize. But Anselm refused in any way to surrender the allegiance which, when Abbot of Bec, he had sworn to Urban. He recognized no right of king or bishops to interfere, and he declared he would give his answer "as he ought and where he ought". These words, writes Dean Stephens (History of The English Church, II, 99), were understood to mean, that, as Archbishop of Canter-

bury, Anselm "refused to be judged by any one save the pope himself, a doctrine which it seems no one was prepared to deny". Through the saint's firmness Urban was recognized, and the pallium brought from him to England; but a little later Anselm again asked leave to go to Rome, and when it was refused he declared in the plainest terms that he must go without leave, for God was to be obeyed rather than man. Pope Urban received him with all possible respect, and publicly spoke of him as "alterius orbis papa", a phrase much quoted by Anglicans, as though it implied the recognition in the Archbishop of Canterbury of a jurisdiction independent of Rome.

But the whole lesson of Anselm's life centred in his belief that it lay with the pope to decide what course was to be followed in matters affecting the Church even at the risk of the king's displeasure, and despite any pretended national customs. Neither does it appear that the rest of the English bishops maintained the contrary as a matter of principle, though they considered that Anselm's attitude was needlessly provocative and uncompromising. There are not wanting signs that Eadmer's desire to exalt his own beloved master has led him to be somewhat less than just to Anselm's suffragans and to the Holy See itself. The archbishop remained in exile until after the death of Rufus, when Henry, who succeeded, made generous promises of freedom to the Church, explicitly renouncing any sort of payment or relief for the appointment of new bishops or abbots, and promising that church revenues should not be seized during vacancies. He recalled Anselm to England, but came into conflict with him almost immediately over the same old question of investitures. At the Councils of Bari (1098) and Rome (1099), at which the saint had personally assisted, anathema had been pronounced on those bishops or abbots who received investiture at the hands of laymen. Anselm accordingly refused either to do homage himself for the restitution of the possessions of the archbishopric or to consecrate other bishops who had received ring and crosier from the king. Eventually, by the consent of both parties, the matter was referred to Rome. In three different embassies that were sent, the pope upheld Anselm's view, despite the efforts made by Henry's envoys to extort some concession. Then Anselm himself went to Rome (1103) while a fresh set of royal emissaries were dispatched to work against him at the Curia. Nothing was settled, for Henry still held out, and Anselm accordingly remained abroad. But at last, when Anselm was on the point of launching an excommunication against the king, the latter, being in political straits, accepted such modified terms as his envoys could obtain from the Holy See. Anselm was allowed to consecrate those who had previously received investiture, but the king at a great council (1107) renounced for the future the claim to invest bishop or abbot by ring and crosier. On the other hand it was tacitly admitted that bishops might do homage to the king for the temporal possessions of their sees. This settlement of the investiture question in England was fifteen years earlier than that arrived at on very similar lines between Pope Callistus II and the Emperor Henry V. The importance of the struggle can hardly be exaggerated, for, as already pointed out, the whole ecclesiastical order was in danger of being reduced to the status of vassals sharing all the vices of secular princes. Moreover this resolute stand made by St. Anselm and the popes was not without its political importance. The clergy as a body had now become sufficiently independent to take a leading part in that resistance to despotism to which the people during the next two centuries were to owe their most fundamental liberties. During all this time England as a whole was in no wise in sympathy with the monarch in his quarrel with the pope. As Dr. Gairdner writes of a later period, "It was a contest not of the English people, but of the King and his government with Rome. . . . As regards national feeling, the people evidently regarded the cause of the Church as the cause of liberty" (Lollards and the Reformation, I, 6). Nothing contributed so much to win the confidence of the nation as the independence shown by the Church in such struggles as those that are associated with the names of St. Anselm, St. Thomas Becket, and Cardinal Stephen Langton.

St. Anselm died peacefully at Canterbury in 1109, but Henry I lived on until 1135. During the remainder of Henry's reign and throughout the anarchy which prevailed under the rule of Stephen (1135–1154), good bishops were for the most part elected. The chapters were ostensibly left free in their choice, though they no doubt responded in some measure to the known preferences of the king. In any case simoniacal compacts are no longer heard of, while the Holy See had generally much to say to the final acceptance of the archbishops and of the more important prelates. A certain impatience of dictation from Rome, shown, for example, in occasional unwillingness to receive a legate or to allow appeals to the pope, may be noted at this as at other periods, but the principle of papal authority was never disputed. For example, the pallium, "taken from the body of Blessed Peter", a symbol of archiepiscopal jurisdiction which still appears in the arms of the English Sees of Canterbury and York, was personally fetched from Rome or at least petitioned for by every archbishop, as it had been in the Anglo-Saxon Church from the very beginning. In cases when the pall was brought to England instead of being conferred at the papal court, archbishops like St. Anselm and Ralph d'Escures went to meet it barefoot. To legates of the Holy See, notwithstanding the fact that their presence was not always desired, extreme deference was shown. Even a mere priest like Cardinal John of Crema, when he came to the country as papal legate, took precedence of the two archbishops in the Council of Westminster (1125). Moreover, when protests were made against the sending of legates, it was not so much that the presence of a papal representative in England was resented, as because men believed that such legatine powers, by old tradition, ought to be conferred on the Archbishop of Canterbury, as had been done, for example, in the case of Tatwine, Plegmund, and Dunstan. As Eadmer reports (Historia Novorum, p. 58), "Inauditum scilicet in Britanniâ . . . , quemlibet hominem supra se vices apostolicas gerere nisi solum archiepiscopum Cantuariæ" (It was surely an unheard-of thing in Britain . . . that any man should bear the Apostolic delegation over him except only the Archbishop of Canterbury). In the spirit of this protest Archbishop William de Corbeil almost immediately after Crema's departure eagerly sought the office of legate for himself, and from that time, though Henry, Bishop of Winchester, was made legate by Innocent II in 1129, the Archbishop of Canterbury was usually constituted *legatus natus* (native, or ordinary, legate), a term used in contradistinction to the *legatus a latere* dispatched on extraordinary occasions "from the side" of the sovereign pontiff in Rome. But in any case the significance of the ordinary legatine appointment, first associated with the person of William de Corbeil (d. 1136), is unmistakable. It was, as Dean Stephens truly observes, "an acknowledgment of the supreme authority of the Pope. The primate shone with a reflected glory, his preeminence was not inherent but derivative" (Hist. of the Eng. Church, II, 142).

Evil as were the times during the first half of the twelfth century the English Church was by no means lacking in vivifying influences. This was the period of the chief development in England of the Cluniac Order (see CLUNY, CONGREGATION OF), a great Benedictine reform already alluded to, of which the first English house, that of Lewes, had been established by

William de Warrenne and Gundrada his wife c. 1077. But the priory of Lewes later on became the mother of several other Cluniac priories, of which the best known are those of Wenlock, Thetford, Bermondsey, and Pontefract. Still more intimately associated with England was the Cistercian Order, another Benedictine reform of which the virtual founder was a Somersetshire man, St. Stephen Harding. His fame has been eclipsed by the glory of St. Bernard, the last of the Fathers and the founder of the Abbey of Clairvaux, but it was Stephen who received St. Bernard and his comrades at Cîteaux in 1113, and who gave them the white habit prescribed by the Cistercian rule. The first abbey of the order in England was that of Waverley in Surrey (1128), which itself became the mother of several other foundations. But Waverley was eclipsed by the Yorkshire Abbey of Rivaulx established (c. 1133) by monks sent directly from Clairvaux by St. Bernard. Among the earliest recruits of Rivaulx was St. Ælred, perhaps the most eloquent of pre-Reformation English preachers. The foundations of the white monks throve and multiplied exceedingly. By the year 1152 there were fifty Cistercian houses in England (Cooke in "Eng. Hist. Rev.", Oct., 1893), of which the best known are Fountains, Tintern, and Meaux. Unfortunately, this rapid development seems to have been followed before long by some relaxation of primitive austerity and fervour, but the movement while it lasted must have contributed greatly to the diffusion of more spiritual ideals and to the correction of the manifold moral evils of the times. The Carthusian rule, the most austere of all, was not introduced into England until somewhat later—the first house, that of Witham in Somerset, was founded by Henry II in 1180, one of the indirect results of the martyrdom of St. Thomas. Probably the extreme rigour of the life prevented the Carthusian foundations from ever becoming numerous. But the Charterhouse at Witham gave to England one of her greatest and holiest bishops, St. Hugh of Lincoln (d. 1200), and the Charterhouse of London at a later date played a noble part in the resistance it offered to the first stages of Henry VIII's revolt from Rome.

The houses of the Austin Canons, or "Black Canons", were more numerous and of earlier date than those of the Carthusians. Their first foundation was that of Colchester, in 1105, and they possessed two great establishments in London: St. Bartholomew's Smithfield, and St. Saviour's Southwark. At Carlisle they formed the cathedral chapter, the only exception to the rule that all the cathedrals which were not served by Benedictines were in the hands of secular canons. And here we may conveniently notice the fact that, owing, probably, to the initial impulse of St. Dunstan and the monastic sympathies of Lanfranc, who virtually reorganized the English Church after the Conquest, England stood almost alone among the nations of Europe in the number of her cathedrals that were served by monks. Canterbury, Durham, Winchester, Rochester, Worcester, Norwich, Ely, Coventry, and Bath all had Benedictine chapters. If this arrangement led to some gain in point of piety, there was also a proportionate disadvantage in the additional friction that was likely to result when it came to the election by religious of successors to the see. The Benedictines, the "Black Monks", were of course always the most numerous monastic body in England, and, while they had been firmly established in the country from the very beginning, there was at all times a pretty steady increase in the number of abbeys and cells which belonged to them. Bound specially by their rule to show hospitality to strangers, and being for the most part good farmers and good landlords, they formed a great element of stability and peace throughout the country, helping to bind district with district through their relations with their dependent cells and with one another. They were also the great centres of learning, more particularly in the collection and multiplication of books, and they were not only patrons of art but they provided in many cases the nearest approach to schools for architecture, painting, sculpture, embroidery, and other useful works. If their revenues were vast, so, it must be also remembered, were their charities. Neither would it be easy to imagine a more worthy object upon which to expend the superfluous wealth of the country than in the erecting of those magnificent abbeys and churches which the monastic builders left to posterity. Speaking of the religious orders generally, it may be said that no more misplaced charge was ever made than that which describes their members as idle and useless. Of all the sections of the community they almost alone in that day were profitably busy. The industrious man-at-arms, the industrious lawyer, the industrious forester, huntsman, or *jongleur* were too often only a scourge to the land in which they lived. For this reason we conceive that a quite unnecessary outcry has been raised by a number of Anglican writers against a practice which undoubtedly became very prevalent in the twelfth century, namely that of making over—technically called "impropriating"—to religious houses the tithes or other sources of revenue of the parish churches. By this arrangement the monastery so benefited received nearly all the funds properly belonging to the parish, but supplied for the religious needs of the parishioners, either by deputing one of the monks to act as parish priest or by paying a small stipend to some secular vicar. No doubt this practice was open to abuse, and various synodal decrees were passed to keep it under control accordingly. Thus as early as 1102 the Council of Westminster laid down the principle that monasteries were not to impropriate churches without the consent of the bishop, and required that churches should not be stripped so bare of revenue as to reduce the priests who served them to penury. Later synodal legislation insisted that "perpetual vicars" should be appointed (i. e. priests who would not be liable to removal, and who would consequently have a permanent interest in their cure), and that "competent stipends", for which a minimum amount was determined, should be paid them for their services. Where, however, these and similar precautions were observed it is certain that many of the wisest and holiest of the English prelates regarded the impropriations of churches to religious communities with no disfavour. St. Hugh of Lincoln made many such grants (see Thurston, "Life of St. Hugh", p. 463), and it seems indisputable that in the then condition of the secular clergy, who were far, as yet, from having recovered completely from the state of ignorance and demoralization into which they had fallen in the preceding century, the churches for which some monastic community made themselves responsible were likely to be spiritually better cared for than those livings to which the crown or some secular magnate presented at will. Strange to say, it is precisely those writers who declaim against the degradation of the medieval clergy, and against their general neglect of the canons enjoining celibacy, who also are loudest in denunciation of the scandal that monks should enjoy the revenues intended for the parish priests.—Can it be supposed that the possession of larger incomes would have tended to make the secular clergy more zealous or more continent?—That there were two sides to the question has, however, been recognized by more thoughtful Anglicans and one such writer, for example, remarks with point: "The secular priests living in solitude on a remote country benefice had more temptations to sink into ignorance and indolence, if not vice, than the member of a brotherhood, who was responsible to it for the discharge of his trust, and might from time to time be refreshed by a visit to the monastic house, or by visitors from it." (Stephens, Hist. Eng. Church, II, 272.)

With the accession of Henry II, in 1154, England, after years of strife, once more passed into the hands of a strong and capable ruler. Without being a whit less selfish or more patriotic than other princes of that age, Henry had the sense to see that good government meant stable government. His legal reforms and the new machinery of justice which he brought into being are of the highest possible importance to the jurist and to the student of constitutional history, but they do not specially concern us here. Henry at the beginning of his reign seems to have been well viewed in Rome, and believing, as the present writer does, that the Bull "Laudabiliter" is unquestionably genuine (see ADRIAN IV, and cf. "The Month", May and June, 1906), the religious mission entrusted to the king, no doubt upon his own representations, in the proposed conquest of Ireland, bears a close resemblance to the pretext advanced for William the Conqueror's invasion of Great Britain. In both cases, also, the Roman pontiff seems to have claimed dominion, granting the land to the invader as a fief upon payment of a certain tribute. The fact, that, according to the Bull "Laudabiliter", Henry himself had admitted (quod tua etiam nobilitas recognoscit) that "Ireland and all other islands upon which Christ, the Sun of Justice, has shone belong to the prerogative of St. Peter and the Holy Roman Church", deserves to be borne in mind in connexion with King John's formal surrender of his kingdom to the Holy See at a later date.

But what specially interests us here in the reign of Henry II is the disputes between the king and Thomas, his archbishop, culminating, in 1170, in the martyrdom of the latter. Thomas Becket, a clerk in the household of Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, having been strongly recommended to Henry, had been taken into his intimate friendship and made Chancellor of the Kingdom, an office which he had discharged with splendid ability for seven years. After the death of Theobald, Thomas, at the instance of the king himself, was elected Archbishop of Canterbury. He vainly tried to escape from the proposed dignity, but, once appointed, his consecration marked the beginning of a complete change of life. He renounced the chancellorship and all secular pursuits, while he devoted himself to the practice of rigorous asceticism. It was not long before he found himself in conflict with the king, as indeed he had foreseen from the first. The first question which caused an open breach between them was a purely secular one. Henry demanded that a certain tax called "the sheriff's aid" should be paid directly into the Exchequer. Thomas, in a Great Council, declared that he was willing to make his contribution to the sheriffs, as had been customary, but absolutely refused to pay if the money was to be added to the revenue of the Crown. Whether this tax was really the Danegeld, as Bishop Stubbs supposes, is very questionable, but in any case we may share his admiration for this, "the first instance of any opposition to the King's will in the matter of taxation which is recorded in our national history", and, as he adds, "it would seem to have been, formally at least, successful" (Const. Hist., I, 463). This incident, however, was soon thrown into the shade by the more serious quarrel over the Constitutions of Clarendon. What was put by the king in the forefront of the dispute was the alleged inadequacy of the punishment meted out to clerics who were guilty of criminal offences. The statement then made that a hundred homicides had been committed by clerics within ten years rests on no adequate evidence, neither are the cases of which we have definite particulars much more satisfactory (see Morris, "Life of St. Thomas", pp. 114 sqq.). It may be that the king was honestly intent on a scheme of judicial reform, and that he found that the growing jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts (the publication of the "Decretum Gratiani" and the increased study of the canon law had made them very popular) was an obstacle in his way. But Becket, who knew him well, suspected that Henry was deliberately striking at the privileges of the Church, and the manner in which a promise was extorted from the bishops to observe the "avitæ consuetudines" before anyone knew what these were, as well as the pretence that the Constitutions of Clarendon represented nothing but the customs said to have been observed in the time of Henry I, do not leave the impression of straightforward dealing. The general purport of the Constitutions, when they were at last made known, was to transfer certain causes—for example, those regarding presentations to benefices—from the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical to that of the King's Courts, to restrain appeals to Rome, to prevent the excommunication of the king's officers and great vassals, and to sanction the king's appropriation of the revenues of bishoprics and abbacies. On one clause, that dealing with criminous clerks, much misapprehension has prevailed. It was formerly supposed that Henry wanted all clerks accused of crimes to be tried in the King's Courts. But this impression, as F. W. Maitland has shown (Roman Canon Law, pp. 132–147), is certainly wrong. A rather complicated arrangement was proposed by which cognizance of the case was first to be taken in the King's Court; if the culprit proved to be a clerk, the case was to be tried in the ecclesiastical court, but an officer of the King's Court was to be present, who, if the accused were found guilty, was to conduct him back to the King's Court after degradation, where he would be dealt with as an ordinary criminal and adequately punished. The king's contention was that flogging, fines, degradation, and excommunication, beyond which the spiritual courts could not go, were insufficient as punishment. The archbishop urged that, apart from the principle of clerical privilege, to degrade a man first and to hang him afterwards was to punish him twice for the same offence. Once degraded, he lost all his rights, and if he committed another crime he might then be punished with death like any other felon. And here also it must not be forgotten that "the forces at the back of St. Thomas represented not only the respect which men feel for a bold fight for principle, but also that blind struggle against the hideous punishments of the age, of which the assertion of ecclesiastical privilege, covering widows and orphans as well as clerks and those that injured them, was a natural expression" (W. H. Hutton in "Social England", I, 394). After a moment of weakness in the earlier stage of the discussion, St. Thomas, in spite of Henry's fury, refused to have anything to say to the Constitutions. Among the rest of the bishops he met with little help, but the pope, Alexander III, loyally supported him. The rest of the story is well known. The archbishop soon found himself compelled to leave the kingdom. For nearly six years he remained abroad, an exile and bereft of his revenues. In 1170 a hollow reconciliation was patched up with the king, and Becket returned to Canterbury. But in a few weeks fresh cause of offence was given, and the king in a fit of passion uttered the rash words which led to the terrible tragedy of the martyrdom. St. Thomas fell in the transept of his cathedral, close beside the steps leading to the high altar, in the late afternoon of 29 December, 1170. All Christendom was horrified, and Henry II, whether from policy or genuine remorse, surrendered his former pretensions while, in 1174, he performed humiliating penance at the martyr's tomb. Within a very few years Canterbury had become a place of pilgrimage celebrated throughout Europe. No one who studies carefully the history of the times can fail to see the immense moral force which such an example lent to the cause of the weak and to the liberties both of the Church and the people, against all forms of absolutism and tyranny. The precise quarrel for which St. Thomas gave his life was relatively a small matter.

What was of supreme importance was the lesson that there was something higher, stronger, and more enduring than the will of the most powerful earthly despot.

The life of the Carthusian, St. Hugh, whom Henry II himself caused to be elected Bishop of Lincoln in 1186, forms an admirable pendant to that of St. Thomas. It may be noted in the first place, in view of the outcry raised a little later against the provision of foreigners to English sees, that St. Hugh was a Burgundian, who even at the end of his life hardly understood the language of the people. But no man ruled his diocese better, no man was more beloved alike by his own secular canons of Lincoln and by the numerous religious in his diocese; while, owing to his holiness, his fearlessness, and his merry humour, he was the only bishop who without yielding an inch of his high principles, preserved the respect and even the friendship of three such monarchs as Henry II, Richard Cœur de Lion, and John. Very memorable was his firm refusal in the national council to grant Richard an aid in knights and money for foreign warfare. Though the reign of Richard, like that of his predecessor Henry II, still continued to be a period of reform in law, it was also a period of unparalleled exactions in money. In this case the great Justiciar, Hubert Walter, who was also Archbishop of Canterbury, had made himself the instrument of the king's designs. Though all the temporal lords submitted, St. Hugh offered an uncompromising and successful resistance. "This", says Bishop Stubbs, "which was done not on ecclesiastical but on constitutional grounds, is an act which stands out prominently by the side of St. Thomas's protest against Henry's proposal to appropriate the sheriffs' share of Danegeld" (Select Charters, p. 28).

Richard's extreme need of money had no doubt been caused in part by his participation in the Crusades and by the huge ransom he had had to pay when captured on his way home by Duke Leopold of Austria. Englishmen, both now and at an earlier date, had played their part in the Crusades. Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury, who accompanied Richard, and who had been a most earnest preacher of the holy war, left his bones in Palestine, and Bishop Hubert Walter, who was destined to succeed him in the archbishopric, became the virtual commander of the English forces upon his death. But the Crusades exercised no great influence upon the national life of England. For our present purpose they are chiefly memorable as emphasizing the truth, so often ignored by Anglican writers, that medieval Christendom, while recognizing many different peoples and many different governments, conceived of the Church of God not as manifold, but as one. According to that "political theory of the Middle Age" which, founded by Gregory VII, had already imposed itself almost universally upon the speculative philosophy of Europe, the Church, embracing and controlling every form of civil government, was cosmopolitan and all-pervading. It was precisely the fact that she was not identified with any country or people, and that she appealed for her sanctions to forces outside of this visible world, that gave to the head of the Church his great position as the arbiter of nations. In principle no temporal ruler disputed the supremacy of the Vicar of Christ so long as the question remained in the abstract and so long as it was some other sovereign who was the sufferer. It was only when his own will was thwarted that active resistance was made, and then it was nearly always on some side issue, some technicality of law that the monarch and his advisers sought to evade the force of an unwelcome pronouncement. The very persistence with which monarchs at times sought to prevent the introduction into England of papal Bulls, provisions, or excommunications, was an acknowledgment rather than a repudiation of the papal authority; just as a man who barricades himself in his house that a writ may not be served on him is really giving proof of his supreme respect for the majesty of the law. This point of view is one that has carefully to be borne in mind in connexion with the resistance to the papal exactions of the thirteenth century and with such apparently unfriendly legislation as the Statutes of Præmunire and Provisors which we shall have to consider later on.

The reign of John (1199–1216) was a time of terrible suffering for the country, but it had results of untold importance in the consolidation of England as a nation. The very loss of her foreign possessions—for in Henry II's day more than half France had recognized the suzerainty of the King of England—contributed to that result. But within Great Britain itself, ever since the Norman Conquest, the political constituents of the nation had been divided between two strongly marked parties more or less in opposition. The first, or feudal, element consisted of the great nobles of the Conquest, with their vassals and the influences they wielded. The tendency of this party was centrifugal or disruptive, and they looked upon the country and its people as their lawful prey. The second, which for convenience' sake may be called the national element, was less homogeneous. It comprised the king, the newer nobility which represented mainly the great officials of the Crown appointed under Henry I and Henry II, and with these the bishops and clergy almost to a man. Taken as a whole, all these recognized the advantage of a centralized government and sympathized with the native population, wishing their rights to be respected and justice to be done. Now it was the work of John's lawless and despotic rule, especially after the restraining influence of Hubert Walter was withdrawn by death, to break up this combination and to unite all parties against himself. In this the action of Pope Innocent III, culminating in the Interdict and the sentence of deposition pronounced against John, played a most vital part. It is needless to recapitulate the story of the election of Stephen Langton as Archbishop of Canterbury, over which John's quarrel with the Holy See practically began. But it is well to recall that Langton, who rendered such splendid service to the liberties of his country, and whose name is imperishably associated with Magna Charta, was the pope's own nominee, elected at his instance by the Christ Church monks who had been dispatched to Rome. Under stress of the Interdict and of John's exactions, the old feudal lords, the clergy, and the new "ministerial" nobility gradually drew together. John found that he had none but a few personal partisans upon whom he could count, and Philip of France with a great following threatened invasion to enforce the pope's sentence of deposition. Under these circumstances John made his submission to the legate, Pandulf, promising to receive all the exiled bishops and to make restitution for the injuries and losses the Church had sustained. A few days later, on 13 May, the vigil of the Ascension, 1213, he went even further, for he surrendered his crown and kingdom into the hands of the legate to be received back from him as a fief which he and his successors were to hold of the pope for an annual rent of one thousand marks. It is not unnatural, perhaps, that this transaction should have been denounced by historians in the language of unmeasured indignation. Even Lingard in his day described it as "heaping everlasting infamy on the memory of John", but the considerations he puts forward in extenuation of the act have not been without weight with later students. It may be said to be now generally acknowledged that the idea of such a surrender probably did not originate with the pope, but with John himself (see Davis, "England under the Normans and Angevins", 1905, p. 368; Norgate, "John Lackland", 1902, p. 181). As the second of these two writers explains, there is a quite intelligible motive for

such an act: "John felt that he must bind the Pope to his personal interest by some special tie of such a nature that the interest of the papacy itself would prevent Innocent from casting it off or breaking it." But secondly, the statement formerly made about the cry of indignation heard in England when the news was known has little or no foundation. The vehement denunciation of the act by the partisan Matthew Paris, as "a thing to be detested for all time", was written many years afterwards. "Some", says Davis, "stigmatised the transaction as ignominious, but the most judicial chronicler of his day calls it a prudent move, for, he adds, there was hardly any other way in which John could escape from all his dangers. Even the hostile barons whose plans received an unexpected check did not venture either now or later to dispute the validity of the transaction" (cf. Adams, "Political Hist. of Eng.", II, 315). For such vassalage there were abundant precedents, both within and without the British Isles. Only twenty years earlier, as Hoveden states, Richard Cœur de Lion resigned his crown to the Emperor Henry, engaging to receive it as a fief of the empire for an annual payment of five thousand pounds; while the Scottish patriots a century later, to defeat the claims of Edward I, acknowledged the pope as their feudal lord and pretended that Scotland had always been a fief of the Holy See. It would be most misleading to interpret these and other similar transactions merely in the light of modern sentiment. Perhaps one of the most regrettable features in the incident of John's submission and absolution is the encouragement which the sense of papal protection seems to have given him to proceed in his career of wrongdoing. His later action toward his subjects was no more straightforward or constitutional than before, and he seems to have deceived or gained over the legate to his side. But Archbishop Langton and his barons by this time knew him well, and by inflexible persistence they forced John to accept their terms. Taking as their foundation an earlier document granted by Henry I at the beginning of his reign, they drew up a charter of liberties, many times confirmed with slight variations in the course of the next century, and destined to be famous through all time as Magna Charta. This great treaty between the king and his people, which Stubbs has described (Const. Hist., II, p. 1) as "the consummation of the work for which unconsciously kings, prelates and lawyers had been labouring for a century, the summing up of one period of national life and the starting point of another", begins with a religious preamble declaring that John was moved to issue this charter out of reverence for God, for the benefit of his own soul, for the exaltation of Holy Church, and for the amendment of his kingdom, and, further, that he had acted therein by the advice of Stephen, Archbishop of Canterbury, of the other bishops, and of Pandulf "subdeacon of the Lord Pope and member of his household", as also of the secular lords, the more important of whom are mentioned by name. As in the charter of Henry I, so here, the first article promises freedom to the Church in England (quod ecclesia Anglicana libera sit et habeat jura sua integra et libertates suas illæsas) and specifies in particular the freedom of election of bishops, which, as the document further explains, had already been promised by the king and ratified by Pope Innocent. For the rest it will be sufficient to say that Magna Charta in substance lays down the principle that the king has no right to violate the law, and, if he attempts to do so, may be constrained by force to obey it. In particular, justice is not to be sold, or delayed, or refused to any man. No freeman is to be taken or imprisoned or outlawed except by the lawful judgment of his peers. No scutage or tax, other than the three regular aids, is to be imposed except by the consent of the common council of the kingdom. Twenty-five barons were appointed to watch over the execution of the Charter, but they were far from retaining the sympathy of all. "Before the conference at Runnymede came to an end", says Mackechnie, "confidence in the good intentions of the 25 executors, drawn it must be remembered entirely from the section of the baronage most unfriendly to John, seems to have been completely lost" (Mackechnie, "Magna Carta", p. 53). The indignation, therefore, formerly expressed at the subsequent action of Innocent III in declaring the charter null and void is now generally admitted to be unreasonable. The barons had themselves claimed the credit of making England a papal fief (Lingard, II, 333; Rymer, I, 185), and it was certainly contrary to feudal usage for a vassal to contract obligations of this serious kind without reference to the overlord.

That the papal condemnation was not directed in principle against English popular liberties, may be inferred from the fact that the Charter was confirmed in November, 1216, upon the accession of the child king, Henry III, at a time when the papal legate Gualo was all-powerful, and was strongly supported by the new pope, Honorius III. The long reign which then began with a regency, despite the personal piety of Henry, was a period of much distress in England. The king's weakness and his partiality for foreign favourites involved him in a vast expenditure, while, on the other hand, the taxation thus necessitated could only have been carried through without disturbance by a strong central government, which was here entirely lacking. Cabals and intrigues of all kinds abounded, and the situation was complicated by constant demands for money made by the Holy See. The exactions of the various legates and the never ending "provisions" of papal nominees to canonries and rich livings were undoubtedly the cause of very bitter feeling at the time, and have formed the favourite theme of historians ever since. It would be useless to deny the existence of very serious abuses, more especially the fact that a large number of French and Italian clergy provided to English benefices never visited the country at all, and were content with simply drawing the revenues. But on the other hand there is much to be said in extenuation of the papal action, which unfortunately has been set before English readers in the most unfavourable light, owing to the bitter antipapalist feeling of the great St. Albans chronicler, Matthew Paris. How much Paris's judgment was warped by his prejudices, may be clearly seen in his unfriendly references to the friars, though they were then, at least relatively, in their first fervour. Lingard says of him that he seems to have collected and preserved every scandalous anecdote that would gratify his censorious disposition, and he adds a very strong personal expression of opinion regarding Paris's untrustworthiness (Hist. of Eng., II, 479). It is not wonderful that in that outspoken age Matthew Paris and others like him, finding their pockets touched by the papal demands, should have raised an outcry which went a good deal beyond the actual damage inflicted. This very period, when England, it is alleged, was ground under the heel of papal tyranny, "was in all other fields of action, except the political, an epoch of unexampled progress" (Tout in "Polit. Hist. of England", III, 81). Again, the pope's need of money, owing to the life-and-death struggle with the Hohenstaufen, was real enough. In the eyes of Gregory IX and Innocent IV the wars with the excommunicated German emperor were as genuine a crusade in behalf of the Church of God as that undertaken against the Turks. Moreover, with regard to the provision of foreigners to English benefices, even after making all allowances for the bitter feeling against aliens which manifested itself so often in the reign of Henry III, it is impossible to deny that the world in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and especially the ecclesiastical world, was cosmopolitan to a degree of which we

can now form no conception. In the early part of the thirteenth century nearly all the oldest and most influential men in England had made at least part of their studies in Paris. The two Archbishops of Canterbury, Stephen Langton and St. Edmund Rich, both men of pure English descent, might be instanced as conspicuous examples, and if Englishmen had to complain of the many foreign ecclesiastics provided for in England, it must not be forgotten that there was quite a considerable number of Englishmen occupying foreign sees and other positions of emolument on the Continent. The fact is indisputable—as indisputable as the fact that Englishmen formed a large proportion of the freebooters who roamed through Italy a century later and accepted the pay of anyone who would hire them—but it is interesting to find it proudly insisted upon by Matthew Paris, who in his indignation at the nomination of foreign ecclesiastics to English benefices, declares that England has no occasion to go abroad to beg for suitable candidates, seeing that she herself was rather accustomed to supply dignitaries for other distant lands ("Nec indiget Anglia extra fines suos in remotis regionibus personas regimini ecclesiarum idoneas mendicare, quæ solet tales aliis sæpius ministrare".—Historia Major, IV, 61).

The cosmopolitan tendencies just alluded to were very much increased in the thirteenth century by one of the greatest religious revivals which the world has seen, viz., that resulting from the foundation and rapid development of the mendicant orders. There is no reason to suppose that the effects produced by the preaching of the Franciscan and Dominican friars, who first came to England in 1224 and 1221 respectively, were more remarkable in this country than abroad, but all historians are agreed that the impressions produced by this popularizing of religion were very marked. The work of spiritual regeneration which they performed at the first was wonderful, and they were warmly encouraged by such holy men and patriotic prelates as the great Bishop Grosseteste. It is perhaps more important to note that, despite the accusations of idleness and worldliness made against them at a later date, their zeal was not extinguished, even if it flagged. An impartial historian who has given special attention to the subject says: "For more than three hundred years the mendicant Friars in England were on the whole a power for good up and down the land, the friends of the poor and the evangelisers of the masses. During all that long time they were supported only by the voluntary offerings of the people at large—just as the hospitals for the sick and incurable are supported now,—and when they were driven out of their houses and their churches were looted in common with those of the monks and nuns, the Friars had no broad acres and no manors, no real property to seize, and very little was gained by the spoiling of their goods, but inasmuch as they were at all times the most devoted servants and subjects of the Pope of Rome, they had to go at last, when Henry VIII had made up his mind to rule over his own kingdom and to be supreme head over State and Church" (Jessopp, "History of England", 34).

It was during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries that the relations between the medieval English Church and the Holy See may be considered to have assumed their final shape. At least this was the period when with such an outspoken champion as the great Bishop Robert of Lincoln (Grosseteste), or later, under so masterful a ruler as Edward I, or, again, amid the growing independence of Parliament, encouraged by such promoters of ecclesiastical disaffection as Wyclif and John of Gaunt in the reign of Edward III, the "Ecclesia Anglicana", according to the theory recently most prevalent, began to assert herself and resolutely set to work to put the pope in his place. And here it may be said once for all that the not unnatural impatience of papal supervision and papal interference which was often shown by strong kings like Edward I, and also at times by the clergy themselves, proves absolutely nothing against the acceptance of the pope's supreme authority as head of the Church. That subordinates should wish to be left free to enjoy a large measure of independence is a law of human nature. England's colonies, for example, may be quite loyal. They may fully recognize in principle the supreme right of the imperial Government, and yet any dictation from home which goes beyond what is customary, and especially when it is of a kind which touches the colonial pocket, provokes resentment and is apt to be angrily resisted. Even in a fervent religious order a proposed visitation of some outlying house or province may be met with remonstrance and an appeal to precedent on the part of those who, however docile, are doubtful of the ability of a foreign authority to understand local conditions. An entire acceptance of the spiritual supremacy of the Holy See is not in the least inconsistent with the belief that an individual pontiff, and still more the officials who form the entourage of that pontiff, may be influenced by mercenary or unworthy motives. There is not any form of authority in the world which is not at times disobeyed and defied under more or less specious pretexts by those who fully recognize in principle their own subordination. Thus it happens that the supporters of "Anglican Continuity" theories are able to quote many utterances of medieval writers that sound disaffected or rebellious in tone, they are able to appeal to many individual acts of disobedience, but they fail altogether in producing any, even the faintest, repudiation in principle of the pope's spiritual supremacy by the accredited representatives of the pre-Reformation Church. By no historian has this truth been more clearly recognized than by the distinguished jurist, F. W. Maitland. Challenging the statement of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission of 1883, which, largely under the guidance of the eminent historian, Bishop Stubbs, reported that "papal law was not binding in [medieval] England even in questions of faith and morals unless it had been accepted by the national authorities", Professor Maitland, with an irrefragable array of illustrations drawn mainly from the classical canon-law book of the English pre-Reformation Church, the "Provinciale" of Bishop Lyndwood (1435), maintains the exact contrary. According to Lyndwood, as Dr. Maitland clearly proves, "The Pope is above the law, . . . to dispute the authority of a papal decretal is to be guilty of heresy, at a time when deliberate heresy was a capital crime". "The last", Dr. Maitland continues, "is no private opinion of a glossator, it is a principle to which archbishops, bishops and clergy of the province of Canterbury have adhered by solemn words" (Roman Canon Law, 17). As the same authority goes on to show, not only did the pope claim and obtain recognition of his right to take into his own hands the judgment of every ecclesiastical cause over the head of the bishop, but it was largely through the questions and appeals of English bishops to Rome, asking for decisions, that the fabric of Roman canon law was built up (loc. cit., 53, 66, etc.). In full accord with this we find Archbishop Peckham telling such a monarch as Edward I that the emperor of all has given authority to the decrees of the popes, and that all men, all kings are bound by those decrees. So we find the Archbishop of Canterbury with all his suffragans writing a joint letter to the pope and telling him that all bishops derived their authority from him as rivulets from the fountainhead (Sandale's "Register", 90–98). We find the pope carving a big slice from the jurisdiction of English bishoprics, as in the case of the Abbey of St. Albans or of Bury St. Edmunds, and making it absolutely and entirely exempt from episcopal authority. We find the very kings who are supposed by their Statutes of Provisors and Præmunire to have

shaken off their allegiance to Rome, begging the sovereign pontiff in most respectful language to issue letters of provision or Bulls of confirmation in favour of such and such an ecclesiastic who enjoys the royal favour. No doubt these statutes of Provisors and Præmunire do in some sense play an important part in the history of the English Church during the fourteenth century, though it is admitted that they were so continually set aside that the permanent result of the legislation was greatly to strengthen the development of the king's dispensing power. The Statutes of Provisors, of which the first was passed in 1351, claimed for all electing bodies and patrons the right to elect or to present freely to the benefices in their gift, and moreover declared invalid all appointments brought about by way of papal "provision", i. e. nomination. Two years later this legislation was supplemented by the first Statute of Præmunire, which enacted that those who brought matters cognizable in the King's Courts before foreign courts should be liable to forfeiture and outlawry. It has been maintained that these acts prove that the English Church did not acknowledge any providing power in the Holy See. To this we may reply (1) that, like all the other English bishops, even Grosseteste, who is so constantly represented as the champion of English resistance to papal authority, in this matter fully recognized the right in principle, though he protested against abuses in the use of it; (2) that the legislation at least professed to be passed not in a spirit of hostility to Rome, but as a remedy for manifold abuses caused by "Rome-runners"—priests thronging to Rome and importuning the Holy See for benefices. It was the lay patrons of livings whose interests suffered by the papal provisions who were the chief promoters of the Acts. (3) That the bishops refused to consent to the Acts (Stubbs, "Const. Hist.", III, 340) and caused their formal protest to be entered on the rolls of Parliament; (4) that the bishops and clergy petitioned spontaneously and repeatedly for their repeal (ibid., 342), that the universities, in 1399, declared that the Acts operated to the detriment of learning, and that in 1416 the Commons also petitioned the king for the abolition of the Statute of Provisors; (5) that the kings themselves disregarded the Acts and constantly asked the popes to provide to the sees; (6) that it is universally admitted that papal provisions were more numerous after the passing of the Acts than before. In the 300 years preceding the Reformation 313 bishops are known to have been provided by the popes; of these 47 were before the passing of the Statute, 266 after it (see Moyes in "The Tablet", 2 Dec., 1893). One thing is certain, that England in several instances owed some of her best and holiest prelates to the action of the popes in providing to English sees in opposition to the known wishes of the king. Stephen Langton, in 1205, St. Edmund Rich, in 1232, and John Peckham, in 1279, are conspicuous examples. We have already said above that a reaction against current Anglican theories regarding the position of the pope in the medieval English Church has been steadily growing during the last quarter of a century. The complete agreement of such writers as Professor F. M. Maitland, Dr. James Gairdner, and Mr. H. Rashdall, approaching the subject along quite different lines of research, is very remarkable. The following passage from one of the most distinguished of the younger school of English historians, Prof. Tout, of Manchester, states the case as frankly as it could have been stated by Lingard himself. After insisting that the Statutes of Provisors and Præmunire, like that of Labourers, or the sumptuary laws, remained a dead letter in practice, and after declaring that to the average clergyman or theologian of the day the pope was the one Divinely appointed source of ecclesiastical authority, the shepherd to whom the Lord had given commission to feed His sheep, Prof. Tout continues: "The anti-papal laws of the fourteenth century were the acts of the secular not of the ecclesiastical power. They were not simply antipapal, they were also anticlerical in their tendency, since to the man of the age an attack on the Pope was an attack on the Church. . . . The clergyman, though his soul grew indignant against the curialists, still believed that the Pope was the divinely appointed autocrat of the Church universal. Being a man, a Pope might be a bad Pope; but the faithful Christian, though he might lament and protest, could not but obey in the last resort. The papacy was so essentially interwoven with the whole Church of the Middle Ages, that few figments have less historical basis than the notion that there was an antipapal Anglican Church in the days of the Edwards" (Polit. Hist. of Eng., III, 379). No one who carefully studies the language and acts of such a man as Grosseteste can fail to realize the truth that in spite of all his fearless criticism of the Roman Curia, his attitude of mind is thoroughly reverential to papal authority. The most famous, as being the least temperately worded, of all his pronouncements is now known to have been addressed, not, as formerly thought, to Pope Innocent IV himself, but to one of his subordinates. On the other hand, as Maitland points out, Grosseteste throughout his life proclaimed in the strongest terms his belief in the plenitude of the papal power. "I know", he says, "and I affirm without any reserve that there belongs to our lord the Pope, and to the Holy Roman Church, the power of disposing freely of all ecclesiastical benefices." And this and similar language, acknowledging, for example, the pope to be the sun from which other bishops, like the moon and stars, receive whatever powers they have to illuminate and fructify the Church, was not only maintained by Grosseteste to the end (see "The Month", March, 1895), but re-echoed by Bishop Arundel nearly two centuries afterwards.

So again the occurrences which followed the publication by Boniface VIII of the Bull "Clericis laicos", in the days of Edward I and Archbishop Winchelsea, tend to show that even when the pope took up a position which was too extreme and from which he was forced ultimately to retire, the English Church was not less, but more, loyal to the Apostolic See than other, Continental, nations. Nothing could be less true to the facts of history than the idea that England stood apart from the rest of Christendom, with an ecclesiastical law, a theology, or in any essential matter even a ritual, of her own. The cosmopolitanism of the religious orders, especially the mendicants, and of the universities, would alone have sufficed to render this isolation impossible. England's isolation began when she broke away from the Roman obedience, suppressed the religious orders, banished every Catholic priest, and adopted a pronunciation of Latin which no Continental scholar could understand.

The great disturbing force in the ecclesiastical life of England during the fourteenth century, much more than the Statutes of Provisors or even the Black Death, was the rise and spread of Lollardy. We may perhaps doubt if the significance of the movement in this country was by any means as great as that which historians, partly on account of the Bohemian upheaval under John Hus which grew out of Wyclif's doctrines, partly through the favourite modern theory that Lollardy produced the Reformation, have generally attributed to it. Dr. James Gairdner, however, who has recently investigated the whole movement and its sequelæ with a thoroughness and knowledge of original materials to which no previous writer can lay claim, has arrived at conclusions which tend very seriously to modify the views hitherto very commonly received. In his idea the novelty and the socialistic tendency of the opinions so boldly proclaimed by Wyclif did constitute a grave political danger, a danger which was not, perhaps, so acute in

COPYRIGHT, 1909, BY ROBERT APPLETON CO.

the reformer's lifetime because the most startling of his views developed late, only ten years or less before his death (1384), but which were eagerly caught up and even exaggerated by ignorant disciples at a time of weak rule and political unrest. The fact that the Great Schism of the West broke out only six years before Wyclif's death added to the complications by leaving the greater part of Christendom in a state of uncertainty as to which of the rival popes had the better claim to men's allegiance, and to this cause most probably is due the fact that Wyclif was left during his last years to propagate his doctrines practically undisturbed. That his doctrines were utterly revolutionary, as judged by any standard of opinion tolerated up to that time it would be absurd to deny. No one can fail to see the danger of teaching that there was no real dominion, no real authority, no real ownership of property without the grace of God. From this he deduced the conclusions that a man in mortal sin had no right to anything at all, that among Christians there ought to be community of goods, and that, as to the clergy having property of their own, it was a gross abuse. Similarly he held that every layman had Christ Himself for priest, bishop, and pope; that a pope was only to be obeyed when he taught according to Scripture, and that a king might take away all the endowments of the Church. With these were combined in his later years theological opinions regarding the sacraments and Transubstantiation which were offensive in the extreme to the Christian sense of that day. Wyclif, no doubt, in his philosophical teaching provided safeguards which mitigated the practical consequences of the principles he held, but these were subtilties which were lost upon the more ignorant and fanatical of his followers, more especially after their master's death. The points that they clearly understood were that tithes were pure alms, and that if the parish priests were not good men the tithes need not be paid; that a priest receiving any annual allowance by compact was simoniacal and excommunicated; that a priest who said Mass in mortal sin did not validly consecrate, but rather committed idolatry; that any priest could hear confessions (without faculties), and in fact that any holy layman predestined by God was competent to administer the sacraments without ordination. Such opinions as these, debated among the ignorant and uninstructed, and reinforced by a constant railing against devotional practices, such as pilgrimages, and against the Roman Court, the friars and all ecclesiastical authority, were obviously full of danger to social order at a time when the Black Death and the question of villeinage which resulted from it, had already provided many elements of disturbance.

Speaking of the proceedings against the foremost representative of Lollard opinions, Sir John Oldcastle, in 1413, Dr. Gairdner says: "It seems to have been a life-and-death struggle between established order and heresy"; and Bishop Stubbs, while doing too much honour by far to the fanatic creed of the Wyclifite leader, remarks: "Perhaps we shall most safely conclude from the tenor of history that his doctrinal creed was far sounder than the principles which guided either his moral or his political conduct." These comments really sum up the situation. The Wyclifite heresy became for a while a real danger to the peace of the country, as Oldcastle's insurrection proved. On the other hand, there was very little that was either sane or ennobling in the dreams which inspired the leaders, and which were imparted to their often very ignorant followers. Given the ideas then, and long after, universally prevalent in regard to heresy and the measures of repression necessary to prevent infection from spreading, there was nothing exceptionally cruel or intolerant about the statute "De hæretico comburendo" of 1401, which provided that heretics convicted before a spiritual court, and refusing to recant, were to be handed over to the secular arm and burnt. There can be no doubt that before this extreme measure was resorted to much provocation had been given by the preaching of doctrines which all Christians then deemed blasphemous, and which were not confined to the vilifying of the Holy Eucharist, the pope, and the clergy, but touched upon the sanctity of marriage and the observance of Sunday as a day of rest. Dr. Gairdner, after a very careful survey of all the evidence, is satisfied that Archbishop Arundel and his suffragans acted in the interests of public order and showed no inclination to enforce the statute either intemperately or tyrannically. In point of fact after the suppression of Oldcastle's insurrection and his execution at the stake, Lollardy was no longer to be feared as a political power. Wyclif's ideas had little hold in England upon men of any weight or consideration. They lingered on for a while and perhaps never entirely died down, though prosecutions for heresy became very rare long before the end of the fifteenth century, but they certainly cannot be regarded as a direct and primary cause of the religious changes which took place in the reign of Henry VIII.

Perhaps the most important in its ultimate consequences of all Wyclif's tenets was the supreme importance which he attributed to Holy Scripture. In his treatise "De Veritate Sacræ Scripturæ", written about 1378, he practically adopts the position that Scripture is the sole rule of faith. It followed in his idea that the word of God ought to become accessible to all, and that all men were free to interpret it for themselves. We are told, moreover, by a contemporary and hostile authority, the chronicler Knighton, that Wyclif himself translated the Gospel into English. Upon this and other evidence it has been commonly supposed that Wyclif was the first to bring the Bible to the knowledge of English readers and that the medieval Church uniformly adopted the practice of withholding the Scriptures from the laity. It is to the credit of modern students of medieval history that the grave misrepresentations involved in this traditional Protestant view are now generally abandoned (see e. g. Gairdner, "Lollardy", I, 100–17; "Cambridge Hist. of Eng. Literature", II, 56–62). We may summarize from the former of these writers the following conclusions, which represent what is best worth recalling upon this subject. The Church was not opposed in principle to the use of vernacular translations. Undoubtedly, translations into English of separate books of Scripture existed as far back as in the days of Bede. It is improbable, however, that a whole Bible in English, as distinct from Anglo-Saxon, existed before Wyclif's time; neither was it much required, for nearly all who could read, could read the Bible either in the Latin of the Vulgate, which the Church preferred, or in French. There was, however, no express prohibition to translate the Scriptures into English until the prohibition of the Provincial Synod of Oxford published in 1409. This prohibition was not seemingly occasioned by corrupt renderings or anything liable to censure in the text, but simply by the fact that it was composed for the general use of the laity, who were encouraged to interpret it in their own way without reference to the tradition and teaching of the Church. In fine, Dr. Gairdner concludes: "To the possession by worthy laymen of licensed translations the Church was never opposed, but to place such a weapon as an English Bible in the hands of men who had no regard for authority, and who would use it without being instructed to use it properly, was dangerous not only to the souls of those who read, but to the peace and order of the Church." The view has of late years been strongly urged by Abbot Gasquet, that the English version (or versions, for there are really two) commonly known as the Wyclifite Bible, has no connexion with Wyclif, but is simply the fourteenth-century translation approved by ecclesiastical author-

ity and existing probably before Wyclif's time. There are not wanting arguments in support of such a contention, but the difficulties are also serious, and the theory cannot be said to have found general acceptance.

The fifteenth century, owing mainly to the long minority of King Henry VI, and to the Wars of the Roses, was a period of political disturbance, and it does not add much to the ecclesiastical history of the country. We shall do well, however, to note that the invention of printing in England, as elsewhere, was cordially welcomed by the Church, and that it was under the shadow of the English Abbeys of Westminster and St. Albans that the earliest presses were erected. Despite the religious indifference which is supposed to have heralded the Reformation, the tone of the literature given to the world at these presses seems to bear witness to the prevalence of a very genuine spirit of piety.

As the story of the English Reformation is more fully told in the second part of this article, while many separate articles are to be found in THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA dealing with particular phases and leading personalities of that period, a brief outline of the great change will suffice to conclude this sketch of pre-Reformation England. Catholic historians and all others, except a small minority representing a particular school of Anglicanism, are agreed that, so far as England was concerned, even after the Wyclif movement, the Great Schism of the West, and the humanist revival of learning had done their worst, the position of the Church under the jurisdiction of Rome remained as secure as it had ever been. Lollardy no doubt had inoculated a certain section of the nation, and there were here and there stirrings indicative of a doctrinal revolt even during the early days of Henry VIII's reign, but with an episcopate thoroughly loyal to the Holy See and with the support of the king's strong government, these rumblings threatened no danger to the religious peace of the kingdom at large. Neither does there seem to have been any great decay of morals among clergy or laity. The public opinion of the learned world has in all substantial respects endorsed Abbot Gasquet's vindication of the discipline observed in the religious houses prior to the suppression. Occasional scandals there probably were, and even a great abbey like St. Alban's may possibly have given some cause for the very grievous charges rehearsed against it in 1491 by Archbishop Morton, though the matter is seriously contested (see bibliography), but there is not the least reason to believe that any wave of moral indignation at ecclesiastical corruption or any resentment of Roman authority had made themselves felt amongst the people of England until many years after Luther had thrown down the gauntlet in Germany. What produced the English Reformation was simply the passion of an able and unscrupulous despot who had the cleverness to turn to his own account certain revolutionary forces which are always inherent in human nature and which are always especially liable to be awakened into activity by the dogmatic teaching and the stern censures of the Church of Rome. Of course the movement was much helped forward by the wider distribution of a modicum of learning which had been effected by the invention of the printing press, and which, while enabling people to read and interpret the text of Scripture for themselves, had too often filled them with conceit and with contempt for all scholastic traditions. The age was, at least relatively, an age of novelties and of unrest. The discovery of America had fired the imagination; the humanism of a coterie of scholars had in a measure spread to the masses. There was general talk of the "New Learning"—by which, however, as Abbot Gasquet has pointed out, men meant not the revival of classical studies, but rather the bold and often heretical speculations about religion which were agitating so many minds. A great part of Germany was already in revolt, and England was not so isolated but that the echoes of controversy reached her shores. All these things made Henry's task easier, but for the severance of England from the obedience of the pope he, and he alone, was responsible. So far as Parliament had any share in the matter, the Parliament was Henry's tool. This estimate of the situation, which was long ago put forward by such writers as Dodd and Lingard, has impressed itself of late years with ever-increasing force upon Anglican opinion and will nowhere be found more clearly enunciated than in the writings of Dr. Brewer and Dr. James Gairdner, who, by their intimate first-hand acquaintance with all the manuscript materials for the reign of Henry VIII, are entitled to speak with supreme authority.

The fact that Henry was himself an amateur theologian and had vindicated against Luther the Catholic doctrine of the sacraments, thereby earning from Leo X the title of "Defender of the Faith", was probably fraught with tremendous consequences in the situation created by his attempted divorce from Queen Catherine. Profoundly impressed with his own dialectical skill, he persuaded himself that his case was thoroughly sound in law, and this probably carried him, almost without his being aware of it, into positions from which no retreat was possible to a man of his temperament. It was in 1529 that the papal commission to Wolsey and Campeggio, to pronounce upon the validity of the dispensation granted to Henry many years before to marry his deceased brother's wife, terminated by the pope's revocation of the cause to Rome. The failure of the divorce commission was quickly followed by the disgrace and death of Wolsey, and Wolsey's removal allowed all that was least amiable in Henry's nature to come to the surface. Two very able men, Thomas Cranmer and Thomas Cromwell, were ready at hand to second his designs, skilfully anticipating and furthering the king's wishes. To Cranmer is undoubtedly due the suggestion that Henry might obtain sufficient authority for treating his marriage as null if only he procured a number of opinions to that effect from the universities of Christendom. This was acted upon, and, by various arts and after the expenditure of a good deal of money, a collection of highly favourable answers was obtained. From Cromwell, on the other hand, the idea came that the king should make himself supreme head of the Church in England and thus get rid of the *imperium in imperio*. This was ingeniously contrived by the outrageous pretence that the clergy had collectively incurred the penalties of Præmunire by recognizing Wolsey's legislative jurisdiction; though this, of course, had been exercised with the royal knowledge and authority. Upon this preposterous pretext the clergy in convocation were compelled to make a huge grant of money and to insert a clause in the preamble of the vote acknowledging the King as "Protector and Supreme Head of the Church of England, as far as the law of Christ allows". This last qualification was only inserted after much debate, though it seems that at that period Henry was willing that the phrase "Supreme Head" should be understood in a way that was not inconsistent with the supremacy of the pope. At any rate, even after this, bishops still continued to receive their Bulls from Rome, and the royal divorce still continued to be pleaded there. Early in 1532 another move was made. The Commons were persuaded to frame a supplication against the Clergy of which drafts remain in the handwriting of Cromwell, showing from whom it emanated. This, after various negotiations and a certain amount of pressure, resulted in the "Submission of the Clergy", by which they promised not to legislate for the future without submitting their enactments for the approval of the king and a mixed committee of Parliament. To bring pressure to bear on the pope, the king caused Parlia-

ment to leave it in Henry's power to withhold from the Holy See altogether the payment of annates, or first-fruits of bishoprics, which consisted in the amount of the first year's revenue. By such gradual steps the breach with Rome was brought about, though even as late as January, 1533, application in a form most discreditably insincere was still made to Rome for the Bulls of the new Archbishop of Canterbury, Cranmer, who had been elected on Warham's death, and who took the oaths of obedience to the pope, though he had previously declared that he regarded them as null and void. Almost immediately afterwards Cranmer pronounced sentence of divorce between Henry and Catherine. The king then had Anne Boleyn crowned, and an Act of Succession was passed next year with a preamble and an oath to be taken by every person of lawful age. Parliament all submitted and took the oath, but More and Fisher refused and were sent to the Tower. The climax of the whole work of disruption may be considered to have been reached in November, 1534, by the passing of the Act of Supremacy, which declared the king Supreme Head of the Church of England, this time without any qualification, and which annexed the title to his imperial crown.

St. Botolph's, Boston, Lincolnshire

A reign of terror now began for all who were unwilling to accept exactly that measure of teaching about matters religious and political which the king thought fit to impose. Fisher and More had been sent to the block, and others, like the Carthusians, who rivalled them in their firmness, were dispatched by that ghastly and more ignominious death-penalty assigned to cases of high treason. In virtue of this martyrdom these and many more are now venerated upon our altars as beatified servants of God. The rising in the North known as the Pilgrimage of Grace followed, and, when this dangerous movement had been frustrated by the astuteness and unscrupulous perjury of the king's representatives, fresh horrors were witnessed in a repression which knew no mercy. Previous to this had taken place the suppression of the smaller monasteries; and that of the larger houses soon followed, while an Act for the dissolution of chantries and free hospitals was passed in 1545, which there was not time to carry entirely into execution before the king's death. Probably all these things, even the destruction of shrines and images, reflect a certain rapacity in the king's nature rather than hostility to what would now be called popish practices. In his sacramental theology he still clung to the positions of the "Assertio septem sacramentorum", the book he had written to refute Luther. Both in the Six Articles and in the "Necessary Doctrine" the dogma of Transubstantiation is insisted upon; and indeed more than one unfortunate reformer who denied the Real Presence was sent to the stake. It was on this side that Henry's task was hardest. Against the Papalist sympathizers amongst his own subjects he consistently maintained a ruthless severity, neither did he relent until all were cowed into submission. Towards men of Calvinist and Lutheran tendencies, who were represented in high places by Cranmer, Cromwell, and many more, the king had intermittently shown favour. He had used them to do his work. They had been of the greatest assistance in prejudicing the cause of the pope, and even the most violent and scurrilous had rendered him service. True, the railing translation of the New Testament by Tyndale, which had been printed and brought to England as early as 1526, was prohibited, as was Coverdale's Bible later on, in 1546, very near the close of his reign. It is plain that the scurrility of the more revolutionary led him to regard such teaching as dangerous to public order. Very remarkable are the words used by Henry in his last speech in Parliament, when he deplored the results of promiscuous Bible-reading: "I am very sorry to know how that most precious jewel, the Word of God, is disputed, rhymed, sung and jangled in every alehouse. I am equally sorry that readers of the same follow it so faintly and coldly in living; of this I am sure, that charity was never so faint among you, and virtuous and godly living was never less used, and God Himself among Christians was never less reverenced, honoured and served." If ever a moral and religious cataclysm was the work of one man, most assuredly the first stage of the Reformation in England was the work of Henry VIII. One could wish we knew that the sense of his own personal responsibility for the evils he deplored had come home to him before the hour when, on 28 January, 1547, he was summoned to his account.

Perhaps the most remarkable feature in the religious condition of England during the last year of Henry's reign was the fact that, besides the king himself, there were probably not a score of persons who were contented with the existing settlement. One large section of the nation was in complete sympathy with the doctrines of the German reformers, and to them the Mass, confession, communion in one kind, etc., which had been preserved untouched throughout all the changes, were simply as gall and wormwood. The great numerical majority, on the other hand, especially in the more remote and thinly populated districts, longed for the restoration of the old order of things. They wished to see the monks back, St. Thomas of Canterbury and the shrines of Our Lady once more in honour, and the pope recognized as the common father of Christendom. During the two short reigns which intervened before Elizabeth came to the throne each of these parties alternately gained the ascendant. Under Edward VI, the Protector Somerset, and after him the Duke of Northumberland, in full harmony with Cranmer, Hooper, and other bishops even more Calvinistically minded, abolished all remnants of popery. Chantries and guilds were suppressed, and their revenues confiscated, images in the churches, and then altars and vestments were removed and destroyed, while the material desecration was only typical of the outrages done to the ancient liturgy of Catholic worship in the first and second Books of Common Prayer. (See Anglicanism; Anglican Orders; Book of Common Prayer.) The bishops who were more Catholically minded, like Bonner and Gardiner, were sent to the Tower. Princess Mary was subjected to the meanest and most petty forms of persecution. Neither can it be maintained that those in power were animated by any disinterested devotion to Reformation principles. Spoliation in its most vulgar form was the order of the day. It is only of late years that fuller historical research has done justice to what seemed the one redeeming feature in the general work of destruction—the foundation of the grammar

schools which are known by the name of King Edward VI. We have now learned that not one of these schools was originally of Edwardian creation (see Leach, "English Schools at the Reformation"). Educational resources had already been seriously impaired under Henry VIII, and "the schools which bear the name of Edward VI owe nothing to him or his government but a more economic establishment. A good many of them had been chantry schools, for if the chantry priest of old wasted his time in singing for souls he not infrequently did good work as a schoolmaster." So says a judicious summarizer of Mr. Leach's researches.

There can be no doubt that these violent measures provoked a reaction. Already in 1549 there had been serious insurrections all over the country, and more particularly in Devonshire and in Norfolk. On the death of the boy king, in July, 1553, an attempt was made by Northumberland to secure the succession for Lady Jane Grey, but Mary, at least for the time, had the people completely with her, and now it was the turn of Bonner, Gardiner, and the Catholic reaction. Overtures were made to the reigning pope, Julius III, and eventually Cardinal Pole, whose mission as legate was unfortunately delayed by the Emperor Charles V for diplomatic reasons connected with the marriage of Queen Mary to his son Philip II, reached England in November, 1554, where he was warmly received. After the Houses of Parliament through the king and queen had petitioned humbly for reconciliation with the Holy See, Pole, on St. Andrew's day, 30 November, 1554, formally pronounced absolution, the king and queen and all present kneeling to receive it. The restoration of ecclesiastical property confiscated during the previous reign was not insisted upon.

The reign of Mary is, unfortunately, chiefly remembered by the severity with which the statutes against heresy, now revived by Parliament, were put into force. Cranmer had been previously sentenced to death for high treason, and the sentence seems to have been politically just, but it was not at once executed. There seems to have been no desire upon the part of Mary or any of her chief advisers for cruel reprisals, but the reactionary forces always at work seem to have frightened them into sterner measures, and, as a result, Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, and a multitude of less conspicuous offenders, most of them only after refusal to recant their heresies, were condemned and executed at the stake. No one has judged this miserable epoch of persecution more leniently than the historian who of all others has made himself live in the spirit of the times. Dr. James Gairdner, stanch Anglican as he is, in his recent work, "Lollardy and the Reformation", seems only to press farther the apology which he has previously offered for their terrible measures of repression. Thus he says: "With all this one might imagine that it was not easy for Mary to be tolerant of the new religion, and yet tolerant she was at first, as far as she well could be. . . . The case was simply that there were a number of persons determined not to demand mere toleration for themselves, but to pluck down what they called idolatry everywhere and to keep the Edwardine service in the parish churches in defiance of all authority, and even of the feelings of their fellow parishioners. In short, there was a spirit of rebellion still in the land which had its root in religious bitterness; and if Mary was to reign in peace, and order to be upheld, that spirit must be repressed. Two hundred and seventy-seven persons are recorded to have been burnt in various parts of England during those sad three years and nine months, from the time the persecution began to the death of Mary. But the appalling number of the sufferers must not blind us altogether to the provocation. Nor must it be forgotten that if it be once judged right to pass an Act of Parliament it is right to put it in force." And as the same authority elsewhere says, "Amongst the victims no doubt, there were many true heroes and really honest men, but many of them would have been persecutors if they had had their way." Queen Mary died 17 November, 1558, and Cardinal Pole passed away on the same day twelve hours later.

To discuss at any length the monastic chronicles, the charters, rolls, and other records which constitute the ultimate sources of our information regarding the medieval history of England would be out of place in the present article. Only a small selection can in any case be made of the many serviceable works that have been published in recent years. It will be convenient to set down first the names of some Catholic books and studies which the reader is likely to find generally useful, and then to add a section of miscellaneous works and of books written from a standpoint which is at any rate not distinctively Catholic.

Catholic.—LINGARD, *History of England* (10 vols., London, 1849); RULE, *Life of St. Anselm* (2 vols., London, 1883); RAGEY, *Histoire de S. Anselme* (2 vols., Paris, 1890); DELARC, *Le Saint-Siège et la conquête d'Angleterre* in *Revue des Quest. Histor.*, XLI (1887); RAGEY, *Eadmer* (Paris, 1892); MORRIS, *Life of St. Thomas Beckett* (London, 1885); L'HUILLIER, *S. Thomas de Canterbury* (Paris, 1891); THURSTON, *Life of St. Hugh of Lincoln* (London, 1898); BISHOP, *Cathedral Canons* in *Dublin Review* (London, 1898), CXXIII; WALLACE, *Life of St. Edmund* (London, 1893); WARD, *St. Edmund Archbishop of Canterbury* (London, 1903); DE PARAVICINI, *Life of St. Edmund of Abingdon* (London, 1898); KNELLER, *Des Richard Löwenherz deutsche Gefangenschaft* (Freiburg, 1893); FELTEN, *Robert Grosseteste Bischof von Lincoln* (Freiburg, 1887); GASQUET, *Henry III and the Church* (London, 1905); STRICKLAND, *Ricerche storiche sopra il B. Bonifacio Archivescovo di Cantorbery* (Turin, 1895); PALMER, *Fasti Ordinis FF. Prædicatorum* (London, 1878); MOYES, *How English Bishops were made before the Reformation* in *The Tablet*, Nov., 1893, and many other articles in the same periodical; GASQUET, *The Great Pestilence* (London, 1893); ID., *The Old English Bible and other Essays* (London, 1897); STEVENSON, *The Truth about John Wyclif* (London, 1885); STONE, *Reformation and Renaissance Studies* (London, 1904); GASQUET, *The Eve of the Reformation* (London, 1900); BRIDGETT, *Life of Blessed John Fisher* (London, 1888); ID., *Life and Writings of Sir Thomas More* (London, 1891); GASQUET, *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries* (London, 1888); RIVINGTON, *Rome and England* (London, 1897); BRIDGETT, *Blunders and Forgeries* (London, 1893); GASQUET, *The Last Abbot of Glastonbury* (London, 1895); ID. (ed.), COBDEN, *Hist. of the Reformation;* STONE, *Mary I of England* (London, 1901); ZIMMERMANN, *Kardinal Pole, sein Leben und seine Schriften* (Ratisbon, 1893); GASQUET AND BISHOP, *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer* (London, 1890).

Upon the religious life of England generally, see: BRIDGETT, *History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain* (new ed., 1908); GASQUET, *Parish Life in Mediæval England* (London, 1906); WATERTON, *Pietas Mariana Britannica* (London, 1879); BRIDGETT, *Our Lady's Dowry* (London, 1875); GASQUET, *English Monastic Life* (London, 1904); TAUNTON, *The English Black Monks of St. Benedict* (2 vols., London, 1897); GASQUET, *Archbishop Morton and St. Albans* in *The Tablet*, Oct. 17, 1908, and Jan. 23, 1909; but cf. GAIRDNER in *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Jan., 1909.

Among shorter Histories of England written from a Catholic standpoint, may be mentioned: BURKE, *Abridgment of Lingard*, re-edited and continued by BIRT (London, 1903); ALLIES, *History of the Church in England* (London, 1902); CATH. TRUTH SOCIETY, *A Short History of the Church in England* (London 1895); GASQUET, *Short Hist. of the Cath. Church in England* (London, 1903); WYATT-DAVIES, *School History of England* (London, 1902); STONE, *The Church in Eng. History* (London, 1907).

Non-Catholic Works.—Of general histories, three different series produced within the last few years may be recommended as representative of the best modern scholarship and as aiming conscientiously at impartiality in the treatment of religious questions: *The Political History of England*, of which the five volumes reaching from 54 B. C. to A. D. 1547 are written respectively by T. HODGKIN, G. B. ADAMS, T. F. TOUT, C. OMAN, H. A. L. FISHER (London, 1904–1905).—Mr. Tout's volume in particular is excellent.—*A History of England in Six Volumes.*—The first four volumes, reaching from the beginning to the age of Elizabeth, are written respectively by C. OMAN, H. W. C. DAVIS, OWEN EDWARDS, and A. D. INNES (London, 1905–1906). By far the best contribution in this series is that of Mr. Davis.—*A History of the English Church.*—The first four volumes, which extend to the death of Queen Mary, have respectively for authors W. HUNT, DEAN STEPHENS, CANON CAPES, and DR. J. GAIRDNER (London, 1901–1902). Dr. Gairdner's work is indispensable to the student of the Reformation period.—The works of the late BISHOP STUBBS have exercised an immense influence on historical study in England. The most noteworthy are the *Constitutional History* (3 vols.); the *Select Charters*, and the *Prefaces* to various contributions to the *Rolls Series* (e. g., HOVEDEN, BENEDICT, etc.), which have lately been collected and published separately. Stubbs's views on the tenure of land etc. during the Norman period are now somewhat out of date, but the chief defect of his work from a Catholic point of view is his adherence to the fiction of a national English Church independent of Rome.—FREEMAN, *Norman Conquest* (5 vols.) and *William Rufus* (2 vols.) show an immense command of detail, but are biassed by the author's rather eccentric views of British imperialism. Many of the less reliable conclusions of Stubbs and Freeman will be found corrected in the works of MAITLAND.

which are of primary importance in more than one field. His *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England* (1898) is of the very highest value as correctly stating the position of the English Church in regard to the Holy See. His *History of English Law* (1895), *Domesday Book and Beyond* (1897), and various contributions to TRAILL, *Social England* (1901), are of great moment from a legal and constitutional point of view. For the later period ending in the reign of Henry VIII or Mary, the writings of J. S. BREWER, particularly the *Prefaces to the Calendars* re-edited under the title of *The Reign of Henry VIII to the Death of Wolsey* (2 vols., 1884), and of DR. J. GAIRDNER are of primary importance, especially as correcting the reckless inaccuracy of Froude. DR. GAIRDNER in particular has recently published a work entitled *Lollardy and the Reformation* (2 vols., 1908), which does fullest justice to the Catholic position.

Among other works of note may be mentioned: BÖHMER, *Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie* (Leipzig, 1899); ID., *Die Fälschungen Erzbischof Lanfranks* (Leipzig, 1902)—inconclusive, as Saltet and others have shown; ROUND, *Feudal England* (London, 1895); NORGATE, *England under the Angevin Kings* (2 vols., London, 1887); ID., *John Lackland* (London, 1902); STEVENSON, *Robert Grosseteste* (London, 1899); BLISS AND TWEMLOW, *Calendars of Entries in Papal Registers Relating to Great Britain and Ireland* (8 vols. already published); JENSEN, *Der englische Peterspfennig* (Heidelberg, 1903); CREIGHTON, *Historical Essays* (London, 1902); ID., *Historical Lectures* (London, 1903)—both these able works are much biased by the writer's Anglican standpoint; JESSOPP, *The Coming of the Friars* (London, 1889); BREWER, *Preface to the Monumenta Franciscana* in *R. S.*, and to the works of GIRALDUS CAMBRENSIS; MAKOWER, *Constitutional History of the Church of England* (London, 1895); WYLIE, *History of England under Henry IV* (4 vols., 1882–96); WORKMAN, *John Wyclif* (London, 1902); *Dr. Gasquet and the Old English Bible* in the *Church Quarterly Review*, Vol. LI (1901); LANG, *The Maid of France* (London, 1908); GAIRDNER, *The Paston Letters* (3 vols., London, 1872–5); DIXON, *History of the Church of England from 1529* (6 vols., London, 1878–1902); EHSES, *Röm. Dok. zur Gesch. der Ehescheidung Heinrichs VIII* (Paderborn, 1902)—a Cath. work. Of the Divorce the best account is by GAIRDNER, *New Lights on the Divorce* in *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XI–XII (1896–97). TYTLER, *England under Edward VI and Mary* (2 vols., London, 1839); LEACH, *English Schools at the Reformation* (London, 1896); POCOCK, on *The Reign of Edward VI* in *English Historical Review*, July, 1895.

For social and economic condition of England, see ASHLEY, *An Introd. to Eng. Economic Hist. and Theory* (2 vols., London, 1893); CUNNINGHAM, *The Growth of Eng. Industry and Commerce* (2 vols., Cambridge, 1896); THOROLD ROGERS, *Hist. of Eng. Agriculture and Prices* (6 vols., London, 1866–87); ID., *Six Centuries of Work and Wages* (2 vols., 1891); RASHDALL, *Universities of the M. A.* (3 vols., Oxford, 1895); CHAMBERS, *The Mediæval Stage* (2 vols., Oxford, 1903).

HERBERT THURSTON.

ENGLAND SINCE THE REFORMATION.—The Protestant Reformation is the great dividing line in the history of England, as of Europe generally. This momentous Revolution, the outcome of many causes, assumed varying shapes in different countries. The Anglican Reformation did not spring from any religious motive. Lord Macaulay is well warranted in saying in his essay on Hallam's "Constitutional History", that "of those who had any important share in bringing it about, Ridley was, perhaps, the only person who did not consider it a mere political job", and that "Ridley did not play a very prominent part". We shall now proceed, first, to trace the history of the so-called Reformation in England, and then to indicate some of its results.

It was not until the twenty-sixth year of the reign of Henry the Eighth—the year 1535—that the English Schism was consummated. The instrument by which that consummation was effected was the "Act concerning the King's Highness to be the Supreme Head of the Church of England, and to have authority to reform and redress all errors, heresies and abuses in the same". This statute severed England from the unity of Christendom and transferred the jurisdiction of the supreme pontiff to "the Imperial Crown" of that realm. That is the unique peculiarity of the Anglican Reformation—the bold usurpation of all papal authority by the sovereign. "The clavis potentiæ and the clavis scientiæ, the universal power of Government in Christ's Church, the power to rule, to distribute, suspend or restore jurisdiction, and the power to define Verities of the Faith and to interpret Holy Scripture has descended on the shoulders of the Kings and Queens of England. The actual bond of the Church of England, her characteristic as a religious communion, that which makes her a whole, is the right of the civil power to be the supreme judge of her doctrine." (Allies, "See of S. Peter", 3rd ed., p. 54.) The Act of Supremacy was the outcome of a struggle between Henry VIII and the pope, extending over six years. Assuredly no such measure was originally contemplated by the king, who, in the early part of his reign, manifested a devotion to the Holy See which Sir Thomas More thought excessive (Roper's Life of More, p. 66). The sole cause of his quarrel with the See of Rome was supplied by the affair of the so-called Divorce. On 22 April, 1509, he ascended the English throne, being then eighteen years old; and on 3 June following he was wedded, by dispensation of Pope Julius, to the Spanish princess, Catherine, who had previously gone through the form of marriage with his elder brother Arthur. That prince had died in 1502, at the age of sixteen, five months after this marriage, which was held not to have been consummated; and so Catherine, at her nuptials with Henry, was arrayed not as a widow, but as a virgin, in a white robe, with her hair falling over her shoulders. Henry cohabited with her for sixteen years, and had issue three sons, who died at their birth or shortly afterwards, as well as one daughter, Mary, who survived. At the end of that time the king, never a model of conjugal fidelity, conceived a personal repulsion for his wife, who was six years older than himself, whose physical charms had faded, and whose health was impaired; he also began to entertain scruples as to his union with her. Whether, as an old Catholic tradition avers, these scruples were suggested to him by Cardinal Wolsey, or whether his personal repulsion prepared the way for them, or merely seconded them, is uncertain. But certain it is that about this time, to use Shakespeare's phrase, "the King's conscience crept too near another lady", that lady being Anne Boleyn. Here, again, exact chronology is impossible. We know that in 1522 Cardinal Wolsey repelled Lord Percy from a project of marriage with Anne on the ground that "the King intended to prefer her to another". But there is no evidence that Henry then desired her for himself. However that may have been, several years elapsed before his passion for her, whatever the date of its origin, gathered that overmastering force which led him to resolve with fixed determination to put away Catherine in order to possess her. For marriage was the price on which, warned by experience, she insisted. Henry's relations with her family had been scandalous. There is evidence, strong if not absolutely conclusive—it is summed up in the Introduction to Lewis' translation of Sander's work, "De Schismate Anglicano" (London, 1877)—that he had had an intrigue with her mother, whence the report, at one time widely credited, that she was his own daughter. It is certain that her sister Mary had been his mistress, and had been very poorly provided for by him when the liaison came to an end, a fact which doubtless put Anne upon her guard. That the king had contracted precisely the same affinity with her, by reason of this intrigue, as that which he alleged to be the cause of his conscientious scruples with regard to Catherine, did not in the least weigh with her, or with him.

The first formal step towards the putting away of Catherine appears to have been taken in 1527, when Henry caused himself to be cited before Cardinal Wolsey and Archbishop Warham on the charge of living incestuously with his brother's widow. The proceedings were secret, and the Court held three sessions, then adjourning *sine die* for the purpose of consulting the most learned bishops of the kingdom on the question whether marriage with a deceased brother's wife was lawful. The majority of the replies were in the affirmative, with the proviso that a papal dispensation had been obtained. Henry, thus baffled, then determined to proceed in common form of law, and Sir Francis Geary in his learned work, "Marriage and Family Relations", has summed up the proceedings as

follows: "By a process well known to Ecclesiastical Law, the King wished to institute his suit in the Appeal Court for this purpose given original jurisdiction. With this object, instead of, as originally intended, suing in an English Consistory or Arches Court, from which appeal lay to Rome, then menaced or actually occupied by the armies of Charles V, a commission from Pope Clement, dated June 9, and confirmed by a *pollicitatio* dated July 13, 1528, was obtained constituting the two cardinals a Legatine Papal Court of both original supreme and ultimate jurisdiction and to proceed judicially. The Court opened May 21, 1529; there followed citation, articles, examination, and publication, and on Friday, July 23, 1529, the cause was ripe for judgment. At that day Campejus [Campeggio] adjourned till October, on the ground that the Roman Vacation, which he was bound to observe, had already begun. But in September the advocation of the cause to Rome, and inhibition of the Legatine Court, given by Clement contrary to his written promise on the word of a Pope, had arrived in England, and the Court never sat again. Henry waited for more than three years, negotiating to have the suit brought to judgment, till at last, in November, 1532, he married Anne Boleyn, and in the following year, May, 1533, Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, gave sentence of nullity. At Rome the cause dragged on,—there is a gap at this epoch in the reports of the Rota, and it does not appear if there was any argument either by the advocates of the 'orator' or 'oratrix', or by the defensor,—till at last, on March 25, 1534, the Pope, in a Consistory of Cardinals, of whom a minority voted against the marriage, pronounced the marriage with Katherine valid, and ordered restitution of conjugal rights."

The Statute of 1535 (26 Hen. VIII, c. 1) above quoted—it is commonly called the Act of Supremacy—which transferred to the king the authority over the Church in England hitherto exercised by the pope, may be regarded as Henry's answer to the papal sentence of 1534. But, as Professor Brewer remarks, "to this result the King was brought by slow and silent steps". The Act of Supremacy was in truth simply the last of a series of enactments whereby, during the whole progress of the matrimonial cause, the king sought to intimidate the pontiff and to obtain a decision favourable to himself. Seven statutes in particular may be noted as preparing the way for, and leading up to, the Act of Supremacy. The 21 Hen. VIII, c. 13, prohibited, under pecuniary penalties, the obtaining from the Holy See of licences for pluralities or non-residence. The 23 Hen. VIII, c. 9, forbade the citation of a person out of the diocese wherein he or she dwelt, except in certain specified cases. The 23 Hen. VIII, c. 20, which is entitled "Concerning the restraint of payment of annates to the See of Rome", was not only an attempt to intimidate, but also to bribe the pope. It forbade, under penalties, the payment of firstfruits to Rome, provided that, if the Bulls for a bishop's consecration were in consequence denied, he might be consecrated without them, and authorized the king to disregard any consequent ecclesiastical censure of "our Holy Father the Pope" and to cause Divine service to be continued in spite of the same; and further *empowered the King by letters patent to give or withhold his assent to the Act, and at his pleasure to suspend, modify, annul and enforce it.* The Act was in fact what Dr. Lingard has called it, "a political experiment to try the resolution of the Pontiff". The experiment failed, and in the next year the royal assent was given to the Act by letters patent. In this year also was passed the Statute, 24 Hen. VIII, c. 12, prohibiting appeals to Rome in testamentary, matrimonial, and certain other causes, and requiring the clergy to continue their ministrations in spite of ecclesiastical censures from Rome. The next year witnessed the passing of the Act (25 Hen. VIII, c. 19) "for the submission of the clergy to the King's Majesty", which prohibited all appeals to Rome. The Act following this in the Statute Book abolished annates, forbade, under the penalties of præmunire, the presentation of bishops and archbishops to "the Bishop of Rome, otherwise called the Pope", and the procuring from him of Bulls for their consecration, and established the method still existing in the Anglican Church (of which more will be said later on) of electing, confirming, and consecrating bishops. It was immediately followed by an Act forbidding, under the same penalties, the king's subjects to sue to the pope, or the Roman See, for "licenses, dispensations, compensations, faculties, grants, rescripts, delegacies or other instruments or writings", to go abroad for any visitations, congregations, or assembly for religion, or to maintain, allow, admit, or obey any process from Rome. The net effect of these enactments was to take away from the pope the headship of the Church of England. That headship the Act of Supremacy conferred on the king.

This sudden falling away of a whole nation from Catholic unity, is an event so strange and so terrible as to require some further explanation than Macaulay's, who refers it to the "brutal passion" and "selfish policy" of Henry VIII. In fact the struggle between that monarch and the pope was the last phase of a contest between the papal and the regal power which had been waged, with longer or briefer truces, from the days of the Norman Conquest. The Second Henry was no less desirous than the Eighth to emancipate himself from the jurisdiction of the supreme pontiff, and the destruction and pillage of the shrine of St. Thomas à Becket was not merely a manifestation of uncontrollable fury and unscrupulous greed; it was also Henry VIII's way of redressing a quarrel of nearly four hundred years' standing. The reason why Henry VIII succeeded where Henry II, a greater man, had failed must be sought in the political and religious conditions of the times. Von Ranke has pointed out that the state of the world in the sixteenth century was "directly hostile to the Papal domination . . . The civil power would no longer acknowledge any higher authority" (Die römischen Päpste, I, 39). In England the monarch was virtually a tyrant. The Wars of the Roses had destroyed the old nobility, formerly an effective check upon regal despotism. "The prerogative", Brewer writes, "was absolute both in theory and practice. Government was identified with the will of the Sovereign; his word was law for the conscience as well as the conduct of his subjects. He was the only representative of the nation. Parliament was little more than an institution for granting subsidies" (Letters and State Papers, II, Part I, p. cxciii, Introd.). The lax lives led by too many of the clergy, the abuses of pluralities, the scandals of the Consistorial Courts, had tended to weaken the influence of the priesthood; "the papal authority", to quote again Brewer, "had ceased to be more than a mere form, a decorum to be observed." The influence of the ecclesiastical order as a check upon arbitrary power was extinct at the death of Wolsey. "Thus it was that the royal supremacy was now to triumph after years of effort, apparently fruitless and often purposeless. That which had been present to the English mind was now to come forth in a distinct consciousness, armed with the power that nothing could resist. Yet that it should come forth in such a form is marvellous. All events had prepared the way for the King's temporal supremacy: opposition to Papal authority was familiar to men; but a spiritual supremacy, an ecclesiastical headship as it separated Henry VIII from all his predecessors by an immeasurable interval, so was it without precedent and at variance with all tradition" (Brewer, Letters and State Paters, I, cvii, Introd.).

Henry VIII made full proof of his ecclesiastical

ministry. In 1535 he appointed Thomas Cromwell his vicegerent, vicar-general, and principal official, with full power to exercise all and every that authority appertaining to himself as head of the Church. The vicar-general's function was, however, confined to ecclesiastical discipline. The settlement of doctrine Henry took under his own care and, as is related in the preamble to the "Act abolishing diversity of opinions" (31 Hen. VIII, c. 14), "most graciously vouchsafed, in his own princely person, to descend and come into his High Court of Parliament" and there expounded his theological views, which were embodied in that Statute, commonly called "The Statute of the Six Articles". It was in 1539 that this Act was passed. It asserted Transubstantiation, the sufficiency of communion under one kind, the obligation of clerical celibacy, the validity "by the law of God" of vows of chastity, the excellence of private masses, the necessity of the sacrament of penance. The penalty for denial of the first article was the stake; of the rest imprisonment and forfeiture as of felony. But while thus upholding, after his own fashion, Catholic doctrine, Henry had possessed himself of a vast amount

WINDSOR CASTLE
South Front

of ecclesiastical property by the suppression first of the smaller and then of the larger religious houses, thus laying the foundation of English pauperism.

After the death of Henry (1547) the direction of ecclesiastical affairs passed chiefly into the hands of Thomas Cranmer. Lord Macaulay has described him accurately as "a supple, timid, interested courtier, who rose into favour by serving Henry in the disgraceful affair of his first divorce", who was "equally false to political and religious obligations", and who "conformed forwards and backwards as the King changed his mind". During the minority of Edward VI, no longer cowed by the "vultus instantis tyranni", he favoured first Lutheranism, then Zwinglianism, and lastly Calvinism, so that it may seem doubtful what form of Protestantism, if any, he really held. Certain it is, however, that he had "the convictions of his own interests", and that these were bound up with the anti-Catholic party. He had judicially pronounced the invalidity of Henry's marriage with Catherine and the illegitimacy of Mary, thereby deeply offending and scandalizing Catholics, who were by no means mollified because, not long afterwards, he had similarly prostituted his judicial office in dealing with Anne Boleyn and her daughter Elizabeth. He was married, contrary to the Statute of the Six Articles, to a daughter of the Protestant divine Osiander, whom, according to a tradition preserved by Sander and Harpsfield (both first-rate authorities), he was in the habit of carrying about in a chest until, in the latter part of Henry VIII's reign, he judged it prudent to send her, for greater security, to Germany. Shortly after the death of the king, he reclaimed her, showing her publicly as his wife. To him are chiefly due the legalization of the marriage of the clergy (2, 3 Ed. VI, c. 21), the desecration and destruction of altars, for which tables were substituted, and of images and pictures, which gave place to the royal arms. He had the chief part in the inspiration and compilation of the first Prayer Book of Edward VI (1548) in supersession of the Breviary and the Missal, a work which, in the preamble of the Act of Parliament sanctioning and enjoining it, is said to have "been drawn up by the aid

WINDSOR CASTLE FROM THE THAMES

of the Holy Ghost". Notwithstanding this encomium, it was superseded, within four years, by a second Cranmerian Prayer Book, not similarly commended in the Act prescribing it, in which the slight outward similarity to the Mass, preserved in the Communion Service of the first Prayer Book, was obliterated. The Ordinal underwent similar treatment; the sacrificing priest, like the Sacrifice, was abolished. Another of Cranmer's exploits was the compilation of Forty-two Articles of Religion which, reduced to Thirty-nine and slightly recast, still form the Confession of Faith of the Anglican Communion. In 1556, under Mary, he met his death at the stake, after vainly endeavouring by copious recantations—Sander avers that "he signed them seventeen times with his own hand"—to save his life. This severity, though doubtless impolitic, can hardly be deemed unjust if his career be carefully considered. But his work lived after him and formed the basis of the ecclesiastical legislation of Elizabeth, when Mary's brief reign came to an end, and with it the ineffectual endeavour to destroy the new religion by the fagot. Mary's fiery zeal for the Catholic Faith failed to undo the work of her two predecessors, and unquestionably did ill service to the Catholic cause. It would be foolish to blame her for not practising a toleration utterly alien from the temper of the times. But there can be no question that Green is well warranted in writing that to her is due "the bitter remembrance of the blood shed in the cause of Rome which, however partial and unjust it must seem to an historic observer, still lies graven deep in the temper of the English people" (Short History, p. 360).

The first act of Elizabeth, when she found herself firmly seated on the throne, was to annul the religious restorations of her sister. "All Laws and Statutes made against the See Apostolic of Rome since the twentieth year of King Henry VIII" had been abolished by the 1 and 2 Philip and Mary, c. 8, which "enacted and declared the Pope's Holiness and See Apostolic to be restored, and to have and enjoy such authority, pre-eminence and jurisdiction as His Holiness used and exercised, or might lawfully have used and exercised, by authority of his supremacy, before that date". Elizabeth, by the first Act of Parliament of her reign, repealed this Statute, and revived the last six of the seven Acts against the Roman pontiff passed between the 21st and 26th year of Henry VIII of which we have given an account, and also certain other anti-papal Statutes passed subsequently to the enactment of Henry's Act of Supremacy. That Act was not revived, doubtless because Elizabeth, as a woman, shrank from assuming the title of Supreme Head of the Church bestowed by it on the sovereign. But, although she did not take to herself that title, she took all the authority implied therein, by this first Act of her reign. It vests the plenitude of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the Crown and the Queen's Highness, who is described as "the only Supreme Governor of this realm as well in all spiritual and ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal", and it prescribes an oath recognizing her to be so for all holding office in Church and State. The next Act on the Statute Book is the Act of Uniformity. It orders the use in the churches of the second Prayer Book of Edward VI, in the place of the Catholic rites, and provides penalties for ministers disobeying this injunction. It also enforces the attendance of the laity at the parish church on Sundays and holidays, for the new service. This was the definite establishment of the new religion in England, the consummation of the revolution initiated by Henry VIII. The bishops, with the exception of Kitchen of Llandaff, refused to accept it, as did about half the clergy. The majority of the laity passively acquiesced in it, just as they had acquiesced in the ecclesiastical changes of Henry, and Edward, and Mary. Its effect was, virtually, to reduce the Church of England to a department of the State. The Anglican bishops became, and are still, nominees of the Crown, election by the dean and chapter, where it exists—in some of the newer dioceses there are no chapters, and the bishops are appointed by Letters Patent—being a mere farcical form of which Emerson has given a pungent description: "The King sends the Dean and Canons a congé d'élire, or leave to elect, but also sends them the name of the person whom they are to elect. They go into the Cathedral, chant and pray; and after these invocations invariably find that the dictates of the Holy Ghost agree with the recommendation of the King." If they arrived at any other conclusion, they would be involved in the penalties of a præmunire. The Convocations of York and Canterbury are similarly fettered. They cannot proceed so much as to discuss any project of ecclesiastical legislation without "Letters of Business" from the Crown. The sovereign is the ultimate arbiter in causes, whether of faith or morals within the Anglican Church, and his decisions of them given by the voice of his Privy Council, are irreformable. But of course in these days the sovereign practically means the Legislature. "The National Church", Cardinal Newman writes in his "Anglican Difficulties", "is strictly part of the Nation, just as the Law or the Parliament is part of the Nation." "It is simply an organ or department of the State, all ecclesiastical acts really proceeding from the civil government." "The Nation itself is the sovereign Lord and Master of the Prayer Book, its composer and interpreter."

Queen Elizabeth's Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity form, in the words of Hallam, "the basis of that restrictive code of laws which pressed so heavily, for more than two centuries, upon the adherents of the Roman church". It is not necessary here to describe in detail that "restrictive code". An account of it will be found in the first chapter of "A Manual of the Law specially affecting Catholics", by W. S. Lilly and J. P. Wallis (London, 1893). But we may observe that the queen who originated it was animated by very different motives from those which influenced her father in his revolt against Rome. Sander has correctly said, "he gave up the Catholic faith for no other reason in the world than that which came from his lust and wickedness"; and, indeed, while severing himself from Catholic unity, and pillaging the possessions of the Church, he was as far as possible from sympathizing with the doctrinal innovations of Protestantism and savagely repressed them. Elizabeth, by the very necessity of her position, was driven—we speak *ex humano die*—to espouse the Protestant cause. No doubt, as Lingard writes, "it is pretty evident that she had no settled notions of religion", and she freely exhibited her contempt for her clergy on many occasions—notably on her death-bed, when she drove away from her presence the Archbishop of Canterbury and certain other Protestant prelates of her own making, telling them "she knew full well that they were hedge priests, and took it for an indignity that they should speak to her" (Dodd, "Church History", III, 70). But, like Cranmer, if she had no religious convictions, she had the convictions of her interests. Her lot was plainly cast in with the Protestant party. Rome had declared her mother's marriage null, and her own birth illegitimate. Catholics, in general, looked upon Mary Queen of Scots as the rightful claimant to the throne which she occupied. Throughout her reign

Church policy and State policy are conjoint:
But Janus-faces, looking different ways.

The Anglican Church, as established by her, was a mere instrument for political ends; in her own phrase, she tuned her pulpits. The maxim, *Cujus regio ejus religio*, was currently accepted in her time. It seemed according to the natural order of things that the people should profess the creed of the prince. Elizabeth is not open to the charges made against her sister of religious fanaticism. But she was given up to that

"self will and self worship" which Bishop Stubbs justly attributes to her father. And, in the well-weighed words of Hallam, "she was too deeply imbued with arbitrary principles to endure any deviation from the mode of worship she should prescribe".

It was on the feast of St. John Baptist, 1559, that the statute took effect which abolished throughout England the old worship, and set up the new. Thenceforth Catholic rites could be performed only by stealth, and at the risk of severe punishment. But during the first decade of the queen's reign Catholics were treated with comparative lenity, occasional fines, confiscations, and imprisonments being the severest penalties employed against them. Camden and others assert that they enjoyed "a pretty free use of their religion". But this is too strongly put. The truth is that a vast number who were Catholics at heart temporized, resorting to the new worship more or less regularly, and attending secretly, when opportunity offered, Catholic rites celebrated by the Marian clergy commonly called "the old priests". Of these a considerable number remained scattered up and down the country, being generally found as chaplains in private families. These occasional conformists were supported by the vague hope of political change which might give relief to their consciences. Elizabeth and her counsellors calculated that when the old priests dropped off, through death and other causes, people generally would be won over to the new religion. But it fell out otherwise. As the old priests disappeared, the question of a supply of Catholic clergy began to engage the minds of those to whom they had ministered. Moreover, stricter conceptions of their duty in respect of heretical worship were gaining ground among English Catholics, partly on account of the decision of a congregation appointed by the Council of Trent, that attendance at it was "grievously sinful", inasmuch as it was "the offspring of schism, the badge of hatred of the Church". Then a man appeared whom Father Bridgett rightly describes as "the father, under God, of the Catholic Church in England after the destruction of the ancient hierarchy", to whom "principally, we owe the continuation of the priesthood, and the succession of the secular clergy".

That man was William Allen, afterwards cardinal. He conceived the idea of an apostolate having for its object the perpetuation of the Faith in England, and in 1568 he founded the seminary at Douai, then belonging to Spanish Flanders, which was for so many generations to minister to the wants of English Catholics. It is notable as the first college organized according to the rules and constitution of the Council of Trent. The missionaries, full of zeal, and not counting their lives dear, who were sent over from this institution, revived the drooping spirits of the faithful in England and maintained the standard of orthodoxy. Elizabeth viewed with much displeasure this frustration of her hopes, nor was the Bull "Regnans in excelsis", by which, in 1570, St. Pius V declared her deposed and her Catholic subjects released from their allegiance, calculated to mollify her. Increased severity of the penal laws marks the rest of Elizabeth's reign. By the Act of Supremacy Catholics offending against that statute had been made liable to capital punishment as traitors, the queen hoping thereby to escape the odium attaching to the infliction of death for religion. Few will now dissent from the words of Green in his "Short History": "There is something even more revolting than open persecution in the policy which brands every Catholic priest as a traitor, and all Catholic worship as disloyalty." But, for a time, the policy succeeded, and the martyrs who suffered for no other cause than their Catholic faith were commonly believed to have been put to death for treason. In 1581 this offence of spiritual treason was the subject of a far more comprehensive enactment (23 Eliz., c. 1). It qualified as traitors all who should absolve or reconcile others to the See of Rome, or willingly be so absolved or reconciled. Many English historians (Hume is the most considerable of them) have affirmed that "sedition, revolt, even assassination were the means by which seminary priests sought to compass their ends against Elizabeth". But this sweeping accusation is not true. No doubt Cardinal Allen, the Jesuit Persons [see PERSONS (PARSONS), ROBERT], and other Catholic exiles were cognizant of, and involved in, plots which had for their end the queen's overthrow, nor would some of the conspirators have shrunk from taking her life any more than she shrank from taking the life of Mary Queen of Scots. But, in spite of all their sufferings, the great body of English Catholics maintained their loyalty. From the political intrigues in which the exiles were so deeply involved they held aloof, nay, many of them viewed with suspicion not only the exiles, but the whole Society of which Persons was a foremost representative, and desired the exclusion of Jesuits from English Colleges and from the English mission. When the Armada was expected they repaired in every county to the standard of the Lord Lieutenant, imploring that they might not be suspected of bartering the national independence for their religious belief. They received from Elizabeth a characteristic reward. "The Queen," writes Lingard, "whether she sought to satisfy the religious animosities of her subjects, or to display her gratitude to the Almighty by punishing the supposed enemies of His worship, celebrated her triumph with the immolation of human victims" (History of England, VI, 255). In the four months between 22 July and 27 November, of 1588, twenty-one seminary priests, eleven laymen, and one woman were put to death for their Catholic faith. During the rest of Elizabeth's life her Catholic subjects groaned under incessant persecution, of which one special note was the systematic use of torture. "The rack seldom stood idle in the Tower during the latter part of her reign", Hallam remarks. The total number of Catholics who suffered under her was one hundred and eighty-nine, one hundred and twenty-eight of them being priests, fifty-eight laymen, and three women. To them should be added, as Law remarks in his "Calendar of English Martyrs" (London, 1870), thirty-two Franciscans who were starved to death.

Notwithstanding the severities of Elizabeth, the number of Catholic clergy on the English missions in her time was considerable. It has been estimated that at the end of the sixteenth century they amounted to three hundred and sixty-six, fifty being survivors of the old Marian priests, three hundred priests from Douai and the other foreign seminaries, and sixteen priests of the Society of Jesus. On the queen's death the eyes of the persecuted remnant of the old faith turned hopefully towards James. Their hopes were doomed to disappointment. That prince took himself seriously as head of the English Church. He chose rather to be the successor of Elizabeth than the avenger of Mary Stuart, and continued the savage policy of the late queen. The year after his accession an Act was passed "for the due execution of the Statutes against Jesuits, Seminary priests and other priests", which took away from Catholics the power of sending their children to be educated abroad, and of providing schools for them at home. In the course of the same year a proclamation was issued banishing all missionary priests out of the kingdom. The next year is marked by the Gunpowder Plot, "the contrivance", as Tierney well observes, "of half a dozen persons of desperate fortunes, who, by that means, brought an odium upon the body of Catholics, who have ever since laboured under the weight of the calumny, though no way concerned". Soon afterwards a new oath of allegiance was devised, rather for the purpose of dividing than of relieving Catholics. It

was incorporated in "An Act for the better discovery and repression of Popish recusants" (a recusant Catholic was simply one who refused to be present at the new service of the Protestant religion in the parish church), and was directed against the deposing power. The Holy See disallowed it, but some Catholics took it, among them being Blackwell the Archpriest. Twenty-eight Catholics, of whom eight were laymen, suffered under James I, but that prince was more concerned to exact money from his Catholic subjects than to slay them. According to his own account he received a net income of £36,000 a year from the fines of Popish recusants (Hardwick Papers, I, 446).

With the accession of Charles I (1625) a somewhat brighter time began for English Catholics. He was unwilling to shed their innocent blood—indeed only two underwent capital punishment while he bore rule—and this reluctance was one of the causes of rupture between him and the Parliament. His policy, Hallam writes, "with some fluctuations, was to wink at the domestic exercise of the Catholic religion, and to admit its professors to pay compensations for clemency, which were not regularly enforced". The number of Catholic clergy in England received a considerable augmentation in his reign. Panzani reported to the Holy See that in 1634 there were on the English mission five hundred secular priests, some hundred and sixty Jesuits, a hundred Benedictines, twenty Franciscans, seven Dominicans, two Minims, five Carmelites, and one Carthusian lay brother, besides the clergy, nine in number, who served the queen's chapel. This large increase in the number of Jesuits was not regarded by all as an unmixed gain, unquestionable as was their zeal and devotion. It was considered by some as the cause of rivalries and dissensions, unpleasant to read of, among the small remnant who kept the faith. The Jesuits seem to have been, at times, open to the charge of aggressiveness, and certainly they did not succeed in dissipating the prejudice so universal against them. One of the burning questions among English Catholics was concerning the episcopal succession. The secular clergy desired a bishop, and Allen had proposed to Gregory XIII that one should be sent. Through Persons' influence at Rome, which was very great, instead of a bishop an archpriest was appointed (1598) in the person of George Blackwell, who has been already mentioned, a friend of his own, who was deprived by the Holy See ten years later for taking the oath of allegiance under James I. Birkhead succeeded him, and Harrison succeeded Birkhead, until, in 1623, Dr. William Bishop was appointed Vicar Apostolic of England. He died in 1624, and was succeeded by Dr. Richard Smith. Shortly afterwards there was an outbreak of persecution occasioned by the Puritan party in the House of Commons led by Sir John Elliot, and Bishop Smith withdrew to France at the end of 1628, never to return to England, which remained without a bishop till 1685.

When war broke out between Charles I and the Parliament, English Catholics, to a man, espoused the cause of the king. They could not do otherwise. Hatred of Catholicism was a dominant note of the Parliamentary party, who bitterly resented the quasi-toleration which the Catholics had for some years enjoyed; and between the meeting of the Long Parliament and the death of Cromwell twenty-four adherents of the Faith suffered martyrdom. The Catholics, as Hallam points out, were "the most strenuous of the King's adherents"; they were also the greatest sufferers for their loyalty. One hundred and seventy Catholic gentlemen lost their lives in the royal cause; and Catholics were especially oppressed under the Commonwealth.

At the Restoration of Charles II, in 1660, English Catholics expected, not unnaturally, to receive some recompense for their unswerving devotion to the royal cause, and this more especially as the new king's personal obligations to them were very great. After his total overthrow at the battle of Worcester, he owed his life to the Catholics of Staffordshire, the Huddlestones, the Giffards, the Whitegreaves, the Penderells. But "Let not virtue seek remuneration for the thing it was" is a lesson written on every page of the history of the Stuarts. Catholics asked, in a petition presented to the House of Lords by Lord Arundell of Wardour, that they might receive the benefit of the Declaration of Breda. Charles was inclined to give them "liberty of conscience", but Lord Chancellor Hyde, afterwards Earl of Clarendon, we read in Kenneth's "Register and Chronicle", "was so hot upon the point, that His Majesty was obliged to yield rather to his importunities than his reasons". The king, who, as he himself expressed it, was not minded to set out again on his travels, recognized that there was in the nation a strong anti-Catholic feeling, and bowed to it, though himself intellectually convinced of the truth of the Catholic religion. The laws against Papists remained on the statute book, and, from time to time, proclamations—they were, it is true, for the most part *brutum fulmen*—were issued requiring Jesuits and other priests to quit the kingdom under the statutory penalties. A singular instance of overmastering anti-Catholic prejudice prevailing in the nation is supplied by the monument erected by the Corporation of London to commemorate the Great Fire of 1666. It bore an inscription in which Catholics were accused of being the authors of that calamity, a monstrous assertion for which no shred of evidence was ever adduced.—

Where London's column pointing to the skies,
Like a tall bully lifts its head and lies,

Pope had the courage to write. But not until the nineteenth century was well advanced was the calumny erased.

It is not possible here to follow, even in briefest outline, the course of Charles II's reign. We may, however, point out that two things are necessary to a right view of it: to understand the character and aims of Charles II, and to realize the dominant temper of the English nation. Idle, voluptuous, and good-humouredly cynical, Charles certainly was; but he possessed deep knowledge of human nature, great political tact, and remarkable tenacity of purpose. That he preferred the Catholic religion to any other, is certain; and he was glad to embrace it on his death-bed. But he recognized the strong Protestant feeling of the people over whom he ruled, and was not prepared to imperil his crown by defying it. He was, however, really desirous to do what he could, without risk to himself, for the relief of Catholics; and this was the motive of his Declaration of Indulgence in 1672, by which he ordered "that all manner of penal laws on matters ecclesiastical against whatever sort of Nonconformist or recusants" should be suspended, and gave liberty of public worship to all dissentients, except Catholics, who were allowed to celebrate the rites of religion in private houses only. This declaration was sovereignly displeasing to all parties in the House of Commons, who answered it by a resolution "that penal statutes in matters ecclesiastical cannot be suspended except by consent of Parliament", and refused supplies until the declaration was recalled. That was a convincing argument to Charles. He recalled the declaration forthwith. Parliament then proceeded to pass a bill—it went through both Houses without opposition, and Charles dared not refuse his royal assent to it—which required every one in the civil and military employment of the Crown to take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, to subscribe a declaration against Transubstantiation, and to receive the Eucharist according to the rites of the Church of England. One effect of this Act (25 Car. II, c. 2) was to deprive James, Duke of York, who had become a Catholic, of his office of Lord High Admiral.

ST. ALBANS ABBEY
TOWER OF LONDON

BEVERLEY MINSTER, YORKSHIRE
HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT, WESTMINSTER

During the next nine years the struggle between the king and the Parliament continued. The popular leader was Ashley, Earl of Shaftesbury—for some time Chancellor—whose character has been delineated by Dryden with merciless severity, but with substantial accuracy, in "Absalom and Achitophel". This statesman's own Protestantism was of the haziest kind, but he was zealous, from political motives, for the national religion, and for that reason was bent upon excluding the Duke of York from the succession to the throne. To accomplish this end, he fought strenuously, unremittingly, nor was any weapon too vile for his use. The Second Test Act, passed through his exertions in 1678, rendered Catholics incapable of sitting in Parliament, and thus deprived twenty-one Catholic peers of their seats in the House of Lords; but the king contrived to procure the insertion of a clause exempting the Duke of York from the operation of the Statute. It was in this same year that Titus Oates appeared on the scene with his pretended Popish Plot. There is no evidence that Ashley was the instigator of the colossal villainy, but he did not scruple to employ it for his own purposes. "The origin of the Plot", says a recent well-informed writer in "Blackwood's Magazine" (May, 1908), "is a mystery. We know no more than that the English people, being mad, interrupted the course of justice, insisted that the judges should condemn every man brought before them, suspected of papistry, and easily believed the crazy stories of hired perjurers. It is most probable that Oates himself contrived the death of Sir Edmund Godfrey." However that may have been, certain it is that the calumnies of Oates and his confederates and imitators awakened the Elizabethan Statutes into fresh activity. The king was far too shrewd to give credence to what Macaulay has well called "a hideous romance resembling rather the dream of a sick man than any transaction which ever took place in this world." But he was powerless to save the victims of popular fanaticism; "I cannot pardon them", he said, "for I dare not." And so, in 1679, the horrors of 1588 were repeated, eight priests of the Society of Jesus, two Franciscans, five secular priests, and seven laymen being put to death, while many more died in their foul prisons. The next year witnessed the judicial murder of Lord Stafford, his peers being unable to withstand the madness of the people. In 1681 Oliver Plunket, the Archbishop of Armagh, was executed at Tyburn, after a mock trial. His was the last blood shed for the Catholic religion in England. The persecution, which had begun with the execution of the three saintly Carthusian friars in the twenty-sixth year of Henry VIII, had lasted, with little intermission, for a century and a half. Three hundred and forty-two martyrs had sealed their faith with their blood, while some fifty confessors, in the reign of Elizabeth and her successors, ended their lives in prison. The king's long struggle with the popular party ended in his complete victory. No more consummate master of political strategy ever perhaps existed; and the violence of the party led by Shaftesbury played into his hands. Shaftesbury himself was arrested on a charge of suborning false witnesses to the Plot; although the Grand Jury of Middlesex ignored the bill of his indictment, he saw that the tide of popular feeling, which had begun to ebb with the execution of Lord Stafford, was now turned completely against him, and at the end of 1682 he fled to Holland, where, two months afterwards, he died.

Charles II was the most popular of kings during the last two years of his reign, and he was careful not to mar his popularity by illegal acts or by measures opposed to the feeling of the nation. The statute for the regulation of printing, passed immediately after the Restoration, had expired in 1679; Charles made no attempt for its renewal. In the same year the Habeas Corpus Act—that great charter of the liberty of the subject—was passed; Charles acquiesced in it. He did indeed infringe the Test Act by the Duke of York's readmission to the Council and restoration to the office of lord high admiral. But, in the recrudescence of loyalty, this tribute to fraternal affection passed unblamed. In his last illness the churches were thronged with crowds praying that God would raise him up again to be a father to his people; and on his death, in February, 1685, all sorts and conditions of his subjects made great lamentation over him.

In the first year of the reign of James II Dr. Leyburn was appointed by the Holy See as vicar Apostolic. In the next year Dr. Giffard received a like appointment, as did Dr. Ellis and Dr. Smith the year after that, England being divided into four districts: the London, the Midland, the Western, and the Northern, in each of which the papal vicar exercised all the authority possessed by an ordinary. The new king came to the throne with advantages which he could hardly have hoped for. He inherited, in some sort, the popularity of his brother, and his religion was forgotten in his blood. He began his reign by a solemn pledge to keep the laws inviolate and to protect the Church of England, and the nation believed him. "We have the word of a king", it was said, "and of a king who was never worse than his word." The saying, whoever was its author, went abroad. It expressed the general conviction, and his first Parliament made proof of exuberant loyalty, granting to the monarch, without demur, a revenue of nearly two millions for life. Argyll's rebellion in the North and Monmouth's in the West but served to bring out the devotion of the nation at large to the sovereign. But the cruelties of Kirke and the savageries of Jeffreys in the "Bloody Circuit" caused a change in the general feeling. The king's popularity began to wane, and the measures to which he now resorted soon put an end to it. Monmouth's revolt was made the pretext for raising the army to twenty thousand men, and it soon appeared that James supposed himself able, with this force at his command, to place himself above the law. He attempted to nullify the provisions of statutes by the exercise of his dispensing power. Judges who refused to fall in with his plans were dismissed; and it was held by a bench packed with his creatures that his dispensation could be pleaded in bar of an Act of Parliament. Armed with this decision, the king proceeded to set aside the disabilities of Catholics and the restraints upon the exercise of their religion. They were admitted to civil and military offices closed to them by the law; members of religious orders appeared in the streets of London in their habits; the Jesuits opened a school which was soon crowded. Further, the king found himself *ex officio* supreme head of the Anglican Communion, and he resolved to use his supremacy as a weapon for its overthrow. Following the precedent of Elizabeth, he appointed an Ecclesiastical Commission, in defiance of an Act of Charles I which declared that court illegal; and he placed Jeffreys at the head of it. He forbade the clergy to preach against popery, and suspended the Bishop of London for refusing to carry out this order. At Oxford he presented a Catholic to the deanery of Christ Church and converted Magdalen College into a Catholic society. Among English Catholics most men of reputation stood aghast at this reckless violence. Few approved it but converts of broken fortune and tarnished reputation. Rome gave no countenance to it. Macaulay is absolutely warranted in writing: "Every letter which went from the Vatican to Whitehall recommended patience, moderation and respect for the prejudices of the English people". "The Pope", he observes in another page, with equal justice, "was too wise a man to believe that a nation so bold and stubborn could be brought back to the Church of Rome by the violent and unconstitutional exercise of the royal authority. It was not difficult to

see that if James attempted to promote the interests of his religion by illegal and unpopular measures, his attempt would fail: the hatred with which the heretical islanders regarded the true faith would become fiercer and stronger than ever: and an indissoluble association would be created in men's minds between Protestantism and civil freedom, between Popery and arbitrary power." This is precisely what happened. And indeed it is not too much to say that British Catholics have, in great measure, to thank the two last Catholic sovereigns for the strong feeling which so long existed against them throughout the nation, and which, even now, has not wholly disappeared. The severities of Mary appeared to give countenance to the popular Protestant opinion that Catholics rely chiefly on the argument from fire and are always ready, if they can, to burn dissidents from their religious belief. The conduct of James II seemed an object lesson confirmatory of the vulgar conviction that Catholics are not bound to keep faith with heretics, and that any violation of law, any "crooked and indirect bye-ways" are justifiable means to the end of advancing the Catholic religion.

The reign of James II lasted only three years. It is not too much to say that before two of them were out he had succeeded in alienating the devotion of the entire nation. The famous Declaration of Indulgence supplied the supreme proof of his folly and was the immediate occasion of his downfall. The gist of it was that by the royal authority all laws against all classes of Nonconformists were suspended, that all religious tests imposed upon them by statute as a qualification for office were abrogated. Only an absolute monarch could claim to exercise such a prerogative. It is true that the Declaration was full of professions of love of liberty of conscience—professions which came oddly from a monarch with James's record. Moreover, as we now know, upon the very eve of publishing it he had written to congratulate Louis XIV upon his revocation of the Edict of Nantes, an example which Barillon, a very competent judge, thought he would have only too gladly followed if he had been able. Those hollow and palpably false professions deceived no one, and the failure of the Declaration to conciliate the support of those who would have chiefly benefited by it, might have suggested caution to a wiser man. But James would brook no opposition; and on 27 April, 1688, he ordered the Anglican clergy to read his Declaration of Indulgence during divine service on two successive Sundays. Nearly all the clergy refused to obey, and Sancroft, the Archbishop of Canterbury, with six of his suffragans, addressed to the king a respectful and temperate protest. The document was treated as a libel, and the famous trial of the seven bishops was the result. The acquittal of the prelates was greeted throughout the country with a tumult of acclaim, which was the signal for the Revolution, whereby the ancient liberties of England were vindicated, and a Parliamentary title to the crown was substituted for an hereditary one.

The disfavour with which Catholics were viewed when William and Mary were placed on the throne vacated by James II, was natural enough. They shared in the hatred inspired by the perfidy, cruelty, and tyranny of the absconded sovereign. William, indeed, would have gladly extended to them the same measure of toleration which, in spite of Tory opposition, he was able to secure for Protestant Nonconformists. He was under great obligations not only to the emperor, but also to the pope, whose sympathy and diplomatic support had been of much help to him in his perilous enterprise. He was, by temperament and by conviction, averse from religious persecution. Moreover, as Hallam justly observes, "no measure would have been more politic, for it would have dealt to the Jacobite cause a more deadly wound than any which double taxation or penal laws were able to effect." And this, no doubt, was one of the reasons why the High Tories persistently opposed it. But the Legislature did not content itself with leaving on the statute book the former statutes against Catholics; it enacted new disqualifications and penalties. The Bill of Rights provides that no member of the reigning house who is a Catholic, or has married a Catholic, can succeed to the throne, and that the sovereign, on becoming a Catholic, or marrying a Catholic, thereby forfeits the crown. This article of the constitution was confirmed by the Act of Settlement (12 & 13 Will. III, c. 2), which conferred the succession on the descendants of the Electress Sophia (a daughter of James I), being Protestants. Another statute, of the first year of William and Mary, prohibited Catholics from residing within ten miles of London and empowered justices to tender to reputed Papists "the oath appointed by law", providing that any who refused it, and yet remained within ten miles of London, was to forfeit and suffer as a Papist recusant convict. A third Act of the same year (1 W. & M., c. 15) provides that no suspected Papist who shall neglect to take the oath appointed by law, when tendered to him by two justices of the peace, and who shall not appear before them upon notice from one authorized under their hands and seals, shall keep any arms, ammunition, or horse above the value of five pounds in his possession, and in that of any other person to his use (other than such as shall be allowed him by the sessions for defence of his house and person); that any two justices may authorize by warrant any person to search for all such arms, ammunition, and horses in the daytime, with the assistance of the constable or his deputy or tithing-man, and to seize them for the king's use; and that if any person shall conceal such arms, ammunition, or horses, he shall be imprisoned for three months and shall forfeit to the king treble the value of such arms, ammunition, or horse. The 7 & 8 Will. III, c. 24, closed to Catholics the professions of counsellor-at-law, barrister, attorney, and solicitor; and the 7 & 8 Will. III, c. 27, declared that any person who refuses to take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, when lawfully tendered, should be liable to suffer as a Popish recusant convict; and that no person who should refuse the said oath should be admitted to give a vote at the elections of any member of Parliament. In 1700 an Act was passed which, Sir Erskine May observes, "cannot be read without astonishment". It incapacitated every Roman Catholic from inheriting or purchasing land, unless he abjured his religion upon oath; and on his refusal it vested his property, during his life, in his next of kin being a Protestant. He was even prohibited from sending his children abroad, to be educated in his own faith. And while his religion was thus proscribed, his civil rights were further restrained by the oath of abjuration. It prescribed imprisonment for life for all Catholic priests, and enacted that an informer, in the event of their being convicted of saying Mass, was to receive a reward of one hundred pounds.

Concerning this Act of William III Hallam remarks, "So unprovoked, so unjust a persecution is the disgrace of the Parliament that passed it." But he goes on to add, "The spirit of Liberty and tolerance was too strong for the tyranny of the law and this statute was not executed according to its purpose. The Catholic landholders neither renounced their religion nor abandoned their inheritance. The judges put such constructions upon the clause of forfeiture as eluded its efficiency." No doubt this is generally true. But, as Charles Butler tells us in his "Historical Memoirs" (London, 1819–21), "in many instances the laws which deprived Catholics of their landed property were enforced." He adds that "in other respects they were subject to great vexation and contumely". They were a very small and very unpopular minority in an age when a common creed was regarded, in every

European country, as the chief bond of civil polity and dissidents from it were more or less rigorously repressed. As a matter of fact, it is to a great English magistrate that we owe the ruling which placed an almost insuperable difficulty in the way of the tribe of informers. At the trial of the Rev. James Webb on the 25th of June, 1768, at Westminster, at the suit of a notorious common informer named Payne, Lord Mansfield told the jury that the defendant could not be condemned "unless there were sufficient proof of his ordination". Such proofs, of course, were not forthcoming. Lord Mansfield, as Charles Butler relates in his above-mentioned "Historical Memoirs", discountenanced the prosecution of Catholic priests and took care that the accused should have every advantage that the form of proceedings, or the letter or spirit of the law, could allow. And at that period the same temper animated English judges generally.

As the second half of the eighteenth century wore on, English Catholics ceased to be regarded by the Government as politically dangerous. A certain number of them had taken part in the rising of 1715, and in the far more serious rising of 1745, and had in some instances been executed for their pains. But in 1766 the Old Pretender died, and the Young Pretender, upon whom his claim devolved, had ceased to excite either dread or enthusiasm. Men no longer took him seriously, and English Catholics in time—it was no very long time—acquiesced in the Revolution of 1688. Nay, they did something more than acquiesce. In 1778 an address was presented to George III, bearing the signatures of the Duke of Norfolk and nine other peers, and of one hundred and sixty-three commoners, on behalf of the Catholic body. It represents to the sovereign their "true attachment to the civil constitution of the country, which having been perpetuated through all changes of religious opinions and establishments, has been at length perfected by that Revolution which has placed your Majesty's illustrious house on the throne of these Kingdoms, and inseparably united your title to the crown with the law and liberties of your people". In this year, 1778, the first Catholic Relief Act was passed. It repealed the worst portions of the Statute of 1699 above mentioned, and set forth a new oath of allegiance which a Catholic could take without denying his religion. Though a very modest measure of relief, it was extremely distasteful to some bigoted Protestants, among whom it is distressing to find the name of John Wesley. But in truth Wesley—it is not a rare case—was no less ignorant and narrow-minded than zealous and devout, as is sufficiently evident from his "Letter concerning the Principles of Roman Catholics". In this document, besides other equally foolish assertions, he alleges that they hold an oath not binding if administered by heretics, and that they believe in the remission of future sins through the Sacrament of Penance. The conclusion he draws is that no government "ought to tolerate men of the Roman Catholic persuasion". There can be no doubt that the diatribes of Wesley and his followers largely swelled the agitation for the repeal of the Act of 1778, which was conducted by the Protestant Association, and which issued in the Lord George Gordon Riots.

It would be an error to impute the prevalence of a milder spirit towards Catholics at this period to sympathy with their religion. It arose rather from the relaxation of dogmatic belief, the latitudinarianism, the indifferentism which is a notable sign of those times, and which infected Catholics as well as Protestants throughout Europe. In England it was manifested, among other ways, in the apostasy of nine Catholic peers, while many other Catholic laymen, of position and influence, assumed a quite un-Catholic attitude towards the episcopate and towards the Government. They desired, legitimately enough, further deliverance from the penal laws; and to compass this end they had recourse to means not at all legitimate. In May, 1783, five of these constituted themselves "a Committee appointed to manage the further affairs of Catholics in this kingdom", to use their own words. "It was in some respects", writes Canon Flanagan (History of the Church in England, II, 393), "a useful institution, working zealously for the supposed interests of the Catholic body. Its zeal, unfortunately, was not according to knowledge. It sought to win emancipation by making to Protestants every concession that it believed it could in conscience, but it forgot meantime that minute theological knowledge would be necessary for so delicate a task; or rather it forgot that it was unintentionally perhaps, but not the less certainly, usurping the place of the bishops and of the Holy See. It was now in treaty with the government for fresh measures of relief. It complained that the Catholics were not allowed their own 'mode of worship'; were punished severely for educating their children 'in their own religious principles', whether at home or abroad; could not practise any of the professions of the law, or serve in the Army or Navy, or vote in the elections, or hold a seat in either House; and it prayed William Pitt, who was now prime minister, to aid them in their intended application for redress". Pitt was favourably inclined towards the committee, whose proceedings, however, were soon marked by great unwisdom. Protestant Nonconformists were at that time striving to obtain a complete toleration, and held out the right hand of fellowship to Catholics. The Catholic committees were well pleased by the proposed alliance, and in a bill which they drafted for the House of Commons, they inserted a clause providing that the relief to be given by it was to be available to those only who subscribed their names, in a Court of Justice, in the following form: "I, A.B., do hereby declare myself to be a Protesting Catholic Dissenter." The four vicars Apostolic, in an encyclical letter, condemned this and other vagaries of the Catholic Committee, and declared that none of the faithful clergy or laity under their care ought to take any oath or subscribe to any instrument wherein the interests of religion are concerned without the previous approbation of their respective bishops. The Holy See approved this letter. In the Relief Act which was passed in 1791 the foolish phrase "Protesting Catholic Dissenters" was struck out, and the oath proposed by the Catholic Committee was utterly discarded, the inoffensive Irish oath of 1778, with slight variations, being substituted for it. Catholics taking this oath were relieved from the penalties of the Statutes of Recusancy and from the obligation of taking the oath of supremacy prescribed by the Statute of William and Mary. Various disabilities were removed, and toleration was extended to Catholic schools and worship. Shortly after this Act was passed the Catholic Committee turned itself into the Cisalpine Club and continued under that name, for thirty years, to trouble more or less the vicars Apostolic.

There can be little doubt that the passing of the Relief Act was facilitated by the outbreak of the Revolution in France. Another result, at first extremely prejudicial to the Catholic Church in England, of that great upheaval was the closing of the seminaries on the Continent, which had furnished to that country a supply of priests. Douai was seized by the French Revolutionary Government in 1793. The English Benedictine houses in France also disappeared. The closing of the English Catholic colleges in France was, however, to some extent compensated by the influx of clergy from that country. No less than eight thousand of these confessors of the Christian Faith sought the hospitality of Protestant England, and it was ungrudgingly given. The King's House at Winchester sheltered a thousand of them, and for several years a considerable sum was voted for their relief by Parliament and was largely supple-

mented by voluntary subscriptions. A certain number of these priests sought and found work on the English Mission. By far the greater part of them returned home when Napoleon had concluded his Concordat with the Holy See and re-established Christian worship in France. Of those who remained a few were irreconcilably dissatisfied with the new ecclesiastical arrangements in their country. They were known as Blanchardists, from their leader Blanchard, and were a source of much annoyance to the vicars Apostolic. The heroic Milner was especially prominent in combating them, and in asserting the rights of the Holy See. That strenuous champion of orthodoxy had, at the same time, to contend with Catholics of his own nationality. The spirit which had animated the Catholic Committee and the Cisalpine Club was by no means extinct, and led to the formation, in 1808, of what was called a "Select Board" which professed as its object the organization of an association for "the general advantage of the Catholic body". That "general advantage" turned out to be the further removal of Catholic disabilities, and the price which the Select Board was prepared to pay for such removal was the vesting in the Crown of an effectual negative upon the appointment of Catholic bishops—commonly called the Veto. The Irish episcopate unanimously opposed this arrangement, and passed a vote of thanks to Dr. Milner for his "apostolic constancy" in withstanding it. On 30 April, 1813, Grattan brought forward a Catholic relief bill in the House of Commons, which substantially provided for the Veto. It was thrown out on the third reading. Eight years later a similar bill passed the House of Commons, but was rejected by the House of Lords. Of the eventual emancipation of Catholics Dr. Milner had no doubt. Twelve years before his death, which took place in 1826, he assured the pope that it was certain to come. But he would not purchase it by the slightest sacrifice of Catholic principle. In 1826 a declaration was put forward by all the vicars Apostolic of England explanatory of various articles of the Catholic Faith greatly misunderstood by many Protestants. It was widely read and doubtless helped to remove prejudice. In the same year Sidney Smith published his masterly "Letter on the Catholic Question". Not, however, till March, 1829, was the long desired boon conceded to Catholics. It was wrung, so to speak, from statesmen who had always opposed it. The Clare election convinced Peel and the Duke of Wellington, who were then in power, that the settlement of the Irish question was a political necessity. The duke reminded the House of Lords that when the Irish Rebellion of 1798 had been suppressed the Legislative Union had been proposed in the next year mainly for the purpose of introducing this very measure of concession, and not obscurely intimated his opinion that further to refuse it must lead to civil war. This relief bill passed both Houses by large majorities. The king's consent was reluctantly given, and the Emancipation Act became law. It should be noted that before the passing of the Emancipation Act the friction of which we have been obliged to speak, between certain prominent members of the Catholic laity and the vicars Apostolic, was virtually at an end. The Cisalpine Club still existed; but, as Monsignor Ward remarks (Catholic London A Century Ago, p. 38), "there was very little Cisalpinism in it". This was largely due to the personal influence of Dr. Poynter, Vicar Apostolic of the London District, whose gentleness and meekness triumphed where the fiery zeal of Milner failed.

When the nineteenth century opened, the Catholics of Great Britain were, to quote Cardinal Newman's words, "a *gens lucifuga*, found in corners and alleys and cellars and the housetops, or in the recesses of the country". Their chapels were few and far between, and were purposely placed in quarters where they were unlikely to attract observation. It was common to locate them in mews, and in their exterior they were hardly distinguishable from the adjoining stables. George Eliot has well remarked in Felix Holt, "Till the agitation about the Catholics in '29, rural Englishmen had hardly known more of Catholics than of the fossil mammoths." Their political emancipation was the beginning of a great change in their social condition. "The steps were higher that men took"; their ostracism began to pass away. Moreover, the reaction which had followed the French Revolution had told in favour of Catholicism even in England. Chateaubriand's "Génie du christianisme" had a world-wide influence, and some of the historical novels of Sir Walter Scott, however deficient in accuracy, presented a much kinder view of the ancient faith than had been commonly taken in Protestant countries. In the history of the Catholic Church in England since 1829 two events require special notice. One was the rise of what is called "The Oxford Movement". Cardinal Newman used to date that movement from the year 1833, when Keble preached at Oxford his famous assize sermon on "National Apostasy". But indeed it was simply the bodying-forth of tendencies which had been long in the air. The old notion of the mediæval period as "a millennium of darkness" had passed away; and from the contemplation of its masterpieces in architecture and painting men proceeded to study its intellectual and spiritual life. They were also led to investigate, in the light of facts and first principles, the claims of Anglicanism. No doubt the "Lectures on the History and Structure of the Prayer Book of the Church of England" delivered by Dr. Lloyd, the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, set many of his hearers thinking, Newman among them. But the object of the leaders of the Oxford Movement at its beginning was not to examine, but to defend, the Anglican Church. This was the intention of the "Tracts for the Times", begun in 1833. It is not here possible, or indeed necessary, to follow the course of the movement, which, as it went on, departed ever more and more widely from the standards—even the highest—of Anglicanism, and approximated ever more and more closely to the Catholic ideal. It culminated in the famous "Tract XC", the theme of which was that the Thirty-nine Articles were susceptible of a Catholic interpretation and could be accepted by one who held all the dogmas of the Council of Trent. Of course the movement greatly interested Catholics, and by no one was it more closely and anxiously followed than by Dr. Wiseman, who had made the acquaintance of Newman and Froude upon the occasion of their visiting Rome in 1833. In September, 1840, Wiseman arrived at Oscott from Rome—where almost all his previous life had been spent—to take up his residence as president of that college and Vicar Apostolic of the Midland District. He felt from the day of his arrival there, as he wrote in a memorandum eight years afterwards, that a new era had commenced in England. To help forward that era was the end to which his great gifts and his large heart were utterly devoted. The majority of hereditary English Catholics were much prejudiced against the Tractarians. Dr. Lingard warned Bishop Wiseman not to trust them. Dr. Griffiths, the Vicar Apostolic of the London District, used similar language. But Wiseman did trust them. He held that Catholic principles, if honestly entertained, must lead to the Catholic Church, and he fully believed in the honesty of Newman and Newman's followers. How Newman was influenced by a paper of his on the Donatists, published in the Dublin Review in 1839, is well known. The Oxford Movement had been directed to the impossible aim of unprotestantizing the Anglican Church. Newman and many of his friends came gradually to see that the aim was impossible. The kindly light which they had so faithfully followed step by step led them on to Rome.

Wiseman testified: "The Church has not received at any time a convert who has joined her in more docility and simplicity of faith than Newman."

Wiseman had earnestly desired "an influx of fresh blood" into the Catholic Church in England. The accession of the converts due to the Oxford Movement brought it. And no doubt it accelerated the restoration of the hierarchy which had been so strongly desired by generations of Catholics. In 1840 Gregory VI had increased the number of English vicars Apostolic from four to eight. Ten years afterwards Pius IX decreed that "the hierarchy of Bishops ordinary,

Beverley Minster

taking their titles from their sees, should, according to the usual rules of the Church, again flourish in the Kingdom of England". The whole of the country was formed into one province consisting of the metropolitan See of Westminster, and the twelve suffragan sees of Southwark, Plymouth, Clifton, Newport and Menevia, Shrewsbury, Liverpool, Salford, Hexham and Newcastle, Beverley, Nottingham, Birmingham, Northampton. This restoration of the hierarchy was certainly not designed as an act of war; it was indeed "unattended by any suspicion that it would give offence to others". But it did give dire offence, and the country resounded with denunciations of what was called "The Papal Aggression". An "insolent and insidious aggression", Lord John Russell, the premier, pronounced it to be, and shortly afterwards introduced into the House of Commons a bill by which the Catholic bishops were prohibited, under penalties, from assuming the territorial titles conferred upon them by the pope. The bill became law after long and angry debates, but was, from the first, a dead letter. There can be no question that Cardinal Wiseman's appeal to the people of England largely contributed to allay the popular passion which his pastoral letter "From without the Flaminian Gate" had had no small share in exciting. Though a somewhat lengthy pamphlet, it was printed *in extenso* in "The Times" and in four other London newspapers, and its circulation was immense. The cardinal appealed to the "manly sense and honest heart" of his countrymen, to "the love of honourable dealing and fair play, which is the instinct of an Englishman", and he did not appeal in vain.

Cardinal Wiseman filled the metropolitan See of Westminster from 1850 to 1865, and it would be hard to overrate the greatness of his services to the Catholic cause in England. Manning truly said in the sermon preached at his funeral: "When he closed his eyes he had already seen the work he had begun expanding everywhere, and the traditions of three hundred years everywhere dissolving before it." When he began that work, there were less than five hundred priests in England; when he ceased from it there were some fifteen hundred. The number of converts during these fifteen years had increased tenfold, and fifty-five monasteries had come into being. But mere statistics give no sufficient notion of the progress made by the Catholic Church under Wiseman's rule, a progress directly due to him in large measure. Not the least important item of his service to religion was the way in which he presented the Church to his countrymen. Mr. Wilfrid Ward is well warranted when he writes: "Wiseman may claim to have been the first effectively to remind Englishmen in our own day of the historical significance of the Catholic Church, which so much impressed Macaulay, and which affected permanently such a man as Comte, which kindled the historical enthusiasm of a De Maîstre, a Görres and a Frederick Schlegel." The organization of the Catholic Church, as it now exists in England, may be said to be due to him. He himself drew up, almost entirely, the decrees regarding it for the First Provincial Synod, held at Oscott (1852). His work, indeed, was not done in the tranquillity which he loved. "Without were fightings, within were fears." Some of the converts did not fuse with the hereditary Catholics, "the little remnant of Catholic England", whom they judged to be ill-educated and behind the times, and this prejudice Wiseman regarded as ungenerous, even if, to some extent, it was not unfounded. He deprecated strongly the spirit of party and sought in all gentleness, to put it down and to guide his flock into the way of peace. On the other hand, some of the old clergy, taking their stand upon the ancient ways, regarded with distrust certain innovations of discipline and devotion introduced by the more zealous of the converts. They looked upon the Oratorians as extravagant. They viewed Monsignor Manning with suspicion. It is unnecessary to enter into the dissensions which embittered Wiseman's declining years. The last two, indeed, were passed in comparative quiet, but amid much physical suffering. Not long before he died he said: "I have never cared for anything but the Church. My sole delight has been in everything connected with her."

Cardinal Wiseman's successor in the See of Westminster—the successor he desired—was the provost of his chapter, Monsignor Manning, whose episcopate lasted until 1892. They were twenty-seven years of fruitful activity, through evil report and through good report. For some time he was certainly unpopular, not only among his Protestant fellow countrymen but



St. Werburgh's, Chester
(Cathedral)

among his own clergy, who did not like his strict discipline and some of whom by no means sympathized with what was called his "ultra-papalism". But gradually the prejudice against him wore off, and his great qualities obtained general recognition. It was the victory of his faith unfeigned, his deep devotion, his spotless integrity, his indomitable courage, his singleness of aim, his entire devotion to the cause which, in his heart of hearts, he believed to be the only cause worth living for. One who knew him well said of him: "He was an Archbishop who lived among his people", "the door-steps of his house were worn with

the footsteps of the fatherless and the widow, the poor, the forlorn, the tempted and the disgraced, who came to him in their hours of trouble and sorrow." No doubt he made mistakes, some of them grave enough —as, for example, his persistent opposition to the frequentation of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge by young Catholic men and his abortive and costly attempt to supply the loss of academical training by a college of higher studies at Kensington under the direction of Monsignor Capel. But it is certainly true that the active part which he played in every department of social reform revealed him not only as a great philanthropist and a great churchman, but also as a statesman of no mean order. It was said by an able writer, upon the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of his consecration: "To him, more than to any man, it is due that English Catholics have at last outgrown the narrow cramped life of their past of persecution, and stand in all things upon a footing of equality with their fellow countrymen." No doubt this happy result was largely due to Manning; but perhaps it was more largely due to another. The revelation of his inner life which John Henry Newman thought himself obliged to put before his countrymen in order to vindicate himself from the wanton attacks of Charles Kingsley, in 1864, came like a revelation to multitudes of what Catholicism as a religion really is. The "Apologia pro Vita Sua" was like a burst of sunlight putting to flight the densest mists of Protestant prejudice. And the "Letter to the Duke of Norfolk" (1875), in reply to Gladstone's pamphlet on the Vatican decrees which appeared in 1874, may be said to have made an end of the old error that a loyal Catholic cannot be a loyal Englishman. It was enough for Newman to affirm that there was no incompatibility between the two characters. His countrymen believed him on his word. Lord Morley of Blackburn, a very competent judge, writes: "Newman raised his Church to what would, not so long before, have seemed a strange and incredible rank in the mind of Protestant England" (Miscellanies, Fourth Series, p. 161).

Herbert Vaughan, who succeeded Cardinal Manning in the See of Westminster, ruled the diocese as archbishop, and the province as metropolitan for nearly eleven years. It was reserved for him to take up a work which his predecessor had put aside—the erection of a cathedral for Westminster. The first public act which Manning had to perform after his nomination to the archbishopric—it was even before his consecration—was to preside over a meeting summoned to promote the building of a cathedral in memory of Cardinal Wiseman. He declared on that occasion: "It is a work which I will take up and will to the utmost of my power promote—when the work of the poor children in London is accomplished, and not till then." This work for the poor Catholic children of London —provision for their education in their religion—was Cardinal Manning's life-work; and before he passed away it was accomplished. The building of the cathedral he left, as he announced in 1874, to his successor. The magnificent fane conceived by the genius of John Francis Bentley may, in some sort, be considered as Cardinal Vaughan's monument, as being the outcome of his energy and zeal. It is a memorial of him, as well as of Cardinal Wiseman.

So much must suffice regarding the history of Catholicism in England from the so-called Reformation to the present day. We now proceed to give some account of the actual position of the Church in that country. We have already seen that in 1850 Pope Pius IX reconstituted the hierarchy, making England one ecclesiastical province under the metropolitan See of Westminster, with the twelve suffragan Sees of Southwark, Hexham and Newcastle, Beverley, Liverpool, Salford, Newport and Menevia, Clifton, Plymouth, Nottingham, Birmingham, and Northampton. In 1878 the Diocese of Beverley was divided into the Dioceses of Leeds and Middlesborough; in 1882 the Diocese of Southwark was divided into the Dioceses of Southwark and Portsmouth, and in 1895 Wales, excepting Glamorganshire, was separated from the Diocese of Newport and Menevia, and formed into the Vicariate Apostolic of Wales. Three years later this vicariate was erected into the Diocese of Menevia, so that the Archbishop of Westminster now has fifteen suffragans. Hitherto, since the Reformation, England had been regarded as a missionary country and had been immediately subject to the Congregation of Propaganda. But Pius X, by his Constitution, "Sapienti Consilio", transferred (1908) England from that state of tutelage to the common law of the Church.

The number of priests, secular and regular, in England, according to the most recent list, is three thousand five hundred and twenty-four, and the number of churches, chapels, and institutes, one thousand seven hundred and thirty-six. Of the regulars who are over a thousand in number, many are French exiles, and a considerable number of them are not engaged in parochial or missionary work. There are three hundred and eleven monasteries and seven hundred and eighty-three convents, a great increase during the half-century which has passed away since 1851, when there were only seventeen monasteries and fifty-three convents. During the same period many churches of imposing proportions, adorned with more or less magnificence, have been erected. Conspicuous among them is the cathedral of Westminster of which mention has been already made. It is in the Byzantine style and is certainly one of the noblest of modern religious edifices. Nearly two hundred and fifty thousand pounds have already been expended on it, and, although still unfinished, it has been open for daily use since Christmas, 1903.

Catholics in England are still subject to various legal disabilities. We have already seen that by the Bill of Rights (1 Will. and Mary st. 2, c. 2) no member of the reigning house who is a Catholic, or has married a Catholic, can succeed to the throne, that the sovereign, on becoming a Catholic, or marrying a Catholic, thereby forfeits the crown, and that the Act of Settlement (12 and 13 Will. III, c. 2, s. 2), by which the succession was confined to the descendants of the Electress Sophia, being Protestants, confirms this article of the Constitution. This last-mentioned statute further enacts "that whosoever shall hereafter come to the possession of the Crown of England shall join in communion with the Church of England as by law established". The Emancipation Act (10 Geo. IV, c. 7), which was largely a disabling Act, provides that nothing contained in it "shall extend or be construed to enable any person otherwise than he is now by law entitled, to hold the office of Lord Chancellor of England or Lord Lieutenant of Ireland", and the common opinion is that Catholics cannot now fill these great positions, but this view appears questionable. The point is discussed at length in Lilly and Wallis's "Manual of the Law specially affecting Catholics", pp. 36–43. The Emancipation Act also contains sections imposing fresh disabilities upon "Jesuits and members of other religious orders, communities or Societies of the Church of Rome, bound by monastic or religious vows". These sections have never been put in force; still, as they remain on the statute book, they have the serious effect of disabling religious orders of men from holding property. An Act of 1860 (23 and 24 Vict., c. 134) has, however, somewhat mitigated this hardship, as also a like hardship regarding bequests for what are deemed superstitious uses, such as Masses for the dead. Such bequests are held by English law to be void, but the Irish courts do not follow the English on this point. It should be noted that up to the passing of the Emancipation Act, trusts for the promotion of Catholic charities were held to be illegal.

COPYRIGHT, 1909, BY ROBERT APPLETON CO.

Nor did that enactment expressly refer to them, so that three years later, in order to remove all doubts concerning them, the Roman Catholic Charities Act was passed, by which such charities were made subject to the same laws as Protestant Dissenting charities. The English law as to trusts for Catholic purposes, which are neither charitable nor void as being for "superstitious uses" or for support of forbidden orders, is the same as that which applies to other bequests which are lawful but not charitable.

The only other Catholic disability which need be noticed here is that no person in Holy orders of the Church of Rome is capable of being elected to serve in Parliament as a Member of the House of Commons. This disability is shared by the clergymen of the Church of England, who, however, can escape from it by the legal process vulgarly, though incorrectly, called renouncing their orders, but not by Protestant Dissenting ministers.

It should be noticed that in England provision is made for securing religious liberty for pauper and criminal Catholics. In every workhouse a creed register is kept in which the religion of every inmate is entered by the master, upon admission, and the Guardians of the Poor are empowered to appoint Catholic clergymen, at suitable salaries, to minister to the Catholic paupers. Similarly, Catholic chaplains may be appointed in public lunatic asylums. Catholic pauper children may be transferred from the workhouse schools to schools of their own religion, and, if boarded out, provision is made for their attending the Catholic church. Catholic ministers to prisons are appointed by the Home Secretary, and are duly remunerated. There are sixteen commissioned army chaplains paid by the State. In the Navy there are twenty-three Catholic chaplains, and a hundred and thirty priests receive capitation allowances.

We go on to say some words on Catholic education in England since the Reformation. Of course it hardly existed when the penal laws were enforced in their full rigour. The clergy, as we have seen, were trained abroad at Rome, at Douai, at Lisbon, at Valladolid. The young laity benefited in intermittent and uncertain fashion by the teaching of the priests. Shakespeare, whom there is strong reason for accounting a Catholic (see Lilly's "Studies in Religion and Literature"), was "reared up", according to an old tradition, by an old Benedictine monk, Dom Thomas Combe, or Coombes. In Pope's time a few Catholic schools were found here and there, and he was sent to one of them, a "Roman Catholic seminary", it is called, at Twyford, kept by Thomas Deane, an ex-fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. But these "seminaries" were carried on with difficulty, being illegal, and it was not until the outbreak of the French Revolution that much was effected for the cause of Catholic education in England. The professors and pupils of the University of Douai, after enduring many hardships, returned to England in 1795, some going to Herefordshire, in the South, and some to Tudhoe, in the North. The Herefordshire establishment developed in time into St. Edmund's College. The school founded at Tudhoe, and removed first to Crook Hill, has expanded into the great college of Ushaw, which now also serves as a seminary for the five northern Dioceses of Hexham and Newcastle, Leeds, Middlesborough, Salford, and Shrewsbury. Thus these two noble institutions may claim as their far-off founder Cardinal Allen. The magnificent Jesuit college of Stonyhurst may in like manner derive its origin from Father Persons, for it was founded by the religious who fled from the house established by him at St-Omer. The not less magnificent college of Downside is the descendant of St. Gregory's, Douai, i. e. of the Benedictine monastery and college founded there in 1606. The monks fleeing from the fury of the French Revolution were received at Acton Burnell in Shropshire by Sir Edward Smith who had been one of their pupils. It was in 1814 that they settled at Downside. The great college of Oscott is now a seminary in which priests are trained for the southern dioceses and is under the joint direction of the Archbishop of Westminster and the Bishops of Birmingham, Clifton, Menevia, Newport, Northampton, and Portsmouth.

St. Joseph's Missionary College was founded by Cardinal Vaughan, who ever took the deepest interest in it, and who is buried in the grounds. Of Catholic higher schools two deserve special mention; that at Edgbaston, founded by Cardinal Newman, and that at Beaumont, established by the Jesuits. Until 1895 Catholic young men were discouraged—nay were inhibited, without special permission of the ecclesiastical authorities—from frequenting the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, but in that year a letter from the Congregation of Propaganda to Cardinal Vaughan announced that the Holy See had removed this restriction, the bishops, however, being enjoined to make proper provision for Catholic worship and instruction for Catholic young men resorting to these ancient seats of learning. Elementary education has also been largely provided for by Catholics in England. Before the Protestant Reformation all the great monasteries had, attached to them, primary schools for poor children. These of course disappeared with the monasteries. In the eighteenth century a number of Protestant charity schools were founded, but it was not until the end of the first quarter of the nineteenth century that provision for elementary public instruction began to be recognized as a public duty. In 1833 a Parliamentary grant was first made "for the purpose" of education. It was divided between two Protestant societies, the British and Foreign School, which ignored dogmatic religious teaching, and the National, which represented the Church of England. In 1847 Catholic elementary schools, which had much increased in numbers, were admitted to share in the government grant, and the Catholic Poor School Committee was founded to supervise and direct them, a duty which this body, now called the Catholic Education Council, still fulfils.

Catholic journalism in England is zealously represented by "The Tablet" newspaper, which was founded so long ago as 1840. It is published weekly. Other Catholic journals are the "Catholic Times", "Catholic Weekly", "Catholic Herald", "Catholic News", and "Universe". The chief Catholic review is the "Dublin Review", founded by Cardinal Wiseman, long edited by W. G. Ward, and now by his son Mr. Wilfrid Ward. It is published quarterly. "The Month", a magazine of general literature edited by Fathers of the Society of Jesus, is issued monthly, as its name denotes. An extremely important publication is the "Catholic Directory", which in its present form dates from the year 1838. But for nearly a century previously there had been a Directory which, however, in its earliest issues was merely an Ordo, or Calendar, for the use of priests reciting Office.

It remains now to speak of certain Catholic societies existing in England. In the first place mention must be made of the Catholic Union of Great Britain, founded in 1871. The earliest meeting recorded in the minute book was held at Norfolk House, on the 10th of February of that year, when it was unanimously agreed, "that a Society of Catholics be founded, under the title of the Catholic Union of Great Britain, to promote all Catholic interests, especially the restoration of the Holy Father to his lawful Sovereign rights". The establishment of the society was sanctioned by the archbishops and bishops of England and by the vicars Apostolic of Scotland (the hierarchy in that country was not restored until 1878), and was emphatically approved by Pius IX. In the rules of the Catholic Union the following means of effecting its objects are specified: "1. By meetings of

the Union and of the Council; 2. By public meetings; 3. By petitions or memorials, or deputations to the Authorities; 4. By local branches; 5. By correspondence with similar societies in other countries; 6. By procuring and publishing information on subjects of interest to Catholics; 7. By co-operation with approved Confraternities, Institutions, and Charitable Associations, for the furtherance of their respective objects; which co-operation shall, in each case, be sanctioned by the Bishop of the Diocese; 8. By any other mode approved of by the Council and the Bishops." For thirty-seven years the Catholic Union has worked steadily and successfully on the lines thus indicated. It has also been of great utility in affording advice and assistance to Catholics, especially the clergy, in matters of doubt and difficulty, legal and administrative. It is governed by a president and council elected by the general body of members. From the first the office of president has been held by the Duke of Norfolk, and for many years the Marquis of Ripon has been the vice-president. On its list of members will be found most British Catholics of position and influence.

The Catholic Truth Society was founded in 1884 by the late Cardinal Vaughan, then rector of the Foreign Missionary College at Mill Hill, and has since had a career of much usefulness. Its main objects are to disseminate among Catholics small and cheap devotional works; to assist the uneducated poor to a better knowledge of their religion; to spread among Protestants information about Catholic truth; to promote the circulation of good, cheap, and popular Catholic books. It holds every year a Conference for the elucidation and discussion of questions affecting the work of the Catholic Church in England. During the twenty years of its existence it has issued publications, great and small, at the rate of about a million a year. It has formed a lending library of books for the blind; and it has a collection of about forty sets of lantern views, with accompanying readings on subjects connected with Catholic faith and history. It has been copied by societies bearing the same names in Scotland and Ireland, in the United States, Canada, Bombay, and Australia.

The Catholic Association was originally founded in 1891. Its objects are stated in its Rules as being "(I) To promote unity and good fellowship among Catholics by organizing lectures, concerts, dances, whist tournaments, excursions, and other gatherings of a social character, and (II) to assist, whenever possible, in the work of Catholic organization, and in the protection and advancement of Catholic interests." It has been particularly successful in the organization of pilgrimages to Rome and other places of Catholic interest.

We cannot better bring to an end this brief survey of the career of Catholicism in England since the Protestant Reformation than in some eloquent and touching words with which Abbot Gasquet concludes his "Short History of the Catholic Church in England":—"When we recall the state to which the long years of persecution had reduced the Catholic body at the dawn of the nineteenth century, we may well wonder at what has been accomplished since then. Who shall say how it has come about? Where out of our poverty, for example, have been found the sums of money for all our innumerable needs? Churches and colleges and schools, monastic buildings and convents, have all had to be built and supported; how, the Providence of God can alone explain. . . . From the first years of the nineteenth century, when the principle 'suffer it to be' was applied to the English Catholic Church, there have been signs of the dawn of the brighter, happier days for the old religion. Slight indeed were the signs at first, slight but significant, and precious memories to us now, of the workings of the Spirit, of the rising of the sap again in the old trunk, and of the bursting of bud and bloom in manifestation of that life which, during the long winter of persecution, had been but dormant. Succisa virescit. Cut down almost to the ground, the tree planted by Augustine has manifested again the divine life within it; it has put forth once more new branches and leaves, and gives promise of abundant fruit."

Anything like a complete bibliography of the subject treated in the foregoing article would attain to the dimensions of a large library catalogue. But the following books may be mentioned: Bellesheim, *Wilhelm Cardinal Allen, 1532–1594, und die englischen Seminäre auf dem Festlande* (Mainz, 1885); Butler, *Historical Memoirs of English, Scottish, and Irish Catholics* (3 vols., London, 1819–21); Id., *Historical account of the Laws respecting the Roman Catholics* (London, 1795); Id., *The Book of the Roman Catholic Church* (London, 1825); Brewer, Gairdner, and Brodie, eds., *Calendar of Letters and Papers foreign and domestic of the reign of Henry VIII* (18 vols., London, 1862–1902); Challoner, *Memoirs of the Missionary priests and other Catholics that suffered death in England, 1577–1684* (2 vols., Manchester, 1803; Derby, 1843); Collier, *History of the Church of England* (London, 1708–09); Dodd, *Church History of England from 1500 to 1688* (Brussels, 1737–42), and new edition by Tierney (5 vols., London, 1839); Foley, *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus* (7 vols., London, 1880); Gasquet, *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries* (5th ed., London, 1893); Id. and E. Bishop, *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer* (London, 1890); Gillow, *Literary and biographical history of Roman Catholics* (5 vols., London, 1886); Gillow ed., *Haydock Papers* (London, 1888); Hallam, *Constitutional History of England from the accession of Henry VII to death of George II* (3 vols., tenth ed., London, 1863); Haudecœur, *La Conservation providentielle du Catholicisme en Angleterre* (Reims, 1898); Husenbeth, *Notices of the English Colleges and Convents on the Continent after the dissolution of the religious houses in England* (Norwich, 1849); Knox, *Records of the English Catholics under the Penal Laws* (2 vols., London, 1882–4); Law, *A Calendar of the English Martyrs of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries* (London, 1876); Lilly and Wallis, *A Manual of the Law specially affecting Catholics* (London, 1893); Macaulay, *Works* (8 vols., London, 1866); May (Lord Farnborough), *Constitutional History of England, 1760–1860* (2 vols., 2nd ed., London, 1863–5); Milner, *Letters to a Prebendary; ans. to Reflections on Popery by J. Sturges, remarks on the opposition of Hoadlyism to the doctrines of the Church of England* (7th ed., London, 1822); Id., *Supplementary Memoirs of English Catholics* (London, 1820); Id., *The End of Religious Controversy;* Id., *Vindication of the end of religious controversy from exceptions of T. Burgess and R. Grier* (London, 1822); Panzani, *Memoirs, giving account of his agency in England, 1634–6*, tr. by Berington, added, *State of English Catholic Church* (Birmingham, 1793); von Ranke, *Die röm. Päpste in d. letzten vier Jhdtn* (3 vols., 7th ed., Leipzig, 1878); Sander, *Rise of the Anglican Schism (1585)*, with continuation by Rishton, tr., with notes, etc., by Lewis (London, 1877); Simpson, *Edmund Campion* (London, 1867); *Statutes at Large;* Strype, *Annals of Reformation* (London, 1708–09); Ward, *Catholic London a Century ago* (London, 1905).

W. S. Lilly.

English Literature.—It is not unfitting to compare English Literature to a great tree whose far spreading and ever fruitful branches have their roots deep down in the soil of the past. Over such a tree, since the small beginnings of its growth, many vicissitudes of climate have passed; periods of storm, of calm, of sunshine, and of rain; of bitter winds and of genial life-bearing breezes; each change leaving its trace behind in the growth and development of the living plant. It is obvious, then, that to present the complete history of such an organism in a few pages is impossible; all that can be attempted in this article is to describe the main lines of its life.

It should not be forgotten, at the outset, that English literature has been no isolated growth. It has sprung from the common Aryan root, has branched off from the primal stem, and has received, and continues to receive, in the course of its growth, multitudinous influences from other literatures growing up around it, as well as from those of an earlier time. Yet, as Freeman said, "We are ourselves, and not somebody else", and one of the most remarkable things about English literature is its power of assimilation. Latin, French, Italian, Greek, Spanish literatures, to name only a few, have poured their influences upon us, not once only, but time after time leaving their trace, and yet our character, our language, our literature, remain unmistakably English. The ancestors of the English (the Teutonic tribes of Angles, Saxons, Jutes, and some Frisians) spent nearly

one hundred and fifty years (455 to 600) in the conquest of the island from the British tribes who had been abandoned by the Roman colonizers nearly fifty years earlier, in 410. Little by little these fierce and hardy heathen tribes, after much fighting among themselves for the supremacy, settled down, and a slow process of civilization made itself felt among them. Christianity, preached by St. Augustine in 597, bringing in its train education, science, and the arts, was the main factor in this refining change. Such British tribes as had escaped the English destroyer remained for a time almost entirely apart, though they and their literature were afterwards to have no small influence upon the literary development of England.

It is not unlikely that the written literature may have begun as early as the sixth century, but at any rate, by the middle of the seventh century the traces of it are clear in the work of Cædmon, according to the testimony of Bede. Between this date and the Norman Conquest, Anglo-Saxon or Old English writers (recent scholars often prefer the latter term as preserving the idea of continuity) produce a body of literature in prose and verse such as was furnished by no other Teutonic nation either in amount or quality during the same centuries. There are extant at least 20,000 lines of verse, and of prose somewhat more. It is almost certain, too, that a good deal has been lost. The language in which we possess it is English of the oldest form, before any notable foreign admixture had taken place. The verse, with rare exceptions, is of the Teutonic alliterative type. Speaking generally, this body of literature may be classed under two great periods: the first, when the monasteries of Northumbria were the homes of learning, between about 670 and 800, when, according to the legend, Cædmon, a lay brother of Whitby, received the gift of poetry and passed it on to not unworthy followers; and the second, from the time of King Alfred (871), with some spaces of interruption, to the early part of the eleventh century, when literature, driven from the North by the Danes, came South and spoke in prose of the vernacular. In all this work, more particularly in the verse, there is great variety. Growth may be traced and changes of style.

EDMUND SPENSER
After a Painting in the Possession of the Earl of Kinnoull

Putting aside minor verse we come first upon the "Beowulf", a narrative poem which, together with a few other fragments, is all we have of the old English epic. It seems clear that the matter of it is much older than its present form. It is a storehouse of the thinking and feeling of the forefathers of the English people when they were still heathen and before they came to Britain, even though the poem may not have been actually put together in its present form until the ninth or tenth century. It gives a picture of very great interest of certain aspects of the actual life of the people. The English temper of mind at its best, enduring and heroic, pervades it throughout.

But this was before Christianity and the monasteries. After the introduction of the new religion the first important record of literature comes under the patriarchal name of Cædmon. It is clear from recent research that Cædmon himself only wrote a very small portion of the so-called Cædmonian poems, but the story of his vision, given by Bede, even if only legend, testifies clearly that the first poetry produced in England began among the people and in religion. The chief interest of the work lies, not in the actual subject-matter, Scriptural paraphrase, but in the way the matter is treated, a Teutonic aspect being frequently given to the narrative. The craving for freedom, the exultation in war, the longing for moral goodness, the respect for women, all these and many other things come out in the rendering of the "Fall of the Angels", the "Temptation of Man", and elsewhere. It is quite clear that several hands have worked at the Cædmonian poems, but in the next great group, a hundred years later, we come upon one individual poet who has signed at least four poems with his name, Cynewulf, and he insists upon our knowing him as the Ancient Mariner constrained the Wedding Guest. He reveals his personality, he becomes real to us. His poems are religious, and perhaps the finest is the "Christ". He is a poet of high order. Among the rest of Old English poetry the elegies and the war poems stand out as the most original.

Old English prose, if we except St. Bede's lost translation of St. John's Gospel, groups itself round two names, those of Alfred and Ælfric. Alfred (849–901) was eager for his people's education, and his literary work consists chiefly of translations of important books of his time:—Gregory the Great's "Pastoral Care", Orosius's "History of the World", Boethius's "Consolation of Philosophy", and (probably done under his superintendence) Bede's "Ecclesiastical History" and Bishop Werfrith's "Dialogues" To some of these he added prefaces and notes in simple, unaffected English, which make us realize his remarkable and lovable character, both as man and king.

Many years after, Ælfric (c. 955–1025), Abbot of Eynsham, a much more cultivated scholar, and a more finished, though not more attractive, prose writer than Alfred, put forth volumes of homilies, saints' lives, translations of books of the Old Testament, and other works, which were greatly and justly prized by his hearers and readers.

The "Old English Chronicle", of which there are seven MSS., a record of events in England from the sixth century to 1154, was meanwhile being written in the monasteries, undisturbed by the many changes passing over England. It is almost certain that Alfred encouraged this work and set it on a surer foundation, perhaps himself adding portions of the record where it concerned his own reign. One other piece of prose literature must be mentioned. In Wulfstan's "Address to the English", with its vivid indignation at the sufferings of the people from the Danes, the author is often as impassioned as an English reformer might be over the abuses of present-day society. It brings us up in date to the last half-century before the Norman Conquest.

The Norman Conquest is as important in the history of English literature as in that of England's political

and social life. It brought a new and invigorating influence to bear upon the English genius, though in the immediate present of the eleventh century it seemed a crushing disaster for the nation. For nearly one hundred and fifty years the race, the language, and the literature of the people were apparently stifled. It seemed as if everything became Norman-French. But as long as the down-trodden English kept life in them the springs of poetry and art could not dry up; and though Robert of Gloucester says that only "low men" held to English at this time, yet there were a good many of these "low men", and we have proof that the native population had still their songs and their wandering bards, while in certain of the monasteries the monks went on chronicling events in their mother tongue much as they had done when a Saxon king had ruled England. The continuity of native verse and prose was never really broken, and just as the English race was at last to absorb its foreign conquerors, and to gain infinitely more than it had suffered from them, so English language and literature were by the same means to be enriched and ennobled to an extent no one then looking on could have dreamed of.



WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE
After the So-called "Chandos" Portrait, National Portrait Gallery, London

Yet at first literature was apparently silenced, and until the beginning of the thirteenth century there is no writing of much importance except the "Old English Chronicle", which ends in 1154. There was, of course, writing in Latin and in French, and the French was even looked upon by some as likely to be more enduring than the Latin. But the Latin writing was in reality no enemy to English; it was the tongue, then as now, of the Church, and it was the medium for communication between scholars and the language of nearly all books of scholarship. The native work, however, never quite disappearing, revives unmistakably at the beginning of the thirteenth century, and between that date and the death of Chaucer in 1400 there is produced a great mass of literature of endless variety but of varying value.

We come then to the Middle Ages, called "of Faith"; the age of the Crusades, "of cathedrals, tournaments, old coloured glass, and other splendid things" —the age to which, in times of dryness, artists, lovers of romance, as well as pious souls of all kinds, have often looked back and have drawn from it fresh inspiration. It has stimulated in modern times new and noble movements in art and in poetry, and its power of inspiration is not yet exhausted. It was an age of contrasts, of faith and of unbelief, of extraordinary saintliness and of strange wickedness, of reverence and of ribaldry. It was the great Catholic age, when the sacred robe of the Church, spotted though it might be in places through human frailty, was still unrent, whole, and she herself was everywhere acknowledged in Europe as the Divinely appointed mother of men. The history of English literature from the beginning of its revival in the thirteenth century is first that of transition (up to about 1250), then of development for about eighty years, in which the work is largely anonymous, finally, a period of achievement, the second half of the fourteenth century, in which individual writers of power begin to emerge, and among them one supreme artist, Geoffrey Chaucer. We trace, too, during these ages the rise of the drama in the miracle- and morality-plays.

On the threshold of the revival stand two works: "The Brut" (1205), a poem of 30,000 lines concerning the history of Britain, written by Layamon, a patriotic English priest of Worcester; full of more or less historical stories, partly translated from French sources and written in an alliterative metre; and it gives us the first account in English of King Arthur, the British hero. The second, a religious work, "The Ormulum", a series of metrical homilies upon the daily Gospels of the Church, was written by Ormin, an Augustinian canon. After this the stream of English literature is continued in poems of great variety, of which many are lyrics. In "The Owl and the Nightingale", a delightful poem standing at the end of this "transition period", we have a happy combination of old and new elements which have already begun to form a fresh native poetry. Nor had prose been idle; one of the most interesting books of the time is the "Ancren Riwle" (q.v.), a series of exhortations on their rule for a community of Dorsetshire nuns.

Passing on over these fifty years we are met by a further outpouring of literary work, abundant and various, if not remarkably original, poetry always taking the chief place. The main kinds of literature in this period of quick development are romances; tales; religious works (legends of saints, treatises and homilies on morality and religion); the great book called "Cursor Mundi"; historical writings; lyrics of love and religion, and songs of political and social life. In all this, French influence is very strong, but there gradually appear among it English elements which are now beginning to hold their own. The romances concerned with the adventures of well-known heroes are the most prominent among all this literature, and these in some cases are translated directly from the French, though never without English touches. The religious work of this time is edifying, but the prose homilies and treatises are sometimes very long and commonplace. Yet a simple faith and tender piety, together with a most sane sense of humour and some imagination, make the religious writings not unfrequently attractive, even from the literary point of view. But regarded as literature, the lyrics of the thirteenth century are perhaps the most remarkable. They are native, and though they bear the marks of artistic culture in their matter, they remind us more of the country than the town. There is a real though un-self-conscious love of nature in them, and the promise of that peculiar and fine quality of the later English lyric which is one of the glories of our literature. Nature, love, and religion are the inspiration of these little medieval poems.

This multitudinous work formed a discipline and preparation, and resulted in the achievements of the latter half of the century. The period 1360 to 1400 is marked by a strong reassertion of the national spirit, and in literature there is a curious reappearance of the Old English alliterative verse after 300 years of apparent neglect. Amongst other poems in this metre there are four by an anonymous writer of high

poetic power, one of them, "The Pearl", of great beauty and of deep religious feeling. To this alliterative class belongs too the well-known "Piers the Plowman". Chaucer's work, coming almost at the same time, has to some extent overshadowed this poem, but as a picture of the society and ideals of the time it forms a complement to Chaucer's "Canterbury Tales". In "Piers the Plowman" we have that grave outlook upon life which marks the English character at its best, carried almost to excess. The author (or authors, we ought now to say, for it has been recently proved that at least three writers must have had a hand in its making) looks upon the society of his time as a "realist". He describes the world almost entirely on its dark side, and though the remedies he offers are good ("Love is the physician of Life"), and though he never altogether loses his belief in a Divine over-ruling order, yet there is an accent of uncertainty and sometimes of despair in his voice.

FRANCIS BACON
After Painting by Paul van Somer

Chaucer (1340–1400), on the other hand, does not care for problems of life or dark thinking. His picture of society is, on the whole, from its bright side, when men are out on holiday, and when over-seriousness would seem out of place. Poetically, and in its structure, "Piers the Plowman" is much below Chaucer's work, but its forcefulness, its pathos, its sincerity, its grim humour, its realistic descriptiveness, and its dramatic moments make it a great poem. Chaucer's work marks the full flowering of English literature in the Middle Ages, and it was he who first raised English poetry to a European position. It is the custom of historians of literature to divide the literary life of Chaucer into a French, an Italian, and an English period, according as his work was influenced by the manner of each national literature. This division represents a fact if it be remembered that he carried on, all through his career, certain of the lessons he had learned from the foreign source in the earlier time. There is little doubt that the impulse to write verse came to Chaucer from France. Old English literature was practically unknown to him, but he was saturated with French poetry, for the literature of France was then, outside the classics, the most influential in Europe. Among many shorter poems of this early time, the very first of which is a hymn to the Blessed Virgin, the translation (in part) of the long French allegorical poem of the "Romance of the Rose", and his original and most interesting elegy on the "Death of Blanche the Duchess", are the most important. It is, however, after he has come upon the literature of Italy—Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio—that his true genius begins to show itself. "Troilus and Cressida", "The Parlement of Foules", "The House of Fame", and "The Legend of Good Women" (the two last unfinished), as well as some of the "Canterbury Tales", belong to this time. They show him as a true artist, feeling his way through experiment to greater perfection of work and developing his unique sense of humour. Then, in the later years of his life, he strikes upon the fruitful idea of the Canterbury pilgrimage as a framework in which to show the full power of his art in his picture of the life of his own, and, to some extent of all, time; and into this frame he fitted tales he had already written, as well as new ones. But, of it all, nothing exceeds the power and truth of the "Prologue" to the "Tales". His picture of life and the commentary upon it comes straight out of his own observation and character. As he saw men so he fearlessly portrays them, the good, the bad, the indifferent. A few of his tales reflect the coarseness of the time, and it is just possible that the apology placed at the end of the MS. of "The Parson's Tale" was written by himself at the close of his life. But, however that may be, over all he writes he throws his own sunny humour and wide charity, and in this as in the width of his sympathies he is not unworthy to be named with Shakespeare. He is the one supreme literary artist before Spenser, and the best brief summary of him and his work is given in that proverb quoted by Dryden in his criticism of Chaucer, "Here is God's plenty". The name of John Gower (1330–1408) is linked by custom with that of Chaucer, but we recognize now what his contemporaries did not, that Gower's lengthy books in verse are the work rather of an expert journeyman than of a genius. But we may legitimately class together the two writers in their influence on the language. Both being widely read, they helped to make the East Midland dialect in which they wrote the literary language of England, and by their choice or rejection of French words welded the language into greater stability and unity. The English language, at the end of the fourteenth century, had begun to assume nearly that modern form we know. People, language, and literature had now become wholly English.

After reviewing this brilliant half-century of poetry, the prose of the same time seems a poor matter. There is no great progress to record, nothing really original of importance was written, and the style follows Latin models rather than the simpler natural manner of the Old English prose. Chaucer wrote prose which in its mediocrity is a curious contrast to his poetry. Sir John Mandeville's "Travels" was a translation of an amusing book, and Wyclif's translation or paraphrase of the Vulgate (in which, however, several other hands than his own had a share), together with his vigorous but heretical tracts and sermons, form the chief prose work of this time.

After the death of Chaucer, poetry declined in quality with strange swiftness. For the next one hundred and fifty years there is no great poet; the art of poetry, chiefly owing to the scarcity of native poetical genius, but also partly to the swift changes the language was undergoing and to the carelessness of those who attempted verse, ceased to be finely exercised. The tradition of Chaucer almost disappeared. In the earlier part of the fifteenth century Lydgate (1370?–1451?) and Hoccleve (1370–1450?) tried to follow in the footsteps of the master they revered, but frankly recognized their own failure. Their voluminous and mediocre work, especially Lydgate's, is not without

interest to the student, but certain anonymous poets, such as the authors of "The Flower and the Leaf" and "London Lickpenny" (formerly given to Lydgate), succeeded better than they, and the latter poem shows that Chaucer's power of social satire had not disappeared. Satire, as always in the decline after a rich imaginative period of verse, came to the front as subject-matter for verse, and later in the century the scathing verse of John Skelton (1460?–1529), though poor as art, is of interest in the light it throws upon the social life of the times. This poet and Stephen Hawes (d. 1523?), who tried in the "Pastime of Pleasure" to revive the old allegorical style, are the only English names of any note in verse in the latter part of the century. In Scotland, however, the followers of Chaucer, of whom the chief were King James I, Dunbar, Henryson, and Gawain Douglas, were producing and continued to produce poetry worthy of immortality

Fifteenth-century prose was less barren than the poetry of the age. Since the Conquest, nearly all serious subject-matter, with few exceptions, had been written of in Latin, but with the invention of printing, and as the power to read and write spread downwards, English prose became more widely recognized as a medium for the treatment of many varied as well as more popular kinds of matter. Four names—Pecock, Fortescue, Caxton, Malory—are recognized as leaders of this movement, but out of their work only Sir Thomas Malory's has become classic. His "Morte D'Arthur", which draws together as many stories and series of stories about King Arthur as he could lay hands upon, is a work of genius, and remains a living book. Its matter is of great intrinsic value and interest, but it is the beauty of its strange childlike style, its un-self-conscious appreciation of lovely and noble things in man and nature, and its underlying religious mysticism, which make it a book of the first order.

JOHN MILTON
After Painting by Pieter van der Plas,
National Portrait Gallery, London

The medieval drama, which grew up during these centuries, was, with one or two exceptions, not the work of poets or literary artists, yet it was one of the most educative influences of the time. Beginning in connexion with the liturgy of the Church, there gradually developed a whole cycle of religious plays, showing forth the history of the world from the Creation to the Last Judgment. These, acted in a series, in public places of the towns, at certain great church festivals, provided as much instruction as amusement. There is no doubt that, in spite of passages in them which may now seem to us materialistic or irreverent, these simple and rude dramatic representations, both miracle-plays and the later developed moralities, pressed home great religious truths upon the people. From the point of view of the development of drama, we may say that English tragedy and comedy have, at least to some extent, their roots in these crude plays in doggerel verse.

Leaving the Middle Ages behind us, we come now to the threshold of the most fateful epoch in the history of the English people—the disruption of the Church, or the so-called "Reformation". This was preceded and accompanied by the earlier movement called the "Renaissance", which, having opened up fresh branches of classical learning, more especially that of Greek poetry and philosophy, awakened and stimulated the human mind both to good and to evil. In England the "New Learning" movement, in the hands of men like More and Colet tended to enlightenment and true learning. The "Utopia" of Sir Thomas More, a book of the noblest ideals, represents its spirit at the best. But the effect of the Renaissance on the manners and morals of those Englishmen who came back imbued with its intoxication from Italy, was much lamented by contemporary writers, as we find in Ascham's "Schoolmaster". Yet it is to this acquaintance with Italy and its literature that we owe the revival of English poetry after its long relapse since the death of Chaucer. In the work of Sir Thomas Wyatt and of the Earl of Surrey, young men who had studied and felt the beauty and power of the great Italian poets, we discover a new beginning, a new poetic art. It was yet uncertain of itself, experimental, hesitating, and not engaged with deep or very noble subject-matter, but, while observing certain common laws of scansion and diction which the last one hundred years had ignored, attempted new and better melodies.

The publication of Tottel's "Miscellany" in 1557, which contains the work of these two poets, marks an epoch in literature. It set up a standard of poetic art below which no future work could sink. The literary world of that age grew full of expectation looking for a new poet who should embody still more fully the poetic ideals of the time.

The new poet came in Edmund Spenser (1552–1599). Seldom has a young writer been so immediately recognized and acclaimed by the accredited literary judges of his own time as Spenser was. And posterity has agreed with their judgment. He forms the second great landmark in English poetry after Chaucer, from whom he received inspiration. He had been bred in the stimulating atmosphere of the new learning and was greatly influenced by classic and Italian literature, but he also appreciated earlier English literature, and the only master he openly acknowledged was Chaucer. Spenser's poetry throughout is of wonderful beauty in its art, and is marked by nobility of aim, purity of spirit, and reverence for religion. His "minor poems" are many, and as Professor Saintsbury remarks, would be "major poems" for any smaller poet. He was, for example, a satirist of no mean order and a sonneteer, but in the general judgment, and rightly, Spenser is the poet of the "Faerie Queene". All his special powers are shown there, and all his character, one might almost say all his history. The large allegorical ground-plan of the "Faerie Queene", not half completed, interesting as it is, does not form the great attraction of the poem. That lies in the pure and appealing beauty of the versification, in the varied and glorious description, often minutely detailed, in the wealth of imagination, and in the impassioned love of everything beautiful which enthrals the reader as it did the poet. That there are flaws in the poem goes without saying, more especially as Spenser died leaving it half finished.

The complete plan of the work cannot be gathered from the poem itself. Spenser's letter to Sir Walter Raleigh, prefixed to all editions, is necessary to make it clear. "The centre falls outside the circle." For Catholics, too, the historical allegory is seriously marred by the anti-Catholic bias of the poet's time.

In places, the Church is bitterly assailed, though in other passages Spenser clearly deprecates the desecration of monasteries, churches, altars, and images as the work of the "Blatant Beast of Calumny". Nor does he give by any means undiluted approval to the Anglican Church or the Puritans. Modern criticism, however, places little emphasis upon any portion of the historical allegory, regarding it as an antiquated hindrance rather than a living help to the true appreciation of the poem. The more purely spiritual elements of the allegory, such as the struggles of the human will against evil, aided by Divine power, are those which are valued by discerning readers. Considered in its essential aspect, the "Faerie Queene" is "the poem of the noble powers of the human soul struggling towards union with God". Spenser holds the supreme place among a multitude of other poets of as real though of less genius than his in the sixteenth century, and the work of these, outside the drama, is perhaps seen at its best in the song and the sonnet, two forms which had now an extraordinary vogue. Nearly a dozen anthologies of Elizabethan lyrics, of which the finest is England's "Helicon" (1600), remain to show us the sweetness, beauty, and rarity of these songs. The sonnets, one of the new Italian poetic forms, introduced by Surrey and Wyatt, are less original, and many of them are translations from foreign sources, but those of Sidney and Shakespeare, at least, stand out by their exceptional force and beauty.

JOSEPH ADDISON
After Painting by Sir Godfrey Kneller

Among the many lesser poets of the time Michael Drayton (1563–1631) has been singled out as especially representative of the general character of Elizabethan poetical genius. He wrote every sort of poetry that was the fashion except moral allegory. His work deserves more notice than is often given to it, and his name is sometimes only associated with his long historical poem of the "Polyolbion". This type of poetry reflects the patriotism of the age, and Samuel Daniel and William Warner, both poets of some genius, also worked at it. The huge "Mirror for Magistrates", begun in 1555, and not in its final edition until James I's reign, had encouraged this kind of verse. Poetry of an argumentative and philosophic type was produced towards the end of the century, but very little of value that was religious, except the work of Robert Southwell. This heroic young Jesuit and martyr wrote with a high object: to show to the brilliant young poets of his time, whose love poems often expressed unworthy passion, "how well verse and virtue sort together". And he did this by using the literary manner of the age, "weaving", as he himself says, "a new web in their old loom". His book had a distinct influence on contemporary and later poetry, touching even Ben Jonson and perhaps Milton himself. Its quaintness of wit (allying it somewhat to the "metaphysical" school of the next generation) are shot through with warm human feeling which makes its direct appeal to the reader. And sincerity is the very note of it all.

But it is, of course, in the drama that we find all the well-known poets—with the one exception of Spenser—putting forth their greatest force. The sudden rise of the drama in the latter half of the sixteenth century is the most remarkable phenomenon of this supremely remarkable literary age. It has never been fully accounted for. Many of the contemporary records concerning plays and the theatre have undoubtedly been lost, so that we have to form our own judgment of Elizabethan dramatic literature and its causes upon, comparatively speaking, insufficient grounds. Out of some 2000 plays known to have been acted, only about 500 exist, as far as we know, and discoveries of new contemporary testimony or work might revolutionize our judgment on the history of Elizabethan drama. However that may be, the facts, as we have them, are that in the earlier half of the sixteenth century we find scarcely any dramatic work that would enable us to foresee the rise of the great romantic drama. Miracle-plays were acted up to 1579, but clearly no great development could come from these, and still less, perhaps, from the scholarly movement towards a so-called classical drama, imitations of the Latin comedies of Plautus and Terence, such as "Ralph Roister Doister", named the "first English comedy", or of the dramas of Seneca, as in "Gorboduc", the "first English tragedy". There was also a popular tragi-comic drama of a somewhat rude kind (such as Shakespeare travestied in the play of "Pyramus and Thisbe" in the "Midsummer Night's Dream"), but this was no more prophetic than the others. Then suddenly there appear between 1580 and 1590 plays with life, invention, and imagination in them, often faulty enough, but living. The predecessors of Shakespeare, Peele, Greene, Kyd, and others, but most of all that wild and poetic genius, Marlowe, "whose raptures were all air and fire", and who practically created our dramatic blank verse, prepare the way for Shakespeare. Rejecting, gradually, by a sort of instinct, those elements in the drama of the past that were alien to the English genius, they struck out, little by little, the now well-known type of Elizabethan romantic drama which in Shakespeare's hands was to attain its highest. And Shakespeare's genius made of it not only a vehicle for the expression of Elizabethan ideals of drama and of life, but a mouthpiece of humanity itself.

Shakespeare belongs not to England but to the whole world, and most modern nations have vied with each other in acute and wondering appreciation of his genius. A mass of critical literature has grown up round his name, discussing problems literary, artistic, personal, of every kind, and continues to grow. Shakespeare and his work furnish inexhaustible matter for meditation upon almost every human interest and problem. After his time there are some fine dramatists, but none can approach him in completeness and height of genius. Ben Jonson, Chapman, Webster, Ford, Massinger, and Shirley—the two last Catholic converts—with others, carry on the line of dramatic writing with genius, skill, and energy, but the glory gradually departs until one is led to think that if the theatres had not been closed in 1640 on account of

the civil war they would have ceased of themselves for want of good plays. Not only had the technical skill in versification, dialogue, and plot decayed, but the moral tone had so much degenerated that most of the hard charges brought against the drama by the Puritans at this time seem well justified.

When we turn to Elizabethan prose we find it a much inferior and less practised form of art than verse. No standard of good prose towards which writers might aim was recognized, and the masterpieces of the Elizabethan age are few. Hooker's "Ecclesiastical Polity" has rightly, by its weighty argument and its grave eloquence, won a place among classics. Lyly in his two volumes of "Euphues" was the first, perhaps, to treat prose as equally worthy with poetry of artistic elaboration, and his book, a medley of story-telling and moralizing, often most excellent as well as interesting in its ethical musing, instituted a fashion of speech and writing from which for some years few writers stood aloof. Sir Philip Sidney's "Arcadia", a long pastoral romance of sentiment, however, broke the spell and in its turn created a vogue. The novels of this time follow the "Euphues" or the "Arcadia" in most examples, but there is also a third type in the work of Nash, the novel of wild and reckless adventure, which was afterwards to become famous in the greater work of Smollett. Criticism of poetry, history, often in the form of chronicles, geography, and adventure, such as in Hakluyt's collection of "Voyages", together with innumerable translations from classical and modern authors, were some of the matters treated in prose. In the novel, as in the drama, the foreign influences, especially those of Spain and Italy, are easy to trace. Though not of the first order of art, the Elizabethan prose is yet most attractive, for it reflects the varied interests and the complex character of the strange and wonderful time of the sixteenth century, and it exhibits in their early stages certain forms of literature, such as criticism and the novel, which were afterwards to develop into orders of the first importance. It is scarcely needful to say that Catholics, of necessity, in this epoch, for them, of disaster and persecution, took little part in the great output of literature.

SAMUEL JOHNSON
After Painting by John Opie

From one point of view the history of English poetry would seem to be a record of action and reaction, of a struggle between one type of poetry and another, between that in which the matter delivered is all important, and that where correctness of form is the chief end at which the poets aim—between, in fact, the romantic and the classical schools. This general trend may be most clearly seen in the work of the crowd of secondary poets in any age, but the few who excel will be found to combine and reconcile in themselves, more or less, the opposing elements, though, naturally, both small and great poets will exhibit some individual bias, however slight, towards one type of work or another. This statement is practically true of the seventeenth century. In the very heart of the romantic poetry of the immediate successors of the Elizabethans, there arose, in the early years of the century, a few young men who began to write verse of another kind altogether, whose work was not developed to its full meaning, however, until Dryden took it up. Meanwhile, one matchless poet, John Milton, living through the greater part of the century, went his own way ("his soul was like a star and dwelt apart"), taking little notice of prevailing types or subject-matter, fusing romantic and classical elements into one superb kind of work that we can find no name for but "Miltonic".

Before looking in any detail at seventeenth-century verse, it is well to glance at the general character of the age. It is a contrast to that which had preceded it. The Elizabethan time had been exuberant almost to intoxication, rejoicing in the great range of possibilities for human life that new knowledge, exploration, and learning seemed to open out before it. But over this mood at the end of the century there passed a change. Questioning succeeded the brilliant joy in things as they had appeared; self-consciousness followed the almost impersonal delight in life; the very foundations of religion, politics, and social life were called up for investigation. There had in reality always been a good deal of unrest beneath the surface, even after the settlement of these matters attempted and apparently in part accomplished by Elizabeth. Now the unrest increased, and a sceptical spirit, light or sad, according to the author's temperament, pervades much of the most capable writing. At the same time there are religious writers who express both in prose and verse the best spirit of the Anglican Church when under the sway of Archbishop Laud, and now there rises also to its full height the great Puritan movement (already, however, split up into a growing number of sects), strongly and narrowly affirmative of certain views concerning Divine and human things, passing oftener than not into intolerance and wild fanaticism. Milton, on the whole, represents this movement at its best, though its weaknesses may be discovered, especially in his prose work, even in him.

At the beginning of the reign of James I we find the group of poets whose inspiration was Spenser, amongst whom the chief are the two Fletchers, William Browne, and George Wither. All have a sweetness and fullness in their work which links them to the Elizabethans. Passing on to the reign of Charles I, we are struck by a more widely spread order of poets, men who, at their best, are all more or less touched by the desire to find behind material objects an imaginative idea, "the search for the after-sense", and who in trying to express that which they thought they found used an over-abundance of imagery, sometimes beautiful, but often pedantic and fantastic to the point of absurdity. To these Dr. Johnson gave the name of "metaphysical", and to see them at their worst one should look at his quotations from them in his "Life of Cowley". The movement was not confined to England; Italy, France, and Spain had felt it earlier. John Donne (whose verse belongs in date to the reign of Elizabeth) is reckoned as the founder of this school in England. Herrick and the amourists known as "Cavalier Lyrists" form one group in it, and Crashaw, Herbert, and Vaughan, religious poets, together with Herrick, are the only ones whose work has secured immortality. Crashaw, a fervent Catholic convert, whose religious verses are often very beautiful, shows in a marked degree the great strength and the great weakness of this school. Professor Saintsbury, the most discerning critic of this poetical group, has said that if Crashaw "could but have kept himself at

his best he would have been the greatest of English poets". Of another Catholic poet, William Habington, Crashaw's contemporary, but less than he, though occasionally writing fine passages, the same critic remarks that he is "creditably distinguished" from too many others "by a very strict and remarkable decency of thought and language".

But this was poetry which could not develop; it was a kind of second crop from the Elizabethan field, and it gradually withered away. Some time before its end, certain young poets, several of whom had been in France, exiled with the Queen, Henrietta Maria, and had caught a new spirit, turned to fresh ways of verse. Edmund Waller (1605–1687) led the way as early as 1620. Denham, Cowley, and Davenant (a Catholic and romantic, brought up in the house of Lord Brooke, Sir Philip Sidney's friend) followed him in varying degrees. These young poets initiated a change of far-reaching effect. In their hands poetry took on another aspect. It discarded nearly all forms of metre except the heroic couplet, refused to use any but rather commonplace imagery, and turning away from all passionate emotion, tended to treat of subjects which belonged to the intellect rather than to imagination or feeling. Satire or didactic poetry gradually usurped almost the whole field. But this was not accomplished in full until Dryden came. It was he who stamped this school with its leading marks, and gave the heroic couplet its "long resounding march and energy divine". Yet the restricted and prosaic subject-matter of this verse—satiric, didactic, and argumentative work on religion ("The Hind and the Panther" was written in the cause of the Church) and politics—has made some critics deny to it, unjustly, the name of poetry. It is poetry of a certain restricted kind.

SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE
After Painting by Washington Allston

John Dryden (1631–1700), had he lived in a time more favourable to imaginative work, would have written verse more purely poetic. He had about him something of the amplitude, inventiveness, and freedom of the Elizabethans, and the history of his poetic development shows him passing from stage to stage of excellence. Though he was the crown and chief of the so-called "classical school", he was indeed deeply tinged with romantic feeling, and he himself knew and acknowledged that poetry was capable of a higher flight and wider range than it had ever taken in his own day. He was, moreover, a man of many powers. He was a prolific dramatist, and his critical writings have made an epoch in the history of English prose. In the course of his life he changed his politics and his religion; and though doubts have been cast upon his good faith in this respect, the most recent criticism is of opinion that he had nothing but spiritual ends to gain by his conversion to Catholicism. It is unfortunate that we cannot exonerate him as an author from the charge of that sensuality which mars a good deal of his dramatic writing—it is no better and sometimes worse than the immoral though brilliantly witty drama of his time. He himself at the close of his life wrote a full apology for this trait in his work.

Dryden's lines on Milton show the exalted estimate he had formed of his greater and earlier contemporary, and time has proved the general truth of it. The poetry of Milton (1608–1674) has become an English classic, and "Paradise Lost" has been translated into many tongues. It is regarded as the one great epic in English, and its fame has somewhat overshadowed that of Milton's earlier work—"L'Allegro", "Il Penseroso", "Comus", and "Lycidas"—poems within their own limits as perfect as anything he ever did. It is when we turn to his prose that we realize, from the immeasurable difference between it and his verse, how comparatively low the received standard of prose must have been. "Milton, the great architect of the paragraph and the sentence in verse, seems to be utterly ignorant of the laws of both in prose, or at least utterly incapable or careless of obeying those laws." Yet it contains some splendid passages more like poetry than prose, but the controversial matter which is the subject of most of it—to say nothing of its often violent manner—is scarcely interesting to the present generation. Prose in the seventeenth century had an eventful history, and in spite of the lack of a high common standard, produced some masterpieces. At the beginning of it there is the weighty work of Sir Francis Bacon (1561–1626), embracing in many volumes matters of natural science, philosophy, history, ethics, worldly wisdom, even fiction, and in the "Essays" and the "Advancement of Learning" especially, adding to English classics. Lord Clarendon's "History" presents a noble gallery of portraits; there is Sir Thomas Browne (accounted by his enthusiastic admirers one of the greatest prose writers in all the range of English), the finest of the rhetorical, fantastic, and wholly delightful set of writers who arose at this time, treating in a semi-speculative fashion a wide, various range of subject-matter. A number of religious and devotional works appear, among which the sermons of Jeremy Taylor stand high, and John Bunyan in "The Pilgrim's Progress" produced a masterpiece of English. Nor must we forget the Authorized Version of the Bible, in 1611—a work of a wonderful prose style, eclectic, drawn from many sources, and yet having the appearance of absolute naturalness and simplicity. Preaching was a notable feature of the time, and the very long sermons of Tillotson, Barrow, Stillingfleet, and others make good literature. Dryden claimed Archbishop Tillotson as his master in prose, and it is when we come to Dryden's own work in the latter half of the century that we find prose beginning to take its place as "the other harmony" of verbal artistic expression. On the whole, it is the mark of Restoration prose to become conversational, and we may say that modern prose, easy, flexible, and fitted for general use, arose in Dryden's critical prefaces.

Dryden died in 1700, and with the opening of the eighteenth century we pass into an age of strongly marked characteristics. The Revolution by which the Stuart dynasty was displaced had been accomplished, involving, naturally, great changes in the fortunes of religious and political life, particularly disastrous to the Catholic Faith in England. In its earlier stages the century is filled by the party strife of Whigs and Tories, and by the religious movements known as Methodism and Deism—two strange opposites. In the upper classes there was a general lowering of spiritual and emotional temperature—to be enthusiastic was "bad form"—and religion and literature equally suffered. The growing middle class seems to some extent to have escaped this tepidity, and the preaching of Methodism touched their hearts.

The "Church of England", now the State "established" Church, was, however, in a state of spiritual poverty—many of her best clergy having left her for conscience' sake at the time of the Act of Uniformity. As far as the current stream of poetry was concerned, it had become an affair of a circle of leisured and fashionable people. A great admiration prevailed for the classics and classical principles, seen generally through the eyes of French critics.

The century opened badly for literature. For years there had not been such a barren literary time. Dryden had just died, and though much verse was being written, it was mostly poor. In prose, there were few men of any mark. The only work showing power was the drama, in the brilliant and unmoral comedies of Congreve, Vanburgh, and Farquhar. But within ten years there was a remarkable change. Pope came to the front in verse, and for many years poetry was to be almost synonymous with his name. In prose there was a galaxy of genius, Swift (1667–1746), Addison (1672–1719), Steele (1671–1726), Berkeley (1685–1753), to mention only a few, in whose hands modern prose—mature, varied, capable, combining, when at its best, strength, sweetness, grace, and magnificence—becomes henceforth a secure possession of English literature. But this was not all at once. Prose had first to go through a discipline from the hands not only of writers just mentioned, together with the great novelists in the first half of the century, but from Dr. Johnson and those who followed him, especially the historians Gibbon and Robertson. It thus took on a certain formality and stateliness not known before.

Percy Bysshe Shelley
After Painting by Amelia Curran at Biscombe

Pope and Johnson are the two names that dominate almost tyrannically the first and second half respectively of the eighteenth century. Most of the elements of his age are more or less represented in the work of Alexander Pope (1688–1744), though, as a Catholic, his religious sympathies lay in another direction than those of his day. His first important poem, the "Essay on Criticism", lays down rules for the guidance of critics according to the prevalent classical ideals; his "Rape of the Lock", perhaps his best poem, gives a brilliant and witty picture of the high society of his time; his translation of Homer is a Greek story told in an eighteenth-century manner; his "Essay on Man" is a versifying of Shaftesbury's philosophy; and the "Essays and Epistles" and the "Dunciad" are didactic and satiric. Dryden and Pope share between them the chief honours of English satire. Pope's picture of Atticus (Addison) and Dryden's of Zimri (Buckingham) have no equals in our satiric literature. The subject-matter of Pope's poetry may sometimes fail to interest us, but the versification always claims attention. Pope refined and polished and super-refined the heroic couplet until it became the most perfect instrument for satiric verse. It has not the original vigour and variety of Dryden's couplet, but it has a finer finish and a more subtle thrust.

The greatest strength of literature, however, at this time went into prose, and the prose writers contemporary with Pope are men of genius, with Swift by far the greatest of them. His "Tale of a Tub" and "Gulliver's Travels"—to mention only the two greatest of his writings—show a power of intellect and imagination worthy to be employed upon much finer subject-matter. The first part of "Gulliver's Travels" finds him, perhaps, at his happiest, and is less marred by the bitter rage against men and life, and the touches of foulness, which spoil so much of his work. He is, too, one of the great humourists, and his style is marked by sincerity, clearness, force, flexibility, and sometimes grace.

But the greatest work in prose, on the whole, was done by Addison and Steele in the essays of "The Tatler" and "The Spectator". They were men of less genius than Swift, but who looked at life humanly and wished to add to men's peace and happiness. They expressed with wit, kindliness, and literary skill their views and their intentions. Their definite aim was to bring together the opposing parties in politics and religion by showing them how much of life and interests they possessed in common, and by gentle raillery and well-bred exhortation, to "rub off their corners". They did accomplish much of this; everybody, regardless of politics, read the Essays, which came out several times a week, or daily, and every one enjoyed and talked them over. Polite literature by this means permeated and helped to refine the great and growing middle class.

Another form of prose which arises now, and was destined to even a much greater future than the essay, was the novel. The modern novel is born with the work of Richardson and Fielding—the work of the one viewing things from an emotional standpoint, that of the other giving a more comprehensive and objective picture of life. Richardson wrote out of his own native feeling and somewhat restricted experience; Fielding, equally original, was largely and beneficially influenced by Cervantes and the novel of Spain. Both are men of genius, whose work grips the reader, but their offences against good taste and morality will always prevent their becoming household companions as Scott and Dickens have become. Smollett and Sterne continue the life of the novel, and Goldsmith, in his masterpiece, "The Vicar of Wakefield", has earned the gratitude of all readers. Biography, philosophy, and history have a large and distinguished place in the prose of this time. Samuel Johnson (1709–1784) accomplished many kinds of literature. His earliest attempt as well as his latest is biography; of essays he wrote many, but his genius is not best suited to that form, and the work is too often ponderous and mannered; novel and ethical treatise are combined in the delightful pages of "Rasselas". His great dictionary is philology with an autobiographical flavour; his lives of the poets are partly biographical, but mainly critical, while criticism fills a good space in his edition of Shakespeare. But it is not only the range and value of all this work which makes it so attractive, but—in spite of its limitations—the sincere, strong, kindly character that animates every line of it.

"That fellow calls forth all my powers", said Johnson of Burke. Edmund Burke (1729–1797) is now looked upon as England's greatest political philosopher, and his writings belong in subject-matter to history and politics, rather than to literature. Their style, however, rich, imaginative, full of energy, varied to suit its theme, moving among worlds of knowledge, and selecting just the right word and illustration in each place, puts him among the great liter-

ary writers of the century. Both Johnson and Burke are touched with the romantic spirit, but Johnson would have vigorously repudiated any charge of romanticism in his work, and indeed he stood as a great bulwark against the flood of new thought and feeling which, becoming apparent after the death of Pope, had been rising little by little, especially in poetry, ever since the twenties. The great romantic movement, so difficult to define, and yet so easy to trace, becomes the supreme point of interest for the literary historian in the later eighteenth century. There is no class of poetry written during this time but stands in some relation to it, and its influence, as we have said, may be seen, though less clearly, in many of the prose writings.

This movement was for the widening and deepening of literature. New fields of subject-matter were taken in hand, and the treatment of these gradually became more imaginative and emotional than it had been since the Elizabethan age. Nature and human life, after suffering from somewhat frigid treatment at the hands of the classical school, seemed to unstiffen and to become warm, living, and natural with the romantic writers. But this was a very gradual process, and began in the very heart of the classical movement; we may even see traces of it in the unrealized longings of Pope himself, who loved Spenser, and who wished he could write a fairy tale. We see the change coming in the gradual rise of fresh metres, and especially of blank verse, in opposition to the heroic couplet; in fact the struggle of romantic against classic centred to some extent round these two forms.

Sir Walter Scott
After Painting by Sir Henry Raeburn,
Collection of the Earl of Home

But just as marked is the choice of new subject-matter. "Nature for her own sake" —natural description imbedded in other matter, or even forming the sole subject of poems—now occupy the writer. Human life, in aspects neglected by the school of Pope, begins to assert itself. And all this new matter, treated first in a melancholy moralizing spirit, gradually grows in imaginative strength, simplicity, and naturalness, until we reach the poetry of Wordsworth and Coleridge, in which the movement is brought to its height and at the same time takes on a new freshness and impetus. James Thomson (1700–1748) published his blank-verse poem of "The Seasons" in 1726–30, and, even though there are many traces in it of the school of Pope, it sounds the first clear note of revolt. It is the first blank-verse poem of importance in the century, and the first important poem devoted to natural description. Many new elements are found in it, too, such as the interest in the poor and the labouring class, and in lands beyond England, as well as a new feeling and affection for animals. In 1748, the year of his death, Thomson published his "Castle of Indolence", the best imitation of Spenser's verse and manner that exists, and this was another sign of change. There were many poems written in blank verse or in Spenserian stanza between this poet and the work of Gray, whose contribution to the romantic movement is seen perhaps most clearly in his translations from the Icelandic and Gaelic, where he opened up a new field of subject-matter for the interest of readers and the use of poets. And Gray's poems, small in quantity, but exquisitely finished, were not his only work; as a prose writer he gives us in his letters and journals first-hand and beautiful descriptions of nature in unaffected English. But his poetry is less simple, and, with its restraint of manner, might in some aspects be claimed by the classical school. It is in the decade after his death that we find the movement towards the more natural style expressing itself unmistakably in the half-mournful glamour of Macpherson's rhythmical prose "translations" of the Celtic poetry of Ossian, in the poems of the unhappy boy-genius Chatterton, and in the collection of "Percy Ballads".

Following on these, however, there is a strong attempt at reaction in the poetry of Dr. Johnson, Churchill, and Goldsmith—though Goldsmith's charming poems are more romantic than he knew. But in the next few years the battle is quickly won for romance by four poets: Burns, Cowper, Crabbe, and Blake, whose significance in the movement is more fully recognized now than it was then. Burns, who wrote the best of his poetry in a mixed Scottish dialect, had been nourished on the best English poets of the past, and the clearness and precision of his verse as well as its satirical and didactic subject-matter belongs to the school of Pope at its best. But, on the other hand, the essential spirit of his satire, in contrast with the detached coldness of Pope's, is a consuming fire, as Swinburne has pointed out, while his songs, full of melody and passionate feeling, though all in the line of previous Scottish poetry, were new as regards England, and were truly romantic in tone and manner. There are poems and passages of verse that we wish Burns had never written, but the largest part of his work belongs to our great literary store of things noble and humane.

In William Cowper (1731–1800) we come to a poet whose influence is more and more recognized as of first importance in the romantic trend of eighteenth-century poetry. Living the most retired of lives, and not writing much until over fifty years of age, he has left a body of poetry marked with his own gentle, affectionate, humorous, and sometimes tragic genius, much of which has become classic in English. His best long poem, "The Task", in blank verse, contains his most original work in the clear and simple descriptions of natural scenery. He also, like Gray, was one of the best of our letter-writers. George Crabbe (1754–1832) wrote nearly all his poetry in the heroic couplet, but used that form with more freedom than his contemporaries. Much of his work is of the story kind, and some of his poems are like novels in verse. Though he chose a hackneyed form for his work, and though all his sketches and stories tend to edification in a didactic way, he is never dull, and his analysis of motive and temperament and his realism are strangely modern in the antiquated setting of the heroic couplet. His work deserves more notice than English readers as a rule give to it. William Blake (1757–1827), the fourth of these poets, is one of those geniuses who belong to no one time or place. Some of the simple and charming poems in his two best-known little volumes, "Songs of Innocence" and "Songs of Experience", might have been written by an Elizabethan, while his long mystical works in verse, not truly poetical, show him in the light of a dreamer whose dreams are rooted in some spiritual reality which only a very few readers can discern with him. But his poetry, as a whole,

though scarcely heeded at all by the public of his own day, has been found, as it has received more attention recently, to contain within itself the germs of many later developments of thought and feeling in society and literature. He was an engraver and painter as well as a poet, and his work in these capacities cannot be neglected if one wishes to understand the character of his genius.

Crabbe and Blake carry us on into the nineteenth century, but before their death Wordsworth and Coleridge accomplished the first of their epoch-making work. With these two poets we enter upon the story of our modern literature. Wordsworth and Coleridge are still in some sense with us, as their predecessors of the seventeenth and eighteenth century are not. All English modern poets are directly or indirectly influenced by them. They deliberately determined to be missionaries in poetry, and they accomplished a mission in the face of great discouragement and opposition. The small volume of "Lyrical Ballads" published in 1798, when they were young men together under thirty, made a revolution in poetry and was the fulfilment of nearly all that the romantic writers had been trying half unconsciously to bring about. The "Ancient Mariner", which opened the book, and the "Tintern Abbey Lines", which closed it, to say nothing of the many successes and few failures which fill up the space between, were alone enough to set up a poetic standard of high and peculiar significance. In these poems there was accurate nature-description of the best kind, shot through with the poet's own imagination and feeling; there was love of, and interest in, vivid human life, regardless of class or country; there was weighty ethical matter without dullness. It is perhaps in this seriousness with which life is viewed that we find one of the key-notes of the poetical literature of the later Victorian age. It has been said of William Wordsworth (1770–1850) that he wrote of "what is in all men", and the leading ideas of his poetry are indeed those in which all natural and sane human beings can join. The healing and joy-giving power of nature, the strength, beauty, and pathos of the simplest human affections, more especially as seen in the less sophisticated men and women of the poorer classes in the country, may be realized by all. But Wordsworth had also a philosophy of nature and her relationship to human beings which was the foundation of all his teaching, and which he expounded in poem after poem, in passages often of very great beauty, and in much variety of style. It may be here noticed that Wordsworth's style varies more than the ordinary judgment gives him credit for. In his eagerness for freedom from conventional phrasing, he strove, as he himself tells us in his prose critical prefaces to the poems, for utter simplicity of language which to us at times seems bare and even puerile in its effect; but he is capable more than most of a richness of style and diction, especially in his blank verse, that is the very opposite of his own theory. He has many styles, and no critical summing up of his manner is ever quite satisfactory to the Wordsworthian who realizes this.

The poetry of Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772–1834) does not represent the poet with anything like the same fullness as does that of Wordsworth. Those of Coleridge's poems which are of the first order of poetry are few, but they are inimitable and perfect of their kind, and have a melody of peculiar witchery. Coleridge was a greater, wider genius than Wordsworth, and his deepest thoughts went into pedestrian prose. He has left only fragmentary work on philosophy and criticism behind him, but even that has affected and still affects the thought of our own time. Had Coleridge possessed the will-power and endurance of Wordsworth in addition to his own genius, no one can tell to what heights he might have attained. His career is a tragedy of character.

On these two poets when young men, as well as on Southey and others, the altruistic philosophy of the French revolutionary movement had a profound effect, and in Wordsworth's "Prelude" we may see to some extent the extraordinary and stimulating influence of these ideas upon some of the young and generous English minds. But in spite of much that was true in it, the elements of error, inadequacy, and crudeness in this philosophy became apparent, especially in the course of the French Revolution, and a revulsion from it fell upon both Coleridge and Wordsworth. Wordsworth alone of the two emerged from the trial unembittered—thanks to nature and to his sister Dorothy—though how crucial to his life this crisis was he has himself told us. No one can properly understand the poetry of this time, nor of the following age of Shelley, Byron, and Keats, if he does not to some extent realize the high and generous hopes raised by the ideas of the Revolution in certain ardent minds in England. They saw countless evils and oppression in the social life of the time, and here, in the working out of the ideas of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity, seemed a full remedy. The three poets just mentioned lived in the reaction from these hopes. Byron was embittered, partly from personal causes, and partly because of the state of the society in which he lived. He saw no redemption at hand. Shelley was fired by the revolutionary principles as he found them interpreted by the rationalism of Godwin, even while he shared, too, in the reaction caused by the excesses of France. Keats never entered into them at all, but turned by a sort of instinct away from the dreariness of life, as he saw it around him, to nature and beauty.

But there is one great writer who was untouched either by the action or reaction of the revolutionary ferment. Sir Walter Scott (1771–1832) loved the past and believed in it, and to the end of his life he was conservative in religion and politics. In his novels and in much of his poetry he made popular those romantic elements in the life of the past which are more particularly associated with the Ages of Faith. His close and affectionate description of the Scottish scenery he loved so much was a strong influence in developing the care for natural scenery which has become one of the leading marks of the nineteenth century. His poetry at its very best is found in many of his short songs and ballads, and in detached passages of his longer poems, and it is verse not unworthy to be placed beside the finest romantic work of the time. But his best-known narrative poems—"The Lay of the Last Minstrel", "Marmion", and "The Lady of the Lake"—have all through a great and special charm, and their style, clear, rapid, full of energy, together with their almost faultless diction, make them worthy of their place among our classics. The popularity of Scott's narrative poetry was overshadowed, however, by the narrative work of Lord Byron, but to our gain, since this led Scott to turn to another form of art and to produce "The Waverley Novels".

Of the three young poets of genius whose short lives accomplished such remarkable poetic work, Lord Byron (1788–1824) is now perhaps the least influential, though at the time his fame overshadowed every other writer of verse. His extraordinarily vigorous satires, marked by his study of Pope, whose poetry he championed in a literary controversy of the time, are unique in the energy of their style and the strength and sting of their wit. It is unfortunate that a large part of them are marred, for the ordinary reader, by their extreme voluptuousness. His verse tales of romantic adventure are imaginative, but pall upon us by their tendency to sentimentality. His songs and occasional pieces, together with "Childe Harold"—parts of which have fine nature-description—show him in a more agreeable poetic light. His many dramas are not truly dramatic, but are rather the outpouring of his own powerful mind seeking an outlet. If we are inclined to take an anti-Byronic attitude, it is well to

remember, first, that his brilliant, undisciplined, passionate work, though it never reached the height of the noblest art, yet taught a lesson of force, vitality, and sincerity to an age which, in spite of its good, was marked by much artificiality, callousness, and insincerity in both life and literature. He did this in a rude and melodramatic way, but he did it. And secondly, let those who judge Byron's wild private career not forget to read the last poem that he wrote, and realize that a change of temper, aspiration towards nobler things, was awakening in him before he died.

Keats and Shelley invite comparison; their difference and their likeness are equally striking. They lived the same length of time, did all their work before thirty, dying young and with tragedy. They left behind them poetry of the highest order—their lyrics are masterpieces—containing the promise of still finer work. They were the devoted lovers of beauty, believing in it as the supreme reality, and were in earnest over their art, both of them leaving behind grave poems expressing their unfinished, and therefore often unsatisfactory and misleading, philosophy of life. Each poet also has written remarkable prose. It is a great mistake to consider Percy Bysshe Shelley (1792–1822) as the "ineffectual angel" sketched by Matthew Arnold. He was quite half human, and not at all ineffectual. His most ethereal lyrics will be found to possess a basis of logical thought, while his prose writings show him as a thinker quite capable of keeping the imagination in her place. There are signs, too, in the development of his work that he was growing more and more capable of preserving the balance of the intellect and the imagination. The work that he accomplished in his short life is much and varied. Putting aside his early poems, there is the almost perfect "Adonais", the grave and beautiful lyrical drama of "Prometheus Unbound", in which he states his hopes (not always well grounded and apparently anti-Christian, though he reverenced certain elements in Christianity) for the future of the world; there is a crowd of short and exquisite lyrics—the highest watermark of English poetry of this kind—as well as the fateful and mystic "Triumph of Life", to say nothing of many others, and amongst them some fine dramatic work in blank verse. And he was only twenty-eight when he was drowned. Upon his errors of thought and of conduct we need not dwell. They are plain before us in his life. Outside his literary work, and, now and then intruding into it, a certain crudity of youth appears. But all he does and says is in good faith, and for his errors he suffered bitterly during his short life. One of the noblest and most discerning of tributes ever paid to his genius has been lately published from the pen of the now well-known Catholic poet, Francis Thompson. John Keats (1795–1821) accomplished less actual work, but had in him, it is generally allowed, greater potentiality of genius. He started life handicapped in circumstance and physical health, while he had no influence or following in his own short lifetime, and "it is the copious perfection of work accomplished so early and under so many disadvantages which is the wonder of biographers". His odes on "The Nightingale", "A Grecian Urn", and "Autumn" are supreme art. Some of his narrative poems are among the best of their kind and his fragment of "Hyperion" shows what he might have accomplished had he lived to practise this graver type of poetry. His fame, however, is now established, and his poetic influence has been one of the strongest in the nineteenth century.

After the death of Keats poetry seems for a time to have exhausted itself. There is little to chronicle except the chirpings of small poets until the great age of Victorian poetry opens with Tennyson and Browning. But, to fill up the early years of the century, there is fine work in prose. The great series of Sir Walter Scott's novels extend from 1814 to 1831, and many smaller efficient writers are ranged round this central figure. The wild enthusiasm with which the Waverley novels were received can perhaps never be renewed. A multitude of causes have tended to divert and disturb the public taste for these great books, and it now fluctuates sometimes farther from, sometimes nearer to, them. But such work as his is immortal, and regardless of human fluctuations, it will, and does, appeal always to a multitude of readers—learned or unlearned—whose mind and imagination are open to receive the gifts of genius apart from the trend of fashion. Scott's novels are full of kindly humanity, of close and accurate drawing of many types of character, only to be equalled by Shakespeare or Chaucer, of wide and detailed historical knowledge, though, to Catholic regret, he never understood or adequately represented the Church, handled magnificently with equal imagination and sanity, so that age after age lives again, not only as the dry facts of history which have been brought laboriously together "bone to his bone", but as a living human world whose dwellers have been raised out of silence to their feet by the creative voice —"an exceeding great army". Of Scott's work even more than of Chaucer's, we may say, with Dryden, "Here is God's plenty".

Scott died in 1832, and the Victorian age opened in literary faintness. Alfred Tennyson and Robert Browning were on the verge of the horizon, but it was not until 1840 or so that there came that dazzling revival of literature such as had not been seen since the Elizabethan age, and which in extent and swiftness of production eclipsed that age. Into the causes of this it is impossible here to enter. Tennyson and Browning are leaders among the poets far into the century, while Elizabeth Barrett Browning makes a distant third. Tennyson and Browning are representative of the most important phases of the Victorian age, universally acknowledged, though general opinion is still divided as to their relative merits. Both are artists of a high order, but Tennyson is the greater and more consistent. Both feel the importance, gravity, and interest of life. Both take a religious view of life and have that spirit of reverence which is lacking in many of their followers. Both believe in their mission to call men to forsake materialism, and each, in his own particular way, is a lover of natural beauty. Browning's sympathies are, in a sense, wider than Tennyson's, but Tennyson's feeling goes deeper, perhaps, on the great religious and moral questions than Browning's.

If we are still too near Tennyson and Browning to be able to form a true estimate of them, we are even less able to judge the writers of the latter half of the nineteenth century. The numerous streams of literature become bewildering to follow. We distinguish before the end of the career of the two greatest poets the fine but smaller figures of Rossetti, William Morris, Matthew Arnold, and others, doing work of true genius though not all of equal power. None of them, however, have the vivid inspirations of great, impelling, impersonal ideas such as filled Wordsworth and Shelley. The note of melancholy and uncertainty concerning life and its meaning and the future beyond this life, is always more or less there in undertone. The optimism of Browning and the faith of Tennyson are not to be found, but their love of beauty is fervent and stimulating.

In the last quarter of the century poetry has taken on many strange and sometimes beautiful forms. A high level of excellence has prevailed on the whole. Poets of remarkable promise and achievement have appeared. Amongst these, Francis Thompson (1859–1907), in the opinion of most, takes the commanding place. The appreciation of him by well-known and most able critics has been extraordinarily unanimous and unstinted. He seems "to have reached the peaks of Parnassus at a bound". He has been compared

with almost every great previous English poet, and whatever may be the more balanced verdict of the future, his poetic immortality is assured. And his Catholic religion was his deepest inspiration.

The prose which grew up around the greatest Victorian poetry was worthy of its company. A brilliant group of writers as well as of thinkers in many spheres of knowledge and art appeared, and in this respect the age has surpassed the Elizabethan. The development of the novel is the most distinguishing mark of Victorian prose literature. Dickens and Thackeray follow upon Scott, with a host of other novelists, men and women, of varying grades of power, who come up to our own day. Graver forms of literature also have been many and splendid. There are the essayists, with Lamb and Hazlitt as the chief; the historians with Macaulay and Carlyle, Froude, Freeman, and Green; Ruskin, with his immense and varied work upon art, economics, and the conduct of life, and whose influence, all for good, in spite of the vagaries of literary taste, is still strong and growing. The enormous extent and range of theological literature is a remarkable feature of the last fifty years, and here the writings of John Henry Newman (q. v.) stand out as a supreme "literary glory". Newman touched poetry with imagination, grace, and skill, but it is by his prose that he is recognized as a great master of English style. While all critics agree that the "Apologia" is a masterpiece, and that "nothing he wrote in prose or verse is superfluous", there is some difference of opinion as to the respective literary values of his earlier and later work. R. H. Hutton, however, one of his acutest non-Catholic critics, considers that "in irony, in humour, in imaginative force, the writings of the later portions of his career far surpass those of his theological apprenticeship".

Catholic writers are now many. After long years of repression they have their full freedom in the arena of literature, and there is more than a promise that when the history of the twentieth century comes to be written many Catholic names will be found in the highest places on the roll of honour.

K. M. WARREN.

England, ESTABLISHED CHURCH OF. See ANGLICANISM.

England, JOHN, first Bishop of Charleston, South Carolina, U. S. A.; b. 23 September, 1786, in Cork, Ireland; d. at Charleston, 11 April, 1842. He was educated in Cork until his fifteenth year, was then taught privately for two years, and entered Carlow College, 31 August, 1803. In his nineteenth year he began to deliver catechetical instructions in the parish chapel and zealously instructed the soldiers in garrison at Cork. He also established a female reformatory together with male and female poor schools. Out of these schools grew the Presentation Convent. He was ordained priest in Cork, 10 October, 1809, and was appointed lecturer at the cathedral. Wherever he preached people thronged to hear him. Pending the opening of the Magdalen Asylum he maintained and ministered to many applicants. In the same year he published the "Religious Repertory", established a circulating library in the parish of St. Mary, Shandon, and attended the city jail. In the elections of 1812 he fearlessly exerted his influence, maintaining that, "in vindicating the political rights of his countrymen, he was but asserting their liberty of conscience". In the same year he was appointed president of the new diocesan College of St. Mary, where he taught theology. In 1814 he vigorously and successfully assailed with tongue and pen the insidious Veto measure which threatened disaster to the Church in Ireland. Next to O'Connell's his influence was the greatest in the agitation which culminated in Catholic Emancipation. To help this cause he founded "The Chronicle" which he continued to edit until he left Ireland. In 1817 he was appointed parish priest of Bandon. (The bigotry and prejudice of this city at that time may be conjectured from the inscription over its gates: "Turk, Jew or Atheist may enter here, but not a Papist.") In spite of the prejudices which he found there, he soon conciliated men of every sect and party.

He was consecrated Bishop of Charleston at Cork, 21 Sept., 1820, and refused to take the customary oath of allegiance to the British Government, declaring his intention to become a citizen of the United States as soon as possible. He arrived in Charleston 30 Dec., 1820. Conditions were most uninviting and unpromising in the new diocese, which consisted of the three States of South Carolina, North Carolina, and Georgia. The Catholics were scattered in little groups over these States. The meagre number in Charleston consisted of very poor immigrants from Ireland and ruined refugees from San Domingo and their servants. In 1832, after twelve years of labour, Bishop England estimated the Catholics of his diocese at eleven thousand souls: 7500 in South Carolina, 3000 in Georgia, and 500 in North Carolina. South Carolina was settled as a royal province by the Lords Proprietors, who brought with them the religion of the Established Church, and it was only in 1790 that enactments imposing religious disabilities were expunged from the constitution of the new State. Religious and social antecedents and traditions, and the resultant public opinion, were unfavourable, if not antagonistic, to the growth of Catholicism. The greatest need was a sufficient number of Catholic clergy. This sparsely settled section, with scattered and impoverished congregations, had not heretofore attracted many men of signal merit and ability. Bishop England faced these unfavourable conditions in a brave and determined spirit. The day after his arrival he assumed formal charge of his see, and almost immediately issued a pastoral and set out on his first visitation of the three States comprising his diocese. No bishop could be more regular and constant in these visitations. He went wherever he heard there was a Catholic, organized the scattered little flocks, ministered to their spiritual needs, appointed persons to teach catechism, and wherever possible urged the building of a church. During these visitations he preached in halls, court houses, State houses, and in chapels and churches of Protestant sects, sometimes at the invitation of the pastors. When in Charleston he preached at least twice every Sunday and delivered several courses of lectures besides various addresses on special occasions. He successfully advocated before the Legislature of South Carolina the granting of a charter for his diocesan corporation, which had been strongly opposed through the machinations of the disaffected trustees. In 1826 he delivered, by invitation, an eloquent discourse before the Congress of the United States. It was the first time a Catholic priest was so honoured. He was chiefly instrumental in having the First Provincial Council of Baltimore convened, and pending this, formulated a constitution for his diocese defining its relations to civil and canon law. This was incorporated by the State and adopted by the several congregations. He



RIGHT REV. JOHN ENGLAND

also organized conventions of representative clergy and laity in each of the States in his diocese, to meet annually. In 1840 these were merged into one general convention. He held a synod of the clergy, 21 Nov., 1831, and in 1832 established a seminary and college under the name of "The Philosophical and Classical Seminary of Charleston", hoping with the income from the collegiate department to maintain the seminary. Notwithstanding his many and varied duties he devoted himself to this institution as teacher of classics and professor of theology. Organized bigotry soon assailed it, reducing the attendance from one hundred and thirty to thirty; but he continued and it became the alma mater of many eminent laymen and apostolic priests. In the words of Chancellor Kent, "Bishop England revived classical learning in South Carolina". In 1822 he organized and incorporated a Book Society to be established in each congregation, and in the same year his indefatigable energy and zeal led him to establish the "United States Catholic Miscellany", the first distinctively Catholic newspaper published in the United States. It continued to be published until 1861 and is a treasury of instructive and edifying reading. He also compiled a catechism and prepared a new edition of the Missal in English with an explanation of the Mass. He was an active member of the Philosophical Society of Charleston, assisted in organizing the Anti-duelling Society, and strenuously opposed Nullification in a community where it was vehemently advocated. His intense loyalty to his faith led him into several controversies which he conducted with a dignity and charity that commanded the respect of his opponents and elicited touching tributes from some of them at his death.

In 1830 he established in Charleston the Sisters of Our Lady of Mercy "to educate females of the middling class of society; also to have a school for free colored girls, and to give religious instruction to female slaves; they will also devote themselves to the service of the sick". Subsequently their scope was enlarged, and branch houses were established at Savannah, Wilmington, and Sumter. In 1834 he further promoted education and charity by the introduction of the Ursulines. In 1835 Rt. Rev. William Clancy arrived from Ireland as the coadjutor of Bishop England, but, after a year's dissatisfied sojourn, he requested and obtained a transfer to another field. Bishop England had originally asked for the appointment of the Rev. Dr. Paul Cullen, then rector of the Irish College, Rome (afterwards the first Irish cardinal), as his coadjutor.

A striking phase of Bishop England's apostolic character was manifested in his spiritual care of the negroes. He celebrated an early Mass in the cathedral for them every Sunday and preached to them at this Mass and at a Vesper service. He was accustomed to deliver two afternoon sermons; if unable to deliver both, he would disappoint the rich and cultured who flocked to hear him, and preach to the poor ignorant Africans. In the epidemics of those days he exhibited great devotion to the sick, while his priests and the Sisters of Mercy volunteered their services in the visitations of cholera and yellow fever. His personal poverty was pitiable. He was known to have walked the streets of Charleston with the bare soles of his feet to the ground. Several times the excessive fatigue and exposure incurred in his visitations and ministrations prostrated him, and more than once he was in danger of death. Twice he visited Hayti as Apostolic Delegate. In 1823 he was asked to take charge of East Florida and, having been given the powers of vicar-general, made a visitation of that territory.

In the interests of his impoverished diocese he visited the chief towns and cities of the Union, crossed the ocean four times, sought aid from the Holy Father, the Propaganda, the Leopoldine Society of Vienna, and made appeals in Ireland, England, France, Italy, wherever he could obtain money, vestments, or books. After Easter, in 1841, he visited Europe for the last time. On the long and boisterous return voyage there was much sickness, and he became seriously ill through his constant attendance on others. Though very weak, notwithstanding, on his arrival in Philadelphia, he preached seventeen nights consecutively, also four nights in Baltimore. With his health broken and his strength almost exhausted, he promptly resumed his duties on his return to Charleston, where he died, sincerely mourned by men of every creed and every party. His apostolic zeal, saintly life, exalted character, profound learning, and matchless eloquence made him a model for Catholics and an ornament of his order.

Most of his writings were given to the public through the columns of the "United States Catholic Miscellany", in the publication of which he was aided by his sister, a woman of many-sided ability and talents. His successor, Bishop Reynolds, collected his various writings, which were published in five volumes at Baltimore, in 1849. A new edition, edited by Archbishop S. B. Messmîr of Milwaukee, was published at Cleveland in 1908.

REYNOLDS, *The Works of the Rt. Rev. John England*, 5 vols. (Baltimore, 1849; Cleveland ed. Messmîr, 1908); SHEA, *Hist. Cath. Ch. in U. S.* (New York, 1889–92); O'GORMAN, *A Hist. of the R. C. Ch. in U. S.* (New York, 1895); CLARKE, *Lives of the Deceased Bishops* (New York, 1872); *Catholic Miscellany* (Charleston, April, 1842) files; REUSS, *Biog. Cycl. Cath. Hierarchy of U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1898); *The Messenger* (New York, 1892), 370–74; *Ibid.* (1890), 769–82; AM. CATH. HIST. SOC., *Records* (Philadelphia, March–June, 1895); READ, *Sketch of Bishop England;* O'CONNELL, *Catholicity in the Carolinas and Virginia;* MORAN in *The Seven Hills Magazine* (Dublin, June, 1907).

P. L. DUFFY.

Englefield, FELIX, a Franciscan friar, d. 1767. He was the younger son of Henry Englefield of White Knights, Reading, and Catherine, daughter of Benjamin Poole of London. His elder brother, Henry, succeeded their cousin Charles as sixth baronet in 1728. It is uncertain whether his own baptismal name was Charles or Francis. He joined the Franciscans at Douai and was ordained there, probably about 1732, when he was approved for preaching and hearing confessions. He had been teaching philosophy there before ordination, and from 1734 to 1746 he taught theology. In 1744 and 1745 he was titular guardian of York, but remained in residence at Douai. From 1746 to 1749 he acted as definitor, and at the end of that period was in England, for in March, 1749, he was sent to Rome on behalf of his own order and other regulars to procure the repeal of the papal decree of 1745 regulating the relations between the vicars Apostolic and the regulars. In this he failed, as Benedict XIV supported the vicars Apostolic by the "Rules of the English Mission", issued in 1753. In 1749 Father Felix was titular guardian of Oxford, and in the following year he attended the general chapter at Rome in place of the provincial, Father Thomas Holmes, who was too infirm to undertake the journey. In 1750–1751 he was titular guardian of Greenwich; custos 1752–1755, and finally, on 19 Aug., 1755, he was elected provincial and held that office till 1758, living for part of the time at Horton in Gloucestershire. While provincial he drew up a valuable list of all the Franciscans then (1758) in England, with their addresses. Father Thaddeus, O.F.M. (op. cit. inf., p. 14) states that he was the reputed author of the "Miraculous Powers of the Church of Christ", published anonymously in 1756. But this was really written by William Walton, afterwards Vicar Apostolic of the Northern District, whose name appears on the title-page of a subsequent issue. Father Englefield died probably at Douai, though one account says he was on the English mission at the time.

KIRK, *Biographies of Eighteenth Century Catholics* (London, 1908); GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.* (London, 1886), II, 169; THADDEUS, *Franciscans in England, 1600–1850* (London, 1898).

EDWIN BURTON.

Englefield, Sir Henry Charles, Bart., antiquary and scientist, b. 1752; d. 21 March, 1822. He was the eldest son of Sir Henry Englefield, sixth baronet, by his second wife, Catherine, daughter of Sir Charles Bucke, Bart. His father, who was the son of Henry Englefield, of White Knights near Reading, had in 1728 succeeded to the title and the Engelfield estates at Wooton Basset, Wilts; so that Henry Charles inherited both White Knights and Wooton Basset on the death of his father, 25 May, 1780. He was never married and devoted his entire life to study. In 1778 at the early age of twenty-six he was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society, and in the following year Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries. For many years he was vice-president of the latter, and succeeded the Marquess Townshend as president. Owing, however, to his being a Catholic, objection was taken to his re-election, and he was replaced by the Earl of Aberdeen. Under his direction the society produced between 1797 and 1813 the series of engravings of English cathedrals, to which series he contributed the dissertations on Durham, Gloucester, and Exeter. In 1781 Englefield joined the Dilettanti Society and acted as its secretary for fourteen years. Besides his antiquarian studies, which resulted in many contributions to "Archæologia", he carried on research in chemistry, mathematics, astronomy, and geology. His "Discovery of a Lake from Madder" won for him the gold medal of the Society of Arts. He took no part in public life, owing to Catholic disabilities, but was intimate with Charles James Fox, and his cheerful temperament and vivacious conversation won him many friends. His portrait was painted by Sir Thomas Lawrence, and two bronze medals were struck bearing his likeness.

In Catholic affairs Englefield took a prominent part, being elected in 1782 a member of the Catholic Committee, formed by the laity for the promotion of Catholic interests, a body which subsequently found itself in conflict with the vicars Apostolic. In the early stages of this dispute he was one of the moving spirits and contributed the pamphlet, mentioned below, in answer to Dr. Horsley, the Anglican prelate. The latter afterwards became the friend of the Catholics, and it was through his influence that the Catholic Relief Bill of 1791 was modified to suit the requirements of the bishops. Throughout the dispute Englefield took an independent line, and at times went rather far in his opposition to the vicars Apostolic, as in 1792, when he was prepared to move a strong resolution at the general meeting of English Catholics. He was dissuaded at the last moment by the three who undertook to act as "Gentlemen Mediators" between the two parties. During his latter years his eyesight failed; he died at his house, Tilney St., London, the baronetcy thereupon becoming extinct. His works are: "Tables of the Apparent Places of the Comet of 1661" (London, 1788); "Letter to the Author of 'The Review of the Case of the Protestant Dissenters'" (London, 1790); "On the Determination of the Orbits of Comets" (London, 1793); "A Walk Through Southampton" (Southampton, 1801); "Description of a New Transit Instrument, Improved by Sir H. Englefield" (London, 1814); "The Andrian, a Verse Translation from Terence" (London, 1814); "Description of the Principal Beauties, Antiquities and Geological Phenomena of the Isle of Wight", with engravings from his own drawings, and a portrait (London, 1816); "Observations on the Probable Consequences of the Demolition of London Bridge" (London, 1821). Gillow has printed (op. cit. inf.) a list of papers contributed to the transactions of the Society of Antiquaries, Royal Society, Royal Institution, Society of Arts, and the Linnæan Society, as well as to "Nicholson's Journal" and "Tillock's Philosophical Magazine".

Annual Register (London, 1822), LXIV; Moses, *A Collection of Vases Formed by Sir H. Englefield* (London, 1819), with portrait; Sotheby, *Life of Sir H. Englefield* (London, 1819); Idem, *Memorial Dedicated to the Society of Dilettanti* (London, 1822); Gillow, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.* (London, 1886), II, 171; Wroth in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (London, 1889), XVII; Ward, *The Dawn of Catholic Emancipation* (London, 1909).

Edwin Burton.

English College, The, in Rome.—I. Foundation.—Some historians (e. g., Dodd, II, 168, following Polydore Vergil, Harpsfield, Spelman, etc.) have traced the origin of the English College back to the Saxon school founded in Rome by Ina, King of the West Saxons, in 727. To an antiquity so great, however, the college, venerable though it be, has no just claim. It dates from about the middle of the fourteenth century, when the Hospice of St. Thomas of Canterbury was founded. This hospice owed its establishment to the jubilees, which brought pilgrims to the Holy City from every country of Europe. Those who arrived from England in 1350 to perform their devotions, found it difficult to obtain suitable accommodation. This suggested an institution, national in character, where English pilgrims might receive shelter and hospitality. The archives of the English College seem to point to the establishment of a guild of laymen, which acquired certain property in the Via Monserrato, the principal persons who took part in the transactions being John Shepherd and Alice his wife, who devoted themselves and their fortunes to the service of the pilgrims in the hospice, and William Chandler, chamberlain, Robert de Pinea, syndic, and John Williams, officials of the community and society of the English of the city. The deeds show that the property in question was acquired in the year 1362, which therefore may be taken as the date of the foundation of the hospice. But from the time of Henry VIII the hospice began to decline. After the persecution had broken out anew under Elizabeth, many of the clergy went into exile. Some of those who found their way to Rome were received into the hospice, and formed a permanent community therein. During Dr. William Allen's visit to Rome in 1576, it was arranged with Pope Gregory XIII that a college should be founded there for the education of priests for the English Mission. As soon as he returned to Douai (30 July, 1576) he sent ten students to Rome to form the nucleus of the new college; six more went in 1577, and again six in 1578. Dr. Gregory Martin, writing on 26 May, 1578, to Father Campion, tells him that twenty-six students are living either in the hospice itself or in the house next door, which has internal communication with the hospice (Douai Diaries, Appendix, p. 316). Indeed, the Pope had already determined to convert the hospice into a seminary; and at Christmas, 1578, "There came out a *Breve* from the Popes Holines comanding all the ould Chaplines to depart within 15 dayes, and assigning all the rents of the Hospitall unto the use of the Seminary, which was presently obayed by the said Priests" (Father Persons's Memoirs: Catholic Record Society, II, 144). Unfortunately, however, Cardinal Morone, the Protector of England, and therefore also of the College, appointed as its rector Dr. Clenock, the warden of the hospice, who was assisted by two Jesuit Fathers as prefect of Studies and procurator. Dr. Gregory Martin, again writing to Father Campion, 18 Feb., 1579 (from Reims), informs him that there are in the college in Rome "at the present moment forty-two of our students, most of whom are divines, one rector, three fathers of your Society, and six servants. They live in the hospital and the adjoining house. The revenues of the hospital have been transferred to the seminary, except what is required for the entertainment of the pilgrims" (Douai Diaries, lviii, and Appendix, p. 319). However, internal dissensions soon arose. Most of the students of the college were, of course, English; but there were also seven or eight Welshmen, for no national distinction was made between the Cambrian and the Saxon, all being considered as English for the purposes of the institution,

The Welsh rector was accused of favouring his fellow-countrymen; and finally the English students broke out into open mutiny. They petitioned the Holy Father that the college should be entrusted to the Fathers of the Society of Jesus, and declared that they would rather leave the college than remain under Dr. Clenock.

The students were ordered by the Cardinal Protector to submit under pain of expulsion; but they preferred to go, and began to make preparations for the journey back to Douai and Reims, or to England. Much sympathy, however, was shown for them in Rome, and, intercession being made with the Pope on their behalf, they were reinstated in the college after two days, and their petition was granted. Dr. Clenock was removed from the rectorship and the government of the college handed over to the Jesuits, the famous Father Robert Persons being given temporary charge till the appointment of the first permanent Rector, Father Alphonsus Agazzari, on 23 April, 1579. This day is the real birthday of the English College in Rome; for on this day the Bull of Foundation was signed by Pope Gregory XIII; on this day the students took the oath to lead an ecclesiastical life, and proceed to England when it should seem good to their superiors; and on this day the College Register begins. The Bull, however, was not published till 23 Dec., 1580. Under this date, the entry occurs in the *College Annals* (*Liber Ruber*), II, 12; of which the following is the translation: "A.D. 1580, on the 23rd of December, to the praise and glory of the most Holy Trinity and of St. Thomas the Martyr, was expedited the Bull of the Foundation of this College, which, though it was granted by Pope Gregory XIII in April last year, did not reach our hands before the above date, and in which, as besides many faculties and spiritual and temporal favours all the goods of the English Hospice were united with the College, we received possession of them on the 29th. Dec., which is dedicated to St. Thomas the Martyr: and although it does not explicitly appear in the Bull, yet the Pope declared by word of mouth that this College was bound to receive and maintain the English pilgrims according to the statutes of the said Hospice. This Bull has been deposited in the College Archives."

Thus the English College, the oldest but two of all the national colleges of Rome (the German College and the Greek College), was launched on its career, the number of students at the time in the college being fifty, a number which later rose to seventy-five. That the college did its work efficiently, and fulfilled the purpose for which it was founded, is abundantly attested by the lists of names of the priests sent into the mission-field, and especially by the roll of its martyrs. During the period 1682–1694, under the Cardinal Protector Howard, O.P., the greater part of the college was rebuilt.

The eighteenth century was a period of decline. Contrary to the original constitutions of the college, boys were admitted for the course of humanities, and some even, of very tender years, for more elementary studies. In August, 1773, the Society of Jesus was suppressed, and the administration of the college was handed over to Italian secular priests. During this period the students were ill-treated, the college was mismanaged, and a large portion of the archives sold for waste-paper. "At the time of the suppression, the number of Students was reduced to four divines, three philosophers, and three grammarians . . . Of those divines and philosophers, only three were ordained priests at Rome, and two at Douay; and the whole number of those ordained at Rome from 1775 to the year 1798, a period of 23 years, did not exceed seven, and of those, two never performed any missionary duties, and the third but for a short time. In that same period four died in the College, and 34, if not more, quitted the house *re infecta!*—Six, however, afterwards pursued their studies in other Colleges, and were ordained priests." (Catholic Magazine, 1832, pp. 359–360.) Bishop Challoner, and afterwards the three vicars Apostolic, Bishops James and Thomas Talbot and Matthew Gibson, entreated the Pope to restore the college to its first administrators, the English secular clergy; and finally, on 12 April, 1783, the Congregation of Propaganda answered that when the rectorship fell vacant, an English priest might be appointed to the post. Cardinal Braschi, the Protector, wrote to Bishop Douglas on 4 November, 1797, informing him that the rector was about to resign, and requesting him to choose, in consultation with Mgr. (afterwards Cardinal) Erskine, an English priest for the office. But before this could be done, the French had invaded Rome, the college was seized and suppressed, and the students sent to England. On the 30th of July, 1814, Cardinal Litta, Prefect of Propaganda, wrote to Bishop Poynter, vicar Apostolic of the London District, informing him that the college was about to be reopened, and enquiring about the fitness of the Rev. Stephen Green, who had been recommended by Bishop Milner for the rectorship. But Father Green died, and other obstacles arose, and nothing more was done for three years. Then Cardinal Consalvi, Secretary of State, acting as protector of the college, directed the English vicars Apostolic to select a priest for rector, and to send him to Rome at once. They chose the Rev. Robert Gradwell, who received his appointment on 8 March, 1818. Ten students, among whom was the future cardinal, Nicholas Wiseman, arrived in the following December. Thus the English College began to live again, and continued to flourish in its career of usefulness to the Church in England.

II. Scholastic Status.—In the Bull of Foundation, Gregory XIII confers on the college the privileges and rights of a university with the power of conferring the degrees of Bachelor, Licentiate, Doctor, and Master in Arts and Divinity. The students, from the beginning, attended the lectures of the Roman College, and then during the suppression of the Society of Jesus, at the University of St. Apollinare (the Roman Seminary). They returned, however, to the Roman College, or Gregorian University, in 1855, and still attend it, taking its degrees in philosophy and theology, as the English College does not exercise its faculty of conferring degrees. The college is immediately subject to the Holy See, which is represented by a cardinal protector. The immediate superiors are the rector, appointed by the pope on the recommendation of the English hierarchy, and vice-rector, appointed by the rector. The first rector, Dr. Maurice Clenock (1578–9), belonged to the English secular clergy. The Jesuits took the reins of government in 1579, and held them for one hundred and ninety-four years. Three of their rectors were Italians, and the rest English, the last being Wm. Hothersall, who, on the suppression of the society, handed the college over to Italian secular priests. From the restoration in 1818 the rectors have always been chosen from the English secular clergy. The college has the privilege of extra-parochiality, the rector being parish-priest for all its members, and exemption from the jurisdiction of the cardinal vicar and other ordinaries and tribunals.

III. Illustrious Students.—Among the names of those included on the college lists, who have laid down their lives for the Faith, and the supremacy of the Holy See, six have been beatified, and thirty-six declared Venerable. The former are, Ralph Sherwin, John Shert, Luke Kirby, Laurence Richardson (*vere* Johnson), William Lacy, and William Hart. Shert was the first missionary priest from the college to enter England. The Venerables are: George Haydock, Thomas Hemerford, John Munden, John Lowe, Robert Morton, Richard Leigh, Christopher Buxton, Ed-

ward James, Christopher Ba(y)les, Edmund Duke, Eustace White, Polidore Plasden (Palmer), Thomas Pormont, Joseph Lampton, John Cornelius, S.J., John Ingram, Robert Southwell, S.J., Henry Walpole, S.J., Edward Thwing, Robert Middleton, Thomas Tichborne, Robert Watkinson (Wilson), Edward Oldcorne, S.J., John Roberts, O.S.B., Richard Smith (Newport), John Almond, John Thules, John Lascelles (*vere* Lockwood), Edward Morgan (John Singleton), Henry Morse (alias Claxton), S.J., Brian Cansfield, S.J., John Woodcock (*alias* Farrington), O.F.M., Edward Mico (*alias* Baines), Anthony Turner (*alias* Ashby), S.J., John Wall (*alias* Marsh), O.F.M., and David Lewis (*alias* Charles Baker), S.J. The cause of beatification of the following, who all died in prison, has not yet been introduced: Roche Chaplain, James Lomax, Martin Sherson, John Brushford, John Harrison, and Edward Turner.

The famous Father Robert Persons was rector of the college in 1588, and again from 1598 till his death in 1610. Father Muzio Vitelleschi, afterwards General of the Society of Jesus, held the rectorship from 1592 to 1594, and again from 1597 to 1598. Cardinal Wiseman went to the college as a student in 1818, became rector in 1828, and was made bishop in 1840. The English College may claim as teachers the great Jesuit theologians of the Roman College: Bellarmine, Suarez, Vasquez, in the distant past; and in modern times Perrone, Franzelin, Ballerini, Billot.

IV. Influence on the Church in England.—The college shares with Douai and the other continental seminaries, the honour of having kept alive the lamp of the Faith in England during the dark days of persecution. Without these colleges the supply of priests for the English Mission would have entirely failed. Moreover, the college in Rome was for English Catholics a connecting link with the centre and Head of Christendom; and the missionaries sent thence formed a visible and tangible bond of union with that Holy See for the supremacy of which the faithful in England were suffering so much. When we turn to the nineteenth century, it suffices to mention the name of Cardinal Nicholas Wiseman, the "Man of Providence", who had the greatest share in the work of the re-establishment of the Catholic Hierarchy in England in 1850, and, as its head, by his genius reconciled the English people to what they at first regarded as a "Papal Aggression". It was he who put the Church in England on a firm basis, and, under God, whom we have to thank for the "Second Spring". But Wiseman was not alone. Of the rectors of the nineteenth century, all but two were made bishops, and in every part of the country the English College alumni may be found in positions of responsibility, vicars-general, canons, and especially professors of the ecclesiastical colleges and seminaries, whence the purity of the Roman Faith is diffused throughout the length and breadth of the land.

The Diary of the English College (1579–1783); published in English by Foley, S.J., *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus* (London, 1880), VI. The title of the original MS. is *Annales Collegii, Pars I., Nomina Alumnorum* (i. e. the College Register), and *Annales Collegii, Pars II* (the real Diary). Foley's version is sometimes inaccurate and defective in both the transcript and the translation, names having been omitted from the Register without any indication of such omission; Catholic Record Society, *Miscellanea*, II (London, 1906), *The Memoirs of Father Robert Persons, S.J.*; Dodd, *Church History of England*, Tierney ed. (London, 1839), II and III, with documents in the appendices; Knox, *Records of the English Catholics, I, Douai Diaries* (London, 1878); *II, The Letters and Memorials of William, Cardinal Allen* (London, 1882); *The Catholic Magazine* (Birmingham, 1832): Various letters, relating principally to the period 1773–1818; and *A Short Account of the English College in Rome:* probably by Dr. Gradwell, rector, 1818–1828; Challoner, *Memoirs of Missionary Priests* (Derby, 1843); Camm, *Lives of the English Martyrs* (London, 1905), and *William Cardinal Allen* (London, 1908); Wiseman, *Recollections of the Last Four Popes* (London, 1858); Ward, *Life of Cardinal Wiseman* (London, 1897); Croke, *Dublin Review* (July and October, 1898), and in the *Atti del Congresso internaz. di Scienze stor.* (Rome, 1903), *The National English Institutions of Rome during the Fourteenth Century;* Gillow, *Biog. Dict. of the Eng. Cath.;* Bartoli, *Dell' Istoria della Compagnia di Giesu, L'Inghilterra* (Rome, 1667).

Charles J. Cronin.

English Confessors and Martyrs (1534–1729).—Though the resistance of the English as a people to the Reformation compares very badly with the resistance offered by several other nations, the example given by those who did stand firm is remarkably interesting and instructive. (1) They suffered the extreme penalty for maintaining the unity of the Church and the supremacy of the Apostolic See, the doctrines most impugned by the Reformation in all lands and at all times. (2) They maintained their faith almost entirely by the most modern methods, and they were the first so to maintain it, i. e. by education of the clergy in seminaries, and of Catholic youth in colleges, at the risk, and often at the cost, of life. (3) The tyranny they had to withstand was, as a rule, not the sudden violence of a tyrant, but the continuous oppression of laws, sanctioned by the people in Parliament, passed on the specious plea of political and national necessity, and operating for centuries with that almost irresistible force which the law acquires when acting for generations in conservative and law-abiding countries. (4) The study of their causes and their acts is easy. The number of martyrs is many; their trials are spread over a long time. We have in many cases the papers of the prosecution as well as those of the defence, and the voice of Rome is frequently heard pronouncing on the questions in debate, and declaring that this or that matter is essential, on which no compromise can be permitted; or by her silence she lets it be understood that some other formula may pass.

The Cause of the Beatification of the English Martyrs is important not for England only, but for all missionary countries, where its precedents may possibly be followed. The English cause is a very ancient one. Pope Gregory XIII, between 1580 and 1585, made several important viva voce concessions. Relics of these martyrs might, in default of others, be used for the consecration of altars, a Te Deum might be publicly sung on the receipt of the news of their martyrdoms, and their pictures with their names attached might be placed in the church of the English College, Rome. These permissions were given without any systematic inquiry that we know of. Pope Urban VIII, in 1642, commenced such an inquiry, and though the outbreak of the Civil War in 1642 postponed indefinitely the public progress of the cause, a list of martyrs was drawn up by the then vicar Apostolic, Dr. Richard Smith, Bishop of Chalcedon, which was subsequently amplified and published by Dr. Richard Challoner. It was not till 1855 that the cause was revived, when Canon John Morris (a Jesuit after 1866) became its apostle. After several unsuccessful petitions, as that of the Third Synod of Westminster in 1859, to obtain an immediate sanction of their cultus by a papal decree, a formal "ordinary process" was held in London, June to September, 1874. The work was one of much difficulty, first because nothing of the sort had been attempted in England before, and secondly because of the multitude of the martyrs. Largely, however, through the public spirit of the Fathers of the London Oratory, who devoted themselves to it unitedly, success was achieved both in gathering together a large body of evidence and in fulfilling the multifarious ceremonial precautions on which the Roman jurists so strongly insist. After the cause had been for twelve years in the Roman courts, two decrees were issued which, broadly speaking, gave full force and efficacy to the two ancient papal ordinations before mentioned (see Beatification and Canonization).

Thus Pope Gregory's concession resulted in the equivalent beatification of sixty-three martyrs mentioned by name in the pictures (at first, in 1888, fifty-

four were admitted; in 1895 eight more were added, with one not in the Roman pictures), while the lists drawn up by Bishops Smith and Challoner led to the "admission of the cause" of 241 martyrs (all but twelve post-Gregorian), who are therefore called "Venerables". Forty-four were left with their fate still in suspense, and are called *Dilati*. Except seven, these are all "Confessors", who certainly died in prison for their faith, though it is not yet proven that they died precisely because of their imprisonment. There is yet another class to be described. While the foregoing cause was pending, great progress was being made with the arrangement of papers in the Public Record Office of London, so that we now know immeasurably more of the persecution and its victims than before the cause began. In short, over 230 additional sufferers seemed possibly worthy of being declared martyrs. They are called the *Prætermissi*, because they were passed over in the first cause. A new cause was thereupon held at Westminster (September, 1888, to August, 1889), and the proceedings have been sent to Rome. For reasons which it is not necessary to touch upon here, it was thought best to include every possible claimant, even those of whom there was very little definite information, and the far-reaching cause of Queen Mary Stuart. This, however, proved a tactical mistake. An obscure cause needs as much attention as a clear cause, or more. Moreover, the Roman courts are, on the one hand, so short-handed that they grudge giving men to a work which will lead to little result, and, on the other hand, they are overwhelmed with causes which certainly need attention. In order to facilitate progress, therefore, the cause has been split up; the case of Queen Mary has been handed over to the hierarchy of Scotland, and other simplifications have been attempted; nevertheless the cause of the *Prætermissi* so far hangs fire. Apostolic letters for a *Processus de Scriptis* were issued by the Sacred Congregation of Rites on 24 March, 1899, ordering the then Archbishop of Westminster to gather up copies of all the extant writings of the martyrs declared Venerable. This proved a lengthy task, and when complete the collection comprised nearly 500 *scripta*, and over 2000 pages. It was not completed till 17 June, 1904. Then, by special concession, four censors were appointed to draw up a preliminary *censura* in England, and this was forwarded to Rome, where, after further consideration, a decree was drawn up and confirmed by the pope on 2 March, 1906, declaring that none of the writings produced would hinder the cause of the martyrs now under discussion. In the course of the same year a further decree was obtained, allowing altars for the *beati*, but not without many restrictions.

I. BEATI.—The sixty-three Blessed will be noticed in detail elsewhere, and the principal authorities will be there noted. Their names are here arranged in companies when they were tried or died together.

(1) *Under King Henry VIII.*—Cardinal: John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, 22 June, 1535. Lord Chancellor: Sir Thomas More, 6 July, 1535. Carthusians: John Houghton, Robert Lawrence, Augustine Webster, 4 May, 1535; Humphrey Middlemore, William Exmew, Sebastian Newdigate, 19 June, 1535; John Rochester, James Walworth, 11 May, 1537; Thomas Johnson, William Greenwood, John Davye, Robert Salt, Walter Pierson, Thomas Greene, Thomas Scryven, Thomas Redyng, Richard Bere, June–Sept., 1537; Robert Horne, 4 Aug., 1540. Benedictines: Richard Whiting, Hugh Farringdon, abbots, 15 Nov., 1539; Thomas Marshal (or John Beche), 1 Dec., 1539; John Thorne, Roger James, William Eynon, John Rugg, 15 Nov., 1539. Doctors of Divinity: Thomas Abel, Edward Powell, Richard Fetherstone, 30 July, 1540. Other secular priests: John Haile, 4 May, 1535; John Larke, 7 March, 1544. Other religious orders: Richard Reynold, Brigittine (4 May, 1535); John Stone, O.S.A., 12 May, 1538; John Forest, O.S.F., 22 May, 1538. Laymen and women: Adrian Fortescue, Knight of St. John, 9 July, 1539; Margaret Pole, Countess of Salisbury, 28 May, 1541; German Gardiner, 7 March, 1544. (2) *Under Queen Elizabeth.*—Martyrs connected with the Excommunication: John Felton, 8 Aug., 1570; Thomas Plumtree p., 4 Jan., 1571; John Storey, D.C.L., 1 June, 1571; Thomas Percy, Earl of Northumberland, 22 Aug., 1572; Thomas Woodhouse p., 13 June, 1573. First martyrs from the seminaries: Cuthbert Mayne, Protomartyr of Douai College, 29 Nov., 1577; John Nelson p. and S.J. before death, 3 Feb , 1578; Thomas Sherwood, church student, 7 Feb., 1578; Everard Hanse p., 31 July, 1581. Martyrs of the Catholic Revival: Edmund Campion, S.J., Ralph Sherwin, Protomartyr of English College, Rome, Alexander Briant p. and S.J. before death, 1 Dec., 1581; John Payne p., 2 April, 1582; Thomas Ford p., John Shert p., Robert Johnson p., 28 May, 1582; William Filby p., Luke Kirby p., Lawrence Richardson p., Thomas Cottam p. and S.J. before death, 30 May, 1582. York martyrs: William Lacey p., Richard Kirkman p., 22 Aug., 1582; James Thompson p., 28 Nov., 1582; William Hart p., 15 March, 1583; Richard Thirkeld p., 29 May, 1583.

II. VENERABLES.—Separate notices will be given of the more notable martyrs and groups of martyrs. But, though they all died heroically, their lives were so retired and obscure that there is generally but little known about them. It may, however, be remarked that, being educated in most cases in the same seminaries, engaged in the same work, and suffering under the same procedure and laws, the details which we know about some of the more notable martyrs (of whom special biographies are given) are generally also true for the more obscure. The authorities, too, will be the same in both cases.

(1) *Under King Henry VIII* (12).—1537–38: Anthony Brookby, Thomas Belchiam, Thomas Cort, Franciscans, thrown into prison for preaching against the king's supremacy. Brookby was strangled with his own girdle, the others died of ill treatment. 1539: Friar Waire, O.S.F., and John Griffith p. (generally known as Griffith Clarke), Vicar of Wandsworth, for supporting the papal legate, Cardinal Pole, drawn and quartered (8 July) at St. Thomas Waterings; Sir Thomas Dingley, Knight of St. John, beheaded, 10 July, with Bl. Adrian Fortescue, q. v. John Travers, Irish Augustinian, who had written against the supremacy; before execution his hand was cut off and burnt, but the writing fingers were not consumed, 30 July. 1540–44: Edmund Brindholme p., of London, and Clement Philpot l., of Calais, attainted for having "adhered to the Pope of Rome", hanged and quartered at Tyburn, 4 Aug., 1540; Sir David Gonson (also Genson and Gunston), Knight of St. John, son of Vice-Admiral Gonson, attainted for "adhering" to Cardinal Pole, hanged and quartered at St. Thomas Waterings, 1 July, 1541; John Ireland p., once a chaplain to More, condemned and executed with Bl. John Larke, 1544; Thomas Ashby l., q. v., 29 March, 1544.

(2) *Under Queen Elizabeth.*—1583: John Slade l., q. v., 30 Oct., Winchester, with John Bodey l., 2 Nov., Andover. 1584: William Carter l., q. v., 11 Jan., Tyburn; George Haydock p., q. v., with James Fenn p., Thomas Hemerford p., John Nutter p., John Munden p., 12 Feb., Tyburn; James Bell p., q. v., with John Finch l., q. v., 20 April, Lancaster; Richard White l., q. v., 17 Oct., Wrexham. 1585: Thomas Alfield p., q. v., with Thomas Webley l., 6 July, Tyburn; Hugh Taylor p., q. v., with Marmaduke Bowes l., 26 Nov., York. From this time onwards almost all the priests suffered under the law of 27 Elizabeth, merely for their priestly character. 1586: Edward Stransham p., q. v., with Nicholas Woodfen p., 21 Jan., Tyburn; Margaret Clitherow l., q. v., 25 March, York; Richard Sergeant p., q. v., with William Thompson p., 20 April,

Tyburn; Robert Anderton p., q. v., with William Marsden p., 25 April, Isle of Wight; Francis Ingleby p., 3 June, York; John Finglow p., 8 Aug., York; John Sandys p., 11 Aug., Gloucester; John Adams p., q. v., with John Lowe p., 8 Oct., Tyburn, and Richard Dibdale p., 8 Oct., Tyburn; Robert Bickerdike l., 8 Oct., York; Richard Langley l., 1 Dec., York. 1587: Thomas Pilchard p., 21 March, Dorchester; Edmund Sykes p., q. v., 23 March, York; Robert Sutton p., q. v., 27 July, Stafford; Stephen Rowsham p., q. v., July or earlier, Gloucester; John Hambley p., q. v., about same time, Chard in Somerset; George Douglas p., 9 Sept., York; Alexander Crowe p., 13 Nov., York. 1588: Nicholas Garlick p., q. v., with Robert Ludlam p. and Richard Sympson p., 24 July, Derby; Robert Morton p., q. v., and Hugh Moor l., in Lincoln's Inn Fields; William Gunter p., Theatre, Southwark; Thomas Holford p., Clerkenwell; William Dean p., and Henry Webley l., Mile End Green; James Claxton p.; Thomas Felton, O.S.F., Hounslow. These eight were condemned together and suffered on the same day, 28 Aug. Richard Leigh p., q. v., Edward Shelley l., Richard Martin l., Richard Flower (Floyd or Lloyd) l., John Roche l., Mrs. Margaret Ward, q. v., all condemned with the last, and all suffered 30 Aug., Tyburn. William Way p., 23 Sept., Kingston-on-Thames; Robert Wilcox p., q. v., with Edward Campion p., Christopher Buxton p., Robert Widmerpool l., 1 Oct., Canterbury; Ralph Crockett p., q. v., with Edward James p., 1 Oct., Chichester; John Robinson p., 1 Oct., Ipswich; William Hartley p., q. v., Theatre, Southwark, with John Weldon (*vere* Hewett) p., Mile End Green, Robert Sutton l., Clerkenwell, and Richard Williams (Queen Mary priest, who was more probably executed in 1592, and his name, erroneously transferred here, seems to have pushed out that of John Symons, or Harrison), 5 Oct., Holloway; Edward Burden p., 29 Nov., York; William Lampley l., Gloucester, day uncertain. 1589: John Amias p., q. v., with Robert Dalby p., 16 March, York; George Nichols p., q. v., with Richard Yaxley p., Thomas Belson l., and Humphrey Pritchard l., 5 July, Oxford; William Spenser p., q. v., with Robert Hardesty l., 24 Sept., York. 1590: Christopher Bayles p., Fleet Street, with Nicholas Horner l., Smithfield, and Alexander Blake l., 4 March, Gray's Inn Lane; Miles Gerard p., q. v., with Francis Dicconson p., 30 April, Rochester; Edward Jones p., Conduit, Fleet Street, and Anthony Middleton p., 6 May, Clerkenwell; Edmund Duke p., with Richard Hill p., q. v., John Hogg p., and Richard Holliday p., 27 May, Durham. 1591: Robert Thorpe p., q. v., with Thomas Watkinson l., 31 May, York; Monford Scott p., q. v., with George Beesley p., 2 July, Fleet Street, London; Roger Dicconson p., with Ralph Milner l., 7 July, Winchester; William Pikes l., day not known, Dorchester; Edmund Jennings p., q. v., with Swithin Wells l., Gray's Inn Fields; Eustace White p., q. v., with Polydore Plasden p., Brian Lacy l., John Mason l., Sydney Hodgson l., all seven, 10 Dec., Tyburn. 1592: William Patenson p., 22 Jan., Tyburn; Thomas Pormort p., q. v., 20 Feb., St. Paul's Churchyard, London; Roger Ashton l., q. v., 23 June, Tyburn. 1593: Edward Waterson p., 7 Jan. (but perhaps of the next year), Newcastle-on-Tyne; James Bird l., hanged 25 March, Winchester; Joseph Lampton p., q. v., 27 July, Newcastle-on-Tyne; William Davies p., q. v., 21 July, Beaumaris. 1594: John Speed l., condemned for receiving a priest, 4 Feb., Durham; William Harrington p., q. v., 18 Feb., Tyburn; John Cornelius, S.J., q. v., with Thomas Bosgrave l., John Carey l., Patrick Salmon l., 4 July, Dorchester; John Boste p., q. v., Durham, with John Ingram p., q. v., Newcastle-on-Tyne, and George Swallowell, a convert minister, tried together, and they suffered 24, 25, and 26 July, Darlington; Edward Osbaldeston p., 16 Nov., York. 1595: Robert Southwell p., S.J., q. v., 21 Feb., Tyburn; Alexander Rawlins p., with Henry Walpole p., S.J., q. v., 7 April, York; William Freeman p., q. v., 13 Aug., Warwick; Philip Howard, q. v., Earl of Arundel, 19 Oct., Tower of London. 1596: George Errington, gentleman, William Knight l., William Gibson l., Henry Abbot l., 29 Nov., York. 1597: William Andleby p., q. v., with Thomas Warcop l., Edward Fulthrop l., 4 July, York. 1598 John Britton l., q. v., 1 April, York; Peter Snow p., q v., with Ralph Grimston l., 15 June, York; John Buckley, O.S.F., q. v., 12 July, St. Thomas Waterings; Christopher Robinson p., 19 Aug., Carlisle; Richard Horner p., 4 Sept., York. 1599: John Lion l., 16 July, Oakham; James Dowdall l., 13 Aug., Exeter. 1600: Christopher Wharton p., 28 March, York; John Rigby l., q. v., 21 June, St. Thomas Waterings; Thomas Sprott p., q. v., with Thomas Hunt p., 11 July, Lincoln; Robert Nutter p., q. v., with Edward Thwing p., 26 July, Lancaster; Thomas Palasor p., q. v., with John Norton l. and John Talbot l., 9 Aug., Durham. 1601: John Pibush p., 18 Feb., St. Thomas Waterings, Mark Barkworth, O.S.B., q. v., with Roger Filcock, S.J. and Anne Line, q. v., 27 Feb., Tyburn; Thurstan Hunt p., q. v., with Robert Middleton p., 31 March, Lancaster; Nicholas Tichborne l., q. v., with Thomas Hackshot l., 24 Aug., Tyburn. 1602: James Harrison p., q. v., with Anthony Battie or Bates l., 22 March, York; James Duckett l., q. v., 19 April, Tyburn; Thomas Tichborne p., q. v., with Robert Watkinson p., and Francis Page, S.J., 20 April, Tyburn. 1603: William Richardson p., 17 Feb., Tyburn.

(3) *Under James I and Charles.*—1604: John Sugar p., q. v., with Robert Grissold l., 16 July, Warwick; Lawrence Bailey l., 16 Sept., Lancaster. 1605: Thomas Welbourne l., with John Fulthering l., 1 Aug., York; William Brown l., 5 Sept., Ripon. 1606: Martyrs at the time of the Powder Plot: Nicholas Owen, S.J., day unknown, Tower; Edward Oldcorne, S.J., q. v., with Ralph Ashley, S.J., q. v., 7 April, Worcester. From this time till the end of the reign the martyrs might have saved their lives had they taken the condemned oath of allegiance. 1607: Robert Drury p., 26 Feb., Tyburn. 1608: Matthew Flathers p., 21 March, York; George Gervase, O.S.B., q. v., 11 April, Tyburn; Thomas Garnet, S.J., q. v., 23 June, Tyburn. 1610: Roger Cadwallador p., q. v., 27 Aug., Leominster; George Napper p., q. v., 9 Nov., Oxford; Thomas Somers p., 10 Dec., Tyburn; John Roberts, O.S.B., q. v., 10 Dec., Tyburn. 1612: William Scot, O.S.B., q. v., with Richard Newport p., 30 May, Tyburn; John Almond p., 5 Dec., Tyburn. 1616: Thomas Atkinson p., q. v., 11 March, York; John Thulis p., with Roger Wrenno l., 18 March, Lancaster; Thomas Maxfield p., q. v., 1 July, Tyburn; Thomas Tunstal p., 13 July, Norwich. 1618: William Southerne p., 30 April, Newcastle-under-Lyne. 1628: Edmund Arrowsmith, S.J. (see EDMUND ARROWSMITH), with Richard Herst l., 20 and 21 Aug., Lancaster.

(4) *Commonwealth.*—All these suffered before the death of Oliver Cromwell.—1641: William Ward p., q. v., 26 July, Tyburn; Edward Barlow, O.S.B., q. v., 10 Sept., Lancaster. 1642: Thomas Reynolds p., with Bartholomew Roe, O.S.B., 21 January, Tyburn; John Lockwood p., q. v., with Edmund Catherick p., q. v., 13 April, York; Edward Morgan p., q. v., 26 April, Tyburn; Hugh Green p., q. v., 19 Aug., Dorchester; Thomas Bullaker, O.S.F., q. v., 12 Oct., Tyburn; Thomas Holland, S.J., q. v., 12 Dec., Tyburn. 1643: Henry Heath, O.S.F., q. v., 17 April, Tyburn; Brian Cansfield, S.J., 3 Aug., York Castle; Arthur Bell, O.S.F., q. v., 11 Dec., Tyburn. 1644: Richard Price, colonel, 7 May, Lincoln; John Duckett p., with Ralph Corbie, S.J., q. v., 7 Sept., Tyburn. 1645: Henry Morse, S.J., q. v., 1 Feb., Tyburn; John Goodman p., q. v., 8 April, Newgate. 1646: Philip Powel, O.S.B., 30 June, Tyburn; John Woodcock, O.S.F., with Edward Bamber p., q. v., and Thomas Whitaker p., 7 Aug., Lancaster. 1651: Peter Wright, S.J., q. v., 19

May, Tyburn. 1654: John Southworth p., q. v., 28 June, Tyburn.

(5) *The Oates Plot.*—1678: Edward Coleman l., q. v., 3 Dec., Tyburn; Edward Mico, S.J., 3 Dec., in Newgate; Thomas Bedingfeld, S.J., 21 Dec., in Gatehouse Prison. 1679: William Ireland, S.J., q. v., with John Grove l., 24 Jan., Tyburn; Thomas Pickering, O.S.B., 9 May, Tyburn; Thomas Whitbread, S.J., with William Harcourt, S.J., John Fenwick, S.J., John Gavan, or Green, S.J., and Anthony Turner, S.J., 20 June, Tyburn; Francis Nevil, S.J., Feb., in Stafford Gaol; Richard Langhorne l., q. v., 14 July, Tyburn; William Plessington p., 19 July, Chester; Philip Evans, S.J., 22 July, with John Lloyd p., 22 July, Cardiff; Nicholas Postgate p., q. v., 7 Aug., York; Charles Mahony, O.S.F., 12 Aug., Ruthin; John Wall, O.S.F., q. v., 22 Aug., Worcester; Francis Levison, O.S.F., 11 Feb., in prison; John Kemble p., q. v., 22 Aug., Hereford; David Lewis, S.J., q. v., 27 Aug., Usk. 1680: Thomas Thwing p., q. v., 23 Oct., York; William Howard, q. v., Viscount Stafford, 29 Dec., Tower Hill. The cause of the Irish Martyr Oliver Plunket, q. v., 1 July, Tower Hill, was commenced with the above martyrs. The cause of his beatification is now being actively proceeded with by the Cardinal Archbishop of Armagh.

III. The Forty-four Dilati.—These, as has been explained above, are those "put off" for further proof. Of these the majority were confessors, who perished after a comparatively short period of imprisonment, though definite proof of their death *ex ærumnis* is not forthcoming. (1) *Under Queen Elizabeth* (18).—Robert Dimock, hereditary champion of England, was arrested at Mass, and perished after a few weeks' imprisonment at Lincoln, 11 Sept., 1580; John Cooper, a young man, brought up by the writer, Dr. Nicholas Harpsfield, and probably a distributor of Catholic books, arrested at Dover, and sent to the Tower, died of "hunger, cold and stench", 1580; Mr. Ailworth (Aylword), probably of Passage Castle, Waterford, who admitted Catholics to Mass at his house, was arrested, and died after eight days, 1580; William Chaplain p., Thomas Cotesmore p., Robert Holmes p., Roger Wakeman p., James Lomax p., perished in 1584. Cotesmore was a bachelor of Oxford in 1536; of Wakeman's sufferings several harrowing details are on record. Thomas Crowther p., Edward Pole p., John Jetter p., and Laurence Vaux p., q. v., perished in 1585; John Harrison p., 1586; Martin Sherson p., and Gabriel Thimelby p., 1587; Thomas Metham, S.J., 1592; Eleanor Hunt and Mrs. Wells, gentlewomen, on unknown days in 1600 and 1602. (2) *Under the Commonwealth* (8).—Edward Wilkes p., died in York Castle before execution in 1642; Boniface Kempe (or Francis Kipton) and Ildephonse Hesketh (or William Hanson), O.S.B., professed of Montserrat, seized by Puritan soldiery in Yorkshire, and worried to death, 26 July (?), 1644; Richard Bradley, S.J., b. at Bryning Hall, Lancs., 1605, of a well-known Catholic family, seized and imprisoned, but died before trial at Manchester, 20 Jan., 1645; John Felton, S.J., visiting another Father in Lincoln, was seized and so badly used that, when released (for no one appeared against him), he died within a month, 17 Feb., 1645; Thomas Vaughan of Courtfield p., and Thomas Blount p., imprisoned at Shrewsbury, d. at unknown dates; Robert Cox, O.S.B., d. in the Clink Prison, 1650. (3) *During the Oates Plot* (10).—Thomas Jennison, S.J., d. after twelve months' imprisonment, 27 Sept., 1679. He had renounced a handsome inheritance in favour of his brother, who, nevertheless, having apostatized, turned king's evidence against him. William Lloyd, d. under sentence of death at Brecknock, 1679. Placid Aldham or John Adland (O.S.B.), a convert clergyman, chaplain to Queen Catherine of Braganza, d. under sentence in 1679. William Atkins, S.J., condemned at Stafford, was too deaf to hear the sentence. When it was shouted in his ear, he turned and thanked the judge; he was reprieved and d. in bonds, 7 March, 1681. Richard Birkett p., d 1680 under sentence in Lancaster Castle; but our martyrologists seem to have made some confusion between him and John Penketh, S.J., a fellow prisoner (see Gillow, Catholic Rec. Soc., IV, pp. 431–40). Richard Lacey (Prince), S.J., Newgate, 11 March, 1680; William Allison p., York Castle, 1681; Edward Turner, S.J., 19 March, 1681, Gatehouse; Benedict Constable, O.S.B., professed at Lamspring, 1669, 11 Dec., 1683, Durham Gaol; William Bennet (Bentney), S.J., 30 October, 1692, Leicester Gaol under William III. (4) *Others Put off for Various Causes.* (8).—John Mawson, assigned to 1614, is not yet sufficiently distinguished from John Mason, 1591; there is a similar difficulty between Matthias Harrison, assigned to 1599, and James Harrison, 1602; William Tyrrwhit, named by error for his brother Robert; likewise the identity of Thomas Dyer, O.S.B., has not been fully proved; James Atkinson, killed under torture by Topcliffe, but evidence is wanted of his constancy to the end. Father Henry Garnet, S.J., q. v.; was he killed *ex odio fidei*, or was he believed to be guilty of the Powder Plot, by merely human misjudgment, not through religious prejudice? The case of Lawrence Hill and Robert Green at the time of the Oates Plot is similar. Was it due to *odium fidei*, or an unprejudiced error?

IV. The Prætermissi (242).—(1) *Martyrs on the Scaffold.*—1534: Elizabeth Barton, q. v. (The Holy Maid of Kent), with five companions; John Dering, O.S.B., Edward Bocking, O.S.B., Hugh Rich, O.S.F., Richard Masters p., Henry Gold p., 1537. Monks, 28.—After the Pilgrimage of Grace, and the Rising of Lincolnshire many, probably several hundred, were executed, of whom no record remains. The following names, which do survive, are grouped under their respective abbeys or priories.—Barling: Matthew Mackerel, abbot and Bishop of Chalcedon, Ord. Præm., Bardney: John Tenant, William Coe, John Francis, William Cowper, Richard Laynton, Hugh Londale, monks. Bridlington: William Wood, Prior. Fountains: William Thyrsk, O. Cist. Guisborough: James Cockerell, Prior. Jervaulx: Adam Sedbar, Abbot; George Asleby, monk. Kirkstead: Richard Harrison, Abbot, Richard Wade, William Swale, Henry Jenkinson, monks. Lenton: Nicholas Heath, Prior; William Gylham, monk. Sawley: William Trafford, Abbot; Richard Eastgate, monk. Whalley: John Paslew, Abbot; John Eastgate, William Haydock, monks. Woburn: Robert Hobbes, Abbot; Ralph Barnes, sub-prior; Laurence Blonham, monk. York: John Pickering, O.S.D., Prior. Place unknown: George ab Alba Rosa, O.S.A. Priests: William Burraby, Thomas Kendal, John Henmarsh, James Mallet, John Pickering, Thomas Redforth. Lords: Darcy and Hussey. Knights: Francis Bigod, Stephen Hammerton, Thomas Percy. Laymen (11): Robert Aske, Robert Constable, Bernard Fletcher, George Huddeswell, Robert Leeche, Roger Neeve, George Lomley, Thomas Moyne, Robert Sotheby, Nicholas Tempest, Philip Trotter. 1538 (7): Henry Courtney, the Marquess of Exeter; Henry Pole, Lord Montague; Sir Edward Neville and Sir Nicholas Carew; George Croft p. and John Collins p.; Hugh Holland l. Their cause was "adhering to the Pope, and his legate Cardinal Pole". 1540 (6): Lawrence Cook, O. Carm., Prior of Doncaster; Thomas Empson, O.S.B.; Robert Bird p.; William Peterson p.; William Richardson p.; Giles Heron l. 1544 (3): Martin de Coudres, O.S.A., and Paul of St. William, O.S.A.; Darby Genning l. 1569, 1570 (8): Thomas Bishop, Simon Digby, John Fulthorpe, John Hall, Christopher Norton, Thomas Norton, Robert Pennyman, Oswald Wilkinson, laymen who suffered, like Blessed Thomas Percy, Earl of Northumberland, q. v., on occasion of the Northern Rising.

Various Years (6): Thomas Gabyt, O. Cist., 1575; William Hambledon p., 1585; Roger Martin p., 1592; Christopher Dixon, O.S.A., 1616; James Laburne, 1583; Edward Arden, 1584.

(2) *Martyrs in Chains.*—Bishops (2): Richard Creagh, Archbishop of Armagh, in Tower of London; Thomas Watson, Bishop of Lincoln, in Wisbeach Castle. Priests in London Prisons (18): Austin Abbot, Richard Adams, Thomas Belser, John Boxall, D.D., James Brushford, Edmund Cannon, William Chedsey, D.D., Henry Cole, D.D., Anthony Draycott, D.D., Andrew Fryer,—— Gretus, Richard Hatton, Nicholas Harpsfield, —— Harrison, Francis Quashet, Thomas Slythurst, William Wood, John Young, D.D. Laymen in London Prisons (35): Alexander Bales, Richard Bolbet, Sandra Cubley, Thomas Cosen, Mrs. Cosen, Hugh Dutton, Edward Ellis, Gabriel Empringham, John Fitzherbert, Sir Thomas Fitzherbert, John Frier, Anthony Fugatio (Portuguese), —— Glynne, David Gwynne, John Hammond (alias Jackson), Richard Hart, Robert Holland, John Lander, Anne Lander, Peter Lawson, Widow Lingon, Philippa Lowe, —— May, John Molineux, Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland, Richard Reynolds, Edmund Sexton, Robert Shelley, Thomas Somerset, Francis Spencer, John Thomas, Peter Tichbourne, William Travers, Sir Edward Waldegrave, Richard Weston. Priests in York (12): John Ackridge, William Baldwin, William Bannersley, Thomas Bedal, Richard Bowes, Henry Comberford, James Gerard, Nicholas Grene, Thomas Harwood, John Pearson, Thomas Ridall, James Swarbrick. Laymen in York (31): Anthony Ash, Thomas Blenkinsop, Stephen Branton, Lucy Budge, John Chalmar, Isabel Chalmer, John Constable, Ralph Cowling, John Eldersha, Isabel Foster, —— Foster, Agnes Fuister, Thomas Horsley, Stephen Hemsworth, Mary Hutton, Agnes Johnson, Thomas Layne, Thomas Luke, Alice Oldcorne, —— Reynold, —— Robinson, John Stable, Mrs. Margaret Stable, Geoffrey Stephenson, Thomas Vavasour, Mrs. Dorothy Vavasour, Margaret Webster, Frances Webster, Christopher Watson, Hercules Welbourne, Alice Williamson. In Various Prisons: Benedictines (11): James Brown, Richard Coppinger, Robert Edmonds, John Feckenham, Laurence Mabbs, William Middleton, Placid Peto, Thomas Preston, Boniface Wilford, Thomas Rede, Sister Isabel Whitehead. Brigittine: Thomas Brownel (lay brother). Cistercians (2): John Almond, Thomas Mudde. Dominican: David Joseph Kemys. Franciscans: Thomas Ackridge, Paul Atkinson, q. v. (the last of the confessors in chains, died in Hurst Castle, after thirty years' imprisonment, 15 October, 1729), Laurence Collier, Walter Coleman, Germain Holmes. Jesuits (12): Matthew Brazier (alias Grimes), Humphrey Browne, Thomas Foster, William Harcourt, John Hudd, Cuthbert Prescott, Ignatius Price, Charles Pritchard, Francis Simeon, Nicholas Tempest, John Thompson, Charles Thursley. Priests (4): William Baldwin, James Gerard, John Pearson, James Swarbrick. Laymen (22): Thurstam Arrowsmith, Humphrey Beresford, William Bredstock, James Clayton, William Deeg, Ursula Foster, —— Green, William Griffith, William Heath, Richard Hocknell, John Jessop, Richard Kitchin, William Knowles, Thomas Lynch, William Maxfield, —— Morecock, Alice Paulin, Edmund Rookwood, Richard Spencer, —— Tremaine, Edmund Vyse, Jane Vyse.

V. The Eleven Bishops.—Since the process of the *Prætermissi* has been held, strong reasons have been shown for including on our list of sufferers, whose causes ought to be considered, the eleven bishops whom Queen Elizabeth deprived and left to die in prison, as Bonner, or under some form of confinement. Their names are: Cuthbert Tunstall, b. Durham, died 18 Nov., 1559; Ralph Bayle, b. Lichfield, d. 18 Nov., 1559; Owen Oglethorpe, b. Carlisle, d. 31 Dec., 1559; John White, b Winchester, d. 12 Jan., 1560; Richard Pate, b. Worcester, d. 23 Nov., 1565; David Poole, b. Peterborough, d. May, 1568; Edmund Bonner, b. London, d. 5 Sept., 1569; Gilbert Bourne, b. Bath and Wells, d. 10 Sept., 1569; Thomas Thirlby, b. Ely., d. 26 Aug., 1570; James Turberville, b. Exeter, d. 1 Nov., 1570; Nicholas Heath, Archbishop of York, d. Dec., 1578.

Lives of the English Martyrs, ed. Camm (2 vols., London, 1904), covering the lives of the *Beati;* the other lives are now in ccurse of preparation; Challoner, *Missionary Priests* (London, 1878); Gillow, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.;* Pollen, *Acts of English Martyrs* (1891); Id., *English Martyrs* (1584–1603), in *Cath. Rec. Soc.*, Vol. V (1908); Stanton, *Menology for England* (London, 1892); Dodd, *Church History* (London, 1839–43); Phillips, *Extinction of the Ancient Hierarchy* (London, 1906).

J. H. Pollen.

English Ladies. See Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

English Versions of the Bible. See Versions of the Bible.

Enniscorthy. See Ferns, Diocese of.

Ennodius, Magnus Felix, rhetorician and bishop, b. probably at Arles, in Southern Gaul, in 474; d. at Pavia, Italy, 17 July, 521. When quite young he went to Pavia, where he was educated, was betrothed, and eventually became a priest, his fiancée at the same time becoming a nun. It does not appear certain that he ever married. Shortly after the death of his benefactor, Epiphanius (496), he received minor orders at Milan, attracted thither no doubt by his uncle Laurentius, bishop of that city. Soon he was ordained deacon and taught in the schools. About this time (498) two popes were elected simultaneously, the deacon Symmachus and the archpriest Laurentius. King Theodoric was in favour of the former, and convened a council at Rome in 501, the famous *Synodus Palmaris*, to settle this question and put an end to much scandal. On this occasion Ennodius acted as secretary to Laurentius of Milan, who was the first to sign the decrees of the council. The adherents of the archpriest Laurentius, who was rejected by the council, wrote against the decisions of the latter. Ennodius answered them and defended the synod in a still extant work entitled "Libellus adversus eos qui contra synodum scribere præsumpserunt". After referring to the objections urged against the incompetency and irregularity of the council, he attacks the enemies of Symmachus and proclaims the inability of human judges to decide matters pertaining to popes: "God no doubt consented to the affairs of men being settled by men; He reserved to Himself the passing of judgment upon the pontiff of the supreme see" (Libellus, §93). In 513 Ennodius was still at Milan, but shortly afterwards he was made Bishop of Pavia. In 515 and 517 he headed two successive embassies which Pope Hormisdas sent to Emperor Anastasius at Constantinople, both of which, however, were barren of results. The unrelenting enmity of the emperor endangered the lives of the envoys in 517. Of the remaining years of his episcopate nothing is known. His epitaph, found by accident, gives the date of his death.

The works of Ennodius comprise poems for special occasions and epigrams, particularly inscriptions for churches or other religious monuments. His defence of the synod of 502, often known as "Libellus pro Synodo", his autobiography (Eucharisticum), his panegyric on King Theodoric, and the biographies of his predecessor Epiphanius of Milan, and a monk, Antonius of Lérins, are interesting from an historical point of view; the first four especially. As much can be said of his numerous letters, addressed to various correspondents. Notwithstanding their verbosity, they contain much useful information concerning the addressees and the customs of the time. Ennodius is the last representative of the ancient schools of rhetoric. His "Parænesis didascalica" (511) celebrates

the wonderful power of that foremost of the liberal arts, by which a guilty man is made to appear innocent, and vice versa. He illustrates his own method in a few declamatory exercises called "Dictiones"; they deal with themes once the delight of pagan rhetoricians, e. g. grief of Thetis on beholding the corpse of Achilles; Menelaus contemplating the ruins of Troy; the lament of Dido forsaken by Æneas, etc. Again, with all the resources of his rhetoric he denounces a man who placed a statue of Minerva in a place of ill-repute; a player who gambled away the field in which his parents lay buried; etc. He shared the popular fallacy of his contemporaries who saw in the reign of Theodoric a revival of the Roman Empire under the control of men of letters. Ennodius remained to the end faithful to the academic traditions of the Roman schools, whose mythological apparatus he was the last to retain; thus in an epithalamium he describes the beauty of the nude Venus, and makes love argue against virginity. Nevertheless, he refutes elsewhere the fables of the poets and points out that the understanding of the Christian Scriptures is the highest intellectual ideal. In him are visible the two tendencies whose conflict is never quite absent from Christian life; outwardly he remains true to classic tradition. His diction is exuberant and florid, but occasionally manifests vigour. The best editions of his writings are those of Hartel, in the sixth volume of the "Corpus ecclesiasticorum latinorum" (Vienna, 1881), and of Vogel in "Monumenta Germaniæ Hist.: Auct." (Berlin, 1885), VII.

Magani, *Ennodio* (Pavia, 1886); Tanzi, *La chronologia degli scritti di Ennodio* (Trieste, 1889); Hasenstab, *Studien zu Ennodius* (Munich, 1890); Vogel in the *Neues Archiv für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* (1898), XXIII, 51; Maguire, *St. Ennodius and the Papal Supremacy* in *Am. Cath. Quart. Rev.*, XXVI, 317, 523; Bardenhewer, *Patrology*, tr. Shahan (Freiburg im Br., St. Louis, 1908), 622–24.

Paul Lejay.

Ensingen (Ensinger), Ulrich, belonged to a family of architects who came from Einsingen near Ulm, Würtemberg, and who shared as master-builders in the construction of the most important Gothic buildings of the fifteenth century in Southern Germany. Ulrich, the founder of the family, is known from the year 1391; d. at Strasburg, 10 Feb., 1419. Apparently he learned his craft in the stonemason's guild of Ulm, and was also, perhaps, a pupil of Master Heinrich the Younger of Ulm. In 1391 he was asked to take charge of the work on the Milan cathedral, but he seems at that time to have stayed in Ulm, where he was architect of the cathedral until his death. At first his engagement at Ulm was for five years only, but in 1397 he was appointed master architect for life. Ulrich completed the choir, began the nave, and made the ground-plan of the tower. In 1394–95 he worked on the cathedral of Milan, but, disagreeing with the Duke of Milan as to questions of artistic detail, he went back to Ulm. His connexion with the work on the Strasburg cathedral, however, lasted longer; at Strasburg he was master-builder during 1399–1419 and built the north tower from the platform to the great window. At the same time he completed the nave and the lower part of the tower of the church of Our Lady at Esslingen. Besides two daughters Ulrich had three sons; his sons all followed the calling of their father. At first they used Ulrich's official title *Kirchenmeister* as a family name, but later adopted that of Ensingen (Ensinger).

(2) Caspar Ensingen was the oldest son; very little is known of him.

(3) Matthias Ensingen, another son, d. 1438. There is evidence that he was employed on the Ulm cathedral from 1427 and at Esslingen during 1436–38.

(4) Matthäus Ensingen, the youngest and most gifted son, can be traced during the years 1420–1463. In 1420 he worked at Strasburg; in the same year he was appointed master-builder for the work on the minster at Berne. The cornerstone of this was laid in 1421, and Matthäus conducted the work until 1449. In addition he had his father's position as architect at Esslingen (1419–1463). It can be proved that he was engaged on the cathedral of Ulm from 1446, but it was not until 1451 that he had charge of its construction as master-builder; before this last appointment he worked (1449–51) on the cathedral at Strasburg without occupying any well-defined position. On the Ulm cathedral he completed the vaulting of the choir and built the tower as high as the nave. During his last years he was for a short time again at Berne.

(5) Vincenz Ensingen, son of Matthäus, employed at Berne from 1448; during 1462–85 he worked at Constance, and in 1472 he built the small cloister at Basle.

Klemm, *Württemberg. Baumeister und Bildhauer* in *Württembergische Vierteljahrsheft* (Stuttgart, 1882), V, 55 sqq., 61 sqq.; Kraus, *Kunst und Altertum in Elsass-Lothringen*, I, 385 sqq., 699, 704.

Joseph Sauer.

Entablature.—A superstructure which lies horizontally upon the columns in classic architecture. It is divided into three parts: the architrave (the supporting member carried from column to column); the frieze (the decorative portion); and the cornice (the crowning and projecting member). Each of the orders has its appropriate entablature, of which both the general height and the subdivisions are regulated by a scale of proportion derived from the diameter of the column. It is occasionally used to complete, architecturally, the upper portion of a wall, even when there are no columns, and in the case of pilasters or detached or engaged columns is sometimes profiled round them.

Anderson and Spiers, *Architecture of Greece and Rome* (London, 1903), 278; Parker, *Glossary of Architecture* (Oxford and London, 1845).

Thomas H. Poole.

Enthronization (from Greek *ἐνθρονίζειν*, to place on a throne).—This word has been employed in different meanings: (1) formerly, it meant the solemn placing of the relics upon the altar of a church which was to be consecrated, hence a newly consecrated church was called *naos enthroniasmenos* (*ναὸς ἐνθρονιασμένος*). (2) In the Middle Ages we find the *inthronizatio matrimonii*, or enthronization of marriage, which was nothing else than the blessing in the nuptial Mass (*benedictio nuptiarum*). (3) In the East it was employed, but seldom, to denote the induction into a parochial benefice. (4) It was used especially to designate the ceremony of enthronization which accompanies the consecration of a bishop. After receiving episcopal consecration, the newly consecrated bishop was solemnly conducted to the episcopal throne, of which he took possession. He received the kiss of peace and listened to the reading of a passage of Holy Scripture, whereupon he pronounced an address or *sermo inthronisticus*. The letters which it was customary for him to send to the other bishops in token of his being in communion with them in the same faith, were called *litteræ inthronisticæ*, or *syllabai enthronistikai* (*συλλαβαὶ ἐνθρονιστικαί*), and the gifts which it was customary for him to present to the bishops who had consecrated him, and to those who had taken part in the ceremonies were called the *inthronisticon* (*ἐνθρονιστικόν*). At present, after the consecration has taken place, the new bishop is conducted by the consecrating bishop and one of the assistants to the throne occupied by the consecrator during the ceremony, or to the seat usually taken by the bishop, if the consecration has taken place in the cathedral church. The enthronization can also take place independently of the consecration; in this case, the bishop, after taking his seat upon the throne, receives there the homage of all ecclesiastics present in the cathedral. These ceremonies have no longer the

slightest juridical importance (see BISHOP). (5) The enthronization of the pope in the Chair of St. Peter, *Cathedra Petri*, was formerly a very important ceremony, which took place at St. Peter's in Rome, or, exceptionally, in the church of St. Peter *ad Vincula*, where there was also a *Cathedra Petri*. This ceremony was performed immediately after the election, if the latter had taken place in the church of St. Peter, or before the coronation. Its object was to proclaim to the Christian world that the newly elected pope was the lawful successor of St. Peter. Before this ceremony had taken place, he was forbidden to take part in the administration of the Church. In 1059 Pope Nicholas II declared that the omission of the enthronization did not prevent the pope from administering the Church. This custom disappeared in the thirteenth century, owing to the fact that in that period the popes seldom resided in Rome. Equivalent to enthronization is the *adoratio* of the pope by the cardinals, which is performed in St. Peter's after the election of the pontiff. It is a simple ceremony and does not confer the slightest right. (6) The Roman Pontifical mentions enthronement amongst the ceremonies which accompany the solemn consecration of a king. It is still practised in the Anglican Episcopal Church at the coronation of the King of England (see CORONATION).

BINGHAM, *Origines sive antiquitates ecclesiasticæ* (Halle, 1724), Bk. II, ch. xi, §10; KRAUS, *Real-Encyklopädie der christlichen Alterthümer* (Freiburg, 1882–1886), I, 423; KREUTZWALD in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Inthronisation;* THALHOFER in *Kirchenlex.* (Freiburg, 1886), IV, 183 (on the *inthronizatio matrimonii*); ZÖPFFEL, *Die Papstwahlen vom XI. bis zum XIV. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 1871), 235–265; WURM, *Die Papstwahl* (Cologne, 1902), 125–26.

A. VAN HOVE.

Enthusiasts. See MESSALIANS.

Eoghan, SAINTS.—(1) EOGHAN OF ARDSTRAW was a native of Leinster, and, after presiding over the Abbey of Kilnamanagh (Co. Wicklow) for fifteen years, settled in the valley of Mourne (Co. Tyrone), his mother's country, about the year 576. He was followed by many disciples including St. Kevin of Glendalough, who completed his studies under this saint. As a boy he had been carried off to Britain, and subsequently he was taken captive to Brittany, together with St. Tighernach, who is best known as the founder of the Abbey of Clones, Co. Monaghan. So great was the fame of the sanctity and learning of St. Eoghan, at Mourne, that he was consecrated first Bishop of Ardstraw about the year 581. It is difficult to give his chronology with any degree of exactness, but the Irish annalists give the date of his death as 23 Aug., 618. His name is generally latinized as Eugenius, but the Irish form is *Eoghan* (Owen), hence *Tir Eoghain*, or Tyrone.

Ardstraw continued as an episcopal see until 1150, when it was translated to Rathlure and subsequently to Maghera, but in 1254 it was definitely removed to Derry. In all these changes St. Eoghan was regarded as the clan patron, and hence he is the tutelary guardian of the See of Derry to this day. His feast is celebrated on 23 August.

O'HANLON, *Lives of the Irish Saints* (Dublin, s. d.), VIII; LANIGAN, *Eccl. Hist. of Ireland* (Dublin, 1829); SHEARMAN, *Loca Patriciana* (Dublin, 1882); *Acta Sanct. Hib. ex Cod. Sal.* (London, 1888); O'DOHERTY, *Derriana* (Dublin, 1902).

(2) EOGHAN OF CLONCULLEN, Co. Tipperary, has been identified with Eoghan, son of Saran of Cloncullen, for whom St. Ailbe of Emly composed a rule. He is entered in the Martyrologies of Tallaght and Donegal, and is venerated on 15 March.

(3) EOGHAN, Bishop, is commemorated in the Martyrology of Tallaght on 18 April, and is included by the Bollandists under that date, but the particulars of his life are scanty in the extreme.

(4) EOGHAN THE SAGE (SAPIENS) finds a place in the Irish martyrologies, and he is also included in the "Acta Sanctorum", but no reliable data as to his life is forthcoming. His feast is celebrated on 28 May.

(5) EOGHAN OF CRANFIELD (Co. Antrim) has been described as Abbot of Moville, but there is reason to believe that he is to be identified with the preceding saint of the same name, especially as the Bollandists style him *Episcopus et Sapiens de-Magh-cremhcaille.* A St. Ernan of Cremhcaille (Cranfield) is honoured on 31 May, but this is also the feast day of St. Eoghan. However, "Ernan" may be a scribal error for "Eoghan", and this would account for the seeming mistake of name in regard to the patron of Cranfield.

There are other Irish saints of this name, but their history is somewhat obscure, and it is not easy to reconcile their chronology.

Acta Sanct. Hib. (Louvain, 1645); TODD AND REEVES, *Martyrology of Donegal* (Dublin, 1864); O'HANLON, *Lives of the Irish Saints* (Dublin, s. d.); O'LAVERTY, *Down and Connor* (Dublin, 1884), III.

W. H. GRATTAN-FLOOD.

Epact (Gr. ἔπακται ἡμέραι; Lat. *dies adjecti*), the surplus days of the solar over the lunar year; hence, more freely, the number of days in the age of the moon on 1 January of any given year. The whole system of epacts is based on the Metonic Lunar Cycle (otherwise known as the Cycle of Golden Numbers), and serves to indicate the days of the year on which the new moons occur.

THE CHURCH LUNAR CALENDAR.—It is generally held that the Last Supper took place on the Jewish Feast of the Passover, which was always kept on the fourteenth day of the first month of the old Jewish calendar. Consequently, since this month always began with that new moon of which the fourteenth day occurred on or next after the vernal equinox, Christ arose from the dead on Sunday, the seventeenth day of the so-called paschal moon. It is evident, then, that an exact anniversary of Easter is impossible except in years in which the seventeenth day of the paschal moon falls on Sunday. In the early days of Christianity there existed a difference of opinion between the Eastern and Western Churches as to the day on which Easter ought to be kept, the former keeping it on the fourteenth day and the latter on the Sunday following. To secure uniformity of practice, the Council of Nicæa (325) decreed that the Western method of keeping Easter on the Sunday after the fourteenth day of the moon should be adopted throughout the Church, believing no doubt that this mode fitted in better with the historical facts and wishing to give a lasting proof that the Jewish Passover was not, as the Quartodeciman heretics believed, an ordinance of Christianity.

As in the Julian calendar the months had lost all their original reference to the moon, the early Christians were compelled to use the Metonic Lunar Cycle of the Greeks to find the fourteenth day of the paschal moon. This cycle in its original form continued to be used until 1582, when it was revised and embodied in the Gregorian calendar. The Church claims no astronomical exactness for her lunar calendar; we shall show presently the confusion which would necessarily result from an extreme adherence to precise astronomical data in determining the date of Easter. She wishes merely to ensure that the fourteenth day of the calendar moon shall fall on or shortly after the real fourteenth day but never before it, since it would be chronologically absurd to keep Easter on or before the Passover. Otherwise, as Clavius plainly states (Romani Calendarii a Gregorio XIII P.M. restituti explicatio, cap. V, § 13, p. 85), she regards with indifference the occurrence of the moons on the day before or after their proper seats and cares much more for peace and uniformity than for the equinox and the new moon. It may be mentioned here that Clavius's estimate of the accuracy of the calendar, in the compilation of which he took such a leading

part, is extremely modest, and the seats assigned by him to the new moons tally with strict astronomical findings in a degree which he seems never to have anticipated. The impossibility of taking the astronomical moons as our sole guide in finding the date of Easter will be best understood from an example: Let us suppose that Easter is to be kept (as is at least implied by the British Act of Parliament regulating its date) on the Sunday after the astronomical full moon, and that this full moon, as sometimes happens, occurs just before midnight on Saturday evening in the western districts of London or New York. The full moon will therefore happen a little after midnight in the eastern districts, so that Easter, if regulated strictly by the paschal full moon, must be kept on one Sunday in the western and on the following Sunday in the eastern districts of the same city. Lest it be thought that this is carrying astronomical exactness to extremes, we may say that, if Easter were dependent on the astronomical moons, the feast could not always be kept on the same Sunday in England and America. Seeing, therefore, that astronomical accuracy must at some point give way to convenience and that an arbitrary decision on this point is necessary, the Church has drawn up a lunar calendar which maintains as close a relation with the astronomical moons as is practicable, and has decreed that Easter is to be kept on the Sunday after the fourteenth day of the paschal moon as indicated by this calendar.

METONIC LUNAR CYCLE OR CYCLE OF GOLDEN NUMBERS.—In the year now known as 432 B. C., Meton, an Athenian astronomer, discovered that 235 lunations (i. e. lunar months) correspond with 19 solar years, or, as we might express it, that after a period of 19 solar years the new moons occur again on the same days of the solar year. He therefore divided the calendar into periods of 19 years, which he numbered 1, 2, 3, etc. to 19, and assumed that the new moons would always fall on the same days in the years indicated by the same number. This discovery found such favour among the Athenians that the number assigned to the current year in the Metonic Cycle was henceforth written in golden characters on a pillar in the temple, and, whether owing to this circumstance or to the importance of the discovery itself, was known as the Golden Number of the year. As the 19 years of the Metonic Cycle were purely lunar (i. e. each contained an exact number of lunar months) and contained in the aggregate 235 lunations, it was clearly impossible that all the years should be of equal length. To twelve of the 19 years 12 lunations were assigned, and to the other seven 13 lunations, the thirteenth lunation being known as the embolismic or intercalary month.

Length of the Lunations.—The latest calculations have shown that the average duration of the lunar month is 29 days, 12 hours, 44 mins., 3 secs. To avoid the difficulty of reckoning fractions of a day in the calendar, all computators, ancient and modern, have assigned 30 and 29 days alternately to the lunations of the year, and regarded the ordinary lunar year of 12 lunations as lasting 354 days, whereas it really lasts some 8 hours and 48 mins. longer. This under-estimation of the year is compensated for in two ways: (1) by the insertion of one extra day in the lunar (as in the solar) calendar every fourth year, and (2) by assigning 30 days to six of the seven embolismic lunations, although the average lunation lasts only about 29½ days. A comparison of the solar and lunar calendars for 76 years (one cycle of 19 years is unsuitable in this case, since it contains sometimes 4, sometimes 5, leap years) will make this clearer:—76 solar years=76×365+19, i. e. 27,759 days. Therefore 940 calendar lunations (since 19 years equal 235 lunations) contain 27,759 days (29 d., 12 hrs., 44 mins., 3 secs.×940=27,758 d., 18 hrs., 7 mins.). But 940 lunations averaging 29½ days equal only 27,730 days. Consequently, if we assign 30 and 29 days uninterruptedly to alternate lunations, the lunar calendar will, after 76 years, anticipate the solar by 29 days. The intercalation of the extra day every fourth year in the lunar calendar reduces the divergence to 10 days in 76 years, i. e. 2½ days in 19 years. The divergence is removed by assigning to the seven embolismic months (which would otherwise have contained 7×29½, or 206½, days) 209 days, 30 days being assigned to each of the first six and 29 to the seventh.

MANNER OF INSERTION OF THE EMBOLISMIC MONTHS.—As the Gregorian and Metonic calendars differ in the manner of inserting the embolismic months, only the former is spoken of here. It has just been said that seven of the 19 years of the lunar cycle contain a thirteenth, or embolismic, month, consisting in six cases of 30 days and in the seventh of 29 days. Granted that the first solar and lunar years begin on the same day (i. e. that the new moon occurs on 1 January), it is evident that, as the ordinary lunar year of 12 lunations is 11 days shorter than the solar, the lunar calendar will, after three years, anticipate the solar by 33 days. To the third lunar year, then, is added the first embolismic month of 30 days, reducing the divergence between the calendars to three days. After three further years, i. e. at the end of the sixth year, the divergence will have mounted to 36 (3×11+3) days, but, by the insertion of the second embolismic lunation, will be reduced to six days. Whenever, then, the divergence between the calendars amounts to more than 30 days, an embolismic month is added to the lunar year; at the end of the nineteenth lunar year, the divergence will be 29 days, and, as the last embolismic month consists of 29 days, it is clear that after the insertion of this month the nineteenth solar and lunar years will end on the same day and that the first new moon of the twentieth (as of the first) year will occur on 1 January. The divergence, therefore, at the end of the 19 successive years of the lunar cycle is: 11, 22, 3, 14, 25, 6, 17, 28, 9, 20, 1, 12, 23, 4, 15, 26, 7, 18, and 0 days.

CYCLE OF EPACTS.—We have defined an epact as the age of the moon on 1 January, i. e. at the beginning of the year. If, then, the new moon occurs on 1 January in the first year of the Lunar Cycle, the Epact of the year is 0 or, as it is more usually expressed, *; and, since the lunar year always begins with the new moon, it is clear that the divergence between the solar and lunar calendars, of which we have just been speaking, gives the Epacts of the succeeding years. Thus, after the first year, the divergence between the calendars amounts to 11 days; therefore, the new moon occurs 11 days before 1 January of the second solar year, which is expressed by saying that the Epact of the second solar year is XI. Granted, then, that the new moon occurs on 1 January in the first year of the Lunar Cycle, the epacts of the 19 years are as follows:

Golden Numbers	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		9		10
Epacts	*		XI		XXII		III		XIV		XXV		VI		XVII		XXVIII		IX
Golden Numbers	11		12		13		14		15		16		17		18		19	
Epacts	XX		I		XII		XXIII		IV		XV		XXVI		VII		XVIII	

INACCURACY OF THE METONIC CYCLE.—Meton's theory, as adopted by the Church until the year 1582, might be briefly expressed as follows:—

		Days
The average Lunar Cycle consists of	19 lunar years averaging 354¼ days, i. e.	6730¾
	6 extra, or embolismic, months of 30 days, i. e.	180
	1 embolismic month of 29 days	29
	Total	6939¾

19 solar years averaging 365¼ days equal.....6939¾
But later computators found that the average lunation lasts 29 days, 12 hours, 44 minutes, 3 seconds, consequently:—

235 calendar lunations (one Lunar Cycle) equal	6939 d. 18 h. 0 m. 0 s.
235 astronomical lunations equal	6939 d. 16 h. 31 m. 45 s.
Difference	1 h. 28 m. 15 s.

We thus see that the average Lunar Cycle is about 1½ hour too long, and that, though the new moons occur on the same dates in successive cycles, they occur, on an average, 1½ hour earlier in the day. The astronomers entrusted with the reformation of the calendar calculated that after a period of 312½ years (310 years is according to our figures a closer approximation) the new moons occur on the day preceding that indicated by the Lunar Cycle, that is, that the moon is one day older at the beginning of the year than the Metonic Cycle, if left unaltered, would show, and they removed this inaccuracy by adding one day to the age of the moon (i. e. to the Epacts) every 300 years seven times in succession and then one day after 400 years (i. e. eight days in 8×312½ or 2500 years). This addition of one to the Epacts is known as the Lunar Equation, and occurs at the beginning of the years 1800, 2100, 2400, 2700, 3000, 3300, 3600, 3900, 4300, 4600, etc. A second disturbance of the Epacts is caused by the occurrence of the non-bissextile centurial years. We have seen above that the assigning of 6939¾ days to 19 lunar years leads to an error of one day every 312½ years, and that within these limits the lunar calendar must not be disturbed; but the assigning of 6939¾ days to every 19 solar years amounts to an error of 3 days every 400 years, and it is therefore necessary to omit one day from the solar calendar in every centurial year not divisible by 400. Consequently, since this extra day in February every fourth year is an essential part of the lunar calendar, the new moons will occur one day later in the non-bissextile centurial years than indicated by the Lunar Cycle (e. g. a new moon which under ordinary circumstances would have occurred on 29 February will occur on 1 March), and the age of the moon will, after the omission of the day, be one day less on all succeeding days of the solar year. As the fact that the January and February moons are not properly indicated is immaterial in a system whose sole object is to indicate as nearly as practicable the fourteenth day of the moon after 21 March, the subtraction of one from the Epacts takes place at the beginning of all non-bissextile centurial years and is known as the Solar Equation. In the following table, +1 is written after the years which have the Lunar Equation, and −1 after those which have the Solar:—

1600		2800		4000	
1700	−1	2900	−1	4100	−1
1800+1	−1	3000+1	−1	4200	−1
1900	−1	3100	−1	4300+1	−1
2000		3200		4400	
2100+1	−1	3300+1	−1	4500	−1
2200	−1	3400	−1	4600+1	−1
2300	−1	3500	−1	4700	−1
2400+1		3600+1		4800	
2500	−1	3700	−1	4900+1	−1
2600	−1	3800	−1	5000	−1
2700+1	−1	3900+1	−1	5100	−1

Clavius continued this table as far as the year 300,000, inserting the Lunar Equation eight times every 2500 years and the Solar three times every 400 years. As he thus treats the year 5200 as a leap year his table is untrustworthy after 5199.

Indication of New Moons.—Before proceeding further, it will be convenient to consider the method devised by Lilius of indicating the new moons of the year in the Gregorian calendar. As the first lunation of the year consists of 30 days, he wrote the Epacts *, XXIX, XXVIII ... III, II, I opposite the first thirty days of January; then continuing, he wrote * opposite the thirty-first, XXIX opposite the first of February and so on to the end of the year, except that in the case of the lunations of 29 days he wrote the two Epacts XXV, XXIV opposite the same day (cf. 5 Feb., 4 April, etc. in the Church calendar). From this arrangement it is evident that if, for example, the Epact of a year is X, the new moons will occur in that year on the days before which the Epact X is placed in the calendar. One qualification must be made to this statement. According to the Metonic Cycle, the new moon can never occur twice on the same date in the same nineteen years (the case is exceedingly rare even in the purely astronomical calendar); consequently, whenever the two Epacts XXV and XXIV occur in the same nineteen years, the new moons of the year whose Epact is XXV are indicated in the months of 29 days by Epact XXVI, with which the number 25 is for this object associated in the Church calendar.

How to Find the Epact.—We have already seen that the Church used the Metonic Cycle until the year 1582 as the only practical means devised of finding the fourteenth day of the paschal moon. Now, this cycle has always been regarded as starting from the year 1 B. C., and not from the year of its introduction (432 B. C.), probably (although all the authors we have seen appear to have overlooked the point) because such change was found necessary if the leading characteristic of the Metonic Cycle were to be retained in changing from a lunar to a solar calendar, viz., that the first lunar and solar years of the cycle should begin on the same day. That two nations with calendars so fundamentally different as those of the Greeks and the Romans should regard the solar year as beginning with the same phases of the sun would be highly improbable, even if there were no direct evidence that such was not the case. But we have shown that when the solar and lunar years begin on the same day, the Epacts of the successive years of the cycle are:—

Golden Numbers	1	2	3	4
Epacts	*	XI	XXII	III

5	6	7	8	9	10
XIV	XXV	VI	XVII	XXVIII	IX

Golden Numbers	11	12	13	14
Epacts	XX	I	XII	XXIII

15	16	17	18	19
IV	XV	XXVI	VII	XVIII

Consequently, if we divide the calendar into cycles of 19 years from 1 B. C., the first year of each cycle will have the Epact *, the second the Epact XI and so on, or, in other words, the Epact of any year before 1582 depends solely on its Golden Number. The Golden Number of any year may be found by adding 1 to the year and dividing by 19, the quotient showing the number of complete cycles elapsed since 1 B. C. and the remainder (or, if there be no remainder, 19) being the Golden Number of the year. Thus, for example, the Golden Number of 1484 is 3, since $\frac{1484 + 1}{19} = 78$, with 3 as remainder; therefore the Epact of the year 1484 is XXII.

In the course of time it was found that the paschal moon of the Metonic Cycle was losing all relation to the real paschal moon, and in the sixteenth century (c. 1576) Gregory XIII entrusted the task of reforming the calendar to a small body of astronomers, of whom Lilius and Clavius are the most renowned. These astronomers having drawn up the table of equations to show the changes in the Epacts necessary to preserve the relations between the ecclesiastical and astronomical calendars, proceeded to calculate the

proper Epacts for the years of the Lunar Cycle after 1582. These they found to be as follows:—

Golden Numbers	1	2	3	4
Epacts	I	XII	XXIII	IV

5	6	7	8	9	10
XV	XXVI	VII	XVIII	XXIX	X

Golden Numbers	11	12	13	14
Epacts	XXI	II	XIII	XXIV

15	16	17	18	19
V	XVI	XXVII	VIII	XIX

Now the essential difference between the Metonic Cycle and the Gregorian system of Epacts lies in this, that, whereas the sphere of application of the former was held to be unlimited, that of the latter is bounded by the Lunar and Solar Equations. Since, then, a Solar Equation occurs in 1700, the Cycle of Epacts just given holds only for the period 1582–1699, after which a new cycle must be formed. To understand the reason of the changes we must remember (1) that by treating 365 days as equivalent to one solar year and to 12 lunations plus 11 days, we under-estimate the solar year by about $5\frac{1}{5}$ hours and the lunations by $8\frac{1}{5}$ hours; (2) that in consequence of this under-estimation of the solar year, one day must be inserted in every fourth solar year except in the case of the centurial years not divisible by 400; and (3) that the under-estimation of the lunations by 6 hours every year (the additional $2\frac{1}{5}$ hours are compensated for in the embolismic months and by the Lunar Equation) necessitates the insertion of one extra day in the lunar calendar every fourth year without exception. To take an example: the Epact of 1696 (its Golden Number being 6) is XXVI, and since this Epact is found opposite 4 February in the Church calendar we know that in 1696 the new moon happened on that date and that consequently 23 February was the twentieth day of the calendar moon. But, since the under-estimation of the lunations amounts to one day in every four years, the following day (our 24 Feb.) was only nominally the twenty-first day of the moon and the proper twenty-first was our 25 February. The Church therefore inserted an extra day after 23 February and treated this and the real 24 Feb. (our 24 and 25) as one continuous day in both the solar and lunar calendars, and consequently 25 February (our 26) was again legitimately regarded as the twenty-second day of the moon and the fifty-sixth day of the astronomical solar year. Coming now to the year 1700, we find its Epact to be X, consequently the new moon occurred on 19 February and 23 February was the fifth day of the calendar moon. But, since no extra day could be inserted in February, 1700, the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth of this month had to be treated as the sixth day of the moon, and the age of the moon on every subsequent day of the year 1700 was one day less than indicated by the Epact X. As the moons of January and February are of very secondary importance in the Church calendar, we may say that the age of the moon in 1700 and all subsequent years was one day less than indicated by the above Cycle of Epacts, and thus the Epacts for the years of the Lunar Cycle after 1700 are:—

Golden Numbers	1	2	3	4
Epacts	*	XI	XXII	III

5	6	7	8	9	10
XIV	XXV	VI	XVII	XXVIII	IX

Golden Numbers	11	12	13	14
Epacts	XX	I	XII	XXIII

15	16	17	18	19
IV	XV	XXVI	VII	XVIII

In the year 1800, both the Lunar and Solar Equations (i. e. the addition and subtraction of 1) occur and no change of Epacts takes place. In 1900 the Solar Equation occurs and we must again subtract 1 from the Epacts. No change takes place in 2000 or in 2100, the former being a leap year and the latter having both equations. In 2200 and in 2300, we must again subtract 1, while in 2400, in which the Lunar Equation occurs and is not neutralized as usual by the Solar Equation, we add 1 to all the Epacts. The accompanying table gives the Epact of every year from 1 B. C. to A. D. 3099.

EPACTS FROM 1 B. C. TO A. D. 3099

Golden Numbers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1 B. C.–A. D. 1582	*	XI	XXII	III	XIV	XXV	VI	XVII	XXVIII	IX	XX	I	XII	XXIII	IV	XV	XXVI	VII	XVIII
1582–1699	I	XII	XXIII	IV	XV	XXVI	VII	XVIII	XXIX	X	XXI	II	XIII	XXIV	V	XVI	XXVII	VIII	XIX
1700–1899	*	XI	XXII	III	XIV	XXV	VI	XVII	XXVIII	IX	XX	I	XII	XXIII	IV	XV	XXVI	VII	XVIII
1900–2199	XXIX	X	XXI	II	XIII	XXIV	V	XVI	XXVII	VIII	XIX	*	XI	XXII	III	XIV	XXV	VI	XVII
2200–2299	XXVIII	IX	XX	I	XII	XXIII	IV	XV	XXVI	VII	XVIII	XXIX	X	XXI	II	XIII	XXIV	V	XVI
2300–2399	XXVII	VIII	XIX	*	XI	XXII	III	XIV	XXV	VI	XVII	XXVIII	IX	XX	I	XII	XXIII	IV	XV
2400–2499	XXVIII	IX	XX	I	XII	XXIII	IV	XV	XXVI	VII	XVIII	XXIX	X	XXI	II	XIII	XXIV	V	XVI
2500–2599	XXVII	VIII	XIX	*	XI	XXII	III	XIV	XXV	VI	XVII	XXVIII	IX	XX	I	XII	XXIII	IV	XV
2600–2899	XXVI	VII	XVIII	XXIX	X	XXI	II	XIII	XXIV	V	XVI	XXVII	VIII	XIX	*	XI	XXII	III	XIV
2900–3099	XXV	VI	XVII	XXVIII	IX	XX	I	XII	XXIII	IV	XV	XXVI	VII	XVIII	XXIX	X	XXI	II	XIII

This table may, with the help of the table of equations, be continued to 5199.

Examples.—(1) To find the Epact of the year 3097. Golden Number is 1, since $\frac{3097+1}{19} = 163$, with 1 as remainder. Epact corresponding to Golden Number 1 after 2900 is XXV; therefore the Epact of 3097 is XXV.

(2) On what Sunday will Easter fall in the year 2459? Golden Number of 2459 is 9, and Epact of ninth year of Lunar Cycle after 2400 is XXVI. Since the Epact of 2459 is XXVI, the new moons of this year will occur on the days before which XXVI is placed in the Church calendar (e. g. in the Breviary). Now, since the paschal moon is that whose fourteenth day falls on or next after 21 March, the paschal new moon can never happen before 8 March. The first day after 8 March to which the Epact XXVI is prefixed in the Church calendar is 4 April; consequently the paschal new moon in the year 2459 will occur on 4 April.

Counting 14 days from 4 April, which we include in our reckoning, we find the fourteenth day of the paschal moon to be 17 April. In 2459, therefore, Easter will be kept on the Sunday after 17 April, which with the help of the Dominical Letters is found to be 20 April. (See DOMINICAL LETTER.)

For bibliography see DOMINICAL LETTER.

THOMAS KENNEDY.

Eparchy (*ἐπαρχία*) was originally the name of one of the divisions of the Roman Empire. Diocletian (284–305) and Maximian divided the empire into four great *Prefectures* (Gaul, Italy, Illyricum, and the East). Each was subdivided into (civil) *Dioceses*, and these again into *Eparchies* under governors (*præsides*, *ἡγεμόνες*). The Church accepted this division as a convenient one for her use. The Prefectures of Gaul, Italy, and Illyricum made up the Roman Patriarchate; the Prefecture of the East was divided (in the fourth century) between the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch and three exarchs. The Diocese of Egypt was the Patriarchate of Alexandria, the Diocese of the East (not to be confused with the Prefecture of the East) became that of Antioch. Asia was under the Exarch of Ephesus, Pontus under Cappadocia, and Thrace under Heraclea. Under these patriarchates and exarchates came the eparchies under metropolitans; they had under them the bishops of the various cities. The original ecclesiastical eparchies then were provinces, each under a metropolitan. The First Council of Nicæa (325) accepts this arrangement and orders that: "the authority [of appointing bishops] shall belong to the metropolitan in each eparchy" (can. iv). That is to say that in each such civil eparchy there shall be a metropolitan bishop who shall have authority over the others. This is the origin of our provinces. Later in Eastern Christendom the use of the word was gradually modified and now it means generally the diocese of a simple bishop. The name *Eparchy* is, however, not commonly used except in Russia. There it is the usual one for a diocese. The Russian Church now counts eighty-six eparchies, of which three (Kiev, Moscow, and St. Petersburg) are ruled by bishops who always bear the title "Metropolitan", and fourteen others are under archbishops.

HINSCHIUS, *Kirchenrecht*, I, 538, 576; FORTESCUE, *The Orthodox Eastern Church* (London, 1907), 22–23, 297.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

PARISH CHURCH—LATIN RITE

CATHEDRAL—GREEK RUTHENIAN RITE

TRINITY COLUMN, CARAFFA MONUMENTS

EPERIES

Epée, CHARLES-MICHEL DE L', a philanthropic priest and inventor of the sign alphabet for the instruction of the deaf and dumb; was b. at Versailles, 25 November, 1712; d. at Paris, 23 December, 1789. He studied theology, but, having refused to sign a condemnation of Jansenism, was denied ordination by Christophe de Beaumont, Archbishop of Paris. He then studied law, but no sooner had he been admitted to the Bar than the Bishop of Troyes consented to ordain him. This bishop died shortly afterwards, whereupon the Abbé de l'Epée returned to Paris, and began to occupy himself with the education of two deaf and dumb sisters who had been recommended to him by Father Vanin, of the Congregation of the Christian Doctrine. He endeavoured to develop the minds of his pupils by means of certain conventional signs constituting a complete alphabet. Succeeding in this attempt, he resolved to devote himself to the education of the deaf and dumb, and founded a school for their instruction at his own expense. His method is based on the principle that "the education of deaf mutes must teach them through the eye what other people acquire through the ear". Several other methods had been tried, previous to this time, to enable the deaf and dumb to communicate with one another and with the rest of mankind, but there can be no doubt that he attained far greater success than Pereira, Bulwer, Dalgarno, Dr. John Wallis, or any of his predecessors, and that the whole system now followed in the instruction of deaf mutes virtually owes its origin to his ingenuity and devotion. His own system has, in its turn, been replaced by a newer method, which teaches the pupils to recognize words and, in time, to utter them, by closely watching, and afterwards imitating, the motions of the lips and tongue in speech, the different portions of the vocal organs being shown by means of diagrams. Excellent results have thus been attained, deaf and dumb persons acquiring the ability to converse fluently. This method has of late increased in favour. But it remains true that the Abbé de l'Epée by his sign system laid the foundations of all systematic instruction of the deaf and dumb, a system which was further developed by his pupil and successor, the Abbé Sicard.

The Abbé de l'Epée became known all over Europe. The Emperor Joseph II himself visited his school. The Duke of Penthièvre, as well as Louis XVI, helped him with large contributions. In 1791, two years after his death, the National Assembly decreed that his name should be enrolled among the benefactors of mankind, and undertook the support of the school he had founded. In 1838 a bronze monument was erected over his grave in the church of Saint-Roch in Paris. He published in 1776 "Institution des sourds-muets par la voie des signes méthodiques"; in 1794, "La véritable manière d'instruire les sourds et muets, confirmée par une longue expérience". He also began a "Dictionnaire général des signes", which was completed by the Abbé Sicard. (See EDUCATION OF THE DEAF AND DUMB.)

BERTHIER, *L'Abbé de l'Epée, sa vie et ses œuvres* (Paris, 1852); *American Annals of the Deaf* (Washington); ARNOLD, *The Education of the Deaf and Dumb* (London, 1872); BELL, *Education of the Deaf* (1898); GORDON, *The Difference between the Two Systems of Teaching Deaf Mute Children* (1898).

JEAN LEBARS.

Eperies, DIOCESE OF (EPERIENSIS RUTHENORUM), of the Greek Ruthenian Rite, suffragan to Gran. De-

tached in 1818 from the Diocese of Munkács, this diocese has had the following bishops: Gregory Tarkovics (1818–41); Joseph Garganecs (1843–75); Nicholas Toth (1876–81); John Vályi (1882). The city of Eperies, called by the Slovaks Pressova, was founded by a German colony in the twelfth century on the Tarcza, a tributary of the Danube, and is now the capital of the county of Sáros, Hungary, with a population of 11,000. It is famous for its sugar factories, its mineral waters, and the rock salt mine situated at Sovar, several miles distant. The diocese contains 160,000 Ruthenian Catholics; 212 priests (nearly all married); 190 parishes scattered over the territory of six counties; 190 churches, 25 chapels, 24 parochial schools, with 28,000 pupils, a college for boys, 2 convents of Basilians, and a theological seminary with 40 students. The episcopal residence, the seminary, and most of the diocesan institutions are situated at Eperies.

NILLES, *Symbolæ ad illustrandam historiam ecclesiæ orientalis in terris coronæ S. Stephani* (Innsbruck), II, 909–12; *Missiones cath.* (Rome, 1907), 795.

S. VAILHÉ.

Ephesians, EPISTLE TO THE.—This article will be treated under the following heads: I. Analysis of the Epistle; II. Special Characteristics: (1) Form: (a) Vocabulary; (b) Style; (2) Doctrines; III. Object; IV. To Whom Addressed; V. Date and Place of Composition; Occasion; VI. Authenticity: (1) Relation to other books of the New Testament; (2) Difficulties arising from the form and doctrines; (3) Tradition.

I. ANALYSIS OF THE EPISTLE.—The letter which, in the MSS. containing the Epistles of St. Paul, bears the title "To the Ephesians" comprises two parts distinctly separated by a doxology (Eph., iii, 20 sq.). The address, in which the Apostle mentions himself only, is not followed by a prologue; in fact, the entire dogmatic part develops the idea which is usually the subject of the prologue in the letters of St. Paul. In a long sentence that reads like a hymn (Eph., i, 3–14), Paul praises God for the blessings which He has bestowed upon all the faithful in accordance with the eternal plan of His will, the sublime plan by which all are to be united under one head, Christ, a plan which, although heretofore secret and mysterious, is now made manifest to believers. Those to whom the Epistle is addressed, having received the Gospel, have, in their turn, been made participants of these blessings, and the Apostle, having recently learned of their conversion and their faith, assures them that he ceases not to give thanks to Heaven for the same (Eph., i, 15, 16) and that, above all, he prays for them. The explanation of this prayer, of its object and motives, constitutes the remainder of the dogmatic part (cf. Eph., iii, 1, 14). Paul asks God that his readers may have a complete knowledge of the hope of their calling, that they may be fully aware both of the riches of their inheritance and the greatness of the Divine power which guarantees the inheritance. This Divine power manifests itself first in Christ, Whom it raised from the dead and Whom it exalted in glory above all creatures and established head of the Church, which is His body. Next, this power and goodness of God was evidenced in the readers, whom it rescued from their sins and raised and exalted with Christ. But it shone forth, above all, in the establishment of a community of salvation welcoming within its fold both Jews and Gentiles without distinction, the Death of Christ having broken down the middle wall of partition, i. e. the Law, and both sections of the human race having thus been reconciled to God so as thenceforth to form but one body, one house, one temple, of which the apostles and Christian prophets are the foundation and Christ Himself is the chief cornerstone. (Eph., i, 16–ii, 20.) Paul, as his readers must have heard, was the minister chosen to preach to the Gentiles of this sublime mystery of God, hidden from all eternity and not revealed even to the angels, according to which the Gentiles are made coheirs with the Jews, constitute a part of the same body, and are joint partakers in the same promises (Eph., iii, 1–13). Deeply imbued with this mystery, the Apostle implores the Father to lead his readers to the perfection of the Christian state and the complete knowledge of Divine charity (Eph., iii, 14–19), continuing the same prayer with which he had begun (Eph., i, 16 sq.).

Having praised God anew in the solemn doxology (Eph., iii, 20 sq.), Paul passes on to the moral part of his letter. His exhortations, which he bases more than is his wont on dogmatic considerations, all revert to that of chapter iv, verse 1, wherein he entreats his readers to show themselves in all things worthy of their vocation. First of all, they must labour to preserve the unity described by the author in the first three chapters and here again brought into prominence: One Spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God. There is, of course, a diversity of ministries, but the respective offices of apostles, prophets, etc. have all been instituted by the same Christ exalted in glory and all tend to the perfection of the society of saints in Christ (Eph., iv, 2–16). From these great social duties, Paul proceeds to the consideration of individual ones. He contrasts the Christian life that his readers are to lead, with their pagan life, insisting above all on the avoidance of two vices, immodesty and covetousness (Eph., iv, 17–v, 3). Then, in treating of family life, he dwells on the duties of husbands and wives, whose union he likens to that of Christ with His Church, and the duties of children and servants (v, 21–vi, 9). In order to fulfil these duties and to combat adverse powers, the readers must put on the armour of God (vi, 10–20).

The Epistle closes with a short epilogue (vi, 21–24), wherein the Apostle tells his correspondents that he has sent Tychicus to give them news of him and that he wishes them peace, charity, and grace.

II. SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS.—(1) *Form*—(a) Vocabulary.—This letter, like all of those written by St. Paul, contains *hapax legomena* (ἅπαξ λεγόμενα), about seventy-five words which are not found in the Apostle's other writings; however, it were a mistake to make this fact the basis of an argument against Pauline authenticity. Of these words nine occur in quotations from the Old Testament and others belong to current language or else designate things which Paul elsewhere had had no occasion to mention. Others, again, are derived from roots used by the Apostle and besides, in comparing these *hapax legomena* (ἅπαξ λεγόμενα) one with another, it is impossible to recognize in them a characteristic vocabulary that would reveal a distinct personality. (Cf. Brunet, "De l'authenticité de l'épître aux Ephésiens; preuves philologiques", Lyons, 1897; Nägeli, "Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus", Göttingen, 1905.)

(b) Style.—This Epistle, even more than that to the Colossians, is remarkable for the length of its periods. The first three chapters contain hardly more than three sentences and these are overladen with relative or participial clauses that are simply strung together, frequently without being connected by the logical particles that occur so frequently in St. Paul. Each particular clause is itself encumbered with numerous prepositional modifiers (especially with ἐν and σύν) of which it is difficult to state the exact meaning. Often, too, several synonyms are in juxtaposition and in very many cases a noun has an explanatory genitive, the sense of which differs but very slightly from that of the noun itself. For all of these reasons the language of the Epistle, heavy, diffuse, and languid, seems very different from the dialectical, animated, and vigorous style of the Apostle's uncontested letters. It is important to note that in the moral part of the Epistle these peculiarities of style do not appear and hence they would seem to depend more on the matter

treated than on the author himself; in fact, even in the dogmatic expositions in the great Epistles, St. Paul's language is frequently involved (cf. Rom., ii, 13 sq.; iv, 16 sq.; v, 12 sq.; etc.). Moreover, it must be observed that all these peculiarities spring from the same cause: they all indicate a certain redundancy of ideas surging in upon a deep and tranquil meditation on a sublime subject, the various aspects of which simultaneously appear to the author's mind and evoke his admiration. Hence also the lyric tone that pervades the first three chapters, which constitute a series of praises, benedictions, thanksgivings, and prayers. A sort of rhythmic composition has been pointed out in chapter i (cf. T. Innitzer, "Der 'Hymnus' im Eph., i, 3–14" in "Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie", 1904, 612 sq.), and in chapter iii traces of liturgical hymnology have been observed (Eph., iii, 20), but they are no more striking than in I Cor. and are not to be compared with the liturgical language of I Clement.

(2) *Doctrines.*—The doctrines on justification, the Law, faith, the flesh, etc., that are characteristic of the great Pauline Epistles, are not totally lacking in the Epistle to the Ephesians, being recognizable in chapter ii (1–16). However, the writer's subject does not lead him to develop these particular doctrines. On the other hand, he clearly indicates, especially in chapter i, the supreme place which, in the order of nature and grace, is allotted to Christ, the author and centre of creation, the point towards which all things converge, the source of all grace, etc. Although, in his great Epistles, St. Paul sometimes touches upon these doctrines (cf. I Cor., viii, 6; xv, 45 sq.; II Cor., v, 18 sq.), they constitute the special object of his letter to the Colossians, where he develops them to a much greater extent than in that to the Ephesians. In fact this Epistle treats more of the Church than of Christ. (On the doctrine of the Church in the Epistle to the Ephesians see Méritan in "Revue biblique", 1898, pp. 343 sq., and W. H. Griffith Thomas in the "Expositor", Oct., 1906, pp. 318 sq.) The word *church* no longer means, as is usual in the great Epistles of St. Paul (see, however, Gal., i, 13; I Cor., xii, 28; xv, 9), some local church or other, but the one universal Church, an organic whole uniting all Christians in one body of which Christ is the head. Here we find the systematized development of elements insinuated from time to time in the letters to the Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans. The author who has declared that there is now neither Jew nor Greek but that all are one in Christ Jesus (Gal., iii, 28); that in each Christian the life of Christ is made manifest (Gal., ii, 20; II Cor., iv, 11 sq.); that all are led by the Spirit of God and of Christ (Rom., viii, 9–14); that each one of the faithful has Christ for head (I Cor., xi, 3), could, by combining these elements, easily come to consider all Christians as forming but one body (Rom., xii, 5; I Cor., xii, 12, 27), animated by one spirit (Eph., iv, 4), a single body having Christ for head. To this body the Gentiles belong by the same right as the Jews. Undoubtedly this mysterious dispensation of Providence was, according to the Epistle to the Ephesians, made manifest to all the Apostles, a declaration which, moreover, the Epistle to the Galatians does not contradict (Gal., ii, 3–9); however, this revelation remains, as it were, the special gift of St. Paul (Eph., iii, 3–8). The right of pagans seems to be no longer questioned, which is easily understood at the close of the Apostle's life. At the death of Christ the wall of separation was broken down (cf. Gal., iii, 13), and all have since had access to the Father in the same spirit. They do not meet on the Jewish ground of the abolished Law but on Christian ground, in the edifice founded directly on Christ. The Church being thus constituted, the author contemplates it just as it appears to him. Besides, if in the extension of the Church he beholds the realization of the eternal decree by which all men have been predestined to the same salvation, he is not obliged to repeat the religious history of mankind in the way he had occasion to describe it in the Epistle to the Romans; neither is he constrained to explain the historical privileges of the Jews, to which he nevertheless alludes (Eph., ii, 12), nor to connect the new economy with the old (see, however, Eph., iii, 6), nor indeed to introduce, at least into the dogmatical exposition, the sins of the pagans, whom he is satisfied to accuse of having lacked intimate communion with God (Eph., ii, 12). For the time being all these points are not his main subject of meditation. It is rather the recent, positive fact of the union of all men in the Church, the body of Christ, that he brings into prominence; the Apostle contemplates Christ Himself in His actual influence over this body and over each of its members; hence it is only occasionally that he recalls the redemptive power of Christ's Death. (Eph., i, 7; ii, 5, 6.) From heaven, where He has been exalted, Christ bestows His gifts on all the faithful without distinction, commanding, however, that in His Church certain offices be held for the common welfare. The hierarchical terms used so constantly later on (ἐπίσκοποι, πρεσβύτεροι, διάκονοι) are not met with here. The apostles and prophets, always mentioned together, in the Epistle to the Ephesians, play a like part, being the founders of the Church (Eph., ii, 20). Thus placed on an equality with the prophets, the apostles are not the chosen Twelve but, as indicated in the letters of St. Paul, those who have seen Christ and been commissioned by Him to preach His Gospel. It is for the same purpose that the prophets in the Epistle to the Ephesians used the charisma, or spiritual gifts described in I Cor., xii–xiv. The evangelists, who are not noticed in Eph., ii, 20, or iii, 5, are inferior in dignity to the apostles and prophets in connexion with whom they are, nevertheless, mentioned (Eph., iv, 11). In his first letters St. Paul had no occasion to allude to them, but they belong to the Apostolic age, as at a later epoch they are never referred to. Finally the "pastors and doctors" (A. V. pastors and teachers), who are clearly distinguished (Eph., iv, 11) from the apostles and prophets, founders of the churches, seem to be those local authorities already indicated in I Thess., v, 12; I Cor., xvi, 15 sq.; Acts, xx, 28. While the attention given to these different ministers forms a distinctive note in the Epistle to the Ephesians, we cannot therefore admit (with Klöpper, for example) that the author is preoccupied with the hierarchy as such. The unity of the Church, a point that he clearly emphasizes, is not so much the juridical unity of an organized society as the vital unity that binds all the members of the body to its head, the glorified Christ. Nor is it true that the author already predicts centuries of future existence for this Church (Klöpper) as, properly speaking, the ages to come, referred to in the Epistle to the Ephesians (ii, 7), are to come in the Kingdom of Heaven (cf. ii, 6). On the other hand we know that St. Paul's hope of soon witnessing Christ's second coming kept constantly diminishing, and therefore, in the latter years of his life, he might well define (Eph., v, 22 sq.) the laws of Christian marriage, which at an earlier period (I Cor., vii, 37 sq.) he regarded only in the light of the approaching advent of Christ.

The exposition that we have given of the doctrines proper to the Epistle to the Ephesians has been so made as to show that none of these doctrines taken separately contradicts the theology of the great Pauline Epistles and that each one individually can be connected with certain elements disseminated in these Epistles. It is nevertheless true that, taken in its entirety, this letter to the Ephesians constitutes a new doctrinal system, the Pauline authenticity of which can only be critically defended by pointing out the circumstances in consequence of which the Apostle was able thus to develop his first theology and profoundly to modify his manner of setting it forth. Naturally

this leads us first of all to try to ascertain the object of the letter to the Ephesians.

III. Object.—It has been said that St. Paul combated immoral doctrines and an antinomian propaganda that especially endangered those to whom the letters were addressed (Pfleiderer), but this hypothesis would not explain the dogmatic part of the Epistle, and even in the hortatory part nothing betokens polemical preoccupation. All the warnings administered are called forth by the pagan origin of the readers, and when the author addresses his prayers to Heaven in their behalf (Eph., i, 17 sqq.; iii, 14 sqq.) he does not mention any particular peril from which he would have God deliver their Christian life. Klöpper thought that the author had Judeo-Christians in view, still denying converted pagans their full right in the Church, and Jacquier gives this as an additional motive. Others have said that the Gentile-Christians of the Epistle had to be reminded of the privileges of the Jews. But not one word in the letter, even in the section containing exhortations to unity (Eph., iv, 2 sq.), reveals the existence of any antagonism among those to whom the Apostle writes, and there is no question of the reproduction or re-establishment of unity. The author never addresses himself to any save converted pagans, and all his considerations tend solely to provide them with a full knowledge of the blessings which, despite their pagan origin, they have acquired in Christ and of the greatness of the love that God has shown them. If, in chapter iii, St. Paul speaks of his personal Apostleship, it is not by way of defending it against attacks but of expressing all his gratitude for having been called, in spite of his unworthiness, to announce the great mystery of which he had sung the praises. Briefly, nothing in the letter allows us to suspect that it responds to any special need on the part of those to whom it is addressed, nor that they, on their side, had given the author any particular occasion for writing it. In so far as either its dogmatic or moral part is concerned, it might have been addressed to any churches whatever founded in the pagan world.

IV. To Whom Addressed.—To whom, then, was the Epistle addressed? This question has evoked a variety of answers. There are critics who maintain the traditional opinion that the Epistle was written to the Ephesians exclusively (Danko, Cornely), but the greater number consider it in the light of a circular letter. Some maintain that it was addressed to Ephesus and the churches of which this city was, so to speak, the metropolis (Michelis, Harless, and Hénle), while others hold that it was sent to the Seven Churches of the Apocalypse (H. Holtzmann) or to the circle of Christian communities within and around Colossæ and Laodicea (Godet, Haupt, Zahn, and Belser); or again to the faithful of Asia Minor (B. Weiss) or to all the Gentile-Christian Churches (Von Soden). The question can only be solved by comparing the Epistle with the knowledge possessed of the life and literary activity of the Apostle. Those who deny the authenticity of the letter must certainly grant that the Pseudo-Paul (i, 1) was careful to conform to literary and historical probabilities; and if not, since the letter vouchsafes no direct indication as to the correspondents whom he supposed the Apostle to be addressing, it would be idle to imagine who they were.

The words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, in the first verse of the Epistle, do not belong to the primitive text. St. Basil attests that, even in his day, they were not met with in the ancient MSS.; in fact they are missing from the Codices B and ℵ (first hand). Moreover, the examination of the Epistle does not warrant the belief that it was addressed to the church in which the Apostle had sojourned longest. When St. Paul writes to one of his churches, he constantly alludes to his former relations with it (see Thess., Gal., Cor.), but here there is nothing personal, no greeting, no special recommendation, no allusion to the author's past. Paul is unacquainted with his correspondents, although he has heard them spoken of (Eph., i, 15), and they have heard of him (Eph., iii, 2; cf. iv, 21). When addressing himself to any particular church, even be it at the time still a stranger to him as, for instance, Rome or Colossæ, the Apostle always assumes a personal tone; hence the abstract and general manner in which he treats his subject from the beginning to the end of the Epistle to the Ephesians can best be accounted for by beholding in this Epistle a circular letter to a group of churches still unknown to Paul. But this explanation, founded on the encyclical character of the Epistle, loses its value if the Church of Ephesus is numbered among those addressed; for, during his three years' sojourn in this city, the Apostle had had frequent intercourse with the neighbouring Christian communities, and in this case he would have had Ephesus especially in view, just as in writing to all the faithful of Achaia (II Cor., i, 1) it was chiefly to the Church of Corinth that he addressed himself.

Nevertheless, it was to a rather restricted circle of Christian communities that Paul sent this letter, as Tychicus was to visit them all and bring them news of him (Eph., vi, 21 sq.), which fact precludes the idea of all the churches of Asia Minor or of all the Gentile-Christian churches. Moreover, since Tychicus was bearer of the Epistle to the Colossians and that to the Ephesians at one and the same time (Col., iv, 7 sq.), those to whom the latter was addressed could not have been far from Colossæ, and we have every reason to suppose them in Asia Minor. However, we do not believe that the Epistle in question was addressed to the churches immediately surrounding Colossæ, as the perils which threatened the faith of the Colossians virtually endangered that of the neighbouring communities, and wherefore, then, two letters differing in tone and object? Having had no personal intercourse with the Colossians, the Apostle would have been satisfied to address to them and their Christian neighbours an encyclical letter embodying all the matter treated in both Epistles. Hence it behooves us to seek elsewhere in Asia Minor, towards the year 60, a rather limited group of churches still unknown to St. Paul. Now, in the course of his three journeys, Paul had traversed all parts of Asia Minor except the northern provinces along the Black Sea, territory which he did not reach prior to his captivity. Nevertheless, the First Epistle of St. Peter shows us that the Faith had already penetrated these regions; hence, with the historical data at our disposal, it is in this vicinity that it seems most reasonable to seek those to whom the Epistle was addressed. These Christians must have been named in the authentic text of the inscription of this Epistle, as they are in all of St. Paul's letters. Now, whenever the substantive participle appears in one of these inscriptions, it serves the sole purpose of introducing the mention of locality. We are therefore authorized to believe that, in the address of the Epistle to the Ephesians (Eph., i, 1: τοῖς ἁγίοις οὖσιν καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ), this participle, so difficult to understand in the received text, originally preceded the designation of the place inhabited by the readers. One might assume that the line containing this designation was omitted owing to some distraction on the part of the first copyist; however, it would then be necessary to admit that the mention of locality, now in question, occurred *in the midst* of qualifying adjectives applied by the Apostle to his readers (ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν . . . . . πιστοῖς), and this is something that is never verified in the letters of St. Paul. Hence we may suppose that, in this address, the indication of place was corrupted rather than omitted, and this paves the way for conjectural restorations. We ourselves have proposed the following: τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν κατ' Ἶριν τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. (Ladeuze in Revue biblique, 1902, pp. 573 sq.) Grammati-

cally, this phrase corresponds perfectly with the Apostle's style (cf. Gal., i, 22; I Cor., i, 2; Phil., i, 1) and palæographically, if transcribed in ancient capitals, it readily accounts for the corruption that has certainly been produced in the text. The Epistle to the Ephesians was, therefore, written to distant churches, located perhaps in various provinces [Pontus, Galatia, Polemonium (the kingdom of Polemon)] and, for this reason, requiring to be designated by a general term, but all situated along the River Iris.

These churches of the north-east of Asia Minor played rather an obscure part in the first century. When the first collection of the Apostle's letters was made, a collection on which the entire textual tradition of these letters depends (cf. Zahn, Geschichte des N. T. Kanons, I, ii, p. 829), it was Ephesus that furnished the copy of this Epistle, having obtained it when Tychicus landed at that port, thence to set out for Colossæ and in the direction of Pontus, and in this copy the text of the address had already been corrupted. Having come from Ephesus, this letter quickly passed for one to the Ephesians, the more so as there was no other written by the Apostle to the most celebrated of churches. This explains why, from the beginning, all except Marcion, even those who did not read the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in the first verse (Origen, Tertullian), look upon this letter as an Epistle to the Ephesians, and why, in all MSS., it is transcribed under this title.

V. Date and Place of Composition; Occasion.—Like the Epistles to the Colossians, to the Philippians, and to Philemon, that to the Ephesians was written during the leisure hours of one of the Apostle's imprisonments (Eph., iii, 1; iv, 1; vi, 20), when he had but little reason to resort to the services of a disciple to write in his name (De Wette, Ewald, and Renan). Lisco (Vincula Sanctorum, Berlin, 1900) is the only one nowadays who claims that these letters antedate the great captivity of St. Paul, maintaining that the Apostle must have written them while a prisoner in Ephesus in 57 and prior to those which he sent to the Corinthians and Romans. But we are not acquainted with any of the details of this captivity at Ephesus. Moreover, the doctrine set forth in the letters in question belongs to an epoch subsequent to the composition of the Epistle to the Romans (58); hence they were not written previously to the captivity in Cæsarea (58–60). On the other hand, they are anterior to the first persecution, to which the author makes no allusion when describing the armour and combats of the faithful; wherefore they cannot be assigned to the last captivity. It consequently remains for them to be ascribed to a period between 58 and 63, but whether they were produced in Cæsarea or in Rome (61–63) is still a much mooted question. The information gleaned here and there is very vague and the arguments brought forward are very doubtful. However, the freedom allowed Paul, and the evangelical activity he displays at the time of writing these letters, would seem more in keeping with his captivity in Rome (Acts, xxviii, 17–31) than in Cæsarea (Acts, xxiii, sq.). One thing, however, is certain, once the authenticity of the Epistles to the Colossians and to the Ephesians is admitted, and that is that they were written at the same time. They both show fundamentally and formally a very close connexion of which we shall speak later on. Tychicus was appointed to convey both Epistles to those to whom they were respectively addressed and to fulfil the same mission in behalf of them (Col., iv, 7 sq.; Eph., vi, 21 sq.). Verse 16 of chapter iv of Colossians does not seem to allude to the letter to the Ephesians, which would need to have been written first; besides, the Epistle here mentioned is scarcely an encyclical, the context leading us to look upon it as a special letter of the same nature as that sent to the Colossians. If, moreover, Paul knew that, before reaching Colossæ, Tychicus would deliver the Epistle to the Ephesians to the Christians at Laodicea, there was no reason why he should insert greetings for the Laodiceans in his Epistle to the Colossians (Col., iv, 15). It is more probable that the Epistle to the Ephesians was written in the second place. It would be less easy to understand why, in repeating to the Colossians the same exhortations that he had made to the Ephesians, for instance, on remarriage (Eph., v, 22 sqq.), the author should have completely suppressed the sublime dogmatic considerations upon which these exhortations had been based. Moreover we believe with Godet that: "It is more natural to think that, of these two mutually complemental letters, the one provoked by a positive request and a definite need [Col.] came first, and that the other [Eph.] was due to the greater solicitude evoked by the composition of the former."

How, then, admitting that St. Paul wrote the Epistle to the Ephesians, shall we explain the origin of this document? The Apostle, who was a captive at Rome, was informed by Epaphras of the dogmatic and moral errors that had come to light in Colossæ and the neighbouring cities, in churches of which he was not the founder. He also learned that he had been censured for not bringing to the perfection of Christianity those whom he had once converted, and for not taking sufficient interest in churches that had sprung up side by side with his own, although without his personal intervention (Col., i, 28–ii, 5). At the same time that Paul received the news concerning Colossæ and its surroundings, he also heard (Eph., i, 15) that in a distant part of Asia Minor Christian communities had been brought to the Faith, perhaps by evangelists (Eph., iv, 11). Impressed by the accusations made against him, Paul took advantage of the departure of Tychicus for Colossæ, to enter into communication with those Christians who had heard of him (Eph., iii, 2) and to address them a letter in which he had to limit himself to general considerations on Christianity, but he wished to prove his Apostolic solicitude for them by making them realize not only the dignity of their Christian vocation, but the oneness of the Church of God and the intimate union by which all the faithful, no matter what their history, are constituted a single body of which Christ is the head.

VI. Authenticity.—If one would only remember to whom the Epistle was addressed and on what occasion it was written, the objections raised against its Pauline authenticity could be readily answered.

(1) *Relation to Other Books of the New Testament.*—The letter to the Ephesians bears some resemblance to the Epistle to the Hebrews and the writings of St. Luke and St. John, in point of ideas and mode of expression, but no such resemblance is traceable in the great Pauline Epistles. Of course one of the Apostle's writings might have been utilized in these later documents but these similarities are too vague to establish a literary relationship. During the four years intervening between the Epistle to the Romans and that to the Ephesians, St. Paul had changed his headquarters and his line of work, and we behold him at Rome and Cæsarea connected with new Christian centres. It is, therefore, easy to understand why his style should savour of the Christian language used in these later books, when we recall that their object has so much in common with the matter treated in the Epistle to the Ephesians. Whatever may now and then have been said on the subject, the same phenomenon is noticeable in the Epistle to the Colossians. If, indeed, the Epistle to the Ephesians agrees with the Acts in more instances than does the Epistle to the Colossians, it is because the two former have one identical object, namely, the constitution of the Church by the calling of the Jews and Gentiles.

The relationship between the Epistle to the Ephesians and I Peter is much closer. The letter to the Ephesians, unlike most of the Pauline Epistles, does

not begin with an act of thanksgiving but with a hymn similar, even in its wording, to that which opens I Peter. Besides, both letters agree in certain typical expressions and in the description of the duties of the domestic life, which terminates in both with the same exhortation to combat the devil. With the majority of critics, we maintain the relationship between these letters to be literary. But I Peter was written last and consequently depends on the Epistle to the Ephesians; for instance, it alludes already to the persecution, at least as impending. Sylvanus, the Apostle's faithful companion, was St. Peter's secretary (I Peter, v, 12), and it is but natural that he should make use of a letter, recently written by St. Paul, on questions analogous to those which he himself had to treat, especially as according to us, those addressed in both of these Epistles are, for the greater part, identical (cf. I Peter, i, 1).

The attacks made upon the authenticity of the Epistle to the Ephesians have been based mainly on its similarity to the Epistle to the Colossians, although some have maintained that the latter depends upon the former (Mayerhoff). In the opinion of Hitzig and Holtzmann, a forger living early in the second century and already imbued with Gnosticism used an authentic letter, written by Paul to the Colossians against the Judeo-Christians of the Apostolic Age, in composing the Epistle to the Ephesians, in conformity to which he himself subsequently revised the letter to the Colossians, giving it the form it has in the canon. De Wette and Ewald looked upon the Epistle to the Ephesians as a verbose amplification of the uncontroversial parts of the letter to the Colossians. However, it is only necessary to read first one of these documents and then the other, in order to see how exaggerated is this view. Von Soden finds a great difference between the two letters but nevertheless holds that several sections of the Epistle to the Ephesians are but a servile paraphrase of passages from the letter to the Colossians (Eph., iii, 1–9 and Col., i, 23–27; Eph., v, 21–vi, 9 and Col., iii, 18–iv, 1) and that still more frequently the later author follows a purely mechanical process by taking a single verse from the letter to the Colossians and using it to introduce and conclude, and serve as a frame, so to speak, for a statement of his own. Thus, he maintains that in Eph., iv, 25–31, the first words of verse 8 of Col., iii, have served as an introduction (Eph., iv, 25) and the last words of the same verse as a conclusion (Eph., iv, 31). Evidently such methods could not be attributed to the Apostle himself. But, neither are we justified in ascribing them to the author of the Epistle to the Ephesians. For instance, the duties of husband and wife are well set forth in Col., iii, 18, 19, but in these verses there is no comparison whatever between Christian marriage and that union of Christ with His Church such as characterizes the same exhortation in Eph., v, 22 sq.; consequently, it would be very arbitrary to maintain the latter text to be a vulgar paraphrase of the former. In comparing the texts quoted, the phenomenon of *framing*, to which von Soden called attention, can be verified in a single passage (Eph., iv, 2–16, where verse 2 resembles Col., iii, 12 sq. and where verses 15, 16, are like Col., ii, 19). In fact, throughout his entire exposition, the author of the Epistle to the Ephesians is constantly repeating ideas and even particular expressions that occur in the letter to the Colossians, and yet neither a servile imitation nor any one of the well-known offences to which plagiarists are liable, can be proved against him.

Moreover, it is chiefly in their hortatory part that these two letters are so remarkably alike and this is only natural if, at intervals of a few days or hours, the same author had to remind two distinct circles of readers of the same common duties of the Christian life. In the dogmatic part of these two Epistles there is a change of subject, treated with a different intention and in another tone. In the one instance we have a hymn running through three chapters and celebrating the call of both Jews and Gentiles and the union of all in the Church of Christ; and in the other, an exposition of Christ's dignity and of the adequacy of the means He vouchsafes us for the obtaining of our salvation, as also thanksgiving and especially prayers for those readers who are liable to misunderstand this doctrine. However, these two objects, Christ and the Church, are closely akin. Besides, if in his letter to the Ephesians, St. Paul reproduces the ideas set forth in that to the Colossians, it is certainly less astonishing than to find a like phenomenon in the Epistles to the Galatians and to the Romans, as it is very natural that the characteristic expressions used by the Apostle in the Epistle to the Colossians should appear in the letter to the Ephesians, since both were written at the same time. In fact it has been remarked that he is prone to repeat typical expressions he has once coined (cf. Zahn, Einleitung, I, p. 363 sq.). Briefly, we conclude with Sabatier that: "These two letters come to us from one and the same author who, when writing the one, had the other in mind and, when composing the second, had not forgotten the first." The vague allusions made in the Epistle to the Ephesians to some of the doctrinal questions treated in the Epistle to the Colossians, can be accounted for in this manner, even though these questions were never proposed by those to whom the former Epistle was addressed.

(2) *Difficulties Arising from the Form and Doctrines.*—The denial of the Pauline authenticity of the Epistle to the Ephesians is based on the special characteristics of the Epistle from the viewpoint of style as well as of doctrine, and, while differing from those of the great Pauline Epistles, these characteristics although more marked, resemble those of the letter to the Colossians. But we have already dwelt upon them at sufficient length.

The circumstances under which the Apostle must have written the Epistle to the Ephesians seem to account for the development of the doctrine and the remarkable change of style. During his two years' captivity in Cæsarea, Paul could not exercise his Apostolic functions, and in Rome, although allowed more liberty, he could not preach the Gospel outside of the house in which he was held prisoner. Hence he must have made up for his want of external activity by a more profound meditation on "his Gospel". The theology of justification, of the Law, and of the conditions essential to salvation, he had already brought to perfection, having systematized it in the Epistle to the Romans and, although keeping it in view, he did not require to develop it any further. In his Epistle to the Romans (viii–xi, xvi, 25–27) he had come to the investigation of the eternal counsels of Providence concerning the salvation of men and had expounded, as it were, a philosophy of the religious history of mankind of which Christ was the centre, as indeed He had always been the central object of St. Paul's faith. Thus, it was on Christ Himself that the solitary meditations of the Apostle were concentrated; in the quiet of his prison he was to develop, by dint of personal intellectual labour and with the aid of new revelations, this first revelation received when "it pleased God *to reveal His Son* in him". He was, moreover, urged by the news brought him from time to time by some of his disciples, as, for instance, by Epaphras, that, in certain churches, errors were being propagated which tended to lessen the rôle and the dignity of Christ, by setting up against Him other intermediaries in the work of salvation. On the other hand, separated from the faithful and having no longer to travel constantly from one church to another, the Apostle was able to embrace in one sweeping glance all the Christians scattered throughout the world. While he resided in the centre of the immense Roman Empire which, in its unity, comprised the world, it was the one

universal Church of Christ, the fulfilment of the mysterious decrees revealed to him, the Church in which it had been his privilege to bring together Jews and pagans, that presented itself to him for contemplation.

These subjects of habitual meditation are naturally introduced in the letters that he had to write at that time. To the Colossians he speaks of Christ's dignity; to the Ephesians, and we have seen why, of the unity of the Church. But in these Epistles, Paul addresses those who are unknown to him; he no longer needs, as in preceding letters, to combat theories which undermined the very foundation of the work and to refute enemies who, in their hatred, attacked him personally. Accordingly, there is no further occasion to use the serried argumentation with which he not only overthrew the arguments of his adversaries but turned them to the latters' confusion. There is more question of setting forth the sublime considerations with which he is filled than of discussions. Then, ideas so crowd upon him that his pen is overtaxed; his sentences teem with synonyms and qualifying epithets and keep taking on new propositions, thus losing the sharpness and vigour of controversy and assuming the ample proportions of a hymn of adoration. Hence we can understand why, in these letters, Paul's style grows dull and sluggish and why the literary composition differs so widely from that of the first Epistles. When writing to the Colossians he at least had one particular church to deal with and certain errors to refute, whereas, in the Epistle to the Ephesians, he addressed himself at one and the same time to a group of unknown churches of which he had received but vague information. There was nothing concrete in this and the Apostle was left entirely to himself and to his own meditations. This is the reason why the special characteristics already indicated in the Epistle to the Colossians appear even more pronounced in that to the Ephesians, particularly in the dogmatic part.

(3) *Tradition.*—If we thus keep in mind the circumstances under which Paul wrote both of these letters, their peculiar character seems no obstacle to their Pauline authenticity. Therefore, the testimony which, in their inscriptions (Col., i, 1; Eph., i, 1), they themselves render to this authenticity and the very ancient tradition which unanimously attributes them to the Apostle preserve all their force. From the traditional viewpoint the Epistle to the Ephesians is in the same class as the best attested letters of St. Paul. Used in the First Epistle of St. Peter, in the Epistle of St. Polycarp, in the works of St. Justin, perhaps in the Didache and I Clement, it appears to have been already well known towards the end of the first century. Marcion and St. Irenæus ascribe it to St. Paul and it seems that St. Ignatius, when writing to the Ephesians, had already made use of it as Pauline. It is also to be noted that if the authenticity of this Epistle has been denied by most of the liberal critics since Schleiermacher's day, it is nevertheless conceded by many modern critics, Protestants among them, and held at least as probable by Harnack and Jülicher. In fact the day seems to be approaching when the whole world will recognize as the work of St. Paul, this Epistle to the Ephesians, of which St. John Chrysostom admired the sublime sentences and doctrines: *νοημάτων μεστὴ . . . . . ὑψηλῶν καὶ δογμάτων.*

Consult *Introductions* to the New Testament. We shall content ourselves here with indicating the latest commentaries, in which the earlier bibliography is mentioned.

CATHOLIC COMMENTARIES: BISPING, *Erklärung der Briefe an die Epheser, Philipper und Kolosser* (Münster, 1866); HENLE, *Der Epheserbrief des hl. Apostels Paulus erklärt* (Augsburg, 1908); BELSER, *Der Epheserbrief übersetzt und erklärt* (Freiburg im Br., 1908); MAUNOURY, *Commentaire sur l'épître aux Galates, aux Ephésiens*, etc. (Paris, 1881).

NON-CATHOLIC COMMENTARIES: OLTRAMARE, *Commentaire sur les épîtres de S. Paul aux Colossiens, aux Ephésiens et à Philémon* (Paris, 1891); VON SODEN, *Die Briefe an die Kolosser, Epheser, Philemon* in *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.*, ed. *Holtzmann* (Freiburg im Br., 1893); HAUPT, *Die Gefangenschaftsbriefe* in *Krit.-exeg. Kommentar*, ed. MEYER (8th ed., Göttingen, 1902); EWALD, *Die Briefe des Paulus an die Epheser, Kolosser und Philemon* in *Kommentar zum N. T.*, ed. ZAHN (Leipzig, 1905); BALJON, *Commentaar op de brieven van Paulus aan de Thess., Ef., Kol. en aan Philemon* (Utrecht, 1907); ABBOTT, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians* in *International Critical Commentary* (Edinburgh, 1897); ROBINSON, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians* (London, 1903); WESTCOTT, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians* (London, 1906); GORE, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians* (London, 1907).

P. LADEUZE.

Ephesus, a titular archiepiscopal see in Asia Minor, said to have been founded in the eleventh century B. C. by Androcles, son of the Athenian King Codrus, with the aid of Ionian colonists. Its coinage dates back to 700 B. C., the period when the first money was struck. After belonging successively to the kings of Lydia, the Persians, and the Syrian successors of Alexander the Great, it passed, after the battle of Magnesia (190 B. C.), to the kings of Pergamum, the last of whom, Attalus III, bequeathed his kingdom to the Roman people (133 B. C.). It was at Ephesus that Mithradates (88 B. C.) signed the decree ordering all the Romans in Asia to be put to death, in which massacre there perished 100,000 persons. Four years later Sulla, again master of the territory, slaughtered at Ephesus all the leaders of the rebellion. From 27 B. C. till a little after A. D. 297, Ephesus was the capital of the proconsular province of Asia, a direct dependency of the Roman Senate. Though unimportant politically, it was noted for its extensive commerce. Many illustrious persons were born at Ephesus, e. g. the philosophers Heraclitus and Hermodorus, the poet Hipponax, the painter Parrhasius (all in the sixth or fifth century B. C.), the geographer Artemidorus, another Artemidorus, astrologer and charlatan, both in the second century of the Christian Era, and the historian and essayist, Xenophon. Ephesus owed its chief renown to its temple of Artemis (Diana), which attracted multitudes of visitors. Its first architect was the Cretan Chersiphron (seventh to sixth century B. C.) but it was afterwards enlarged. It was situated on the bank of the River Selinus and its precincts had the right of asylum. This building, which was looked upon in antiquity as one of the marvels of the world, was burnt by Herostratus (356 B. C.) the night of the birth of Alexander the Great, and was afterwards rebuilt, almost in the same proportions, by the architect Dinocrates. Its construction is said to have lasted 120 years, according to some historians 220. It was over 400 feet in length and 200 in breadth, and rested upon 128 pillars of about sixty feet in height. It was stripped of its riches by Nero and was finally destroyed by the Goths (A. D. 262).

It was through the Jews that Christianity was first introduced into Ephesus. The original community was under the leadership of Apollo (I Cor., i, 12). They were disciples of St. John the Baptist, and were converted by Aquila and Priscilla. Then came St. Paul, who lived three years at Ephesus to establish and organize the new church; he was wont to teach in the *schola* or lecture-hall of the rhetorician Tyrannus (Acts, xix, 9) and performed there many miracles. Eventually he was obliged to depart, in consequence of a sedition stirred up by the goldsmith Demetrius and other makers of ex-votoes for the temple of Diana (Acts, xviii, 24 sqq.; xix, 1 sqq.). A little later, on his way to Jerusalem, he sent for the elders of the community of Ephesus to come to Miletus and bade them there a touching farewell (Acts, xx, 17–35). The Church of Ephesus was committed to his disciple, St. Timothy, a native of the city (I Tim., i, 3; II Tim., i, 18; iv, 12). The Epistle of St. Paul to the Ephesians was not perhaps addressed directly to them; it may be only a circular letter sent by him to several churches. The sojourn and death of the Apostle St. John at Ephesus are not mentioned in the New Testament,

but both are attested as early as the latter part of the second century by St. Irenæus (Adv. Hær., III, iii, 4), Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., V, xxi), Clement of Alexandria, the "Acta Joannis", and a little earlier by St. Justin and the Montanists. Byzantine tradition has always shown at Ephesus the tomb of the Apostle. Another tradition, which may be trustworthy, though less ancient, makes Ephesus the scene of the death of St. Mary Magdalen. On the other hand the opinion that the Blessed Virgin died there rests on no ancient testimony; the often quoted but ambiguous text of the Council of Ephesus (431), means only that there was at that time at Ephesus a church of the Virgin. (See Ramsay in "Expositor", June, 1905, also his "Seven Cities of Asia".) We learn, moreover, from Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., V, xxiv) that the three daughters of the Apostle St. Philip were buried at Ephesus.

About 110 St. Ignatius of Antioch, having been greeted at Smyrna by messengers of the Church of Ephesus, sent to it one of his seven famous epistles. During the first three centuries, Ephesus was, next to Antioch, the chief centre of Christianity in Asia Minor. In the year 190 its bishop, St. Polycrates, held a council to consider the paschal controversy and declared himself in favour of the Quartodeciman practice; nevertheless the Ephesian Church soon conformed in this particular to the practice of all the other Churches. It seems certain that the sixth canon of the Council of Nicæa (325), confirmed for Ephesus its ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the whole "diocese" or civil territory of Asia Minor, i. e. over eleven ecclesiastical provinces; at all events, the second canon of the Council of Constantinople (381) formally recognized this authority. But Constantinople was already claiming the first rank among the Churches of the East and was trying to annex the Churches of Thrace, Asia, and Pontus. To resist these encroachments, Ephesus made common cause with Alexandria. We therefore find Bishop Memnon of Ephesus siding with St. Cyril at the Third Œcumenical Council, held at Ephesus in 431 in condemnation of Nestorianism, and another bishop, Stephen, supporting Dioscorus at the so-called Robber Council (*Latrocinium Ephesinum*) of 449, which approved the heresy of Eutyches. But the resistance of Ephesus was overcome at the Council of Chalcedon (451), whose famous twenty-eighth canon placed the twenty-eight ecclesiastical provinces of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople. Henceforth Ephesus was but the second metropolis of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, nor did it ever recover its former standing, despite a council of 474 in which Paul, the Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria restored its ancient rights. Egyptian influence was responsible for the hold which Monophysitism gained at Ephesus during the sixth century; the famous ecclesiastical historian, John of Asia, was then one of its bishops. The metropolis of Ephesus in those days ruled over thirty-six suffragan sees. Justinian, who imitated Constantine in stripping the city of many works of art to adorn Constantinople, built there a magnificent church consecrated to St. John; this was soon a famous place of pilgrimage.

Ephesus was taken in 655 and 717 by the Arabs. Later it became the capital of the theme of the Thracesians. During the Iconoclastic period two bishops of Ephesus suffered martyrdom, Hypatius in 735 and Theophilus in the ninth century. In the same city the fierce general Lachanodracon put to death thirty-eight monks from the monastery of Pelecete in Bithynia and other partisans of the holy images. In 899 Leo the Wise transferred the relics of St. Mary Magdalen to Constantinople. The city was captured in 1090 and destroyed by the Seljuk Turks, but the Byzantines succeeded in retaking it and rebuilt it on the neighbouring hills around the church of St. John. Henceforth it was commonly called *Hagios Theologos* (the holy theologian, i. e. St. John the Divine), or in Turkish *Aya Solouk* (to the Greeks the Apostle St. John is "the Theologian"); the French called the site *Altelot* and the Italians *Alto Luogo*. At the beginning of the thirteenth century its metropolitan, Nicholas Mesarites, had an important rôle at conferences between the Greeks and the Latins. The city was again plundered by the Turks in the first years of the fourteenth century, then by the Catalonian mercenaries in the pay of the Byzantines, and once more by the Turks. The church of St. John was transformed into a mosque, and the city was ruled by a Turkish ameer, who carried on a little trade with the West, but it could no longer maintain its Greek bishop. A series of Latin bishops governed the see from 1318 to 1411. The ruin of Ephesus was completed by Timur-Leng in 1403 and by nearly a half-century of civil wars among its Turkish masters. When at the Council of Florence in 1439 Mark of Ephesus (Marcus Eugenicus) showed himself so haughty towards the Latins, he was the pastor of a miserable village, all that remained of the great city which Pliny once called *alterum lumen Asiæ*, or the second eye of Asia (Hist. nat., V, xxix; also Apoc., ii, 5; cf. W. Brockhoff, "Ephesus vom vierten christlich. Jhdt. bis seinem Untergang", Jena, 1906).

To-day Aya Solouk has 3000 inhabitants, all Greeks. It is situated in the caza of Koush Adassi, in the vilayet of Aïdin or Smyrna, about fifty miles from Smyrna, on the Smyrna-Aïdin railway. The ruins of Ephesus stand in the marshy and unhealthy plain below the village. There are the remains of the temple of Diana, the theatre, with a capacity of 25,000 spectators, the stadium, the great gymnasium, and the "Double Church", probably the ancient cathedral, one aisle of which was dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, the other to St. John, where the councils of 431 and 449 were held. The Greek metropolitan resides at Manissa, the ancient Magnesia.

Wood, *On the Antiquities of Ephesus having relation to Christianity* in *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archæology*, VI, 328; Idem, *Discoveries at Ephesus* (London, 1877); Falkener, *Ephesus and the Temple of Diana* (London, 1862); Arundell, *Discoveries in Asia Minor* (London, 1834), II, 247–272; Barclay-Head, *History of the Coinage of Ephesus* (London, 1880); Guhl, *Ephesiaca* (Berlin, 1843); Curtius, *Ephesos* (Berlin, 1874); Benndorf, *Forschungen in Ephesos* (Vienna, 1905); Chapot, *La province Romaine proconsulaire d'Asie* (Paris, 1904); Gude, *De ecclesiæ ephesinæ statu ævo apostolorum* (Paris, 1732); Cruse-Blicher, *De statu Ephesiorum ad quos scripsit Paulus* (Hanover, 1733); Le Camus in Vig., *Dict. de la Bible*, s.v. *Ephèse*; Zimmermann, *Ephesos im ersten christl. Jhdt.* (Berlin, 1894); Lequien, *Oriens christianus* (Paris, 1740), I, 671–694; Brockhoff, *Studien zur Gesch. der Stadt Ephesos* (Jena, 1905); Weber, *Le guide du voyageur à Ephèse* (Smyrna, 1891); Buerchner, *Ephesos* in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyc.*, s. v.; Ramsay, *The Seven Cities of Asia* (London, 1907).

S. Vailhé.

Ephesus, Council of, the third œcumenical council, 431. The idea of this great council seems to have been due to Nestorius, the Bishop of Constantinople. St. Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, had accused him to Pope St. Celestine of heresy, and the pope had replied on 11 August, 430, by charging St. Cyril to assume his authority and give notice in his name to Nestorius that, unless he recanted within ten days of receiving this ultimatum, he was to consider himself excommunicated and deposed. The summons was served on Nestorius on a Sunday, 30 November, or 7 December, by four bishops sent by Cyril. But Nestorius was evidently well informed of what he was to expect. He regarded himself as having been calumniated to the pope, and he did not choose to be given over into the hands of Cyril. The latter was, in his opinion, not merely a personal enemy, but a dangerous theologian, who was reviving to some extent the errors of Apollinarius. Nestorius had influence over the Emperor of the East, Theodosius II, whom he induced to summon a general council to judge of the difference between the

Patriarch of Alexandria and himself, and he worked so well that the letters of convocation were issued by the emperor to all metropolitans on 19 November, some days before the messengers of Cyril arrived. The emperor was able to take this course without seeming to favour Nestorius too much, because the monks of the capital, whom Nestorius had excommunicated for their opposition to his heretical teaching, had also appealed to him to call together a council. Nestorius, therefore, paid no attention to the pope's ultimatum, and refused to be guided by the advice to submit which his friend John, the Patriarch of Antioch, volunteered.

The pope was pleased that the whole East should be united to condemn the new heresy. He sent two bishops, Arcadius and Projectus, to represent himself and his Roman council, and the Roman priest, Philip, as his personal representative. Philip, therefore, takes the first place, though, not being a bishop, he could not preside. It was probably a matter of course that the Patriarch of Alexandria should be president. The legates were directed not to take part in the discussions, but to give judgment on them. It seems that Chalcedon, twenty years later, set the precedent that the papal legates should always be technically presidents at an œcumenical council, and this was henceforth looked upon as a matter of course, and Greek historians assumed that it must have been the case at Nicæa.

The emperor was anxious for the presence of the most venerated prelate of the whole world, Augustine, and sent a special messenger to that great man with a letter in honourable terms. But the saint had died during the siege of Hippo in the preceding August, though the troubles of Africa had prevented news from reaching Constantinople. Theodosius wrote an angry letter to Cyril, and a temperate one to the council. The tone of the latter epistle and of the instructions given to the imperial commissioner, Count Candidian, to be absolutely impartial, are ascribed by the Coptic Acts to the influence exercised on the emperor by the Abbot Victor, who had been sent to Constantinople by Cyril to act as his agent at the Court on account of the veneration and friendship which Theodosius was known to feel for the holy man. Nestorius, with sixteen bishops, and Cyril, with fifty, arrived before Pentecost at Ephesus. The Coptic tells us that the two parties arrived on the same day, and that in the evening **Nestorius** proposed that all should join in the Vesper service together. The other bishops refused. Memnon, Bishop of Ephesus, was afraid of violence, and sent his clergy only to the church. The mention of a Flavian, who seems to be the Bishop of Philippi, casts some doubt on this story, for that bishop did not arrive till later. Memnon of Ephesus had forty suffragans present, not counting twelve from Pamphylia (whom John of Antioch calls heretics). Juvenal of Jerusalem, with the neighbouring bishops whom he looked upon as his suffragans, and Flavian of Philippi, with a contingent from the countries which looked to Thessalonica as their metropolis, arrived soon after Pentecost. The Patriarch of Antioch, John, an old friend of Nestorius, wrote to explain that his suffragans had not been able to start till after the Octave of Easter. (The Coptic Acts say that there was a famine at Antioch.) The journey of thirty days had been lengthened by the death of some horses; he would accomplish the last five or six stages at leisure. But he did not arrive, and it was said that he was loitering because he did not wish to join in condemning Nestorius. Meanwhile the heat was great. Many bishops were ill. Two or three died. Two of John's metropolitans, those of Apamea and Hierapolis, arrived and declared that John did not wish the opening of the council to be deferred on account of his delay. However, these two bishops and Theodoret of Cyrus, with sixty-five others, wrote a memorial addressed to St. Cyril and Juvenal of Jerusalem, begging that the arrival of John should be awaited. Count Candidian arrived, with the imperial decree, and he took the same view. But Cyril and the majority determined to open the council on 22 June, sixteen days having passed since John had announced his arrival in five or six. It was clear to the majority that this delay was intentional, and they were probably right. Yet it is regrettable that all possible allowance was not made, especially as no news had yet come from Rome.

For Cyril had written to the pope with regard to an important question of procedure. Nestorius had not recanted within the ten days fixed by the pope, and he was consequently treated as excommunicate by the majority of the bishops. Was he to be allowed a fresh trial, although the pope had already condemned him? Or, on the other hand, was he to be merely given the opportunity of explaining or excusing his contumacy? One might have presumed that Pope Celestine, in approving of the council, intended that Nestorius should have a full trial, and in fact this was declared in his letter which was still on the way. But as no reply had come to Cyril, that saint considered that he had no right to treat the pope's sentence as a matter for further discussion, and no doubt he had not much wish to do so. The council assembled on 22 June, and St. Cyril assumed the presidency both as Patriarch of Alexandria and "as filling the place of the most holy and blessed Archbishop of the Roman Church, Celestine", in order to carry out his original commission, which he considered, in the absence of any reply from Rome, to be still in force. In the morning one hundred and sixty bishops were present, and by evening one hundred and ninety-eight had assembled. The session began by a justification of the decision to delay no longer. Nestorius had been on the previous day invited to attend. He had replied that he would come if he chose. To a second summons, which was now dispatched, he sent a message from his house, which was surrounded with armed men, that he would appear when all the bishops had come together. Indeed only some twenty of the sixty-eight who had demanded a delay had rallied to Cyril, and Nestorius's own suffragans had also stayed away. To a third summons he gave no answer. This attitude corresponds with his original attitude to the ultimatum sent by Cyril. He would not acknowledge Cyril as a judge, and he looked upon the opening of the council before the arrival of his friends from Antioch as a flagrant injustice.

The session proceeded. The Nicene Creed was read, and then the second letter of Cyril to Nestorius, on which the bishops at Cyril's desire, severally gave their judgement that it was in accordance with the Nicene faith, one hundred and twenty-six speaking in turn. Next the reply of Nestorius was read. All then cried Anathema to Nestorius. Then Pope Celestine's letter to St. Cyril was read, and after it the third letter of Cyril to Nestorius, with the anathematisms which the heretic was to accept. The bishops who had served this ultimatum on Nestorius deposed that they had given him the letter. He had promised his answer on the morrow, but had not given any, and did not even admit them. Then two friends of Nestorius, Theodotus of Ancyra and Acacius of Mitylene, were invited by Cyril to give an account of their conversations at Ephesus with Nestorius. Acacius said that Nestorius had repeatedly declared *διμηνιαῖον ἢ τριμηνιαῖον μὴ δεῖν λέγεσθαι Θεόν*. Nestorius's own account of this conversation in his "Apology" (Bethune-Baker, p. 71) shows that this phrase is to be translated thus: "We must not say that God is two or three months old." This is not so shocking as the meaning which has usually been ascribed to the words in modern as well as ancient times (e. g. by Socrates, VII, xxxiv): "A baby of two or three months old ought not to be called God." The former sense agrees with the accusation of Acacius that Nestorius declared "one must

either deny the Godhead [θεότης] of the Only-begotten to have become man, or else admit the same of the Father and of the Holy Ghost." (Nestorius means that the Divine Nature is numerically one—and if Nestorius really said θεότης, and not ὑπόστασις, he was right, and Acacius was wrong.) Acacius further accused him of uttering the heresy that the Son who died is to be distinguished from the Word of God. A series of extracts from the holy Fathers was then read, Peter I and Athanasius of Alexandria, Július and Felix of Rome (but these papal letters were Apollinarian forgeries), Theophilus, Cyril's uncle, Cyprian, Ambrose, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Atticus, Amphilochius. After these, contrasting passages from the writings of Nestorius were read. These were of course *pièces justificatives* brought forward by Cyril, and necessary to inform the council as to the question at issue. Hefele has wrongly understood that the bishops were examining the doctrine of Nestorius afresh, without accepting the condemnation by the pope as necessarily correct. A fine letter from Capreolus, Bishop of Carthage, and primate of a greater number of bishops than any of the Eastern patriarchs, was next produced. He writes in the midst of the devastation of Africa by the Vandals, and naturally could neither hold any synod nor send any bishops. No discussion followed (and Hefele is wrong in suggesting an omission in the Acts, which are already of extraordinary length for a single day), but the bishops accepted with acclamation the words of Capreolus against novelty and in praise of ancient faith, and all proceeded to sign the sentence against Nestorius. As the excommunication by St. Celestine was still in force, and as Nestorius had contumaciously refused to answer the threefold summons enjoined by the canons, the sentence was worded as follows:—

> The holy synod said: "Since in addition to the rest the most impious Nestorius has neither been willing to obey our citation, nor to receive the most holy and God-fearing bishops whom we sent to him, we have necessarily betaken ourselves to the examination of his impieties; and, having apprehended from his letters and from his writings, and from his recent sayings in this metropolis which have been reported, that his opinions and teachings are impious, we being necessarily impelled thereto both by the canons [for his contumacy] and by the letter [to Cyril] of our most holy father and colleague Celestine, Bishop of the Roman Church, with many tears have arrived at the following grievous sentence against him: Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who has been blasphemed by him, has defined by this holy synod that the same Nestorius is excluded from all episcopal dignity and from every assembly of bishops."

This sentence received 198 signatures, and some more were afterwards added. A brief notification addressed to "the new Judas" was sent to Nestorius. The Coptic Acts tell us that, as he would not receive it, it was affixed to his door. The whole business had been concluded in a single long session, and it was evening when the result was known. The people of Ephesus, full of rejoicing, escorted the fathers to their houses with torches and incense. Count Candidian, on the other hand, had the notices of the deposition torn down, and silenced the cries in the streets. The council wrote at once to the emperor and to the people and clergy of Constantinople, though the Acts had not yet been written out in full. In a letter to the Egyptian bishops in the same city and to the Abbot Dalmatius (the Coptic substitutes Abbot Victor), Cyril asks for their vigilance, as Candidian was sending false reports. Sermons were preached by Cyril and his friends, and the people of Ephesus were much excited. Even before this, Nestorius, writing, with ten bishops, to the emperor to complain that the council was to begin without waiting for the Antiochenes and the Westerns, had spoken of the violence of the people, egged on by their bishop Memnon who (so the heretic said) had shut the churches to him and threatened him with death.

Five days after the first session John of Antioch arrived. The party of Cyril sent a deputation to meet him honourably, but John was surrounded by soldiers, and complained that the bishops were creating a disturbance. Before he would speak to them, he held an assembly which he designated "the holy synod". Candidian deposed that he had disapproved of the assembling of the bishops before John's arrival; he had attended the session and read the emperor's letter (of this not a word in the Acts, so Candidian was apparently lying). John accused Memnon of violence, and Cyril of Arian, Apollinarian, and Eunomian heresy. These two were deposed by forty-three bishops present; the members of the council were to be forgiven, provided they would condemn the twelve anathematisms of Cyril. This was absurd, for most of these could not be understood in anything but a Catholic sense. But John, who was not a bad man, was in a bad temper. It is noticeable that not a word was said in favour of Nestorius at this assembly. The party of Cyril was now complaining of Count Candidian and his soldiers, as the other side did of Memnon and the populace. Both parties sent their report to Rome. The emperor was much distressed at the division, and wrote that a collective session must be held, and the matter begun afresh. The official named Palladius who brought this epistle took back with him many letters from both sides. Cyril proposed that the emperor should send for him and five bishops, to render an exact account.

At last on 10 July the papal envoys arrived. The second session assembled in the episcopal residence. The legate Philip opened the proceedings by saying that the former letter of St. Celestine had been already read, in which he had decided the present question; the pope had now sent another letter. This was read. It contained a general exhortation to the council, and concluded by saying that the legates had instructions to carry out what the pope had formerly decided; doubtless the council would agree. The Fathers then cried: "This is a just judgment. To Celestine the new Paul! To the new Paul Cyril! To Celestine, the guardian of the Faith! To Celestine agreeing with the Synod! The Synod gives thanks to Cyril. One Celestine, one Cyril!" The legate Projectus then says that the letter enjoins on the council, though they need no instruction, to carry into effect the sentence which the pope had pronounced. Hefele wrongly interprets this: "That is, that all the bishops should accede to the Papal sentence" (vol. III, 136). Firmus, the Exarch of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, replies that the pope, by the letter which he sent to the Bishops of Alexandria, Jerusalem, Thessalonica, Constantinople, and Antioch, had long since given his sentence and decision; and the synod—the ten days having passed, and also a much longer period—having waited beyond the day of opening fixed by the emperor, had followed the course indicated by the pope, and, as Nestorius did not appear, had executed upon him the papal sentence, having inflicted the canonical and Apostolic judgment upon him. This was a reply to Projectus, declaring that what the pope required had been done, and it is an accurate account of the work of the first session and of the sentence; *canonical* refers to the words of the sentence, "necessarily obliged by the canons", and *Apostolic* to the words "and by the letter of the bishop of Rome". The legate Arcadius expressed his regret for the late arrival of his party, on account of storms, and asked to see the decrees of the council. Philip, the pope's personal legate, then thanked the bishops for adhering by their acclamations as holy members to their holy head—"For your blessedness is not unaware that the Apostle Peter is

the head of the Faith and of the Apostles." The Metropolitan of Ancyra declared that God had shown the justice of the synod's sentence by the coming of St. Celestine's letter and of the legates. The session closed with the reading of the pope's letter to the emperor.

On the following day, 11 July, the third session took place. The legates had read the Acts of the first session and now demanded only that the condemnation of Nestorius should be formally read in their presence. When this had been done, the three legates severally pronounced a confirmation in the pope's name. The exordium of the speech of Philip is celebrated: "It is doubtful to none, nay it has been known to all ages, that holy and blessed Peter, the prince and head of the Apostles, the column of the Faith, the foundation of the Catholic Church, received from our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Redeemer of the human race, the keys of the Kingdom, and that to him was given the power of binding and loosing sins, who until this day and for ever lives and judges in his successors. His successor in order and his representative, our holy and most blessed Pope Celestine . . . " It was with words such as these before their eyes that Greek Fathers and councils spoke of the Council of Ephesus as celebrated "by Celestine and Cyril". A translation of these speeches was read, for Cyril then rose and said that the synod had understood them clearly; and now the Acts of all three sessions must be presented to the legates for their signature. Arcadius replied that they were of course willing. The synod ordered that the Acts should be set before them, and they signed them. A letter was sent to the emperor, telling him how St. Celestine had held a synod at Rome and had sent his legates, representing himself and the whole of the West. The whole world has therefore agreed; Theodosius should allow the bishops to go home, for many suffered from being at Ephesus, and their dioceses also must suffer. Only a few friends of Nestorius held out against the world's judgment. A new bishop must be appointed for Constantinople.

On 16 July a more solemn session was held, like the first, in the cathedral of the Theotokos. Cyril and Memnon presented a written protest against the *conciliabulum* of John of Antioch. He was cited to appear, but would not even admit the envoys. Next day the fifth session was held in the same church. John had set up a placard in the city accusing the synod of the Apollinarian heresy. He is again cited, and this is counted as the third canonical summons. He would pay no attention. In consequence the council suspended and excommunicated him, together with thirty-four bishops of his party, but refrained from deposing them. Some of John's party had already deserted him, and he had gained only a few. In the letters to the emperor and the pope which were then dispatched, the synod described itself as now consisting of two hundred and ten bishops. The long letter to Celestine gives a full account of the council, and mentions that the pope's decrees against the Pelagians had been read and confirmed. At the end of the sixth session, which dealt only with the case of two Nestorianizing priests, was made the famous declaration that no one must produce or compose any other creed than (*παρά*, *præter*, "beyond"—"contrary to"?) the Nicene, and that anyone who should propose any such to pagans, Jews, or heretics, who wished to be converted, should be deposed if a bishop or cleric, or anathematized if a layman. This decision became later a fruitful source of objections to the decrees of later synods and to the addition of the *filioque* to the so-called Constantinopolitan Creed; but that creed itself would be abolished by this decree if it is taken too literally. We know of several matters connected with Pamphylia and Thrace which were treated by the council, which are not found in the Acts. St. Leo tells us that Cyril reported to the pope the intrigues by which Juvenal of Jerusalem tried at Ephesus to carve himself a patriarchate out of that of Antioch, in which his see lay. He was to succeed in this twenty years later, at Chalcedon. In the seventh and last session on 31 July (it seems) the bishops of Cyprus persuaded the council to approve their claim of having been anciently and rightly exempt from the jurisdiction of Antioch. Six canons were also passed against the adherents and supporters of Nestorius.

The history of the intrigues by which both parties tried to get the emperor on their side need not be detailed here. The orthodox were triumphant at Ephesus by their numbers and by the agreement of the papal legates. The population of Ephesus was on their side. The people of Constantinople rejoiced at the deposition of their heretical bishop. But Count Candidian and his troops were on the side of Nestorius, whose friend, Count Irenæus, was also at Ephesus, working for him. The emperor had always championed Nestorius, but had been somewhat shaken by the reports of the council. Communication with Constantinople was impeded both by the friends of Nestorius there and by Candidian at Ephesus. A letter was taken to Constantinople at last in a hollow cane, by a messenger disguised as a beggar, in which the miserable condition of the bishops at Ephesus was described, scarce a day passing without a funeral, and entreaty was made that they might be allowed to send representatives to the emperor. The holy abbot, St. Dalmatius, to whom the letter was addressed, as well as to the emperor, clergy, and people of Constantinople, left his monastery in obedience to a Divine voice and, at the head of the many thousand monks of the city, all chanting and carrying tapers, made his way through enthusiastic crowds to the palace. They passed back right through the city, after the abbot Dalmatius had interviewed the emperor, and the letter was read to the people in the church of St. Mocius. All shouted "Anathema to Nestorius!"

Eventually the pious and well-meaning emperor arrived at the extraordinary decision that he should ratify the depositions decreed by both councils. He therefore declared that Cyril, Memnon, and John were all deposed. Memnon and Cyril were kept in close confinement. But in spite of all the exertions of the Antiochian party, the representatives of the envoys whom the council was eventually allowed to send, with the legate Philip, to the Court, persuaded the emperor to accept the great council as the true one. Nestorius anticipated his fate by requesting permission to retire to his former monastery. The synod was dissolved about the beginning of October, and Cyril arrived amid much joy at Alexandria on 30 October. St. Celestine was now dead, but his successor, St. Sixtus III, confirmed the council.

The *Acts* of the synod, together with other documents connected with it, will be found in Greek and Latin in MANSI, IV, V; HARDOUIN, I, and the other *Collections of Councils*. Another old Latin translation in MANSI, V, 477; a collection of 225 documents in a Latin translation (MANSI, V, 731) were published by BALUZE under the name of *Synodicon adversus Tragœdiam Irenæi*, because it embodies and replies to a collection called *Tragœdia* made in his own defence by Count Irenæus, the friend of Nestorius, and afterwards Bishop of Tyre. On these documents see QUENTIN, *J. D. Mansi et les grandes collections conciliaires* (Paris, 1900). The fragmentary *Coptic Acts* were first published, with a French translation, by BOURIANT, in *Mémoires publiés par la Mission Archéol. française au Caire* (Paris, 1892), VIII—see a short account by AMÉLINEAU in *Comptes rendus de l'Acad. des Inscr. et belles-lettres* (1890), 212, and *Church Quart. Rev.*, Oct., 1891; they had been signalized earlier by ZOEGA, *Catalogus Copt. MSS. Mus. Borg. Velitr.* (1810), and by LENORMANT in *Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscr.* (1853), XIX, 2, 301. A German translation with careful discussion, by KRAATZ, *Koptische Akten zum Eph. Konzil* in *Texte und Unters.* (1904), new series, XI, 2; Kraatz holds one of the five documents which are not known in Greek or Latin to be spurious; the rest of the fragment is so clearly intended to exalt the influence of Abbot Victor that it is of little value. But this judgment is perhaps too severe.—On the council, TILLEMONT, XIV; HEFELE, *History of the Councils*, III; a new French edition by LECLERCQ (Paris, in progress), II; LEO ALLATIUS, *Vindiciæ synodi Ephesinæ et Sancti Cyrilli de processione Spiritus ex*

Patre et Filio (Rome, 1661); RIVINGTON, *The Roman Primacy, 430–451* (London, 1899); BETHUNE-BAKER, *Nestorius and his Teaching* (Cambridge, 1908); MAHÉ, *Les anathématismes de S. Cyrille et les évêques orientaux* in *Revue d'hist. eccl.* (Louvain, 1906), VII, 3.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

Ephesus, ROBBER COUNCIL OF (LATROCINIUM).—The Acts of the first session of this synod were read at the Council of Chalcedon, 451, and have thus been preserved to us. The remainder of the Acts (the first session being wanting) are known only through a Syriac translation by a Monophysite monk, published from the British Museum MS. Addit. 14,530, written in the year 535. On the events which preceded the opening of the council, 8 August, 449, see DIOSCURUS. The emperor had convoked it, the pope had agreed. No time had been left for any Western bishops to attend, except a certain Julius of an unknown see, who, together with a Roman priest, Renatus (he died on the way), and the deacon Hilarus, afterwards pope, represented St. Leo. The Emperor Theodosius II gave to Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, the presidency —*τὴν αὐθεντίαν καὶ τὰ πρωτεῖα*. The legate Julius is mentioned next, but when this name was read at Chalcedon, the bishops cried: "He was cast out. No one represented Leo." Next in order was Juvenal of Jerusalem, above both the Patriarch of Antioch, Domnus, and St. Flavian of Constantinople. The number of bishops present was 127, with eight representatives of absent bishops, and lastly the deacon Hilarus with his notary Dulcitius. The question before the council by order of the emperor was whether St. Flavian, in a synod held by him at Constantinople in November, 448, had justly deposed and excommunicated the Archimandrite Eutyches for refusing to admit two natures in Christ. Consequently Flavian and six other bishops, who had been present at his synod, were not allowed to sit as judges in the council. The brief of convocation by Theodosius was read, and then the Roman legates explained that it would have been contrary to custom for the pope to be present in person, but he had sent a letter by them. In this letter St. Leo had appealed to his dogmatic letter to Flavian, which he intended to be read at the council and accepted by it as a rule of faith. But Dioscorus took care not to have it read, and instead of it a letter of the emperor, ordering the presence at the council of the fanatical anti-Nestorian monk Barsumas, was presented. The question of faith was next proceeded with. Dioscorus declared that this was not a matter for inquiry: they had only to inquire into the recent doings. He was acclaimed as a guardian of the Faith. Eutyches then was introduced, and declared that he held the Nicene Creed, to which nothing could be added, and from which nothing could be taken away. He had been condemned by Flavian for a mere slip of the tongue, though he had declared that he held the faith of Nicæa and Ephesus, and had appealed to the present council. He had been in danger of his life. He now asked for judgment against the calumnies which had been brought against him.

The accuser of Eutyches, Bishop Eusebius of Dorylæum, was not allowed to be heard. The bishops agreed that the Acts of the condemnation of Eutyches, at a council held at Constantinople in November, 448, should be read, but the legates asked that the pope's letter might be heard first. Eutyches interrupted with the complaint that he did not trust the legates; they had been to dine with Flavian, and had received much courtesy. Dioscorus decided that the Acts of the trial should have precedence, and so the letter of St. Leo was never read at all. The Acts were then read in full (for an account of them see EUTYCHES), and also the account of an inquiry made on 13 April into the allegation of Eutyches that the synodal Acts had been incorrectly taken down, and of another inquiry on 27 April into the accusation made by Eutyches that Flavian had drawn up the sentence against him beforehand. While the trial was being related, cries arose of belief in one nature, that two natures meant Nestorianism, of "Burn Eusebius", and so forth. St. Flavian rose to complain that no opportunity was given him of defending himself. The Acts of the Robber Council now give a list of 114 votes in the form of short speeches absolving Eutyches. Even three of his former judges joined in this, although by the emperor's order they were not to vote. Barsumas added his voice in the last place. A petition was read from the monastery of Eutyches, which had been excommunicated by Flavian. On the assertion of the monks that they agreed in all things with Eutyches, and with the holy Fathers, the synod absolved them.

Next in order to establish the true Faith an extract was read from the Acts of the first session of the Council of Ephesus of 431. Many of the bishops, and also the deacon Hilarus, expressed their assent, some adding that nothing beyond this faith could be allowed. Dioscorus then spoke, declaring that it followed that Flavian and Eusebius must be deposed. No less than 101 bishops gave their votes orally, and the signatures of all the 135 bishops follow in the Acts. Flavian and Eusebius had previously interposed an appeal to the pope and to a council under his authority. Their formal letters of appeal have been recently published by Amelli. The evidence given at Chalcedon is conclusive that the account in the Acts of this final scene of the session is not to be trusted. The secretaries of the bishops had been violently prevented from taking notes. It was declared that both Barsumas and Dioscorus struck Flavian, though this may be exaggeration. But we must believe that many bishops threw themselves on their knees to beg Dioscorus for mercy to Flavian, that the military were introduced and also Alexandrian Parabolani, and that a scene of violence ensued; that the bishops signed under the influence of bodily fear, that some signed a blank paper, and that others did not sign at all, the names being afterwards filled in of all who were actually present.

The papal legate Hilarus uttered a single word in Latin, *Contradicitur*, annulling the sentence in the pope's name. He then escaped with difficulty. Flavian was deported into exile, and died a few days later in Lydia. No more of the Acts was read at Chalcedon. But we learn from Theodoret, Evagrius, and others, that the Robber Council deposed Theodoret himself, Domnus, and Ibas. The Syriac Acts take up the history where the Chalcedonian Acts break off. Of the first session only the formal documents, letters of the emperor, petitions of Eutyches, are known to be preserved in Syriac, though not in the same MS. It is evident that the Monophysite editor thoroughly disapproved of the first session, and purposely omitted it, not because of the high-handed proceedings of Dioscorus, but because the Monophysites as a general rule condemned Eutyches as a heretic, and did not wish to remember his rehabilitation by a council which they considered to be œcumenical.

In the next session, according to the Syriac Acts, 113 were present, including Barsumas. Nine new names appear. The legates were sent for, as they did not appear, but only the notary Dulcitius could be found, and he was unwell. The legates had shaken off the dust of their feet against the assembly. It was a charge against Dioscorus at Chalcedon that he "had held an (œcumenical) council without the Apostolic See, which was never allowed". This manifestly refers to his having continued the council after the departure of the legates. The first case was that of Ibas, Bishop of Edessa. This famous champion of the Antiochian party had been accused of crimes before Domnus, Bishop of Antioch, and had been acquitted, soon after Easter, 448. His accusers had gone to Constantinople and obtained a new trial from the emperor. The bishops Photius of Tyre, Eustathius of

Berytus, and Uranius of Imeria were to examine the matter. These bishops met at Tyre, removed to Berytus, and returned to Tyre, and eventually acquitted Ibas once more, together with his fellow-accused, Daniel, Bishop of Harran, and John of Theodosianopolis. This was in February, 449. The bishops had been too kind, Cherœas, Governor of Osrhoene was now ordered to go to Edessa to make a new inquiry. He was received by the people on 12 April with shouts (the detailed summary of which took up some two or three pages of his report), in honour of the emperor, the governor, the late Bishop Rabbula, and against Nestorius and Ibas. Cherœas sent to Constantinople, with two letters of his own, an elaborate report, detailing all the accusations he could manage to rake together against Ibas. The emperor ordered that a new bishop should be chosen. It was this report, which provided a history of the whole affair, that was now read at length by order of Dioscorus. When the famous letter of Ibas to Maris was read, cries arose such as "These things pollute our ears. . . Cyril is immortal. . . . Let Ibas be burnt in the midst of the city of Antioch. . . Exile is of no use. Nestorius and Ibas should be burnt together!" A final indictment was made in a speech by a priest of Edessa named Eulogius. Sentence was finally given against Ibas of deposition and excommunication, without any suggestion that he ought to be cited or that his defence ought to be heard. It is scandalous to find the three bishops who had acquitted him but a few months previously, only anxious to show their concurrence. They even pretended to forget what had been proved at Tyre and Berytus. In the next case, that of Ibas's nephew, Daniel of Harran, they declared that at Tyre they had clearly seen his guilt, and had only acquitted him because of his voluntary resignation. He was quickly deposed by the agreement of all the council. He was, of course, not present and could not defend himself.

It was next the turn of Irenæus, who as an influential layman at the former Council of Ephesus had shown much favour to Nestorius. He had later become Bishop of Tyre, but the emperor had deposed him in 448, and the miserable Photius, already mentioned, had succeeded him. The synod made no difficulty in ratifying the deposition of Irenæus as a bigamist and a blasphemer. Aquilinus, Bishop of Byblus, because he had been consecrated by Irenæus and was his friend, was next deposed. Sophronius, Bishop of Tella, was a cousin of Ibas. He was therefore accused of magic, and his case was reserved for the judgment of the new Bishop of Edessa—a surprisingly mild decision. The council turned to higher game. The great Theodoret, whose learning and eloquence in the pulpit and with the pen were the terror of the party of Dioscorus, had been confined by the emperor within his own diocese in the preceding year, to prevent his preaching at Antioch; and Theodosius had twice written to prevent his coming to Ephesus to the council. It was not difficult to find reasons for deposing him in his absence. Far as he was from being a Nestorian, he had been a friend of Nestorius, and for more than three years (431–4) the most redoubtable antagonist of St. Cyril. But the two great theologians had come to terms and had celebrated their agreement with great joy. Theodoret had tried to make friends with Dioscorus, but his advances had been rejected with scorn. A monk of Antioch now brought forward a volume of extracts from the works of Theodoret. First was read Theodoret's fine letter to the monks of the East (see Mansi, V, 1023), then some extracts from a lost "Apology for Diodorus and Theodore"—the very name of this work sufficed in the eyes of the council for a condemnation to be pronounced. Dioscorus pronounced the sentence of deposition and excommunication.

When Theodoret in his remote diocese heard of this absurd sentence on an absent man against whose reputation not a word was uttered, he at once appealed to the pope in a famous letter (Ep. cxiii). He wrote also to the legate Renatus (Ep. cxvi), being unaware that he was dead. The council had a yet bolder task before it. Domnus of Antioch is said to have agreed in the first session to the acquittal of Eutyches. But he refused, on the plea of sickness, to appear any more at the council. He seems to have been disgusted, or terrified, or both, at the tyranny exercised by Dioscorus. The council had sent him an account of their actions, and he replied (if we may believe the Acts) that he agreed to all the sentences that had been given and regretted that his health made his attendance impossible.

It is almost incredible that immediately after receiving this message, the council proceeded to hear a number of petitions from monks and priests against Domnus himself. He was accused of friendship with Theodoret and Flavian, of Nestorianism, of altering the form of the Sacrament of Baptism, of intruding an immoral bishop into Emesa, of having been uncanonically appointed himself, and in fact of being an enemy of Dioscorus. Several pages of the MS. are unfortunately lost; but it does not seem that the unfortunate patriarch was cited to appear, or given a chance of defending himself. The bishops shouted that he was worse than Ibas. He was deposed by a vote of the council, and with this final act of injustice the Acts come to an end. The council wrote the usual letter to the emperor (see Perry, trans., p. 431), who was charmed with the result of the council and confirmed it with a letter (Mansi, VII, 495, and Perry, p. 364). Dioscorus sent an encyclical to the bishops of the East, with a form of adhesion to the council which they were to sign (Perry, p. 375). He went to Constantinople and appointed his secretary Anatolius bishop of that great see. Juvenal of Jerusalem had become his tool, he had deposed the Patriarchs of Antioch and Constantinople; but one powerful adversary yet remained. He halted at Nicæa, and with ten bishops (no doubt the ten Egyptian metropolitans whom he had brought to Ephesus), "in addition to all his other crimes he extended his madness against him who had been entrusted with the guardianship of the Vine by the Saviour"—in the words of the bishops at Chalcedon—and excommunicated the pope himself.

Meanwhile St. Leo had received the appeals of Theodoret and Flavian (of whose death he was unaware), and had written to them and to the emperor and empress that all the Acts of the council were null. He excommunicated all who had taken part in it, and absolved all whom it had condemned, with the exception of Domnus of Antioch, who seems to have had no wish to resume his see and retired into the monastic life which he had left many years before with regret. (For the results of the Robber Council, or Latrocinium, —the name given to it by St. Leo—see CHALCEDON, EUTYCHES, and LEO I, POPE.)

The *Acts* of the first session of the council will be found in those of the Council of Chalcedon, in MANSI, HARDOUIN, and the other collections. The Syriac Acts were published in the original by PERRY, *Secundam Synodum Ephesinam necnon excerpta quæ ad eam pertinent* (Oxford, 1875); tr. IDEM, *The Second Synod of Ephesus from Syriac MSS.* (Dartford, 1881). For French and German versions and other literature, see DIOSCORUS.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

Ephesus, THE SEVEN SLEEPERS OF.—The story is one of the many examples of the legend about a man who falls asleep and years after wakes up to find the world changed. It is told in Greek by Symeon Metaphrastes (q. v.) in his "Lives of the Saints" for the month of July. Gregory of Tours did it into Latin. There is a Syriac version by James of Sarug (d. 521), and from the Syriac the story was done into other Eastern languages. There is also an Anglo-Norman poem, "Li set dormanz", written by a certain Chardry, and it occurs again in Jacobus de Voragine's "Golden Legend" (*Legenda aurea*) and in an Old-Norse fragment. Of all these versions and re-editions

it seems that the Greek form of the story, which is the basis of Symeon Metaphrastes, is the source. The story is this: Decius (249–251) once came to Ephesus to enforce his laws against Christians—a gruesome description of the horrors he made them suffer follows—here he found seven noble young men, named Maximilian, Jamblichos, Martin, John, Dionysios, Exakostodianos, and Antoninos (so Metaphrastes; the names vary considerably; Gregory of Tours has Achillides, Diomedes, Diogenus, Probatus, Stephanus, Sambatus, and Quiriacus), who were Christians. The emperor tried them and then gave them a short time for consideration, till he came back again to Ephesus. They gave their property to the poor, took a few coins only with them and went into a cave on Mount Anchilos to pray and prepare for death. Decius came back after a journey and inquired after these seven men. They heard of his return and then, as they said their last prayer in the cave before giving themselves up, fell asleep. The emperor told his soldiers to find them, and when found asleep in the cave he ordered it to be closed up with huge stones and sealed; thus they were buried alive. But a Christian came and wrote on the outside the names of the martyrs and their story. Years passed, the empire became Christian, and Theodosius [either the Great (379–395) or the Younger (408–450), Koch, op. cit. *infra*, p. 12] reigned. In his time some heretics denied the resurrection of the body. While this controversy went on, a rich landowner named Adolios had the Sleepers' cave opened, to use it as a cattle-stall. Then they awake, thinking they have slept only one night, and send one of their number (Diomedes) to the city to buy food, that they may eat before they give themselves up. Diomedes comes into Ephesus and the usual story of cross-purposes follows. He is amazed to see crosses over churches, and the people cannot understand whence he got his money coined by Decius. Of course at last it comes out that the last thing he knew was Decius's reign; eventually the bishop and the prefect go up to the cave with him, where they find the six others and the inscription. Theodosius is sent for, and the saints tell him their story. Every one rejoices at this proof of the resurrection of the body. The sleepers, having improved the occasion by a long discourse, then die praising God. The emperor wants to build golden tombs for them, but they appear to him in a dream and ask to be buried in the earth in their cave. The cave is adorned with precious stones, a great church built over it, and every year the feast of the Seven Sleepers is kept.

Koch (op. cit.) has examined the growth of this story and the spread of the legend of miraculously long sleep. Aristotle (Phys., IV, xi) refers to a similar tale about sleepers at Sardes; there are many more examples from various countries (Koch, pp. 24–40, quotes German, British, Slav, Indian, Jewish, Chinese, and Arabian versions). Frederick Barbarossa and Rip van Winkle are well-known later examples. The Ephesus story is told in the Koran (Sura xviii), and it has had a long history and further developments in Islam (Koch, 123–152), as well as in medieval Christendom (ib., 153–183). Baronius was the first to doubt it (Ann. Eccl. in the Acta SS., July, 386, 48); it was then discredited till modern study of folk-lore gave it an honoured place again as the classical example of a widely spread myth. The Seven Sleepers have feasts in the Byzantine Calendar on 4 August and 22 October; in the Roman Martyrology they are commemorated as Sts. Maximianus, Malchus, Martinianus, Dionysius, Joannes, Serapion, and Constantinus on 27 July.

METAPHRASTES' version is in *P. G.*, CXV, 427–448; GREGORY OF TOURS, *Passio VII Dormientium* in the *Anal. Bolland.*, XII, 371–387; CHARDRY, *Li Set Dormanz*, ed. KOCH (Leipzig, 1879); *Legenda Aurea* and CAXTON'S version for July; KOCH, *Die Siebenschläferlegende, ihr Ursprung u. ihre Verbreitung* (Leipzig, 1883), an exhaustive monograph with a full bibliography.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Ephod (Heb. אפוד or אפד; Gr. *ἐπωμίς, ἐφώδ, ἐφούδ*; Lat. *superhumerale*) is a kind of garment mentioned in the O. T., which differed according to its use by the high-priest, by other persons present at religious services, or as the object of idolatrous worship.

Ephod of the High-Priest.—Supplementing the data contained in the Bible with those gleaned from Josephus and the Egyptian monuments, we may distinguish in the ephod three parts: a kind of waistcoat or bodice, two shoulder-pieces, and a girdle. The first of these pieces constituted the main part of the ephod; it is described by some writers as resembling the form of the chasuble, by others as being an oblong piece of cloth bound round the body under the arms and reaching as far as the waist. Its material was fine-twisted linen, embroidered with violet, purple, and scarlet twice-dyed threads, and interwoven with gold (Ex., xxviii, 6; xxxix, 2). The ephod proper must not be confounded with the "tunick of the ephod" (Ex., xxviii, 31–35), nor with the "rational of judgment" (Ex., xxviii, 15–20). The tunick was worn under the ephod; it was a sleeveless frock, made "all of violet", and was put on by being drawn over the head, something in the manner of a cassock. Its skirt was adorned with a border of pomegranates "of violet, and purple, and scarlet twice dyed, with little bells set between", whose sound was to be heard while the high-priest was ministering. The "rational of judgment" was a breastplate fastened on the front of the ephod which it resembled in material and workmanship. It was a span in length and width, and was ornamented with four rows of precious stones on which were inscribed the names of the twelve tribes. It held also the *Urim* and *Thummim* (doctrine and truth) by means of which the high-priest consulted the Lord. The second part of the ephod consisted of a pair of shoulder-pieces, or suspenders, fastened to the bodices in front and behind, and passing over the shoulders. Each of these straps was adorned with an onyx stone engraved with the names of six of the tribes of Israel, so that the high-priest while ministering wore the names of all the tribes, six upon each shoulder (Ex., xxviii, 9–12; xxv, 7; xxxv, 9; xxxix, 16–19). The third part of the ephod was the cincture, of the same material as the main part of the ephod and woven in one piece with it, by which it was girt around the waist (Lev., viii, 7). Some writers maintain that the correct Hebrew reading of Ex., xxviii, 8, speaks of this band of the ephod; the contention agrees with the Syriac and Chaldee versions and with the rendering of Josephus (cf. Ex., xxviii, 27 sq.; xxix, 5; xxxix, 20 sq.). It must not be imagined that the ephod was the ordinary garb of the high-priest; he wore it while performing the duties of his ministry (Ex., xxviii, 4; Lev., viii, 7; I K., ii, 28) and when consulting the Lord. Thus David learned through Abiathar's ephod the disposition of the people of Ceila (I K., xxiii, 11 sq.) and the best plan of campaign against the Amalecites (I K., xxx, 7 sqq.). In I K., xiv, 18, it appears that Saul wished the priest Achias to consult the Lord by means of the Ark; but the Septuagint reading of this passage, its context (I K., xiv, 3), and the text of Josephus (Ant. Jud., VI, vi, 3) plainly show that in I K., xiv, 18, we must read "take the ephod" instead of "bring the ark".

The Common Ephod.—An ephod was worn by Samuel when serving in the time of Heli (I K., ii, 18), by the eighty-five priests slain by Doeg in the sanctuary of Nobe (I K., xxii, 18), and by David dancing before the Ark (II K., vi, 14). This garment is called the linen ephod; its general form may be supposed to have resembled the ephod of the high-priest, but its material was not the celebrated fine white linen, nor does it appear to have been adorned with the variegated colours of the high-priest's ephod. The Septuagint translators seem to have intended to emphasize the difference between the ephod of the high-priest

and that worn by David, for they call this latter the idolatrous ephod.

The Idolatrous Ephod.—According to Judges, viii, 26 sq., Gedeon made an ephod out of part of the spoils taken from the Madianites, their golden earlets, jewels, purple raiment, and golden chains. All Israel paid idolatrous worship to this ephod, so that it became a ruin to Gedeon and all his house. Some writers, following the Syriac and Arabic versions, have explained this ephod as denoting a gold casing of an oracular image. But there is no other instance of such a figurative meaning of ephod; besides, the Hebrew verb used to express the placing of the ephod on the part of Gedeon denotes in Judges, vi, 37, the spreading of the fleece of wool. The opinion that Gedeon's ephod was a costly garment like that of the high-priest, is, therefore, preferable.

HAGEN, *Lexicon Biblicum* (Paris, 1907), II, 188 sq.; LEVESQUE in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v.; DRIVER in HAST., *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v.; MAYER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.

A. J. MAAS.

Ephraem (EPHREM, EPHRAIM), SAINT, b. at Nisibis, then under Roman rule, early in the fourth century; d. June, 373. The name of his father is unknown, but he was a pagan and a priest of the goddess Abnil or Abizal. His mother was a native of Amid. Ephraem was instructed in the Christian mysteries by St. James, the famous Bishop of Nisibis, and was baptized at the age of eighteen (or twenty-eight). Thenceforth he became more intimate with the holy bishop, who availed himself of the services of Ephraem to renew the moral life of the citizens of Nisibis, especially during the sieges of 338, 346, and 350. One of his biographers relates that on a certain occasion he cursed from the city walls the Persian hosts, whereupon a cloud of flies and mosquitoes settled on the army of Sapor II and compelled it to withdraw. The adventurous campaign of Julian the Apostate, which for a time menaced Persia, ended, as is well known, in disaster, and his successor, Jovianus, was only too happy to rescue from annihilation some remnant of the great army which his predecessor had led across the Euphrates. To accomplish even so much the emperor had to sign a disadvantageous treaty, by the terms of which Rome lost the Eastern provinces conquered at the end of the third century; among the cities retroceded to Persia was Nisibis (363). To escape the cruel persecution that was then raging in Persia, most of the Christian population abandoned Nisibis *en masse*. Ephraem went with his people, and settled first at Beit-Garbaya, then at Amid, finally at Edessa, the capital of Osrhoene, where he spent the remaining ten years of his life, a hermit remarkable for his severe asceticism. Nevertheless he took an interest in all matters that closely concerned the population of Edessa. Several ancient writers say that he was a deacon; as such he could well have been authorized to preach in public. At this time some ten heretical sects were active in Edessa; Ephraem contended vigorously with all of them, notably with the disciples of the illustrious philosopher Bardesanes. To this period belongs neary all his literary work; apart from some poems composed at Nisibis, the rest of his writings—sermons, hymns, exegetical treatises—date from his sojourn at Edessa. It is not improbable that he is one of the chief founders of the theological "School of the Persians", so called because its first students and original masters were Persian Christian refugees of 363. At his death St. Ephraem was borne without pomp to the cemetery "of the foreigners". The Armenian monks of the monastery of St. Sergius at Edessa claim to possess his body.

The aforesaid facts represent all that is historically certain concerning the career of Ephraem (see Bouvy, "Les sources historiques de la vie de S. Ephrem" in "Revue Augustinienne", 1903, 155–64). All details added later by Syrian biographers are at best of doubtful value. To this class belong not only the legendary and occasionally puerile traits so dear to Oriental writers, but also others seemingly reliable, e. g. an alleged journey to Egypt with a sojourn of eight years, during which he is said to have confuted publicly certain spokesmen of the Arian heretics. The relations of St. Ephraem and St. Basil are narrated by very reliable authors, e. g. St. Gregory of Nyssa (the Pseudo?) and Sozomen, according to whom the hermit of Edessa, attracted by the great reputation of St. Basil, resolved to visit him at Cæsarea. He was warmly received and was ordained deacon by St. Basil; four years later he refused both the priesthood and the episcopate that St. Basil offered him through delegates sent for that purpose to Edessa. Though Ephraem seems to have been quite ignorant of Greek, this meeting with St. Basil is not improbable; some good critics, however, hold the evidence insufficient, and therefore reject it, or at least withhold their adhesion. The life of St. Ephraem, therefore, offers not a few obscure problems; only the general outline of his career is known to us. It is certain, however, that while he lived he was very influential among the Syrian Christians of Edessa, and that his memory was revered by all, Orthodox, Monophysites, and Nestorians They call him the "sun of the Syrians," the "column of the Church", the "harp of the Holy Spirit". More extraordinary still is the homage paid by Greeks who rarely mention Syrian writers. Among the works of St. Gregory of Nyssa (P. G., XLVI, 819) is a sermon (though not acknowledged by some) which is a real panegyric of St. Ephraem. Twenty years after the latter's death St. Jerome mentions him as follows in his catalogue of illustrious Christians: "Ephraem, deacon of the Church of Edessa, wrote many works [*opuscula*] in Syriac, and became so famous that his writings are publicly read in some churches after the Sacred Scriptures. I have read in Greek a volume of his on the Holy Spirit; though it was only a translation, I recognized therein the sublime genius of the man" (De viris illustr., c. cxv). Theodoret of Cyrus also praised his poetic genius and theological knowledge (Hist. Eccl., IV, xxvi). Sozomen pretends that Ephraem wrote 3,000,000 verses, and gives the names of some of his disciples, some of whom remained orthodox, while others fell into heresy (Hist. Eccl., III, xvi). From the Syrian and Byzantine Churches the fame of Ephraem spread among all Christians. The Roman Martyrology mentions him on 1 February. In their menologies and synaxaria Greeks and Russians, Jacobites, Chaldeans, Copts, and Armenians honour the holy deacon of Edessa.

WORKS OF ST. EPHRAEM.—The works of this saint are so numerous and important that it is impossible to treat them here in detail. Let it suffice to consider briefly: (1) the text and the principal versions and editions of his writings; (2) his exegetical writings; (3) his poetical writings.

(1) *Texts and Principal Versions and Editions.*—The Syriac original of Ephraem's writings is preserved in many manuscripts, one of which dates from the fifth century. Through much transcription, however, his writings, particularly those used in the various liturgies, have suffered no little interpolation. Moreover, many of his exegetical works have perished, or at least have not yet been found in the libraries of the Orient. Numerous versions, however, console us for the loss of the originals. He was still living, or at least not long dead, when the translation of his writings into Greek was begun. Armenian writers seem to have undertaken the translation of his Biblical commentaries. The Mechitarists have edited in part these commentaries and hold the Armenian version as very ancient (fifth century). The Monophysites, it is well known, were wont from an early date to translate or adapt many Syriac works. The writings of Ephraem were eventually translated into Arabic and

Ethiopian (translations as yet unedited). In medieval times some of his minor works were translated from the Greek into Slavonic and Latin. From these versions were eventually made French, German, Italian, and English adaptations of the ascetic writings of St. Ephraem. The first printed (Latin) edition was based on a translation from the Greek done by Ambrogio Traversari (St. Ambrose of Camaldoli), and issued from the press of Bartholomew Guldenbeek of Sultz, in 1475. A far better edition was executed by Gerhard Vossius (1589–1619), the learned provost of Tongres, at the request of Gregory XIII. In 1709 Edward Thwaites edited, from manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, the Greek text, hitherto known only in fragments. The Syriac original was unknown in Europe until the fruitful Oriental voyage (1706–07) of the Maronites Gabriel Eva, Elias, and especially Joseph Simeon Assemani (1716–17), which resulted in the discovery of a precious collection of manuscripts in the Nitrian (Egypt) monastery of Our Lady. These manuscripts found their way at once to the Vatican Library. In the first half of the nineteenth century the British Museum was notably enriched by similar fortunate discoveries of Lord Prudhol (1828), Curzon (1832), and Tattam (1839, 1841). All recent editions of the Syriac original of Ephraem's writings are based on these manuscripts. In the Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris) and the Bodleian (Oxford) are a few Syriac fragments of minor importance. Joseph Simeon Assemani hastened to make the best use of his newly found manuscripts and proposed at once to Clement XII a complete edition of the writings of Ephraem in the Syriac original and the Greek versions, with a new Latin version of the entire material. He took for his own share the edition of the Greek text. The Syriac text was entrusted to the Jesuit Peter Mobarak (Benedictus), a native Maronite. After the death of Mobarak, his labours were continued by Stephanus Evodius Assemani. Finally this monumental edition of the works of Ephraem appeared at Rome (1732–46) in six folio volumes. It was completed by the labours of Overbeck (Oxford, 1865) and Bickell (Carmina Nisibena, 1866), while other savants edited newly found fragments (Zingerle, P. Martin, Rubens Duval). A splendid edition (Mechlin, 1882–1902) of the hymns and sermons of St. Ephraem is owing to the late Monsignor T. J. Lamy. However, a complete edition of the vast works of the great Syriac doctor is yet to be executed.

(2) *Exegetical Writings.*—Ephraem wrote commentaries on the entire Scriptures, both the Old and the New Testament, but much of his work has been lost. There is extant in Syriac his commentary on Genesis and on a large portion of Exodus; for the other books of the Old Testament we have a Syriac abridgment, handed down in a catena of the ninth century by the Syriac monk Severus (851–61). The commentaries on Ruth, Esdras, Nehemias, Esther, the Psalms, Proverbs, the Canticle of Canticles, and Ecclesiasticus are lost. Of his commentaries on the New Testament there has survived only an Armenian version. The Scriptural canon of Ephraem resembles our own very closely. It seems doubtful that he accepted the deuterocanonical writings; at least no commentary of his on these books has reached us. On the other hand he accepted as canonical the apocryphal Third Epistle to the Corinthians, and wrote a commentary on it. The Scriptural text used by Ephraem is the Syriac Peshito, slightly differing, however, from the printed text of that very ancient version. The New Testament was known to him, as to all Syrians, both Eastern and Western, before the time of Rabulas, in the harmonized "Diatessaron" of Tatian; it is also this text which serves as the basis of his commentary. His text of the Acts of the Apostles appears to have been one closely related to that called the "Occidental". (J. R. Harris," Fragments of the Commentary of Ephrem Syrus upon the Diatessaron", London, 1905; J. H. Hill, "A Dissertation on the Gospel Commentary of St. Ephraem the Syrian", Edinburgh, 1896; F. C. Burkitt, "St. Ephraim's Quotations from the Gospel, Corrected and Arranged", in "Texts and Studies", Cambridge, 1901, VII, 2.) The exegesis of Ephraem is that of the Syriac writers generally, whether hellenized or not, and is closely related to that of Aphraates, being, like the latter, quite respectful of Jewish traditions and often based on them. As an exegete, Ephraem is sober, exhibits a preference for the literal sense, is discreet in his use of allegory; in a word, he inclines strongly to the Antiochene School, and reminds us in particular of Theodoret. He admits in Scripture but few Messianic passages in the literal sense, many more, however, prophetic of Christ in the typological sense, which here is to be carefully distinguished from the allegorical sense. It is not improbable that most of his commentaries were written for the Christian Persian school (*Schola Persarum*) at Nisibis; as seen above, he was one of its founders, also one of its most distinguished teachers.

(3) *Poetical Writings.*—Most of Ephraem's sermons and exhortations are in verse, though a few sermons in prose have been preserved. If we put aside his exegetical writings, the rest of his works may be divided into homilies and hymns. The homilies (Syriac *memrê*, i. e. discourses) are written in seven-syllable verse, often divided into two parts of three and four syllables respectively. He celebrates in them the feasts of Our Lord and of the saints; sometimes he expounds a Scriptural narrative or takes up a spiritual or edifying theme. In the East the Lessons for the ecclesiastical services (see OFFICE, DIVINE; BREVIARY) were often taken from the homilies of Ephraem. The hymns (Syriac *madrashê*, i. e. instructions) offer a greater variety both of style and rhythm. They were written for the choir service of nuns, and were destined to be chanted by them; hence the division into strophes, the last verses of each strophe being repeated in a kind of refrain. This refrain is indicated at the beginning of each hymn, after the manner of an antiphon; there is also an indication of the musical key in which the hymn should be sung. The following may serve as an illustration. It is taken from an Epiphany hymn (ed. Lamy, I, p. 4).—Air: Behold the month. Refrain: Glory to Thee from Thy flock on the day of Thy manifestation. Strophe: He has renewed the heavens, because the foolish ones had adored all the stars | He has renewed the earth which had lost its vigour through Adam= A new creation was made by His spittle | And He Who is all-powerful made straight both bodies and minds= Refrain: Glory to Thee etc.—Mgr. Lamy, the learned editor of the hymns, noted seventy-five different rhythms and airs. Some hymns are acrostic, i. e., sometimes each strophe begins with a letter of the alphabet, as is the case with several (Hebrew) metrical pieces in the Bible, or again the first letters of a number of verses or strophes form a given word. In the latter way Ephraem signed several of his hymns. In Syriac poetry St. Ephraem is a pioneer of genius, the master often imitated but never equalled. He is not, however, the inventor of Syriac poetry; this honour seems due to the aforesaid heretic Bardesanes of Edessa. Ephraem himself tells us that in the neighbourhood of Nisibis and Edessa the poems of this Gnostic and his son Harmonius contributed efficaciously to the success of their false teachings. Indeed, if Ephraem entered the same field, it was with the hope of vanquishing heresy with its own weapons perfected by himself. The Western reader of the hymns of Ephraem is inclined to wonder at the enthusiasm of his admirers in the ancient Syriac Church. His "lyricism" is by no means what we understand by that term. His poetry seems to us prolix, tiresome, colourless, lacking in the personal note, and in general devoid of charm. To be just, however, it must be

remembered that his poems are known to most readers only in versions, from which of course the original rhythm has disappeared—precisely the charm and most striking feature of this poetry. These hymns, moreover, were not written for private reading, but were meant to be sung by alternating choirs. We have only to compare the Latin psalms as sung in the choir of a Benedictine monastery with the private reading of them by the priest in the recitation of his Breviary. Nor must we forget that literary taste is not everywhere and at all times the same. We are influenced by Greek thought more deeply than we are aware or like to admit. In literature we admire most the qualities of lucidity, sobriety, and varied action. Orientals, on the other hand, never weary of endless repetition of the same thought in slightly altered form; they delight in pretty verbal niceties, in the manifold play of rhythm and accent, rhyme and assonance, and acrostic. In this respect it is scarcely necessary to remind the reader of the well-known peculiarities and qualities of Arabic poetry.

As stated above there is no complete edition of the works of St. Ephraem; nor is there any satisfactory life of the great doctor. Mention has been made of the Assemani edition of his works: *Opera omnia quæ extant græce syriace latine in sex tomos distributa* (Rome, 1732–46). It is considered imperfect from the textual standpoint, while the Latin translation is rather a paraphrase. OVERBECK, *S. Ephræmi Syri opera selecta* (Oxford, 1865); BICKELL, *Carmina Nisibena* (Leipzig, 1866); LAMY, *Hymni et Sermones* (Mechlin, 1882–86 and 1902). Among the versions it may suffice to mention the Armenian version edited by the MECHITARISTS (Venice, 1856, 1893). See also BICKELL, *Conspectus rei Syrorum litterariæ* (Münster, 1871); WRIGHT, *A Short History of Syriac Literature* (London, 1894); ZINGERLE in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Ephräm;* especially BARDENHEWER, *Patrology*, tr. SHAHAN (Freiburg im Br., 1908), 387–93, excellent appreciation and extensive bibliography; RÖDIGER-NESTLE in *Realencyk. f. prot. Theol. und Kirche*, s. v. *Ephräm;* DUVAL, *Hist. de la litt. syriaque* (3d. ed., Paris, 1906); IDEM, *Histoire d'Edesse*, 150–61; LAMY, *Prolegomena* to Vols. I and II of the *Hymni et Sermones.*

JÉRÔME LABOURT.

Ephraim of Antioch (Ἐφραίμιος), one of the defenders of the Faith of Chalcedon (451) against the Monophysites, b. at Amida in Mesopotamia; d. in 545. He was Count of the East (*Comes Orientis*) under Justinian I. In 527 he succeeded Euphrasius as Patriarch of Antioch. Most of his many works are lost. We know the titles of them, however, from Anastasius Sinaita (c. 700), St. John Damascene (d. about 754) or whoever was the author of the "Sacra Parallela", and especially Photius (d. 891). Anastasius (P. G., LXXXIX, 1185–1188) quotes passages from a work of Ephraim against Severus, the Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch (512–519). The "Sacra Parallela" give a short passage from "St. Ephraim, Archbishop of Antioch", taken from a work "On John the Grammarian and the Synod" (Tit. lxi, cf. P. G., LXXXVI, 2, 2104–2109). Photius (P. G., CIII, 957–1024) speaks of four books by Ephraim. The first consisted of sermons and letters, the second and third contained a treatise against Severus in three parts and an answer to five questions about Genesis addressed to the author by a monk named Anatolius. The fragments quoted by Photius represent practically all that is left of Ephraim's writings. Cardinal Mai was able to add a few more from a MS. Catena in the Vatican library (P. G., LXXXVI, loc. cit.). Krumbacher (Byz. Litt., loc. cit.) mentions a few other fragments in the Paris library, etc., and considers that Ephraim would deserve the same reputation as Leontius Byzantinus if more of his work had been preserved. He had an extensive knowledge of Greek Fathers and follows chiefly St. Cyril of Alexandria in his Christology.

KRUMBACHER, *Byzantinische Litteratur* (Munich, 1897), 57; BARDENHEWER, *Patrology*, tr. SHAHAN (St. Louis, 1908), 551.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Epicureanism.—This term has two distinct, though cognate, meanings. In its popular sense, the word stands for a refined and calculating selfishness, seeking not power or fame, but the pleasures of sense, particularly of the palate, and those in company rather than solitude. An epicure is one who is extremely choice and delicate in his viands. In the other sense, Epicureanism signifies a philosophical system, which includes a theory of conduct, of nature, and of mind.

HISTORY.—Epicurus, from whom this system takes its name, was a Greek, born at Samos 341 B. C., who, in 307 B. C., founded a school at Athens, and died 270 B. C. The Stoic School, diametrically opposite to this, was founded about the same time, probably 310 B. C. Thus these two systems, having for their respective watchwords *Pleasure* and *Duty*, sprang up within the first generation after Aristotle (d. 322 B. C.), each of them holding a half-truth and by exaggeration turning it into falsehood. The Epicurean School was rather a practical discipline than a habit of speculation. The master laid down his principles dogmatically, as if they must be evident as soon as stated, to any one not foolish. His disciples were made to learn his maxims by heart; and they acquired a spirit of unity more akin to that of a political party, or of a sect, than to the mere intellectual agreement of a school of philosophers. About a century and a quarter after the death of its founder, the system was introduced into Rome, and there, as well as in its native country, it attracted in the course of time a number of adherents such as moved the astonishment of Cicero. It had the fortune to be adopted by the finest of didactic poets, Lucretius (91–51 B. C.), and was expounded by him in a poem (De rerum naturâ) with a beauty of expression and a fervour of eloquence worthy of a nobler theme. In the latter half of the second century, when Marcus Aurelius was founding chairs of philosophy at Athens, that emperor, himself a Stoic, recognized the Epicurean (together with his own, and the Platonic, and the Aristotelic systems) as one of the four great philosophies to be established and endowed on a footing of equality. In modern times Epicureanism has had many theoretical as well as practical adherents. In the seventeenth century, when Aristoteleanism and Scholasticism were assailed by the champions of the new sciences, Gassendi (q. v.) selected Epicurus for his master; but he seems to have been attracted chiefly by the physics, and to have aimed at reforming the moral theory so as to make it tolerable to a Christian. The numerous editions of the poem of Lucretius which the present age is producing may be taken to indicate a sympathy with the philosophy expounded in it.

EPICUREAN ETHICS.—Philosophy was described by Epicurus as "the art of making life happy", and he says that "prudence is the noblest part of philosophy". His natural philosophy and epistemology seem to have been adopted for the sake of his theory of life. It is, therefore, proper that his ethics should first be explained. The purpose of life, according to Epicurus, is personal happiness; and by happiness he means not that state of well-being and perfection of which the consciousness is accompanied by pleasure, but pleasure itself. Moreover, this pleasure is sensuous, for it is such only as is attainable in this life. This pleasure is the immediate purpose of every action. "Habituate yourself", he says, "to think that death is nothing to us; for all good and evil is in feeling; now death is the privation of feeling. Hence, the right knowledge that death is nothing to us makes us enjoy what there is in this life, not adding to it an indefinite duration, but eradicating the desire of immortality." His idea of the pleasurable differs from that of the Cyrenaic School which preceded him. The Cyrenaics looked to the momentary pleasures of gaiety and excitement. The pleasure of Epicurus is a state, equably diffused, "the absence of [bodily] pain and [mental] anxiety". "That which begets the pleasurable life is not [sensual indulgence], but a sober reason which searches for the grounds of choosing and rejecting, and which ban-

ishes those doctrines through which mental trouble, for the most part, arises." The wise man will accordingly desire "not the longest life, but the most pleasurable". It is for the sake of this condition of permanent pleasure, or tranquillity, that the virtues are desirable. "We cannot live pleasurably without living prudently, gracefully, and justly; and we cannot live prudently, gracefully, and justly, without living pleasurably", in consequence; for "the virtues are by nature united with a pleasurable life; and a pleasurable life cannot be separated from these." The virtues, in short, are to be practised not for their own sake, but solely as a means of pleasure, "as medicine is used for the sake of health". In accordance with this view, he says that "friendship is to be pursued by the wise man only for its utility; but he will begin, as he sows the field in order to reap". "The wise man will not take any part in public affairs"; moreover, "the wise man will not marry and have children". But "the wise man will be humane to his slaves". "He will not think all sinners to be equally bad, nor all philosophers to be equally good." That is, apparently, he will not have any very exacting standard, and will neither believe very much in human virtue, nor be very much surprised at the discovery of human frailty. In this system, "prudence is the source of all pleasure and of all virtue".

The defects of this theory of life are obvious. In the first place, as to the matter of fact, experience shows that happiness is not best attained by directly seeking it. The selfish are not more happy, but less so, than the unselfish. In the next place, the theory altogether destroys virtue as virtue, and eliminates the idea and sentiment expressed by the words "ought", "duty", "right", and "wrong". Virtue, indeed, tends to produce the truest and highest pleasure; all such pleasure, so far as it depends upon ourselves, depends upon virtue. But he who practises virtue for the sake of the pleasure alone is selfish, not virtuous, and he will never enjoy the pleasure, because he has not the virtue. A similar observation may be made upon the Epicurean theory of friendship. Friendship for the sake of advantage is not true friendship in the proper sense of the word. External actions, apart from affection, cannot constitute friendship; that affection no one can feel merely because he judges it would be advantageous and pleasurable; in fact he cannot know the pleasure until he first feels the affection. If we consider the Epicurean condemnation of patriotism and of the family life, we must pronounce a still severer censure. Such a view of life is the meanest form of selfishness leading in general to vice. Epicurus, perhaps, was better than his theory; but the theory itself, if it did not originate in coldness of heart and meanness of spirit, was extremely well suited to encourage them. If sincerely embraced and consistently carried out, it undermined all that was chivalrous and heroic, and even all that was ordinarily virtuous. Fortitude and justice, as such, ceased to be objects of admiration, and temperance sank into a mere matter of calculation. Even prudence itself, dissociated from all moral quality, became a mere balancing between the pleasures of the present and of the future.

THEOLOGY.—Epicurus said that "it was not impiety to deny the gods of the multitude, but it was impiety to think of the gods as the multitude thought"; a sound principle, but one which he wrongly applied, since he got rid of what was true as well as of what was corrupt in the vulgar religion. Fear of the gods was an evil to be eradicated, as incompatible with tranquillity. As to their nature, the gods are immortal, but material, like every other being. He seems to have held that there was one supreme being; but this god was not the creator, scarcely the orderer, of the universe, the gods being only a part of the All. Nor is there a Providence, for an interest in human affairs would be inconsistent with perfect happiness. In short, the gods are magnified Epicurean philosophers.

NATURAL PHILOSOPHY.—The physics of Epicurus are in a general sense atomic. He claimed originality for his theory, asserting that it began with his reflections upon a passage in Hesiod. As he read in school that all things came from chaos, he asked, What is chaos? —a question which his teacher could not answer. It is generally held, however, that he really learned his atomism from the Democritean philosophy, modifying it in one important respect; for he supposes that the atoms in falling through empty space collide by virtue of a *self-determining power*, or rather an indetermination owing to which it is possible for them by chance to swerve a little from the vertical direction.

BIOLOGY.—In this Epicurus simply followed the view of Empedocles, that, first, all sorts of living things and animals, well or ill organized, were evolved from the earth and that those survived which were suited to preserve themselves and reproduce their kind.

ANTHROPOLOGY.—The anthropology of Lucretius may be supposed to have been derived, like his physics and biology, from Epicurus. According to the Lucretian theory men were originally savage; the primitive condition was one of mutual war; in this condition men were like the wild beasts in strength and cunning; civil society was formed under the pressure of the evils of anarchy. The reader recognizes here the ideas indicated by the eighteenth-century phrases "state of nature" and "social contract". The "golden age" is a dream.

LOGIC.—The Epicurean logic is criterional. The test of truth practically is the pleasant and the painful belief. Theoretically, their criterion is sensation. Sensation never is deceptive; the error lies in our judgment. Dreams, the ravings of fever or lunacy, the delirium of the drunkard are true in their own way. Besides sensation the human mind has also *notions*, or anticipations (προλήψεις), as when, seeing an object at a distance, one wonders whether it is a man or a tree. These notions are the results left by previous sensations. The notion does not appear to differ from the internal sense of a brute, such as enables a dog, for example, to welcome strangers belonging to the profession of his master, and to bark furiously at a beggar that he has never seen before. The understanding, then, does not differ essentially from the internal senses.

PSYCHOLOGY.—The human soul is material and mortal, being composed of a finer kind of atoms, resembling those of air or fire, but even more subtle. It is the bodily organism that holds together the atoms composing the soul. Yet the human will is free. "Better were it to accept all the legends of the gods, than to make ourselves slaves to the Fate of the natural philosophers." Fatalism, which to minds of a stoical disposition seemed a source of strength, was to those of an Epicurean temper simply a source of unpleasantness and helplessness. The freedom asserted by the Epicureans is not rational freedom in the true sense of the word. It does not consist in the power of choosing the right and the noble in preference to the pleasant. It is little better than physical contingency, and may be described as Casualism. The whole philosophy may well be described in a trenchant phrase of Macaulay as "the silliest and meanest of all systems of natural and moral philosophy".

The Volumina Herculanensia (first series, Naples, 1793–1855; and 2d series, Naples, 1861–1876), I–XI, contain many fragments of treatises by Epicurus and several members of the school. Fragments of EPICURUS's *Physics*, books II and XI, have been published by ORELLI, after ROSINI (Leipzig, 1818). See also *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Oxford Copies of the Herculanean Rolls* (Oxford, 1886); DIOGENES LAERTIUS, *De Vitis et Dogmatibus Philosophorum*, X (from which almost every quotation in this article is taken); LUCRETIUS, *De Rerum Naturâ*, especially the edition with notes by MONRO, 2 vols. (London, 1898–1900); ARRIAN, *Discourses of Epictetus*, I, xxiii; II, xx; III, vii; ATHENÆUS, XII; PLUTARCH, *Liber, Quod ne suaviter quidem vivi potest secundum Epicuri decreta;* SENECA, *Epist.*, I, ix; *De Beneficiis*, IV, ii; CICERO, *De Fin.*, I, vii; II, vii, xxv, xxx, xxxi;

Tuscul., V, xxxi; *De Nat. Deor.*, xvi, xvii, xxv; SEXTUS EMPIRICUS, *Adv. Mathem.*, XI, clxix; GASSENDI, *De Vitâ, Moribus, et Doctrinâ Epicuri, libri octo* (Lyons, 1647); *De Vitâ, Moribus, et Placitis Epicuri, seu Animadversiones in X. Librum Diog. Laer.* (1649); *Syntagma Philosophiæ Epicuri* (1649); WALLACE in *Encyclopædia Brittannica* (London, 1880), s. v. *Epicurus;* TURNER, *History of Philosophy* (Boston, 1903) 175–183; LEWES, *Biogr. Hist. of Phil.*, II; ZELLER, *Philos. of the Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics* tr. REICHEL; SCHWEGLER, *Hist. of Phil.*, XVIII (New York, 1902); TREZZA, *Epicuro e l'Epicurismo* (Florence, 1877); MASSON, *Lucretius, Epicurean and Poet* (London, 1908).

M. J. RYAN.

Epicurus. See EPICUREANISM.

Epidaurum, DIOCESE OF. See RAGUSA.

Epigraphy, CHRISTIAN. See INSCRIPTIONS.

Epikeia. See LAW.

Epiklesis (Gr. *ἐπίκλησις*; Lat. *invocatio*) is the name of a prayer that occurs in all Eastern liturgies (and originally in Western liturgies also) after the words of Institution, in which the celebrant prays that God may send down His Holy Spirit to change this bread and wine into the Body and Blood of His Son. This form has given rise to one of the chief controversies between the Eastern and Western Churches, inasmuch as all Eastern schismatics now believe that the Epiklesis, and not the words of Institution, is the essential form (or at least the essential complement) of the sacrament.

Form of the Epiklesis.—It is certain that all the old liturgies contained such a prayer. For instance, the Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions, immediately after the recital of the words of Institution, goes on to the Anamnesis—"Remembering therefore His Passion . . . "—in which occur the words: "Thou, the God who lackest nothing, being pleased with them (the Offerings) for the honour of Thy Christ, and sending down Thy Holy Spirit on this sacrifice, the witness of the Passion of the Lord Jesus, to manifest (*ὅπως ἀποφήνῃ*) this bread as the Body of Thy Christ and this chalice as the Blood of Thy Christ . . . " (Brightman, Liturgies Eastern and Western, I, 21). So the Greek and Syrian Liturgies of St. James (ibid., 54, 88–89), the Alexandrine Liturgies (ibid., 134, 179), the Abyssinian Rite (ibid., 233), those of the Nestorians (ibid., 287) and Armenians (ibid., 439). The Epiklesis in the Byzantine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom is said thus: "We offer to Thee this reasonable and unbloody sacrifice; and we beg Thee, we ask Thee, we pray Thee that Thou, sending down Thy Holy Spirit on us and on these present gifts" (the Deacon says: "Bless, Sir, the holy bread") "make this bread into the Precious Body of Thy Christ" (Deacon: "Amen. Bless, Sir, the holy chalice"); "and that which is in this chalice, the Precious Blood of Thy Christ" (Deacon: "Amen. Bless, Sir, both"), "changing [*μεταβαλών*] them by Thy Holy Spirit" (Deacon: "Amen, Amen, Amen."). (Brightman, op. cit., I, 386–387.)

Nor is there any doubt that the Western rites at one time contained similar invocations. The Gallican Liturgy had variable forms according to the feast. That for the Circumcision was: "Hæc nos, Domine, instituta et præcepta retinentes suppliciter oramus uti hoc sacrificium suscipere et benedicere et sanctificare digneris: ut fiat nobis eucharistia legitima in tuo Filiique tui nomine et Spiritus sancti, in transformationem corporis ac sanguinis domini Dei nostri Jesu Christi unigeniti tui, per quem omnia creas . . . " (Duchesne, "Origines du culte chrétien", 2nd ed., Paris, 1898, p. 208, taken from St. Germanus of Paris, d. 576). There are many allusions to the Gallican Invocation, for instance St. Isidore of Seville (De eccl. officiis, I, 15, etc.). The Roman Rite too at one time had an Epiklesis after the words of Institution. Pope Gelasius I (492–496) refers to it plainly: "Quomodo ad divini mysterii consecrationem cœlestis Spiritus adveniet, si sacerdos . . . criminosis plenus actionibus reprobetur?" ("Epp. Fragm.", vii, in Thiel, "Epp. Rom. Pont.", I, 486.) Watterich (Der Konsekrationsmoment im h. Abendmahl, 1896, pp. 133 sq.) brings other evidences of the old Roman Invocation. He (p. 166) and Drews (Entstehungsgesch. des Kanons, 1902, p. 28) think that several secrets in the Leonine Sacramentary were originally Invocations (see article CANON OF THE MASS). Of this Invocation we have now only a fragment, with the essential clause left out—our prayer: "Supplices te rogamus" (Duchesne, op. cit., 173–5). It seems that an early insistence on the words of Institution as the form of Consecration (see, for instance, Ps.-Ambrose, "De Mysteriis", IX, 52, and "De Sacramentis", IV, 4, 14–15, 23; St. Augustine, Sermo ccxxvii, in P. L., XXXVIII, 1099) led in the West to the neglect and mutilation of the Epiklesis.

Origin.—It should be noticed that the Epiklesis for the Holy Eucharist is only one of many such forms. In other sacraments and blessings similar prayers were used, to ask God to send His Holy Spirit to sanctify the matter. There was an Epiklesis for the water of baptism. Tertullian (De bapt., iv), Optatus of Mileve ("De schism. Don., III, ii, VI, iii, in "Corp. Script. eccl. Latin.", vol. XXVI, 69, 148, 149), St. Jerome (Contra Lucif., vi, vii), St. Augustine (De bapt., V, xx, xxviii), in the West; and St. Basil (De Spir. Sancto, xv, 35), St. Gregory of Nyssa (Orat. cat. magn. xxxiii), and St. Cyril of Jerusalem (Cat. iii, 3), in the East, refer to it. In Egypt especially, Epikleses were used to bless wine, oil, milk, etc. In all these cases (including that of the Holy Eucharist) the idea of invoking the Holy Ghost to sanctify is a natural one derived from Scripture (Joel, ii, 32; Acts, ii, 21: *ὃ ἂν ἐπικαλέσηται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου . . .* ; cf. Rom., x, 13; I Cor., i, 2). That in the Liturgy the Invocation should occur after the words of Institution is only one more case of many which show that people were not much concerned about the exact instant at which all the essence of the sacrament was complete. They looked upon the whole Consecration-prayer as one simple thing. In it the words of Institution always occur (with the doubtful exception of the Nestorian Rite); they believed that Christ would, according to His promise, do the rest. But they did not ask at which exact moment the change takes place. Besides the words of Institution there are many other blessings, prayers, and signs of the cross, some of which came before and some after the words, and all, including the words themselves, combine to make up the one Canon of which the effect is Transubstantiation. So also in our baptism and ordination services, part of the forms and prayers whose effect is the sacramental grace comes, in order of time, after the essential words. It was not till Scholastic times that theologians began to discuss the minimum of form required for the essence of each sacrament.

The Controversy.—The Catholic Church has decided the question by making us kneel and adore the Holy Eucharist immediately after the words of Institution, and by letting her old Invocation practically disappear. On the other hand Orthodox theologians all consider the Epiklesis as being at least an essential part of the Consecration. In this question they have two schools. Some, Peter Mogilas, for instance, consider the Epiklesis alone as consecrating (Kimmel, Monumenta fidei eccl. orient., Jena, 1850, I, 180), so that presumably the words of Institution might be left out without affecting the validity of the sacrament. But the greater number, and now apparently all, require the words of Institution too. They must be said, not merely historically, but as the first part of the essential form; they sow as it were the seed that comes forth and is perfected by the Epiklesis. Both elements, then, are essential. This is the theory defended by their theologians at the Council of Florence (1439). A deputation of Latins and Greeks was appointed then

to discuss the question. The Greeks maintained that both forms are necessary, that Transubstantiation does not take place till the second one (the Epiklesis) is pronounced, and that the Latin "Supplices te rogamus" is a true Epiklesis having the same effect as theirs. On the other hand the Dominican John of Torquemada defended the Western position that the words of Institution alone and at once consecrate (Hardouin, IX, 977 sqq.). The decree of the council eventually defined this ("quod illa verba divina Salvatoris omnem virtutem transsubstantiationis habent", ibid.; see also the decree for the Armenians: "forma huius sacramenti sunt verba Salvatoris" in Denziger, 10th ed., no. 698–old no. 593). Cardinal Bessarion afterwards wrote a book (De Sacramento Eucharistiæ et quibus verbis Christi corpus conficitur, 1462, in P. G., CLXI, 494–525), to whom Marcus Eugenicus of Ephesus answered in a treatise with a long title: "That not only by the sound of the Lord's words are the divine gifts sanctified, but (in addition) by the prayer after these and by the consecration of the priest in the strength of the Holy Ghost".

The official Euchologion of the Orthodox Church has a note after the words of Institution to explain that: "Since the demonstrative pronouns: This is my body, and again: This is my blood, do not refer to the Offerings that are present, but to those which Jesus, taking in His hands and blessing, gave to His Disciples; therefore those words of the Lord are repeated as a narrative [διηγηματικῶς], and consequently it is superfluous to show the Offerings (by an elevation) and indeed contrary to the right mind of the Eastern Church of Christ" (ed. Venice, 1898, p. 63). This would seem to imply that Christ's words have no part in the form of the sacrament. On the other hand Dositheus in the Synod of Jerusalem (1672) apparently requires both words of Institution and Epiklesis: "It [the Holy Eucharist] is instituted by the essential word [ῥήματι ὑπαρκτικῳ, i. e. Christ's word] and sanctified by the invocation of the Holy Ghost" (Conf. Dosithei, in Kimmel, op. cit., I, 451), and this seems to be the common theory among the Orthodox in our time. Their arguments for the necessity of the Epiklesis as at any rate the perfecting part of the form are: (1) that the context shows the words of Institution to be used only as a narrative; (2) that otherwise the Epiklesis would be superfluous and deceptive: its very form shows that it consecrates; (3) tradition. The first and second points are not difficult to answer. The words of Institution are certainly used historically ("qui pridie quam pateretur, sumpsit panem . . . ac dixit: hoc est enim corpus meum", as well as all Eastern forms, is an historical account of what happened at the Last Supper); but this is no proof that they may not be used effectively and with actual meaning too. Given the intention of so doing, they necessarily would be so used. The second point is already answered above: the succession of time in sacramental prayers necessarily involves nothing but a dramatic representation of what presumably really takes place in one instant (this point is further evolved by Fortescue, "The Orth. Eastern Church", pp. 387 sq.). As for tradition, in any case it is only a question of Eastern tradition. In the West there has been a great unanimity in speaking of the words of Institution as consecrating, especially since St. Augustine; and the disappearance of any real Epiklesis in our Liturgy confirms this. Among Eastern Fathers there is less unanimity. Some, notably St. Cyril of Jerusalem, refer the consecration to the action of the Holy Ghost in a way that seems to imply that the Epiklesis is the moment (St. Cyril, Cat. xix, 7; xxi, 3; xxiii, 7, 19; cf. Basil, "De Spir. Sancto", xxvii sqq.); others, as St. John Chrysostom (Hom. i, De prod. Iudæ, 6: "He [Christ] says: This is my body. This word changes the offering"; cf. Hom. ii, in II Tim., i), quite plainly refer Consecration to Christ's words. It should be noted that these Fathers were concerned to defend the Real Presence, not to explain the moment at which it began, that they always thought of the whole Eucharistic prayer as one form, containing both Christ's words and the Invocation, and that a statement that the change takes place by the power of the Holy Ghost does not necessarily show that the writer attaches that change to this special prayer. For instance St. Irenæus says that "the bread which receives the Invocation of God is not common bread, but a Eucharist" (Adv. hær., IV, xviii, 5), and, yet immediately before (IV, xviii, 4), he explains that that bread is the Body of Christ over which the earlier part of the Anaphora is said. The final argument against the Epiklesis as Consecration-form is the account of the Last Supper in the Gospels. We know what Christ did then, and that He told us to do the same thing. There is no hint of an Epiklesis at the Last Supper.

It may finally be noted that later, in the West too (since the sixteenth century especially), this question aroused some not very important discussion. The Dominican Ambrose Catharinus (sixteenth century) thought that our Consecration takes place at an Epiklesis that precedes the recital of Christ's words. This Epiklesis he thinks to be the prayer "Quam oblationem". A few others (including Renaudot) more or less shared his opinion. Against these Hoppe (op. cit. infra) showed that in any case the Epiklesis always follows the words of Institution and that our "Quam Oblationem" cannot be considered one at all. He and others suggest a mitigated theory, according to which the Invocation (in our case the "Supplices te rogamus") belongs not to the essence of the sacrament, but in some way to its (accidental) integrity. John of Torquemada at the Council of Florence (Hardouin, IX, 976), Suarez (De Sacram., disp. lviii, 3), Bellarmine (De Euch., iv, 14), Lugo (De Euch., disp. xi, 1) explain that the Invocation of the Holy Ghost is made rather that He may sanctify our reception of the Holy Eucharist. This is a theoretical explanation sought out to account for the fact of the Epiklesis, without giving up our insistence on the words of Institution as alone consecrating. Historically and according to the text of the old invocations they must rather be looked upon as dramatically postponed expressions of what happens at one moment. There are many like cases in our rite (examples quoted in "The Orth. Eastern Church", loc. cit.).

ZORN, *Dissertatio historico-theologica de Epiklesi* (Rostock, 1705); HOPPE, *Die Epiklesis der griech. u. orient. Liturgien u. der röm. Konsekrationskanon* (Schaffhausen, 1864); FRANZ, *Der eucharistische Konsekrationsmoment* (Würzburg, 1875); IDEM, *Die eucharistische Wandlung u. die Epiklese* (Würzburg, 1880); PROBST, *Liturgie des IV. Jahrhunderts u. deren Reform* (Münster, 1893); WATTERICH, *Der Konsekrationsmoment im hl. Abendmahl* (Heidelberg 1896); LINGENS, *Die eucharistische Consecrationsform* in *Zeitschrift für kath. Theol.* (Innsbruck, 1897), pp. 51–106.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Epiphania, a titular see in Cilicia Secunda, in Asia Minor, suffragan of Anazarbus. This city is mentioned by many ancient geographers, Ptolemy, Pliny, Stephanus Byzantius, etc. It was formerly called Oiniandos and afterwards Epiphania, after Antiochus IV Epiphanes, King of Syria (175–164 B. C.). Cicero once encamped there, and Pompey settled there some of the pirates he had subdued. The city had a special era beginning in A. D. 37 (Barthélemy, Numismatique ancienne, 247). Seven bishops of Epiphania are known, from 325 to 692 (Lequien, Oriens christ., II, 895). The first, St. Amphion, suffered during the persecution of Diocletian and was present at the Council of Nicæa (325). Epiphania was the birthplace of George, the usurping Bishop of Alexandria in the fourth century. Its ruins stand near Piyas, in the sanjak of Djebel-i-Bereket, vilayet of Adana; there are remains of walls, a temple, an acropolis, an aqueduct, and many houses, all built in basalt. Nearby are the celebrated "Cilician Gates" and the battle-

field of Issus (Ramsay, Asia Minor, 386; Alishan, Sissouan, Venice, 1899, 475).

Another Epiphania was a suffragan of Damascus. It is the modern Hamah, on the Orontes (about 60,000 inhabitants). Jesuits and native Mariamet sisters care for its Catholic population, who are, for the most part, Greek Melchites. For these and for Catholic Syrians, Hamah is united with Emesa (q. v.).

S. Vailhé.

Epiphanius, surnamed Scholasticus, or in modern terms, the Philologist, a translator of various Greek works in the middle of the sixth century of the Christian Era. He prepared for Cassiodorus the text of the "Historia Tripartita", a compilation of the works of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret. We also have his translation of the commentary of Didymus on the Seven Catholic Epistles and that of the "Codex encyclicus", a list of the adhesions of the bishops of the East to the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, a list drawn up in 458 by order of the Emperor Leo I. Epiphanius made several additions to it. He also translated the commentary of Didymus on the Book of Proverbs and that of Epiphanius of Salamina on the Canticle of Canticles. These works are either lost or as yet undiscovered. "He belongs", says Jülicher, "to the group who, like Dionysius Exiguus, Mutianus, and many unknown others, satisfied the needs of the Latins for translations of Greek theologians."

Bardenhewer, *Patrology* (tr. St. Louis, 1908), 532, 557, 636; Jülicher in *Realencyc. der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Stuttgart, 1907), VI, i, 195.

Paul Lejay.

Epiphanius of Constantinople, d. 535. Epiphanius succeeded John II (518–20) as Patriarch of Constantinople. It was the time of the reaction against Monophysitism in the Eastern Empire that followed the accession of Justin I (518–27). Justin was Catholic; he let the Henoticon (482) of his predecessor Zeno (474–91) quietly drop, and very soon after his accession he caused a synod of forty bishops to meet under John II at the capital, in order to proclaim a general acceptance of the decrees of Chalcedon throughout the empire, the restoration of Catholic, and the deposition of Monophysite, bishops (P. G., LXXXVI, I, 785). The same synod reopened negotiations with the Roman See after the schism of Acacius (484–519). The reigning pope was Hormisdas (514–23), and it was on this occasion that he composed his famous formula. On Easter Day, 24 March, 519, the reunion was proclaimed. Severus of Antioch and the other Monophysite leaders fled to Egypt. The papal legates remained at Constantinople till 520. In that year the Patriarch John died, and Epiphanius was elected as his successor. He was then given authority from the pope to reconcile all schismatics and Monophysites who retracted their errors and signed the formula. Epiphanius signed it himself in the first place (Mansi, VIII, 502 sqq.).

Four letters from Epiphanius to Hormisdas are extant, with the pope's letters to him (P. L., LXIII). In the first, from Hormisdas to Epiphanius (col. 493), the pope complains that he has received as yet no letter and no legate to announce the patriarch's accession. In the second letter (l. c.) the pope requires that three repentant Monophysite bishops, Elias, Thomas, and Nicostratus, should be restored to their sees, and he appoints Epiphanius to restore them. Epiphanius then writes to Hormisdas (col. 494–95) to announce his succession to the See of Constantinople, as the pope had demanded. He excuses himself for his delay by explaining the difficult circumstances and the disorder that still remain since the Monophysite troubles, and protests his exceeding desire for communion with the Roman See: "It is my special prayer, most blessed Father, to be united to you and to embrace the Divine dogmas which were left by the holy Apostles especially to the holy See of Peter, chief of the Apostles; for I count nothing more precious than them" (l. c.). He then draws up a very orthodox profession of faith according to the decrees of Ephesus and Chalcedon; he accepts all the dogmatic letters of St. Leo I, and declares that he will never name in his diptychs anyone who is condemned by the pope. His second letter (col. 497–99) to Hormisdas praises the emperor's zeal for the Faith, explains the case of many bishops in Pontus, Asia, and the (civil) "diocese" of the East, whom Epiphanius wishes to receive back into communion now that they have renounced Monophysitism, and mentions a jewelled chalice and other gifts he sends to the pope (this letter is dated 520). Hormisdas answers (col. 505–6), exhorting the patriarch to persevere in reconciling Monophysites and thanking him for his presents. Epiphanius' third letter relates that a number of Eastern bishops have petitioned the emperor for union with Rome (col. 506–7), and the fourth (col. 507) praises Paulinus, whom the pope had sent to Constantinople as his legate. Migne (P. G., LXXXVI, Pt. I, 783–86) gives the text of the condemnation of Severus and Peter of Antioch, made by a synod of Constantinople held under Epiphanius. Assemani (Bibl. Orient., I, 619) gives a list of forty-five canons drawn up by this same synod. Epiphanius was succeeded by Anthimus I.

Sinclair in *Dict. Christ. Biog.* (London, 1880), II, 157–8; *Acta SS.* (1741), June, V, 164; Baronius, *Ann. eccl.*, ad ann. 520, 521, 533, 535; Ceillier, *Hist. des auteurs eccl.* (Paris, 1858–69), s. v.

Adrian Fortescue.

Epiphany, known also under the following names: (1) *τά ἐπιφάνια*, or *ἡ ἐπιφάνιος, sc. ἡμέρα* (rarely *ἡ ἐπιφάνεια*: though, e. g., in Athanasius, *ἡ σωματικὴ ἐπιφάνεια* occurs); *θεοφάνεια*: *dies epiphaniarum; festivitas declarationis, manifestationis; apparitio; acceptio.* (2) *ἡμέρα τῶν φώτων*: *dies luminum; dies lavacri.* (3) *φαγιφάνια, Bethphania;* etc. (4) *Festum trium regum:* whence the Dutch *Drie-koningendag*, Danish *Hellig-tre-kongersdag;* etc. (5) Twelfth Day, Swedish *Trettondedag;* etc.—The meaning of these names will be explained below. The feast was called among the Syrians *denho* (up-going), a name to be connected with the notion of rising light expressed in Luke, i, 78. The name *Epiphania* survives in Befana, the great fair held at that season in Rome; it is difficult to say how closely the practice then observed of buying all sorts of earthenware images, combined with whistles, and representing some type of Roman life, is to be connected with the rather similar custom in vogue during the December feast of the Saturnalia. For the earthenware or pastry *sigillaria* then sold all over Rome, see Macrobius; s. I, x, xxiv; II, xlix; and Brand, "Pop. Ant.", 180, 183.

I. History.—As its name suggests, the Epiphany had its origin in the Eastern Church. There exists indeed a homily of Hippolytus to which (in one MS. only) is affixed the lemma *εἰς τὰ ἅγια θεοφάνεια* [not *ἐπιφάνεια*: Kellner]; it is throughout addressed to one about to be baptized, and deals only with the Sacrament of Baptism. It was edited by Bonwetsch and Achelis (Leipzig, 1897); Achelis and others consider it spurious. The first reference about which we can feel certain is in Clement (Strom., I, xxi, 45, in P. G., VIII, 888), who writes: "There are those, too, who over-curiously assign to the Birth of Our Saviour not only its year but its day, which they say to be on 25 Pachon (20 May) in the twenty-eighth year of Augustus. But the followers of Basilides celebrate the day of His Baptism too, spending the previous night in readings. And they say that it was the 15th of the month Tybi of the 15th year of Tiberius Cæsar. And some say that it was observed the 11th of the same month." Now, 11 and 15 Tybi are 6 and 10 January, respectively. The question at once arises: did these

Basilidians celebrate Christ's Nativity and also His Baptism on 6 and 10 January, or did they merely keep His Baptism on these days, as well as His Nativity on another date? The evidence, if not Clement's actual words, suggests the former. It is certain that the Epiphany festival in the East very early admitted a more or less marked commemoration of the Nativity, or at least of the *Angeli ad Pastores*, the most striking "manifestation" of Christ's glory on that occasion. Moreover, the first actual reference to the ecclesiastical feast of the Epiphany (Ammianus Marcellinus, XXI, ii), in 361, appears to be doubled in Zonaras (XIII, xi) by a reference to the same festival as that of Christ's Nativity. Moreover, Epiphanius (Hær., li, 27, in P. G., XLI, 936) says that the sixth of January is *ἡμέρα γενεθλίων τούτεστιν ἐπιφανίων*, Christ's Birthday, i. e. His Epiphany. Indeed, he assigns the Baptism to 12 Athyr, i. e. 6 November. Again, in chapters xxviii and xxix (P. G., XLI, 940 sq.), he asserts that Christ's Birth, i. e. Theophany, occurred on 6 January, as did the miracle at Cana, in consequence of which water, in various places (Cibyra, for instance), was then yearly by a miracle turned into wine, of which he had himself drunk. It will be noticed, first, if Clement does not expressly deny that the Church celebrated the Epiphany in his time at Alexandria, he at least implies that she did not. Still less can we think that 6 January was then observed by the Church as holy. Moreover, Origen, in his list of festivals (Contra Celsum, VIII, xxii, P. G., XI, 1549), makes no mention of it.

Owing no doubt to the vagueness of the name *Epiphany*, very different manifestations of Christ's glory and Divinity were celebrated in this feast quite early in its history, especially the Baptism, the miracle at Cana, the Nativity, and the visit of the Magi. But we cannot for a moment suppose that in the first instance a festival of manifestations in general was established, into which popular local devotion read specified meaning as circumstances dictated. It seems fairly clear that the Baptism was the event predominantly commemorated. The Apostolic Constitutions (VIII, xxxiii; cf. V, xii) mention it. Kellner quotes (cf. Selden, de Synedriis, III, xv, 204, 220) the oldest Coptic Calendar for the name *Dies baptismi sanctificati*, and the later for that of *Immersio Domini* as applied to this feast. Gregory of Nazianzus identifies, indeed, *τὰ θεοφάνια* with *ἡ ἁγία τοῦ Χριστοῦ γέννησις*, but this sermon (Orat. xxxviii in P. G., XXXVI, 312) was probably preached 25 Dec., 380; and after referring to Christ's Birth, he assures his hearers (P. G., 329) that they shall shortly see Christ baptized. On 6 and 7 Jan., he preached orations xxxix and xl (P. G., loc. cit.) and there declared (col. 349) that the Birth of Christ and the leading of the Magi by a star having been already celebrated, the commemoration of His Baptism would now take place. The first of these two sermons is headed *εἰς τὰ ἅγια φῶτα*, referring to the lights carried on that day to symbolize the spiritual illumination of baptism, and the day must carefully be distinguished from the Feast of the Purification, also called *Festum luminum* for a wholly different reason. Chrysostom, however, in 386 (see CHRISTMAS) preached "Hom. vi in B. Philogonium" where (P. G., XLVIII, 752) he calls the Nativity the parent of festivals, for, had not Christ been born, neither would He have been baptized, *ὅπερ ἐστὶ τὰ θεοφάνια*. This shows how loosely this title was used. (Cf. Chrys., "Hom. in Bapt. Chr.", c. ii, in P. G., XLIX, 363; A. D. 387). Cassian (Coll., X, 2, in P. L., XLIX, 820) says that even in his time (418–427) the Egyptian monasteries still celebrated the Nativity and Baptism on 6 January.

At Jerusalem the feast had a special reference to the Nativity owing to the neighbourhood of Bethlehem. The account left to us by Etheria (Silvia) is mutilated at the beginning. The title of the subsequent feast, *Quadragesimæ de Epiphania* (Peregrin. Silviæ, ed. Geyer, c. xxvi), leaves us, however, in no doubt as to what she is describing. On the vigil of the feast (5 Jan.) a procession left Jerusalem for Bethlehem and returned in the morning. At the second hour the services were held in the splendidly decorated Golgotha church, after which that of the Anastasis was visited. On the second and third days this ceremony was repeated; on the fourth the service was offered on Mount Olivet; on the fifth at the grave of Lazarus at Bethany; on the sixth on Sion; on the seventh in the church of the Anastasis, on the eighth in that of the Holy Cross. The procession to Bethlehem was nightly repeated. It will be seen, accordingly, that this Epiphany octave had throughout so strong a Nativity colouring as to lead to the exclusion of the commemoration of the Baptism in the year 385 at any rate. It is, however, by way of actual baptism on this day that the West seems to enter into connexion with the East. St. Chrysostom (Hom. in Bapt. Chr. in P. G., XLIX, 363) tells us how the Antiochians used to take home baptismal water consecrated on the night of the festival, and that it remained for a year without corruption. To this day, the blessing of the waters by the dipping into river, sea, or lake of a crucifix, and by other complicated ritual, is a most popular ceremony. A vivid account is quoted by Neale ("Holy Eastern Church", Introduction, p. 754; cf. the Greek, Syriac, Coptic, and Russian versions, edited or translated from the original texts by John, Marquess of Bute, and A. Wallis Budge). The people consider that all ailments, spiritual and physical, can be cured by the application of the blessed water. This custom would seem, however, to be originally connected rather with the miracle of Cana than with the Baptism. That baptism on this day was quite usual in the West is proved, however, by the complaint of Bishop Himerius of Tarragona to Pope Damasus (d. 384), that baptisms were being celebrated on the feast of the Epiphany. Pope Siricius, who answered him (P. L., XIII, 1134), identifies the feasts of *Natalitia Christi* and of His *Apparitio*, and is very indignant at the extension of the period for baptisms beyond that of Easter and that of Pentecost. Pope Leo I ("Ep. xvi ad Sicil. episcopos", c. i, in P. L., LIV, 701; cf. 696) denounces the practice as an *irrationabilis novitas;* yet the Council of Gerona (can. iv) condemned it in 517, and Victor Vitensis alludes to it as the regular practice of the (Roman-) African Church (De Persec. Vandal., II, xvii, in P. L., LVIII, 216). St. Gregory of Tours, moreover (De gloriâ martyrum, in P. L., LXXI, 783; cf. cc. xvii, xix), relates that those who lived near the Jordan bathed in it that day, and that miracles were then wont to take place. St. Jerome (Comm. in Ez., I, i, on verse 3 in P. L., XXV, 18) definitely asserts that it is for the baptism and opening of the heavens that the *dies Epiphaniorum* is still venerable and not for the Nativity of Christ in the flesh, for then *absconditus est, et non apparuit*—"He was hidden, and did not appear."

That the Epiphany was of later introduction in the West than the Christmas festival of 25 December, has been made clear in the article CHRISTMAS. It is not contained in the Philocalian Calendar, while it seems most likely that 25 December was celebrated at Rome before the sermon of Pope Liberius (in St. Ambrose, De virg., iii, I, in P. L., XVI, 231) which many assign to 25 Dec., 354. St. Augustine clearly observes Oriental associations in the Epiphany feasts: "Rightly", says he (Serm. ccii, 2, in Epiph. Domini, 4, in P. L., XXXVIII, 1033), "have the heretic Donatists always refused to celebrate this day with us; for neither do they love unity, nor are they in communion with the Eastern Church, where that star appeared." St. Philastrius (Hær., c. cxl, in P. L., XII, 1273) adds that certain heretics refuse to celebrate the Epiphany, regarding it, apparently, as a needless duplication of the

Nativity feast, though, adds the saint, it was only after twelve days that Christ "appeared to the Magi in the Temple". The *dies epiphaniorum*, he says (P. L., XII, 1274), is by some thought to be "the day of the Baptism, or of the Transformation which occurred on the mountain". Finally, an unknown Syrian annotator of Barsalibi (Assemani, Bibl. Orient., II, 163) boldly writes: "The Lord was born in the month of January on the same day on which we celebrate the Epiphany; for of old the feasts of the Nativity and Epiphany were kept on one and the same day, because on the same day He was born and baptized. The reason why our fathers changed the solemnity celebrated on 6 January, and transferred it to 25 December follows: It was the custom of the heathens to celebrate the birthday of the sun on this very day, 25 December, and on it they lit lights on account of the feast. In these solemnities and festivities the Christians too participated. When, therefore, the teachers observed that the Christians were inclined to this festival, they took counsel and decided that the true birth-feast be kept on this day, and on 6 Jan., the feast of the Epiphanies. Simultaneously, therefore, with this appointment the custom prevailed of burning lights until the sixth day."

It is simpler to say that, about the time of the diffusion of the December celebration in the East, the West took up the Oriental January feast, retaining all its chief characteristics, though attaching overwhelming importance, as time went on, to the apparition to the Magi. Epiphanius indeed had said (loc. cit.) that not only did water in many places turn into wine on 6 Jan., but that whole rivers, and probably the Nile, experienced a similar miracle; nothing of this sort is noted in the West. The Leonine Sacramentary is defective here; but Leo's eight homilies on the *Theophania* (in P. L., LIV, Serm. xxxi, col. 234, to Serm. xxxviii, col. 263) bear almost wholly on the Magi, while in Serm. xxxv, col. 249, he definitely asserts their visit to be the commemoration for which the feast was instituted. Fulgentius (Serm. iv in P. L., LXV, 732) speaks only of the Magi and the Innocents. Augustine's sermons (cxcix–cciv in P. L., XXXVIII) deal almost exclusively with this manifestation, and the Gelasian Sacramentary (P. L., LXXIV, 1062) exclusively, both on the vigil and the feast. The Gregorian Sacramentary makes great use of Ps. lxxii (A.V. lxxiii), 10 and mentions the three great apparitions in the Canon only. The Ambrosian, however, refers to all three manifestations in the vigil-preface, and in the feast-preface to Baptism alone. The "Missale Vesontiense" (Neale and Forbes, The Anc. Liturgies of the Gallican Church, p. 228) speaks, in the prayer, of *Illuminatio, Manifestatio, Declaratio*, and composes its Gospel of Matt., iii, 13–17; Luke, iii, 22; and John, ii, 1–11, where the Baptism and Cana are dwelt upon. The Magi are referred to on the Circumcision. The Gothic Missal (Neale and Forbes, op. cit., p. 52) mentions the Magi on the vigil, saying that the Nativity, Baptism, and Cana make Christ's *Illustratio*. All the manifestations are, however, referred to, including (casually) the feeding of the 5000, a popular allusion in the East, whence the name *φαγιφάνια*. Augustine (Serm. suppl. cxxxvi, 1, in P. L., XXXIX, 2013) speaks of the raising of Lazarus (cf. day 5 of the Jerusalem ritual) as on an equality with the other manifestations, whence in the East the name *Bethphania* occurs. Maximus of Turin admits the day to be of three miracles, and speculates (Hom. vii, in epiph., in P. L., LVII, 273) on the historical connexion of date and events. Polemius Silvanus, Paulinus of Nola (Poem. xxvii; Natal., v, 47, in P. L., LXI) and Sedulius (in P. L., LXXII) all insist on the three manifestations. The Mozarabic Missal refers mainly to the Magi, using of their welcome by Christ the word *Acceptio*, a term of "initiation" common to Mithraists and Christians. In 381, the Council of Sargossa (can. iv), read together with the Mozarabic Missal's Mass *in jejunio epiphaniæ*, makes it clear that a fast at this season was not uncommon even among the orthodox. "Cod. Theod." (II, viii, 20; XXV, v, 2) forbids the circus on this day in the year 400; "Cod. Justi." (III, xii, 6) makes it a day of obligation. In 380 it is already marked by cessation of legal business in Spain; in Thrace (if we can trust the "Passio S. Philippi" in Ruinart, "Acta", 440, 2) it was kept as early as 304. Kellner quotes the "Testamentum Jesu Christi" (Mainz, 1899) as citing it twice (I, 28; IV, 67, 101) as a high festival together with Easter and Pentecost.

In the present Office, *Crudelis Herodes* alludes to the three manifestations; in Nocturn i, the first response for the day, the octave, and the Sunday within the octave, deals with the Baptism, as does the second response; the third response, as all those of Nocturns i and iii, is on the Magi. The antiphon to the Benedictus runs: "To-day the Church is joined to her celestial spouse, because in Jordan Christ doth wash her sins; the Magi hasten with gifts to the royal marriage-feast, and the guests exult in the water turned to wine." *O Sola* refers to the Magi only. The Magnificat antiphon of Second Vespers reads: "We keep our Holy Day adorned with three miracles: to-day a star led the Magi to the crib, to-day wine was made from water at the marriage, to-day in Jordan Christ willed to be baptized by John to save us." On the Epiphany it was a very general custom to announce the date of Easter, and even of other festivals, a practice ordered by many councils, e. g. that of Orléans in 541 (can. i); Auxerre in 578 and 585 (can. ii), and still observed (Kellner) at Turin, etc. Gelasius finally tells us (Ep. ad episc. Lucan., c. xii, in P. L., LIX, 52) that the dedication of virgins occurred especially on that day.

II. Origin.—The reason for the fixing of this date it is impossible to discover. The only tolerable solution is that of Mgr. Duchesne (Orig. Chr., 262), who explains simultaneously the celebration of 6 January and of 25 December by a backward reckoning from 6 April and 25 March respectively. The Pepyzitæ, or Phrygian Montanists, says Sozomen (Hist. Eccl., VII, xviii, in P. G., LXVII, 1473), kept Easter on 6 April; hence (reckoning an exact number of years to the Divine life) Christ's birthday would have fallen on 6 January. But, it may be urged, the first notice we have of the observance of this date, refers to Christ's Baptism. But this (if we may assume the Basilidians, too, to have argued from 6 April) will have fallen on the exact anniversary of the Birth. But why preeminently celebrate the Baptism? Can it be that the celebration started with those, of whatever sect, who held that at the Baptism the Godhead descended upon Christ? On this uncertain territory we had better risk no footstep till fresh evidence, if such there be, be furnished us. Nor is this the place to discuss the legends of the Three Kings, which will be found in the article Magi.

Kellner, *Heortologie* (Freiburg im Br., 1906); Funk in Kraus, *Real-Encyclopädie*, s. v. *Feste;* Bingham, *Antiquities of the Christian Church* (London, 1708–22), Bk. XX, c. iv; Usener, *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Bonn, 1889), I.

Cyril Martindale.

Episcopacy. See Hierarchy.

Episcopal Church. See Anglicanism; Protestant Episcopal Church of America.

Epistemology (*ἐπιστήμη*, knowledge, science, and *λόγος*, speech, thought, discourse), in a most general way, is that branch of philosophy which is concerned with the value of human knowledge. The name *epistemology* is of recent origin, but especially since the publication of Ferrier's "Institutes of Metaphysics: the Theory of Knowing and Being" (1854), it has come to be used currently instead of other terms, still sometimes met with, like applied logic, material or

critical logic, critical or initial philosophy, etc. To the same part of philosophy the name *criteriology* is given by the authors of some Latin textbooks and by the Louvain School. The exact province of epistemology is as yet but imperfectly determined, the two main views corresponding to the two meanings of the Greek word ἐπιστήμη. According as this is understood in its more general sense of knowledge, or in its more special sense of scientific knowledge, epistemology is "the theory of the origin, nature and limits of knowledge" (Baldwin, "Dict. of Philos. and Psychol.", New York, 1901, s. v. "Epistemology", I, 333; cf. "Gnosiology", I, 414); or "the philosophy of the sciences", and more exactly, "the critical study of the principles, hypotheses and results of the various sciences, designed to determine their logical (not psychological) origin, their value and objective import" ("Bulletin de la Société française de Philos.", June, 1905, fasc. no. 7 of the Vocabulaire philosophique, s. v. "Epistémologie", 221; cf. Aug., 1906, fasc. 9 of the Vocabul., s. v. "Gnoséologie", 332). The Italian usage agrees with the French. According to Ranzoli ("Dizionario di scienze filosofiche", Milan, 1905, s. v. "Epistemologia", 226; cf. "Gnosiologia", 286), epistemology "determines the objects of every science by ascertaining their differentiating characteristics, fixes their relations and common principles, the laws of their development and their special methods". Here we shall consider epistemology in its first and broader meaning, which is the usual one in English, as applying to the theory of knowledge, the German *Erkenntnistheorie*, i. e. "that part of philosophy which, in the first place, describes, analyses, examines genetically the facts of knowledge as such (psychology of knowledge), and then tests chiefly the value of knowledge and of its various kinds, its conditions of validity, range and limits (critique of knowledge)" (Eisler, Wörterbuch der philos. Begriffe, 2d ed., Berlin, 1904, I, 298). In that sense epistemology does not merely deal with certain assumptions of science, but undertakes to test the cognitive faculty itself in all its functions.

Historical Outline.—The first efforts of Greek thinkers centre around the study of nature. This early philosophy is almost exclusively objective, and supposes, without examining it, the validity of knowledge. Doubt arose later chiefly from the disagreement of philosophers in determining the primordial elements of matter and in discussing the nature and attributes of reality. Parmenides holds that it is unchangeable; Heraclitus, that it is constantly changing; Democritus endows it with an eternal inherent motion, while Anaxagoras requires an independent and intelligent motor. This led the Sophists to question the possibility of certitude, and prepared the way for their sceptical tendencies. With Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, who oppose the Sophists, the power of the mind to know truth and reach certitude is vindicated, and the conditions for the validity of knowledge are examined. But epistemological questions are not yet treated on their own merits, nor kept sufficiently distinct from purely logical and metaphysical inquiries. The philosophy of the Stoics is primarily practical, knowledge being looked upon as a means of right living and as a condition of happiness. As man must act according to guiding principles and rational convictions, human action supposes the possibility of knowledge. Subordinating science to ethics, the Epicureans admit the necessity of knowledge for conduct. And since Epicurean ethics rests essentially on the experience of pleasure and pain, these sensations are ultimately the practical criterion of truth. The conflict of opinions, the impossibility of demonstrating everything, the relativity of perception, became again the main arguments of scepticism. Pyrrho claims that the nature of things is unknowable, and consequently we must abstain from judging; herein consist human virtue and happiness. The representatives of the Middle Academy also are sceptical, although in a less radical manner. Thus Arcesilaus, while denying the possibility of certitude and claiming that the duty of a wise man is to refuse his assent to any proposition, admits nevertheless that a degree of probability sufficient for the conduct of life is attainable. Carneades develops the same doctrine and emphasizes its sceptical aspect. Later sceptics, Ænesidemus, Agrippa, and Sextus Empiricus, make no essential addition.

The Fathers of the Church are occupied chiefly in defending Christian dogmas, and thus indirectly in showing the harmony of revealed truth with reason. St. Augustine goes farther than any other in the analysis of knowledge and in the inquiry concerning its validity. He wrote a special treatise against the sceptics of the Academy who admitted no certain, but only probable, knowledge. What is probability, he asks in an argument *ad hominem*, but a likeness of or an approach to truth and certitude? And then how can one speak of probability who does not first admit certitude? On one point at least, the existence of the thinking subject, doubt is impossible. Should a man doubt everything or be in error, the very fact of doubting or being deceived implies existence. First logical principles also are certain. Although the senses are not untrustworthy, perfect knowledge is intellectual knowledge based on the data of the senses and rising beyond them to general causes. In medieval philosophy the main epistemological issue is the objective value of universal ideas. After Plato and Aristotle the Scholastics hold that there is no science of the individual as such. As science deals with general principles and laws, to know how far science is legitimate it is necessary to know first the value of general notions and the relations of the universal to the individual. Does the universal exist in nature, or is it a purely mental product? Such was the question raised by Porphyry in his introduction to Aristotle's "Categories". Up to the end of the twelfth century, the answers are limited to two, corresponding to the two possibilities mentioned by Porphyry. Hence if one may speak of Realism at that period, it does not seem altogether correct to speak of Conceptualism or Nominalism in the well-defined sense which these terms have since acquired (see De Wulf, Hist. de la phil. médiévale, 2d ed., Louvain, 1905). Later, a distinction is introduced which St. Thomas formulates clearly and which avoids both extremes. The universal as such does not exist in nature, but only in the mind. Yet it is not a mere product of mental activity; it has a basis in really existing things; that is, by their individual and by their common features, existing things offer to the mind a basis for the exercise of its functions of abstraction and generalization. This moderate Realism, as it is called in opposition to Conceptualism on the one side, and, on the other, to exaggerated, or absolute Realism, is also essentially the doctrine of Duns Scotus; and it prevailed in the School till the period of decadence when Nominalism or Terminism was introduced by Occam and his followers.

In modern times Descartes may be mentioned for his methodical doubt and his solution of it in the *Cogito, ergo sum*, i. e. I think, therefore, I exist. But Locke, in his "Essay concerning Human Understanding", is the first to give a clear statement of epistemological problems. To begin with ontological discussions is to begin "at the wrong end" and to take "a wrong course". Hence "it came to my thoughts that . . . before we set ourselves upon inquiries of that nature, it was necessary to examine our own abilities, and to see what objects our understandings were, or were not fitted to deal with" (Epistle to the Reader). Locke's purpose is to discover "the certainty, evidence and extent" of human knowledge (I, i, 3), to find "the horizon which sets the bounds between the enlightened and dark parts of things,

between what is, and what is not comprehensible by us" (I, i, 7), and "to search out the bounds between opinion and knowledge" (I, i, 3). One who reflects on the contradictions among men, and the assurance with which every man maintains his own opinion "may perhaps have reason to suspect that either there is no such thing as truth at all, or that mankind hath no sufficient means to attain a certain knowledge of it" (I, i, 2). This investigation will prevent us from undertaking the study of things that are "beyond the reach of our capacities" (I, i, 4), and will be "a cure of skepticism and idleness" (I, i, 6). Such is the problem; among the main points in its solution may be mentioned the following: "We have the knowledge of our own existence by intuition; of the existence of God by demonstration; and of other things by sensation" (IV, ix, 2). The nature of the soul cannot be known, nor does the trustworthiness of the senses extend to "secondary qualities"; a fortiori, substance and essences are unknowable. These and other conclusions, however, are not reached by a truly epistemological method, i. e. by the criticism of the processes and postulates of knowledge, but almost exclusively by the psychological method of mental analysis. Following in Locke's footsteps and proceeding farther, Berkeley denied the objectivity even of primary qualities of matter, and Hume held a universal and radical phenomenalism. Aroused from his "dogmatic slumber" by the scepticism of Hume, Kant took up again the same problem of the extent, validity, and limits of human knowledge. This is the task of criticism, not the criticism of books and systems, but of reason itself in the whole range of its powers, and in regard to its ability to attain knowledge transcending experience. Briefly stated, the solution reached by Kant is that we know things-as-they-appear, or phenomena, but not the noumena, or things-in-themselves. These latter, precisely because they are outside the mind, are also outside the possibility of knowledge. Kant's successors, identifying the theory of being with the theory of knowing, elaborated his "Critique" into a system of metaphysics in which the very existence of things-in-themselves was denied. After Kant we reach the present period in the evolution of epistemological problems.

Problems.—To-day epistemology stands in the foreground of philosophical sciences. The preceding outline, however, shows that it was the last to be constituted as a distinct investigation and to receive a special systematic treatment. In older philosophers are found partial discussions, not yet co-ordinated and regarding only special aspects of the problem. The problem itself is not formulated before Locke, and no true epistemological solution attempted before Kant. In the beginning of philosophical investigation, as well as in the beginning of cognitive life in the individual, knowledge and certitude are accepted as self-evident facts needing no discussion. Full of confidence in its own powers, reason at once rises to the highest metaphysical considerations regarding the nature, essential elements, and origin of matter and of the human soul. But contradiction and conflict of opinions oblige the mind to turn back upon itself, to reflect in order to compare, test, and perhaps revise its conclusions; for contradictions cause doubt, and doubt leads to reflection on the value of knowledge. Throughout history, also, interest in epistemological questions is aroused chiefly after periods characterized by ontological investigations implying the assumption of the validity of knowledge. As the psychology of knowledge develops, problems of epistemology grow more numerous, and their solutions more varied. Originally the choice is almost exclusively between affirming the value of knowledge and denying it. For one who looks upon knowledge as a simple fact, these are the only two possible alternatives. After psychology has shown the complexity of the knowing-process, pointed out its various elements, examined its genesis, and followed its development, knowledge is no longer deemed either valid or invalid in its totality. Certain forms of it may be rejected and others retained; or knowledge may be held as valid up to, but not beyond, a certain point. In fact, at present, one would look in vain for absolute and unlimited dogmatism as well as for pure and complete scepticism. Opinions vary between these two extremes; and hence comes, partly at least, the confusion of terms by which various views are designated—a labyrinth in which even the most experienced can hardly find their way. Here a few systems only will be mentioned, and their names used in their most general and obvious sense.

The main problems of epistemology may be conveniently reduced to the following. Starting from the fact of spontaneous certitude, the first question is: Does reflection also justify certitude? Is certain knowledge within man's power? In a general way Dogmatism gives an affirmative, Scepticism a negative answer. Modern Agnosticism (q. v.) attempts to indicate the limits of human knowledge and concludes that the ultimate reality is unknowable. This leads to a second problem: How does knowledge arise, and what modes of knowledge are valid? Empiricism (q. v.) admits no other trustworthy information than the data of experience, while Rationalism (q. v.) claims that reason as a special faculty is more important. A third question presents itself: What is knowledge? Cognition is a process within the mind with the special feature of referring to something without the mind, of representing some extramental reality. What is the value of this representative aspect? Is it merely the result of the mind's inner activity, as Idealism (q. v.) claims? Or is the mind also passive in the act of knowing, and does it in fact reflect some other reality, as Realism asserts? And if there exist such realities, can we know anything about them in addition to the fact of their existence? What is the relation between the idea in the mind and the thing outside the mind? Finally, even if knowledge is valid, the fact of error is undeniable; what then will be the criterion by which truth may be distinguished from error? What signs decide whether certitude in any case is justified? Such systems as Intellectualism, Mysticism, Pragmatism, Traditionalism, etc., have attempted to answer these questions in various ways.

Like all other sciences, epistemology should start from self-evident facts, namely the facts of knowledge and certitude. To begin, as Descartes did, with a universal doubt is to do away with the facts instead of interpreting them; nor is it possible consistently to emerge out of such a doubt. Locke's principle that "knowledge is conversant only with our ideas" is contrary to experience, since in fact it is for the psychologist alone that ideas become objects of knowledge. First to isolate the mind absolutely from external reality, and then to ask how it can nevertheless come into contact with this reality, is to propose an insoluble problem. As to the Kantian attitude, it has been criticized repeatedly for examining the validity of knowledge with the knowing faculty, for making reason its own critic and judge while its rights to criticize and judge are still held in doubt. Epistemology, the science of knowing, is closely related to metaphysics, the science of being, as its necessary introduction, and as gradually leading into it. The main epistemological issues cannot be met without stepping almost immediately on metaphysical ground, since the faculty of knowledge cannot be examined apart from its exercise and therefore from the contents of knowledge. Logic in its strict sense is the science of the laws of thought; it is concerned with the form, not the matter of knowledge, and in this it differs from epistemology. Psychology deals with knowledge as a mental fact, apart from its truth or falsity; it endeavours to deter-

mine the conditions, not only of cognitive, but of all mental processes and to discover their relations and the laws of their sequence. Thus logic and epistemology complement the work of psychology in two different directions, and epistemology forms a transition from psychology and logic to metaphysics. The importance of epistemology can hardly be overestimated, since it deals with the ground-work of knowledge itself, and therefore of all scientific, philosophical, moral, and religious principles. At the present time especially it is an indispensable requisite for apologetics, for the very foundations of religion are precisely the doctrines most frequently looked upon as beyond the reach of human intelligence. In fact much recent discussion concerning the value of knowledge has taken place on the ground of apologetics, and for the distinct purpose of testing the value of religious beliefs. If, contrary to the definitions of the Council of the Vatican, the existence of God and some at least of His attributes cannot be demonstrated, it is evident that there is no possibility of revelation and supernatural faith. As Pius X expresses it (Encycl. "Pascendi", 8 Sept., 1907), to confine reason within the field of phenomena and give it no right and no power to go beyond these limits is to make it "incapable of lifting itself up to God and of recognizing His existence by means of visible things. . . . And then all will readily perceive what becomes of natural theology, of the motives of credibility and of external revelation". (See SCEPTICISM; CERTITUDE; DOUBT.)

BOWNE, *Theory of Thought and Knowledge* (New York, 1899); EISLER, *Einführung in die Erkenntnistheorie* (Leipzig, 1907); CARDAIR, *La connaissance* (Paris, 1895); HOBHOUSE, *The Theory of Knowledge* (London, 1896); LADD, *Philosophy of Knowledge* (New York, 1897); MERCIER, *Critériologie générale* (Louvain, 1906); MIVART, *The Groundwork of Science: A Study of Epistemology* (New York, 1898); RICKABY, *First Principles of Knowledge* (3d ed., London, —); VEITCH, *Knowing and Being* (Edinburgh, 1889); VOLKMANN, *Ueber die Frage nach dem Verhältnis vom Denken und Sein* (Vienna, 1898); WALTER, *The Principles of Knowledge* (West Newton, 1904).

C. A. DUBRAY.

Epistle (IN THE MASS). See LESSONS.

Epistle (IN SCRIPTURE), Lat. *epistola;* Gr. ἐπιστολή; in Hebrew, at first only the general term meaning "book" was used, then certain transitional expressions signifying "writing", and finally אגרת, *'iggéreth* (of Assyrian or Persian origin), and נשתון, *nīshtewān* (of Persian derivation), which the Septuagint always renders ἐπιστολή. In the study of Biblical epistles, it will be found convenient to distinguish between the Old Testament and the New.

THE OLD TESTAMENT exhibits two periods in its idea of an epistle: first, it presents the epistle under the general concept of a book or a writing; secondly, it regards the epistle as a distinct literary form. It may be difficult to point out the dividing line between these two periods with accuracy; in general it may be maintained that the Hebrews developed their notion of epistle as a specific form of writing during the time of the Captivity. The first instance of a written Biblical message is found in II K., xi, 14–15, where we are told about David's letter to Joab concerning Urias; there was need for secrecy in this case as well as in that of Jezabel's order to the ancients and chief men of the city in the matter of Naboth (III K., xxi, 8–9), and of Jehu's commands sent to Samaria (IV K., x, 1, 6). It may have been in order to avoid the danger of a personal interview that the Prophet Elias (Eliseus?) wrote to King Joram concerning his impending punishment (II Par., xxi, 12–15). The desire to be emphatic and peremptory prompted the letter of the King of Syria to the King of Israel, asking for the cure of Naaman's leprosy (IV K., v, 5–7), and Sennacherib's open letter to Ezechias (IV K., xix, 14; Is., xxxvii, 14; II Par., xxxii, 17); the wish to be courteous seems to have inspired the letter of Merodach Baladan to Ezechias after the latter's recovery from sickness (IV K., xx, 12; Is., xxxix, 1). Similar to the foregoing authoritative letters is the message addressed by Jeremias to the exiles in Babylon (Jer., xxix, 1 sq.); the Prophet alludes also to letters sent by a pseudo-prophet from Babylon to Jerusalem with the purpose of undermining Jeremias's authority (ibid., 25, 29).

Thus far, letters are of relatively rare occurrence in the Bible, and they are not regarded as constituting a distinct class of literature. Hereafter they become more frequent, and both their name and their form mark them as a peculiar literary species. Their subsequent frequency may be inferred from their repeated occurrence in the Books of Esther, Esdras, and Nehemias: Esth., i, 22; iii, 12; viii, 5 sq.; ix, 20, 29; xiii, 1–7; xvi, 1–24; I Esdr., iv, 7, 11 sq.; v, 6; vii, 11; Neh., ii, 7; vi, 5, 17, 19. Their general name "book" gives way, first, to that of "writing" (II Par., ii, 11; xxi, 12; Esth., iii, 13–14; viii, 10, 13), and then to that of "letter" (II Par., xxx, 1, 6; I Esdr., iv, 7 sqq.; v, 5 sqq.; Neh., ii, 7–9; vi, 5, 17, 19; Esth., ix, 26, 29). Their form begins to be marked by a formal address and a distinctively epistolary ending. Instances of such explicit addresses may be seen in Esdr., v, 7: "To Darius the king all peace"; Esth., xiii, 1: "Artaxerxes the great king who reigneth from India to Ethiopia, to the princes and governors of the hundred and twenty-seven provinces, that are subject to his empire, greeting"; I Mach., xi, 30: "King Demetrius to his brother Jonathan, and to the nation of the Jews, greeting". An instance of an epistolary conclusion occurs in II Mach., xi, 33: "Fare ye well. In the year one hundred and forty-eight, the fifteenth day of the month of Xanthicus"; a similar example may be seen, ibid., 38. But the Old Testament does not furnish us with any model of private correspondence between Hebrews.

THE NEW TESTAMENT presents us with a very highly developed form of epistle. Recent writers on the subject have found it convenient to follow Professor Deissmann in his distinction between the letter and the epistle. The letter is a private and confidential conversation with the addressee, his anticipated answers shaping the course of the writing; the epistle is general in its aim, addresses all whom it may concern, and tends to publication. The letter is a spontaneous product of the writer, the epistle follows the rules of art. If publication be regarded as an essential condition of literature, the letter may be described as a "pre-literary form of self-expression". In order to apply this distinction more effectively to the written messages contained in, or referred to by, the New-Testament Books, we shall group the relevant data as pre-Pauline, Pauline, and post-Pauline.

Pre-Pauline.—The Book of Acts (ix, 2; xxii, 5; xxviii, 21) shows that the Jews of Jerusalem sent occasional letters to the synagogues of the Dispersion; Acts, xv, 22–23, gives a parallel instance of a letter written by the Apostles from Jerusalem to the churches in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia. We may also infer from the testimony of the New Testament (I Cor., xvi, 3; II Cor., iii, 1; Rom., xvi, 1–2; Acts, xviii, 27) that letters of commendation were of common occurrence. I Cor., vii, 1, informs us that the Corinthian Christians had applied to St. Paul in their difficulties by way of letter.

Pauline.—The Pauline Epistles form a collection which was formerly called ὁ ἀπόστολος. They are called "epistles", though that addressed to the Hebrews hardly deserves the name, being really a theological homily. The Epistles mentioned in I Cor., v, 9, and Col., iv, 16, have not been preserved to us; their accidental loss makes us suspect that other Epistles may have perished. The peculiar form and style of the Pauline Epistles are studied in their respective introductions and commentaries; but we may add here that I Tim., II Tim., and Tit. are called Pastoral Epistles; owing to its peculiar style and form, it is supposed by some writers that the Epistle to the Hebrews was not even dictated by the Apostle, but

only expresses his doctrine. Only the three Pastoral Epistles and Philemon are addressed to individuals; all the others are directed to churches, most of which, however, were well known to the writer. They exhibit more of their author's personal character than most profane letters do.

Post-Pauline.—Generally speaking, we may describe the so-called Catholic Epistles as Post-Pauline. We need not note here that these Epistles are not named after the addressee, as happens in the case of the Pauline Epistles, but after the inspired author. The Epistle of St. James has no final greetings; it was meant for a class, not for persons known to the writer. In I John we have a sermon rather than a letter, though its familiarity of language indicates that the readers were known to the writer. The following two Epistles of St. John are real letters in style and form. St. Peter's first Epistle supposes some familiarity with his readers on the part of the writer; this can hardly be said of II Peter or of the Epistle of Jude. What has been said sufficiently shows that Professor Deissmann's distinction between the artistic epistle and pre-literary letter cannot be applied with strict accuracy. Quite a number of the New-Testament Epistles contain those touches of intimate familiarity which are supposed to be the essential characteristics of the letter.

Jacquier in Vig., *Dict. de la Bible* (Paris, 1899), II, 1897; Bartlet in Hast., *Dict. of the Bible* (New York, 1900), s. v.; Knabenbauer, *Lexicon Biblicum* (Paris, 1907), II, 202 sq.; Prat, *Théologie de Saint Paul* (Paris, 1908), 33 sq.; Deissmann, *Bibelstudien* (1895), 189–252.

A. J. Maas.

Epistolæ obscurorum virorum. See Hoogstraten; Pfefferkorn; Reuchlin.

Epitaphs, Early Christian. See Inscriptions.

Epping, Joseph, German astronomer and Assyriologist, b. at Neuenkirchen, near Rheine in Westphalia, 1 Dec., 1835; d. at Exaeten, Holland, 22 Aug., 1894. His parents died while he was very young and he owed his early education to the fostering care of relations. After completing the usual gymnasium course at Rheine and at Münster he matriculated at the academy in Münster, where he devoted himself particularly to mathematics. In 1859 he entered the novitiate of the Society of Jesus in Münster and after his philosophical studies was appointed professor of mathematics and astronomy at Maria-Laach. He spent the years from 1867 to 1871 in the study of theology and was ordained priest in 1870. García Moreno, President of Ecuador, had petitioned the General of the Jesuits in the early seventies for members of the Society to form the faculty of the Polytechnicum at Quito, which he had recently founded. A number of German Jesuits responded to the call, among them Epping, who set out in June, 1872, for Quito to become professor of mathematics. He quickly learned Spanish and was able to write a textbook of geometry in that language. He likewise took an active part in all the scientific work of the Fathers. The political disturbances which followed the assassination of Moreno (6 Aug., 1875) made it necessary for the Jesuits to return to Europe, and Epping arrived in Holland in the fall of 1876. He spent the remaining years of his life at Blijenbeck, and later at Exaeten, as professor of astronomy and mathematics to the younger members of his order, devoting his leisure to research and literary work.

Epping's first published volume, "Der Kreislauf im Kosmos", appeared in 1882. It was an exposition and critique of the Kant-Laplace nebular hypothesis and a refutation of the pantheistic and materialistic conclusions which had been drawn from it. His most important work, however, was begun in collaboration with Father Strassmaier who, in connexion with his own studies in Assyriology, had induced him to undertake a mathematical investigation of the Babylonian astronomical observations and tables. After considerable labour the key was found. He discovered the table of differences for the new moon in one of the tablets and identified *Guttu* with Mars, *Sakku* with Saturn, and *Te-ut* with Jupiter (Epping and Strassmaier in "Stimmen aus Maria-Laach", Vol. XXI, pp. 277–292). Eight years later he published "Astronomisches aus Babylon oder das Wissen der Chaldäer über den gestirnten Himmel" (Freiburg im Br., 1889). This work was of much importance both from the standpoint of astronomy and chronology. It contains an exposition of the astronomy of the ancient Babylonians, worked out from their Ephemerides of the moon and the planets. This was supplemented by "Die babylonische Berechnung des Neumondes" (Stimmen aus Maria-Laach, Vol. XXXIX, pp. 225–240). He was also the author of a number of articles in the "Zeitschrift für Assyriologie". Father Epping suffered much from ill-health during the last years of his life. He was none the less a man of untiring activity and combined geniality and a keen sense of humour with a deep and simple piety.

Baumgartner in *Zeitschr. f. Assyriologie* (Weimar, 1894), appendix IX.

H. M. Brock.

Equity. See Law.

Equivocation. See Mental Reservation.

Era. See Chronology.

Erasmus, Desiderius, the most brilliant and most important leader of German humanism, b. at Rotterdam, Holland, 28 October, probably in 1466; d. at Basle, Switzerland, 12 July, 1536. He was the illegitimate child of Gerard, a citizen of Gouda, and Margaretha Rogers, and at a later date latinized his name as Desiderius Erasmus. Eventually his father became a priest. Erasmus and an elder brother were brought up at Gouda by their mother. When nine years old he was sent to the school of the celebrated humanist Hegius at Deventer, where his taste for humanism was awakened and his powers of mind received their bent for life. The most brilliant qualities of his intellect, a wonderful memory and an extraordinarily quick power of comprehension, showed themselves even in this his earliest training. His mother died when he was thirteen years old, and a little later his father also; he was now sent by his guardians for two years, which he afterwards called two lost years, to the monastery school of Hertogenbosch. Then, after wandering aimlessly about for a time, he was forced, through necessity and the insistence of his guardians, to enter in 1486 the monastery of Emaus, near Gouda, a house of Canons Regular. He felt no true religious vocation for such a step, and in later years characterized this act as the greatest misfortune of his life. As a matter of fact the beginnings of his religious indifferentism and of his weakness of character are to be sought in his joyless youth and in the years spent under compulsion in the monastery. He was left free, however, to pursue his studies, and devoted himself mainly to the ancient classics, whose content and formal beauty he passionately admired. His religious training was obtained from the study of St. Jerome and Lorenzo Valla. In 1491 a lucky accident freed him from monastic life. The Bishop of Cambrai was minded to visit Italy and chose Erasmus as secretary and travelling companion, attracted by the young man's linguistic attainments; he also ordained him priest in 1492. The journey was never made, but Erasmus remained in the service of the bishop, who, in 1496, sent him to Paris to complete his studies. The scholastic method of instruction then prevalent at Paris was so repugnant to him that he spent much of his time travelling through France and the Netherlands, receiving occasionally friendly help; he was also for a while at Orléans, where he worked at his collection of proverbs, the later "Adagia". The

money for a trip to England he earned by acting as tutor to three Englishmen, from whom he also obtained valuable letters of introduction. During his stay in England (1498–99), he made the acquaintance at Oxford of Colet, Thomas More, Latimer, and others, with all of whom acquaintance ripened into lifelong friendship. Colet showed him how to reconcile the ancient faith with humanism by abandoning the scholastic method and devoting himself to a thorough study of the Scriptures. Consequently, on his return to the Continent he took up with ardour the study of Greek at Paris and Louvain. The first publications of Erasmus occurred in this early period. In 1500 was issued the "Adagia", a collection of Greek and Latin proverbs, and in 1508 another greatly enlarged edition of the same; in 1502 appeared the "Enchiridion militis christiani", in which he described the nature of true religion and true piety, but with comments that were biting and antagonistic to the Church; in 1505 Lorenzo Valla's "Annotationes" to the New Testament, the manuscript of which he had found in a monastery at Brussels. His introduction to this work is important, for in it occurred his first utterance concerning the Scriptures, laying especial stress on the necessity of a new translation, a return to the original text, and respect for the literal sense.

In 1506 he was finally able, by the aid of his English friends, to attain his greatest desire, a journey to Italy. On his way thither he received at Turin the degree of Doctor of Divinity; at Bologna, Padua, and Venice, the academic centres of Upper Italy, he was greeted with enthusiastic honour by the most distinguished humanists, and he spent some time in each of these cities. At Venice he formed an intimate friendship with the famous printer Aldus Manutius. His reception at Rome was equally flattering; the cardinals, especially Giovanni de' Medici (later Leo X), and Domenico Grimani, were particularly gracious to him. He could not, however, be persuaded to fix his residence at Rome, and refused all offers of ecclesiastical promotion. Henry VIII had just reached the throne of England, and thus awakened in Erasmus the hope of an advantageous appointment in that country, for which he accordingly set out. On his way out of Italy (1509) he wrote the satire known as "The Praise of Folly" ("Moriæ Encomium", or "Laus Stultitiæ"), which in a few months went through seven editions. Originally meant for private circulation, it scourges the abuses and follies of the various classes of society, especially of the Church. It is a cold-blooded, deliberate attempt to discredit the Church, and its satire and stinging comment on ecclesiastical conditions are not intended as a healing medicine but a deadly poison.

Erasmus may now be said to have reached the acme of his fame; he was in high repute throughout all Europe, and was regarded as an oracle both by princes and scholars. Every one felt it an honour to enter into correspondence with him. His inborn vanity and self-complacency were thereby increased almost to the point of becoming a disease; at the same time he sought, often by the grossest flattery, to obtain the favour and material support of patrons or to secure the continuance of such benefits. This was also the period of his greatest literary productivity. He wrote at this time works destined to influence profoundly the ecclesiastical revolution that was soon to break out. The next five years he spent in England, but never accepted a permanent office; it was only for a short time that he held a professorship of Greek at Cambridge. When the hopes he had based on the friendship of Henry VIII proved vain and he realized that Henry's money was all needed in warlike schemes, Erasmus returned to Brabant, where he became one of the royal councillors of Archduke Charles, later Emperor Charles V. This office gave him a fixed salary, and for his princely patron he now wrote the "Institutio principis christiani", a humanistic portrait of the ideal ruler. The archduke thought of making Erasmus a bishop, wherefore, with the aid of the papal legate Ammonius, the famous scholar obtained a papal Brief releasing him from all obligations to his monastery and also from the censures he had incurred by discarding the dress of his order without permission. No longer obliged to have permanent residence, Erasmus kept up his wandering life, occupied alternately with the composition and the publication of his works. In order to secure absolute freedom Erasmus refused many brilliant offers, among them an invitation from the King of France to reside at Paris, from Archduke Ferdinand to come to Vienna, and from Henry VIII to return to England. He frequently went to Basle to visit the famous printer Froben, who published henceforth nearly all the writings of Erasmus and procured for them a very wide circulation. In this way Erasmus came into closer relations with German humanism, and his influence did much to increase its prestige in south-western Germany, inasmuch as the followers of the "new learning" in Basle, Constance, Schlettstadt, and Strasburg, looked up to him as their leader. One of his chief works at this period is the "Colloquia Familiaria", first published in 1518, issued in an enlarged form in 1526, and often reprinted. It is a kind of textbook for the study of the Latin language, an introduction to the purely natural formal training of the mind, and a typical example of the frivolous Renaissance spirit. The defects of ecclesiastical and monastic life are in this work held up to pitiless scorn; moreover, he descends only too often to indecent and cynical descriptions. His edition of the Greek original of the New Testament, "Novum Instrumentum omne" (Basle, 1516), no model of text-critical scholarship, was accompanied by a classical Latin translation destined to replace the Vulgate. Among the notes, partly textual criticism, partly exegetical comments, were inserted sarcastic slurs on the ecclesiastical conditions of the period. In a general introduction he discussed the importance of the Scriptures and the best method of studying them. Although the Complutensian edition offered a better text and was also printed, but not published, at an earlier date, yet the edition of Erasmus remained for a long time authoritative on account of his high reputation, and became the basis of the *textus receptus* or received text. No less instrumental in preparing the way for the future Reformation, by setting aside the scholastic method and undermining the traditional authority of the Scriptures, were the "Paraphrases of the New Testament" (1517 and later). This work was dedicated to various princes and prelates, e. g. the paraphrases of the Evangelists, to Charles V, Francis I, Henry VIII, and Ferdinand I. In these publications the attitude of Erasmus towards the text of the New Testament is an extremely radical one, even if he did not follow out all its logical consequences. In his opinion the Epistle of St. James shows few signs of the Apostolic spirit; the Epistle to the Ephesians has not the diction of St. Paul, and the Epistle to the Hebrews he assigns with some hesitation to Clement of Rome. In exegesis he favoured a cold rationalism and treated the Biblical narratives just as he did ancient classical myths, and interpreted them in a subjective and figurative, or, as he called it, allegorical, sense.

The literary works issued by Erasmus up to this time made him the intellectual father of the Reformation. What the Reformation destroyed in the organic life of the Church Erasmus had already openly or covertly subverted in a moral sense in his "Praise of Folly", his "Adagia", and "Colloquia", by his pitiless sarcasm or by his cold scepticism. Like his teacher Lorenzo Valla, he regarded Scholasticism as the greatest perversion of the religious spirit; according to him this degeneration dated from the primitive Christological controversies, which caused the Church to lose its evangelical simplicity and become the vic-

tim of hair-splitting philosophy, which culminated in Scholasticism. With the latter there appeared in the Church that Pharisaism which based righteousness on good works and monastic sanctity, and on a ceremonialism beneath whose weight the Christian spirit was stifled. Instead of devoting itself to the eternal salvation of souls, Scholasticism repelled the religiously inclined by its hair-splitting metaphysical speculations and its over-curious discussion of unsolvable mysteries. The religious life, he held, was not furthered by discussions concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost, or the *causa formalis efficiens*, and the *character indelebilis* of baptism, or *gratia gratis data* or *acquisita;* of just as little consequence was the doctrine of original sin. Even his concept of the Blessed Eucharist was quite rationalistic and resembled the later teaching of Zwingli. Similarly he rejected the Divine origin of the primacy, of confession, the indissolubility of marriage, and other fundamental principles of Christian life and the ecclesiastical constitution. He would replace these *traditiunculæ* and *constitutiunculæ hominum* by the simple words of the Scriptures, the interpretation of which should be left to the individual judgment. The disciplinary ordinances of the Church met with even less consideration; fasts, pilgrimages, veneration of saints and their relics, the prayers of the Breviary, celibacy, and religious orders in general he classed among the perversities of a formalistic Scholasticism. Over against this "holiness of good works" he set the "philosophy of Christ", a purely natural ethical ideal, guided by human sagacity. Of course this natural standard of morals obliterated almost entirely all differences between heathen and Christian morality, so that Erasmus could speak with perfect seriousness of a "Saint" Virgil or a "Saint" Horace. In his edition of the Greek New Testament and in his "Paraphrases" of the same he forestalled the Protestant view of the Scriptures.

Concerning the Scriptures, Luther did not express himself in a more rationalistic manner than Erasmus; nor did he interpret them more rationalistically. The only difference is that Luther said clearly and positively what Erasmus often merely suggested by a doubt, and that the former sought in the Bible, above all other things, the certainty of justification by Christ, while the latter, with an almost Pelagian definiteness, sought therein the model of a moral life. Substantially the same fundamental principles and arguments were put forth by the representatives of eighteenth-century "Enlightenment" to attain exactly the same results. It must be added, however, that the attitude of Erasmus towards the religious questions of his time was conditioned rather by literary interests than by profound interior conviction. His demeanour was apt to be influenced by anxiety for peace and by personal considerations; moreover, in contrast to Luther, it was the refined and scholarly public, not the common people, that he sought to influence by his writings. He, therefore, laboured for a reform of the Church that would not be antagonistic to the pope and the bishops, nor productive of a violent rupture, but which, through the dissemination of a larger enlightenment, would eventually but gradually result in the wished-for reorganization. This was to be the work, however, not of the common people, but of scholars and princes. Hence he tried subsequently to check the Lutheran movement by some kind of peaceful compromise. With a scholar's love of peace, he was from the beginning disinclined to enter deeply into the current religious dispute. For a time his reform ideas seemed to have some prospect of success, especially during the reigns of Adrian VI and Paul III. As soon, however, as the Lutheran movement was seen to mean definitive separation from the Church, it was clear that a rigorous adherence to the latter was the only logical attitude and the one most capable of defence. In the first years of the Reformation many thought that Luther was only carrying out the programme of Erasmus, and this was the opinion of those strict Catholics who from the outset of the great conflict included Erasmus in their attacks on Luther. Given the wavering character of Erasmus, such attacks were to provoke on his part a very equivocal attitude, if not plain double-dealing. He gave Luther clearly to understand that he agreed with him, and urged only a less violent manner and more consideration for the pope and ecclesiastical dignitaries. At the same time he affected in public an attitude of strict neutrality, and as time went on withdrew more and more from Luther. In 1519 he wrote to Luther: "I observe as strict a neutrality as possible, in order to advance scholarship, which is again beginning to flourish, by my modesty rather than by passion or violence." That close relations between these two fundamentally different characters were maintained as late as the Diet of Worms, though both soon clearly saw the difference in their points of view and their attitudes, was largely due to Melanchthon. Though Erasmus had prepared the way for him, Luther was greatly dissatisfied with him because of his strongly rationalistic concept of original sin and the doctrine of grace. As early as 1517 Luther thus expressed himself concerning Erasmus: "My liking for Erasmus declines from day to day. . . . The human is of more value to him than the Divine. . . . The times are now dangerous, and I see that a man is not a more sincere or a wiser Christian for all that he is a good Greek or Hebrew scholar." Luther felt hurt, moreover, by the cool and reserved manner in which Erasmus passed judgment on his writings and actions. Nevertheless, Erasmus always opposed any persecution of Luther, and frequently and in no measured terms condemned the Bull of excommunication. At the same time, he declined any association with Luther, and protested his ignorance of the latter's writings and his own complete submission to the highest ecclesiastical authority. But with all this he took the part of Luther in his correspondence with the Elector Frederick of Saxony. He expressed his views concerning Luther's doctrine in twenty-two "Axiomata" addressed to the Elector's court chaplain, Spalatinus, which, to his disgust, were soon afterwards printed. In this memoir and in other writings addressed to the emperor and to friends at Rome, Erasmus proposed arbitration by a court of scholars; he complained, moreover, of the violent attacks made on himself by the monks, and asserted his absolute neutrality and his fidelity to Rome. The latter assurance was all the more necessary as the papal legate Aleander in his reports to Rome put the authorities on their guard against Erasmus, and accused him of being an accomplice in the religious revolt. "The poison of Erasmus has a much more dangerous effect than that of Luther, who by his notorious satirical and insulting letters has injured his own teaching."

While Erasmus, by his relations with the Roman Curia, was able to checkmate the aforesaid and similar hostile complaints, in Germany he continued to be regarded with distrust and even with hatred, sentiments that acquired new strength when, in spite of repeated entreaties, he refused to appear publicly against Luther. Insinuations and charges of this kind were brought against him, especially by the theologians of Louvain. Consequently, in 1521, he moved to Basle, where the presence of numerous humanists of the Upper Rhine seemed to assure him a peaceful existence. Even here his attitude continued for a considerable time uncertain. To Duke George of Saxony he expressed himself most favourably concerning Luther and blamed both the Bull of excommunication and the imperial edict against the reformer; yet in his correspondence with the emperor and with Adrian VI he denied all association with Luther, and reverted again to his plan of reconciliation by means



ERASMUS—HOLBEIN

ACADEMY OF FINE ARTS, PARMA

ot a court of arbitration. He also defended with great earnestness his own orthodoxy against Stunica, who wrote the treatise "Erasmi Rotterdami blasphemiæ et impietates" (Rome, 1522), to prove that Lutheran errors were to be found in the aforesaid "Annotationes" to the New Testament. The same year (1522) the fugitive Von Hutten, on his way to Zurich, attempted, but in vain, to meet at Basle his former friend. Von Hutten revenged himself in his "Expostulatio cum Erasmo" (1523), in which he laid bare with passionate violence all the weaknesses, all the *parvitas et imbecillitas animi* of his former patron. Erasmus replied from Basle with his "Spongia Erasmi adversus adspergines Hutteni", in which, with equal violence, he attacked the character and life of his opponent, and defended himself against the reproach of duplicity. He had endeavoured, so he wrote, to hold aloof from all parties; he had, indeed, attacked Roman abuses, but he had never attacked the Apostolic See or its teaching.

All sympathetic association of Erasmus with the Reformers now ceased, though Melanchthon tried to stay the final rupture. One after another, the leaders of the religious anti-Roman movement withdrew from the famous humanist, especially Zwingli and Œcolampadius. This same year Erasmus resolved at last to heed the many appeals made to him, especially by Adrian VI and Henry VIII, to write against Luther. For the first time he took a decided stand, moved, no doubt, by the fear of losing the confidence of both parties. He chose with skill the point on which he would attack Luther. Erasmus had complained much earlier that the new religious movement begat only commotion, moral disorganization, and the interruption, if not the complete ruin, of learned studies. These abuses he traced to Luther's denial of free will. He wrote, therefore, in defence of the freedom of the will, an attack on Luther, entitled: "Diatribe de libero arbitrio" (1524). The work, it may be said, was couched in a calm and dignified style. Though by no means sufficiently profound in its theological reasoning, the proofs are drawn with skill from the Bible and from reason. Luther's reply was the "De servo arbitrio" (1524), henceforth the official programme of the new movement. Starting from the third chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, it teaches the absolute incompetency of man in his fallen state to perform moral acts; no franker antithesis to the humanistic ideal could be imagined. Erasmus replied in a work entitled "Hyperaspistes" (1526), but without effect. Luther ignored this reply, except in private letters, in which he showed much irritation. Some years later, however, when the "Explanatio Symboli" of Erasmus appeared (1533), Luther attacked him once more in a public letter, to which Erasmus replied in his "Adversus calumniosissimam epistolam Martini Lutheri". These passages at arms brought on Erasmus the violent hatred of the Wittenberg reformer, who now called him nothing but a sceptic and an Epicurean. Catholics, however, considered that Erasmus had somewhat rehabilitated himself, although the more extreme still disbelieved in him. He had not ceased to insist on the need of reforms, though he now spoke more composedly of many matters, such as celibacy. In his later years, it may be said, he held aloof from all religious conflicts, devoted to his humanistic studies and to an intimate circle of such friends as Boniface Amerbach, Beatus Rhenanus, and Glareanus. Nor was he indifferent to contemporary efforts at conciliation; he was in favour of ecclesiastical reunion. Meantime, the Reformation made rapid progress in Basle, where it took the form, greatly detested by Erasmus, of a violent destruction of images. He removed, therefore (1529), to Freiburg in the Breisgau, not far from Basle, in which city he could still find congenial Catholic surroundings. He did not relax his efforts for religious peace, in favour of which he exerted all his influence, especially at the imperial court. He also wrote, at the request of Melanchthon and Julius von Pflug, his "De sarciendâ Ecclesiæ concordiâ" (1533), in which he advocates the removal of ecclesiastical abuses in concord with Rome and without any changes in the ecclesiastical constitution. Notwithstanding his rupture with Luther, an intense distrust of Erasmus was still widespread; as late as 1527 the Paris Sorbonne censured thirty-two of his propositions. It is a remarkable fact that the attitude of the popes towards Erasmus was never inimical; on the contrary, they exhibited at all times the most complete confidence in him. Paul III even wanted to make him a cardinal, but Erasmus declined the honour, alleging his age and ill-health. Naturally weak and sickly, and suffering all his life from calculi, his strength in the end failed completely. Under these circumstances he decided to accept the invitation of Mary, regent of the Netherlands, to live in Brabant, and was preparing at Basle for the journey when a sudden attack of dysentery caused his death. He died with composure and with all the signs of a devout trust in God; he did not receive the last sacraments, but why cannot now be settled. He was buried with great pomp in the cathedral at Basle. Shortly before his death he heard the sorrowful news of the execution of two of his English friends, Sir Thomas More and Bishop Fisher.

Editions of the classics and the Fathers of the Church kept Erasmus fully employed during the later period of his life at Basle. In his editions of the Fathers Erasmus formed a means of realizing the theological ideal of Humanism, which was to make accessible the original sources of ecclesiastical and theological development and thus to popularize the historical concept of the Church as against the purely speculative viewpoint of Scholasticism. As early as 1516–18 Erasmus had published in nine volumes the works of St. Jerome, a theologian to whom he felt especially drawn. In 1523 appeared his edition of St. Hilary of Poitiers; in 1526 that of St. Irenæus of Lyons; in 1527, St. Ambrose; in 1528, St. Augustine; in 1529 the edition of Epiphanius; in 1530, St. Chrysostom; his edition of Origen he did not live to finish. In the same period he issued the theological and pedagogical treatises: "Ecclesiastes sive Concionator evangelicus" (1535), a greatly admired homiletic work; "Modus confitendi" (1525), a guide to right confession; "Modus orandi Deum"; "Vidua christiana"; "De civilitate morum puerilium"; "De præparatione ad mortem", etc.

Opinions concerning Erasmus will vary greatly. No one has defended him without reserve, his defects of character being too striking to make this possible. His vanity and egotism were boundless, and to gratify them he was ready to pursue former friends with defamation and invective; his flattery, where favour and material advantages were to be had, was often repulsive, and he lacked straightforward speech and decision in just those moments when both were necessary. His religious ideal was entirely humanistic: reform of the Church on the basis of her traditional constitution, the introduction of humanistic "enlightenment" into ecclesiastical doctrine, without, however, breaking with Rome. By nature a cold, scholarly character, he had no real interest in uncongenial questions and subjects, above all no living affectionate sympathy for the doctrines and destinies of the Church. Devoid of any power of practical initiative he was constitutionally unfitted for a more active part in the violent religious movements of his day, or even to sacrifice himself for the defence of the Church. His bitter sarcasm had, indeed, done much to prepare the way for the Reformation; it spared neither the most sacred elements of religion nor his former friends. His was an absolutely unspeculative brain, and he lacked entirely all power of acute philosophical definition; we need not wonder, therefore, that on the one hand he

was unable to grasp firmly ecclesiastical doctrine or deal justly with its scholastic formulation, while on the other he inveighed with extreme injustice against the institutions of the Church. It must not be forgotten that the grave defects of his character were compensated by brilliant qualities. His splendid gifts explain the universal European fame of the man through several decades, a public esteem and admiration far excelling in degree and extent the lot of any scholar since his day. He had an unequalled talent for form, great journalistic gifts, a surpassing power of expression; for strong and moving discourse, keen irony, and covert sarcasm, he was unsurpassed. In him the world beheld a scholar of comprehensive and many-sided learning, though neither profound nor thorough, a man of universal observation, a writer whose diction was brilliant and elegant in the highest degree. In a word, Erasmus exhibits the quintessence of the Renaissance spirit; in him are faithfully mirrored both its good and bad qualities.

It cannot be denied that Erasmus was a potent factor in the educational movement of his time. As the foremost of the German humanists, he laboured constantly and effectually for the spread of the new learning, which imparted to the education of the Renaissance period its content and spirit. By his intercourse with scholars and students, his published satires on existing institutions and methods, and especially his work in editing and translating the Greek and Latin authors, he gave a powerful impulse to the study of the classics. But his more direct contributions to education are marked by the inconsistency which appears in his whole career. Some of his writings, e. g. his "Order of Study" (De ratione Studii, 1516) and his "Liberal Education of Children" (De pueris statim ac liberaliter instituendis, 1529), contain excellent advice to parents and teachers on the care of children, development of individuality, training in virtue and in the practice of religion, with emphasis on the moral qualifications of the teacher and the judicious selection of subjects of study. In other writings, as in the "Colloquia", the tone and the language are just the opposite, so offensive in fact that even Luther in his "Table Talk" declares: "If I die I will forbid my children to read his Colloquies . . . See now what poison he scatters in his Colloquies among his made-up people, and goes craftily at our youth to poison them." It is not surprising that this work was condemned by the Sorbonne (1526) as dangerous to morals, and was eventually placed on the Index. That in most works on the history of education Erasmus occupies so large a place, while others who contributed far more to the development of educational method (e. g. Vives) are not mentioned, is perhaps due to sympathy with the anti-ecclesiastical attitude of Erasmus, rather than to the intrinsic value of his constructive work (see Stöckl, Gesch. d. Pädagogik, Mainz, 1876).

A complete edition of the works of Erasmus, to which a life of him was added, was issued by Beatus Rhenanus (Basle, 1540–41) in 9 vols.; an edition was also published by Le Clerc (Leyden, 1703–06), 10 vols.; Ruelens, "Erasmi Rott. Silva carminum" (Brussels, 1864). The editions of the letters of Erasmus have been as follows: "Epistulæ familiares Erasmi" (Basle, 1518); Herzog, "Epistulæ famil. ad Bon. Amerbachium" (Basle, 1779); Horawitz, "Erasmiana" in the Transactions of the philosophical-historical section of the Academy of Vienna, vols. XC and XCV (1878–85); Horawitz, "Erasmus and Martin Lipsius" (1882); F. M. Nichols, "The Epistles of Erasmus" (London, 1901–04), 2 vols.; von Miaskowski, "Correspondenz des Erasmus mit Polen" (Breslau, 1901). Selections from his pedagogical writings were published by Reichling, "Ausgew. pädagogische Schriften des Erasmus" (Freiburg, 1896).

Information about the life of Erasmus is obtained from his letters to Servatius and Grunnius. DURAND DE LAUR, *Erasme de Rotterd., précurseur et initiateur de l'esprit moderne* (Paris, 1872), II; DRUMMOND, *Erasmus, His Life and Character* (London, 1873), II; FEUGÈRE, *Erasme, étude sur sa vie et ses ouvrages* (Paris, 1874); GILLY, *Erasme* (Arras, 1879); RICHTER, *Erasmusstudien* (Dresden, 1891); FR. SEEBOHM, *The Oxford Reformers: John Colet, Erasmus, and Thomas More* (London, 1887); FROUDE, *Life and Letters of Erasmus* (London, 1894, 1899); EMERTON, *Erasmus* (London, 1899); PENNINGTON, *Erasmus* (London, 1901); CAPEY, *Erasmus* (London, 1902), with a good bibliography, pp. 196–220; concerning the policy of conciliation of Erasmus see WOKER, *De Erasmi studiis irenicis* (Paderborn, 1872); KALKOFF in *Zeitschrift für Reformationsgesch.*, I (1904), 1 sqq.; HARTFELDER, *Erasmus u. die Päpste* in *Histor. Taschenbuch*, VI, Series XI, 148 sqq.; PASTOR, *Gesch. der Päpste*, I, IV, 472 sqq.; LEZIUS, *Zur Characteristik des relig. Standpunktes des Erasmus* (1895); RICHTER, *Desid. Erasmus u. seine Stellung zu Luther* (Leipzig, 1907); HERMELINK, *Die religiösen Reformbestrebungen des deutschen Humanismus* (Tübingen, 1907); STICHART, *Rasmus von Rotterd., seine Stellung zur Kirche und zu den relig. Bewegungen seiner Zeit* (Leipzig, 1870); SCHOLZ, *Die pädagogischen und didactischen Grundsätze des Erasmus* (1880); BECHER, *Die Ansichten des Erasmus über die Erziehung und den ersten Unterricht der Kinder* (1890); GLÖCKNER, *Das Ideal der Bildung und Erziehung bei Erasmus* (1890); HOFFMANN, *Essai d'une liste d'ouvrages concernant la vie et les écrits d'Erasme* (Brussels, 1866); *Erasmiana*, issued by the University of Geneva (Geneva, 1897–1901), I–III.

JOSEPH SAUER.

Erastus and Erastianism.—The name "Erastianism" is often used in a somewhat loose sense as denoting an undue subservience of the Church to the State. This was not, however, the principal question on which the system of Erastus turned, but rather a subsidiary one and a deduction from it. This can be explained by a short account of his life and works.

The real name of Erastus was Thomas Lieber or Liebler. He used the latinized form in his works, and accordingly has become known by that name. He was born at Baden, in Switzerland, of humble parents, 7 September, 1524; and died 31 December, 1583. For his education he went to Basle in 1540, and two years later, he found a patron by whose assistance he was able to enter the university. His zeal for learning may be estimated from the fact that although by disease he lost the use of his right arm, he learnt to write with his left hand, and is said to have been able to take down his notes more fluently than others who had no similar impediment. During his residence at Basle there was an outbreak of plague. Erastus was one of the victims; but he did not suffer severely, and on his recovery, schools having been suspended, he left Basle and proceeded to Bologna, where he studied philosophy and medicine. He was afterwards for a time also at the University of Padua. In 1553 he went to Germany and obtained an appointment as court physician to the Prince of Hennenberg. We next find him in 1558 as court physician to the elector Palatine, Otho Heinrich, and occupying at the same time the chair of medicine in the University of Heidelberg.

Although his work and lectureship were both connected with medicine, the chief interest of Erastus had always been in theology. Heidelberg was at that time the scene of severe controversial strife. Erastus, who was himself a follower of Zwingli, threw himself heart and soul into the conflict against the Lutherans. The Elector Frederick III (who had succeeded Otho Heinrich in 1559) was then enforcing the teaching of Calvinistic doctrines, and Beza was actively defending them as against Breny in Stuttgart. A conference was arranged to take place at the monastery of Maulbronn in 1564, and by request of the elector, Erastus took a prominent part therein. He published a statement defending the doctrine of Zwingli, and on its being attacked, he wrote a second defence the following year. The conference was far from successful in settling the dispute, which continued in an aggravated form. In 1568, Erastus wrote his celebrated "Theses" against what he called the "excommunicatory fever", which we shall discuss presently. They were violently attacked by Beza, and Erastus answered the following year by his "Confirmatio Thesium". Notwithstanding his efforts, a full presbyterian system was set up in 1570 at Heidelberg, and the

council proceeded to excommunicate Erastus on the ground of his alleged Unitarianism. After a long further controversy, he succeeded in convincing them that this allegation was false; and the excommunication was removed in 1575; but his position had become a difficult one, and five years later he resigned his office. He returned to Basle, where he taught ethics for a short time, until his death. On his tomb in St. Martin's church he is described as "an acute philosopher, a clever physician, and a sincere theologian". He left behind him the reputation of an upright life, with great amiability of character, coupled with an absorbing zeal for learning. He took an active part in combating the superstitions of astrology; but he showed that he was not free from the prejudices of his day by advocating the killing of witches.

The great work by which Erastus is known is his "Seventy-five Theses", to which we have already alluded. They were never printed in his lifetime, but during his last illness he expressed a desire that they should be published, and Castelvetro, who married his widow, carried out his wishes. The "Theses" and "Confirmatio thesium" appeared together in 1589, the printer's name and place being suppressed from motives of prudence. The central question about which the "Theses" turned was that of excommunication. The term is not, however, used by Erastus in the Catholic sense as excluding the delinquent from the society or membership of the Church. The excommunication to which he alludes was the exclusion of those of bad life from participation in the sacraments. He explains what he means in the introduction to the "Theses" which he wrote at the end of his life. "It is about sixteen years ago", he writes, "since some men were seized on by a certain excommunicatory fever, which they did adorn with the title of ecclesiastical discipline. . . . They affirmed the manner thereof to be this; that some certain presbyters should sit in the name of the whole Church and should judge who were worthy or unworthy to come unto the Lord's Supper." The first eight theses are devoted to a detailed explanation of the various senses in which the word *excommunication* is used, and in the ninth Erastus defines the issue with which he is concerned: "This, then, is the question, whether any command or any example can be produced from Holy Scriptures requiring or intimating that such persons [i. e. sinners] should be excluded from the sacraments." In the following thesis (x) he says: "Our answer is that none such can be found, but rather that many, as well examples as precepts, of an opposite tendency, occur everywhere in the Bible." The following twenty-eight theses are devoted to developing and maintaining his conclusions, before proceeding in the last half of his work to answer possible objections.

The chief argument on which Erastus bases his whole system is an analogy between the Jewish and Christian Dispensations, and it is exactly here that the fallacy of his conclusions becomes manifest. A Catholic, indeed, would be less likely to fall into the error of looking upon the Sacrament of the Eucharist and the Sacrifice of the Mass as in any close way analogous to the Sacrifices of the Old Law, and the slaying of the paschal lamb; or the relation of the ceremonial law to the political law of the Jews as in any way realized or realizable in the most Christian of states. To a Protestant who looked upon the Bible as the sole source of Revelation this was different. Erastus argued that by the Law of Moses no one was excluded from the offering of the paschal sacrifice, but every male was commanded to observe it under pain of death; and with respect to the ordinary sacrifices in the Temple, not only was no one excluded from them, but there was a positive command for all to assist at least three times a year, on the chief feasts, viz. Pasch, Pentecost, and Tabernacles. In illustration of the Jewish tradition, he also pointed to the conduct of St. John, who administered his baptism to all, good and bad indiscriminately. He laid great stress also on Christ Himself having admitted Judas to the participation of the Holy Communion at its institution; though he grants that this is not certain, as some commentators are of opinion that the traitor had already gone out, at any rate Judas was never publicly or even privately excluded; and, in any case, he shared in the celebration of the pasch, showing that Christ promulgated no law of exclusion.

A further argument is drawn from the nature of the sacraments themselves, again bringing into prominence the different point of view between Protestants and Catholics; for Erastus looked upon the "preaching of the Word" as equal in sacredness with the sacraments. "I ask", he said, "are the sacraments superior in authority and dignity to the Word? Are they more useful and necessary? None of those who have been saved were saved without the Word; but without sacraments, especially without the Lord's Supper, there doubtless might be, and there have been many saved who, however, did not despise these ordinances. So seems the Apostle to have judged when he wrote that he was sent not to baptize but to preach the Word. Do not almost all divines hold the sacraments to be visible words and to exhibit to the eyes what words express to the ear? Why, then, do we go about to exclude nobody from the Word, while from the sacraments, especially the Lord's Supper, we would exclude some, and that contrary to, or without, the express command of God?" (thesis xxxviii).

He deals at some length (thesis xv) with the Jewish law as to the "unclean", contending that uncleanness was by no means intended to typify sin; for, in that case, he argues, since the unclean were excluded from sacrifice while the sinful were not, it would follow that those who were blameless—for legal uncleanness was incurred by such acts as contact with the dead, etc.—were, from being types of sinners, punished more severely than sinners themselves; this he considers a *reductio ad absurdum*. He contended that uncleanness was a figure, "not of a work, but of a quality—even our depraved nature"; and he adds, "neither did it prefigure in what manner this ought to be punished [in the Church on earth], for Moses taught this in plain and explicit terms, but what should be our condition in a future life." In meeting the question of the expulsion from the synagogues alluded to by Christ, Erastus contended (thesis xxii) that this was a merely civil act: for the synagogues were also law courts; and, in fact, those who were expelled from the synagogues were not excluded from the Temple. He added also that he would see no difficulty, even otherwise, in admitting that abuses might have crept into the Jewish as into the Christian Church, and that the Pharisees might have acted in a spirit out of keeping with the true and proper interpretation of the Law.

Out of the seventy-five theses of Erastus, the first seventy-two are devoted to the question of excommunication: it is only in the last three that the general relation of the Church to the State, which comes as a corollary to his theory, is discussed. This can be given in his own words. "I see no reason", he says, "why the Christian magistrate at the present day should not possess the same power which God commanded the magistrate to exercise in the Jewish commonwealth. Do we imagine that we are able to continue a better constitution of Church and State than that?" (thesis lxxiii). He then proceeds to discuss the position of the magistrate in the Jewish nation, and argues in the following thesis (lxxiv) that "if that Church and State were most wisely founded, arranged, and appointed, any other must merit approbation which approaches to its form as nearly as present times and circumstances will permit. So that wherever the magistrate is godly, there is no need of any other authority under any other pretension or title to rule or

punish the people—as if the Christian magistrate differed nothing from the heathen. . . . I allow indeed the magistrate ought to consult, when *doctrine* is concerned, those who have particularly studied it; but that there should be any such ecclesiastical tribunal to take cognizance of men's conduct, we find no such thing anywhere appointed in the Holy Scriptures!" It may reasonably be asked how the system of Erastus could work in a state which is professedly un-Christian, and the last thesis is devoted to answering that question. "But in those churches, the members of which live under an ungodly government (for example Popish or Mohammedan), grave and pious men should be chosen according to the precept of the Apostle, to settle disputes by arbitration, compose quarrels, and do other offices of that sort. These men ought also, in conjunction with the ministers, to admonish and reprove them who live unholy and impure lives; and if they do not succeed, they may also punish, or rather recall them to virtue, either by refusing to hold private intercourse with them or by a public rebuke, or by any other such mark of disapprobation. But from the sacraments which God has instituted, they may not debar any who desire to partake."

The full system of Erastus was never accepted or promulgated by any definite sect or band of followers; but the influence of his opinions was very considerable, both in Germany and in Great Britain. The Presbyterians of course have always vigorously repudiated his doctrines; but in the Westminster Assembly (1643–7) there was a strong Erastian party. After a long controversy, a definite resolution, affirming that the Church has its own government distinct from the civil power, was carried almost unanimously, the sole dissentient being the well-known divine, John Lightfoot. On the general questions of the relation between Church and State, it must be admitted that the opinions popularly denoted by the word *Erastian* have had unmistakable influence on the Established Church of England, though there has always been a party resisting the encroachments of the civil power. We can, perhaps, take Hooker's "Ecclesiastical Polity" as an authoritative exposition of this phase of Anglicanism. Hooker was a contemporary of Erastus, and in his preface he gives an account of the controversy of the latter with Beza. The eighth volume, however, in which he deals with the question before us did not appear until 1648, many years after his death. Its authenticity has been questioned; but it is now generally conceded that it is based on rough notes made during his lifetime. He adopts the analogy of Erastus between the Jewish nation and a Christian state. Starting from the truism that a good monarch should look to the spiritual good of his subjects no less than to the temporal, he defends at once the title of the king to be head of the Church. He considers that the consent of the laity is required before an ecclesiastical law can be binding, and looks upon Parliament as their mouthpiece, and accordingly defends the right of Parliament to legislate on ecclesiastical matters. He defends the king's power of appointing bishops and his jurisdiction over ecclesiastical courts.

We may contrast with this the Catholic system of the union of Church and State which has always been the Church's ideal, and has often been in great measure realized, and in our own days has been brought into prominence by the solemn pronouncements of Pius IX. The power of the State is maintained to be of God, either immediately, or mediately through the will of the people; and the civil government exists side by side with the ecclesiastical government. Each is complete in its own sphere. The pope has "temporal power", using the term in its true sense, i. e. of his right to certain interference with the temporal government of states when the principles of religion are at stake. On the other hand, any interference on the part of the State with ecclesiastical appointments, as, for example, by nomination of bishops or by veto on such nomination, or even on the election of the pope, such as has sometimes existed in the case of some Catholic powers, is conceded by courtesy, in consideration of services rendered and by no means acknowledged as a right. See Hergenröther, "Catholic Church and Christian State" (tr. London, 1876). The "Theses" of Erastus and the "Confirmatio Thesium" were reprinted at Amsterdam in 1649. An English translation of the "Theses", without the "Confirmatio", appeared in London in 1659—a very literal rendering, in places hardly intelligible. A new translation of the "Theses", by Dr. Robert Lee, with a valuable preface, was published at Edinburgh in 1844 and is still the standard edition.

HENSON, *English Religion in the Seventeenth Century*, article *Erastianism* (London, 1903); FERGUSSON, *Refutation of Erastianism* (1692); STANLEY, *Essays on Church and State* (London, 1870); DALE, *Hist. of Eng. Congregationalism* (London, 1907); LECHLER-STÄHELIN in *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie*, s. v. *Erastus;* BONNARD, *Thomas Eraste et la Discipline ecclésiastique* (Lausanne, 1894).

BERNARD WARD.

Erbermann (EBERMANN), VEIT, theologian and controversialist, b. 25 May, 1597, at Rendweisdorff, in Bavaria; d. 8 April, 1675. He was born of Lutheran parents, but at an early age he became a Catholic, and on 30 May, 1620, entered the Society of Jesus. After completing his ecclesiastical studies he taught philosophy and Scholastic theology, first at Mainz and afterwards at Würzburg. Subsequently he was appointed rector of the pontifical seminary at Fulda, which position he held for seven years. His theological attainments and zeal for the Church brought him into conflict with many of the leading Reformers of his time. He watched with a keen interest what in Protestant theological circles is known as "the syncretistic controversy", and in his frequent encounters with its chief representatives proved himself an able champion of Catholicism. His principal works are: "Anatomia Calixtina" (Mainz, 1644), and "Irenicon Catholicum" (2 vols., Mainz, 1645–46), in which he examines critically the religious tenets of George Calixtus; "Interrogationes apologeticæ" (Würzburg, 1651); "Examen Examinis Conringiani" (Würzburg, 1644), an exposition of the infallibility of the Church against H. Conring; "Anti-Musæus, i. e. parallela Ecclesiæ veræ et falsæ" (Würzburg, 1659), and "Anti-Musæi pars altera" (Würzburg 1661); "Asserta theologica de fide divinâ" (Würzburg, 1665).

HURTER, *Nomenclator;* SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la c. de J.* (Paris, 1892), III, 407.

JOSEPH SCHROEDER.

Ercilla y Zúñiga, ALONSO DE, Spanish soldier and poet, b. in Madrid, 7 August, 1533; d. in the same city, 29 Nov., 1594. After his father's death, his mother became lady-in-waiting to the Infanta María and made young Alonso a page to Prince Philip. Ercilla received a very thorough education, for, besides having the most learned teachers, he enjoyed the advantages of very extensive travelling and of living at court where he came in contact with high personages. When he was only fifteen he accompanied Philip through Italy and Germany; and their travels lasted three years. Later, Ercilla accompanied his mother to Bohemia where he left her and then visited Austria, Hungary, and other countries. Returning to Spain, he soon started out again with Philip. In London he made the acquaintance of Jerónimo de Alderete (1555), whose stories of his thrilling adventures in the New World so fired Ercilla's imagination that he determined to accompany Alderete to the New World. He therefore obtained leave from Philip, and they set sail for America, 15 Oct., 1555. Soon after their arrival, however, Alderete died (near Panamá, April, 1556). Ercilla continued on his way to Peru, and in 1557 joined the forces of García Hurtado de Mendoza, who

had recently been appointed Governor of Chile. During the succeeding two or three years he played a brilliant part in combating an insurrection among the natives of Arauco, a province of Chile, suffering great hardships, and distinguishing himself several times in battle. After a severe illness he returned to Spain in 1562, and for a time resumed his travels through Europe. In 1570, he married Doña María de Bazán, a woman of illustrious family and of intellectual attainments. He died at Madrid neglected and in great poverty.

Ercilla's great work is "La Araucana", an epic poem of thirty-seven cantos, describing the difficulties encountered by the Spaniards during the insurrection in Arauco, and the heroic deeds of the natives as well as his companions. The epic partakes of the character of history, and the author adheres with such strict fidelity to the truth, that subsequent historians characterize his work as thoroughly trustworthy. In it the difficult art of story-telling is carried to perfection. Places are admirably described, dates are given with accuracy, and the customs of the natives faithfully set forth, giving to the narrative animation and colouring. The poem was published in three parts, the first appearing in 1569, the second in 1578, and the third in 1590. The best editions are those published by the Spanish Academy in 1776 and 1828.

ARANA, *Historia general de Chile* (Santiago, 1884); TICKNOR, *History of Spanish Literature* (New York, 1854), II, III.

VENTURA FUENTES.

Erconwald, SAINT, Bishop of London, d. about 690. He belonged to the princely family of the East Anglian Offa, and devoted a considerable portion of his patrimony to founding two monasteries, one for monks at Chertsey, and the other for nuns at Barking in Essex. Over the latter he placed his sister, St. Ethelburga, as abbess. He himself discharged the duties of superior at Chertsey. Erconwald continued his monastic life till the death of Bishop Wini in 675, when he was called to the See of London, at the instance of King Sebbi and Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury. As monk and bishop he was renowned for holiness of life, and miracles were wrought in attestation of his sanctity. The sick were cured by contact with the litter on which he had been carried; this we have on the testimony of Venerable Bede. He was present in 686 at the reconciliation between Archbishop Theodore and Wilfrith. King Ini in the preface to his laws calls Erconwald "my bishop". During his episcopate he enlarged his church, augmented its revenues, and obtained for it special privileges from the king.

According to an ancient epitaph, Erconwald ruled the Diocese of London for eleven years. He is said to have eventually retired to the convent of his sister at Barking, where he died 30 April. He was buried in St. Paul's, and his tomb became renowned for miracles. The citizens of London had a special devotion to him, and they regarded with pride the magnificence of his shrine. During the burning of the cathedral in 1087 it is related that the shrine and its silken coverings remained intact. A solemn translation of St. Erconwald's body took place 14 Nov., 1148, when it was raised above the high altar. The shrine was robbed of its jewels and ornaments in the sixteenth century; and the bones of the saint are said to have been then buried at the east end of the choir. His feast is observed by English Catholics on 14 November. Prior to the Reformation, the anniversaries of St. Erconwald's death and translation of his relics were observed at St. Paul's as feasts of the first class, according to an ordinance of Bishop Braybroke in 1386.

BEDE, *Historia Eccl.*, IV, 6; *Acta SS.*, April, III; BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, 30 April; STANTON, *Menology of England and Wales* (London, 1887), 30 April; *Britannia Sancta* (London, 1745); STUBBS in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s.v. *Erkenwald;* HUNT in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v. *Erkenwald.*

COLUMBA EDMONDS.

Erdely. See TRANSYLVANIA.

Erdeswicke, SAMPSON, antiquarian, date of birth unknown; d. 1603. He was born at Sandon in Staffordshire, his father, Hugh Erdeswicke, being descended from Richard de Vernon, Baron of Shipbrook, in the reign of William the Conqueror. The family resided originally at Erdeswicke Hall, in Cheshire, afterwards at Leighton and finally in the reign of Edward III settled at Sandon. Hugh Erdeswicke was a staunch Catholic who suffered much for the Faith. In 1582 he was reported to the Privy Council by the Anglican Bishop of Coventry as "the sorest and dangerousest papist, one of them in all England". His son, Sampson, born in the reign of Henry VIII, entered Brasenose College, Oxford, as a gentleman-commoner in 1553. Leaving Oxford, he returned to Sandon where he spent the rest of his life as a country gentleman under the usual disabilities of a recusant. He devoted himself to antiquarian studies, particularly to the thorough "Survey of Staffordshire". By this work his name is chiefly remembered, but it was not published during his lifetime, and considerable mystery exists as to the original MS., because the numerous existing copies differ much from one another. A description of these was published by William Salt, F.S.A., in 1844. The "Survey" itself was published by Degge (1717 and 1723), by Shaw in his Staffordshire (1798), and lastly by Harwood (1820 and 1844). Other unpublished MSS. by Erdeswicke are in the British Museum and the College of Arms. Latterly he employed as amanuensis, William Wyrley, a youth whom he had educated and who afterwards published writings of his own. One of these, "The True Use of Armorie", was claimed by Erdeswicke as his own work, but he told William Burton the antiquary, that he had given Wyrley leave to publish it under his own name; but Antony à Wood denies this, adding that "Erdeswicke being oftentimes crazed, especially in his last day, and fit then for no kind of serious business, would say anything which came into his mind, as 'tis very well known at this day among the chief of the College of Arms" (Ath. Oxon., Bliss ed., II, 217–18). Erdeswicke married first Elizabeth Dixwell, secondly Mary Digby (24 April, 1593). He died in 1603, but the date usually given, 11 April, must be erroneous, as his will is dated 15 May. He is buried in Sandon Church, beneath an elaborate monument representing his own recumbent figure. Camden and other antiquaries praise his knowledge and industry, and he is believed to have been elected a member of the Society of Antiquaries founded by Archbishop Parker in 1572.

HARWOOD, *Erdeswicke's Survey of Staffordshire* (London, 1844), pp. 36–43; WOOD, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, BLISS ed. I, 736–7; II, 217–19; Historical MSS. Commission, *Reports* (1874), II, V (1876), VI (1877), and VIII (1881); GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.* (London, 1886), II, 174; GOODWIN in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (London, 1889), XVII; BIRT, *Erdeswicke Family. Some Historical Notes from the Margins of a Manuscript* in *Dublin Review*, CXXIV (London, 1899).

EDWIN BURTON.

Erdington Abbey, situated in a suburb of Birmingham, Warwickshire, England, belongs to the Benedictine congregation of St. Martin of Beuron, Germany, and is dedicated to St. Thomas of Canterbury. Driven from Germany by the Falk laws, four of these exiled monks went to Erdington at the request of Bishop Ullathorne, O.S.B., and of the Rev. Daniel Haigh, M.A., a convert Anglican clergyman who gave them the splendid Gothic church which he had built and embellished out of his own private fortune, as a thank-offering to Almighty God for the gift of the true Faith. Father Haigh's modest presbytery was the first monastery, and here Dom Placid Walter, Arch-Abbot of the Beuron Congregation, Dom Hildebrand de Hemptine, later Abbot Primate of the Benedictine Order, Dom Leo Linse, afterwards Abbot of Fort Augustus in

Scotland, Dom Leodgar Stocker, and a lay brother took up their abode in October, 1876. Dom Placid was the first prior. Two years later, Dom Hildebrand succeeded Dom Placid, and at once set about building a monastery that would accommodate a community large enough to chant the Divine Office in choir. It was finished in 1880, when the number of monks was increased to eleven with three lay brothers.

Meanwhile Father Haigh had found his last resting-place in the Blessed Sacrament chapel, so the untenanted presbytery was converted into a Catholic grammar school, the first of its kind in the neighbourhood of Birmingham, with Dom Wilfrid Wallace, an English priest who had lately joined the community, as head master. Dom Leo Linse became prior in 1882, and was succeeded in 1886 by Dom Boniface Wolff, who was followed, in turn, by Dom Silvester Schlecht in 1895. On the feast of the Assumption, 1896, the priory was transformed into an abbey by a Brief of Leo XIII, though three years elapsed before it received an abbot. These were years of spiritual and material development. A novitiate was opened and a school for oblates, several members were added to the community, and a large addition made to the monastic buildings. These comprised the abbot's apartments and chapel, rooms for guests, entrance hall, parlours, novitiate, and clericate. They were completed and blessed in 1898. In July, 1899, Dom Ansgar Höckelmann was appointed its first abbot, and he was blessed in the abbey church on 3 Sept., by Bishop Ilsley of Birmingham. Since then a spacious refectory and library have been built, and the community continues to grow.

The Church and Abbey of Erdington, A Record of fifty years, 1850–1900 (Birmingham, 1900); BAXTER, *Erdington Abbey* in the *Catholic Fireside* (London, 27 Dec., 1902).

PETER NUGENT.

Erhard of Ratisbon, SAINT, bishop of that city in the seventh century, probably identical with an Abbot Erhard of Ebersheimmünster mentioned in a Merovingian diploma of 684. Ancient documents call him also Erard and Herhard. The legendary account of his life offers little that is historically certain. The following, however, seems reliable. Erhard was born in Ireland, then known as "Scotia". Like many of his countrymen he went to the Continent as missionary bishop or chorepiscopus, and coming to the Vosges met there St. Hildulf, said to have been Archbishop of Trier, and who lived there as a hermit (666–671). He is called Erhard's brother, but very likely spiritual relationship was meant. It is said that each of them founded seven monasteries. Thence Erhard went to Ratisbon and founded the nunnery of Niedermünster. By Divine inspiration he was recalled to the Rhineland to baptize St. Odilia, blind from her birth, but who received her eyesight at her baptism. He sent a messenger to her father, Duke Attich, and reconciled him with his disowned daughter. According to another account, St. Odilia was baptized by Hildulf, Erhard acting as her sponsor. The year of his death is not known. He was interred in the still-extant Erhard-crypt at Niedermünster, and miracles were wrought at his grave, that was guarded in the Middle Ages by "Erhardinonnen", a religious community of women who observed there a perpetual round of prayer. Otto II, in 974, made donations of properties in the Danube valley to the convent "where the holy confessor Erhard rests". On 7 Oct., 1052, the remains of the holy bishops Erhard and Wolfgang were raised by Pope St. Leo IX in presence of Emperor Henry III and many bishops, a ceremony which was at that time equivalent to canonization. Ratisbon documents, however, mention only the raising of Wolfgang, not that of Erhard. At the close of the eleventh century, Paul von Bernried, a monk of Fulda, at the suggestion of Abbess Heilika of Niedermünster, wrote a life of Erhard and added a second book containing a number of miracles. The learned canon of Ratisbon, Conrad of Megenberg (d. 1374), furnished a new edition of this work. The church in Niedermünster, now a parish church, still preserves the crosier of the saint, made of black buffalo-horn. A bone of his skull was enclosed in a precious receptacle in 1866 and is placed upon the heads of the faithful on his feast day, 8 Jan. Three ancient Latin lives of the saint are found in the Acta Sanctorum (8 Jan). The beautiful reliquary is reproduced in Jakob, "Die Kunst im Dienste der Kirche" (illust. 16).

GELTINGER, *Kurze Lebensgeschichte des hl. Bischofes Erhardus* (Ratisbon, 1878); SEPP, *Vita S. Hrodberti* (1891), 59 sqq.; *Bibl. hag. latina*, 389.

GABRIEL MEIER.

Eric the Red. See AMERICA, PRE-COLUMBIAN DISCOVERY OF.

Erie, DIOCESE OF (ERIENSIS), established 1853; it embraces the thirteen counties of North-Western Pennsylvania, U. S. A.: Erie, Crawford, Warren, McKean, Potter, Mercer, Venango, Forest, Elk, Cameron, Clarion, Jefferson, and Clearfield, an area of 10,027 square miles.

ST. PETER'S CATHEDRAL, ERIE

This territory enjoys the distinction of having been under three different national and ecclesiastical governments: under the French flag and the See of Quebec from 1753 to 1758; under the English flag and the Vicariate Apostolic of London from 1758 to the Treaty of Paris, 3 September, 1783, and the erection of the See of Baltimore in 1789; under the American flag since the Treaty of Paris and a part of the See of Baltimore until the establishment of the Diocese of Philadelphia in 1808. In August, 1843, when the Diocese of Pittsburg was formed, it included all that part of the State of Pennsylvania west of a line running along the eastern border of Bedford, Huntingdon, Clearfield, Elk, McKean, and Potter counties, and consequently, the territory of the present Diocese of Erie.

In 1853 the Right Rev. Michael O'Connor, the first Bishop of Pittsburg, petitioned the Holy See, through the Fifth Provincial Council of Baltimore, for a division of his diocese, and took for himself the poorest part, and thus became the first Bishop of the Diocese of Erie. When Bishop O'Connor assumed the government of the diocese, 29 July, 1853, there were only twenty-eight churches with eleven secular priests and three Benedictine Fathers to attend to the wants of the Catholics scattered throughout the thirteen counties. At the urgent request and petition of the priests and people of Pittsburg, Bishop O'Connor was restored to them, having governed the Diocese of Erie for the short period of seven months.

His successor at Erie was the Rev. Josue Moody Young, a member of an old Puritan, New England family, born 29 Oct., 1808, at Shapleigh, Maine. He became a convert from Congregationalism and was baptized in October, 1828, by the famous New England missionary, Father Charles D. Ffrench, O.P., when he then changed the Moody of his name to Maria. He was ordained priest 1 April, 1838, and consecrated second Bishop of Erie, in Cincinnati, by Archbishop

Purcell, on 23 April, 1854. The outlook at his accession was gloomy. Many of the priests who were affiliated with Pittsburg before the division, returned there with Bishop O'Connor. Among those who cast their lot with the new diocese the most noteworthy were the Very Rev. John D. Coady, Revs. Anthony Reck, Joseph Hartman, M. A. De La Roque, John Berbegier, Andrew Skopez, Kieran O'Brannigan, and also Messrs. John Koch and Thomas Lonnergan, at that time studying for the priesthood. There were but two churches in Erie city, St. Patrick's, the pro-cathedral, and St. Mary's, built for a German congregation by Rev. Joseph Hartman. Outside the city there were twenty-eight churches, with eleven secular priests and three Benedictines for a Catholic population of 12,000. The church buildings outside the city of Erie were mostly wooden structures. There was only one Catholic school. The discovery of petroleum on Oil Creek, 28 August, 1859, gave a great impetus to both secular and religious progress throughout the diocese. To accommodate the settlers that located in the valleys of Oil Creek and the Allegheny River, where towns sprang up as by magic, churches were hastily erected, but the number of priests was still inadequate. As there were no railroads Bishop Young's labours were in the beginning very heavy. He died suddenly 18 September, 1866. At his death the Catholic population had more than doubled, and several new churches and schools had sprung into existence.

The vicar-general, Very Rev. John D. Coady, governed the diocese during the interregnum until the third bishop, the Rev. Tobias Mullen, was consecrated, 2 August, 1868. He was born in the County Tyrone, Ireland, 4 March, 1818, and was ordained priest at Pittsburg, 1 Sept., 1844, having gone there with Bishop O'Connor from Maynooth the previous year as a volunteer for the American mission. Under his direction a new era began, priests were ordained, new parishes sprang up, churches and schools were built, regular conferences for the clergy were held. Religious orders were introduced and new institutions arose for the maintenance and spread of religion, and for the enlightenment, and comfort, and shelter of suffering humanity. The frame churches gave place to brick and stone structures. The bishop himself was a tireless worker and infused his own spirit into his priests. A Catholic weekly, the "Lake Shore Visitor", was issued, edited mostly by the bishop himself, in the midst of labours that called him to every part of his extensive diocese. The Poles, the Slavs, the Hungarians, and the Italians had churches and priests provided for them, the orphans a large new home, the sick were provided with two large hospitals, and finally his crowning work, St. Peter's Cathedral, was finished, clear of debt, and consecrated in 1893, the twenty-fifth anniversary of his consecration. In the following year he celebrated the golden jubilee of his priesthood. His strong active mind and body began to fail and on 19 May, 1897, he suffered a paralytic stroke and a coadjutor, the Rev. John E. Fitz Maurice, president of St. Charles's Seminary, Overbrook, Philadelphia, was chosen by the Holy See and consecrated titular Bishop of Amisus with right of succession in Philadelphia, 24 February, 1898. Bishop Mullen resigned, 10 August, 1899, and died, 22 April, 1900. Bishop Fitz Maurice succeeded as fourth bishop of the diocese, on 19 September, 1899, and the good work inaugurated under the late bishop went on quietly and steadily. He was born at Newtown-Sandes, County Kerry, Ireland, 9 Jan., 1840, and ordained priest in Philadelphia, 21 Dec., 1862. After officiating in several parishes he was appointed rector of the diocesan seminary in 1886.

The religious orders in the diocese are the Benedictines, the Redemptorists, the Brothers of Mary, the Benedictine Nuns, the Sisters of St. Joseph, the Sisters of Mercy, and the Felician Sisters. At one time the Franciscans, the Bridgettines, and the Sisters of the Humility of Mary had houses in the diocese. The Benedictines settled at St. Mary's, Elk county, under Bishop O'Connor and in 1858 took charge of St. Mary's, Erie. The Redemptorists in 1875 began their foundation, purchasing a Presbyterian college—at Northeast—which they made a seminary and college for young men who intended to join their order. They have 142 students.

The Sisters of St. Joseph entered the diocese in 1860, and have charge of the orphan asylum, the home for the aged, the two hospitals, the Academy of Villa Maria, the mother-house in the diocese, and of fifteen parochial schools. The Sisters of Mercy, who entered the diocese 24 September, 1870, besides the academy in Titusville, the mother-house, have charge of eight parochial schools. The Sisters of St. Benedict (St. Mary's, Penn.) (22 July, 1852) have St. Benedict's Academy, the mother-house at St. Mary's, and teach seven schools. The (Erie) Sisters of St. Benedict, besides the academy and school of St. Mary's Church, teach five parochial schools, and also conduct an academy in Sharon. The Felician Sisters teach St. Stanislaus' Polish school, in the city of Erie.

There are in the diocese 100 churches, with resident priests, 46 missions with churches, and 11 chapels; 160 priests—135 secular, 25 regular; 45 parochial schools, 3 academies for young ladies, 1 orphan asylum with 216 orphans, making a total of young people under the care of the Church, 10,385; two hospitals, and one home for the aged. The Catholic population of the diocese is estimated at 121,108.

LAMBING, *Hist. Cath. Ch. in Diocese of Pittsburg* (New York, 1880); BATES, *Hist. of Cranford County;* SMALL, *Legislative Hand-Book;* SHEA, *Hist. of Cath. Ch. in U. S.* (New York, 1894); REUSS, *Biog. Cyclo. of Cath. Hierarchy of U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1898).

JAMES J. DUNN.

Eriugena, JOHN SCOTUS, an Irish teacher, theologian, philosopher, and poet, who lived in the ninth century.

NAME.—Eriugena's contemporaries invariably refer to him as *Joannes Scottus* or *Joannes Scottigena*. In the MSS. of the tenth and subsequent centuries the forms *Eriugena*, *Ierugena*, and *Erigena* occur. Of these, the oldest and most acceptable, philologically, is *Eriugena*, which, as it was perhaps sometimes written *Eriygena*, was changed into *Erigena*. It means "a native of Ireland". The form *Ierugena* is evidently an attempt to connect the first part of the name with the Greek word *ἱερός*, and means "a native of the Island of Saints"; the combination *Joannes Scotus Erigena* cannot be traced beyond the sixteenth century.

BIRTHPLACE.—At one time the birthplace of Eriugena was a matter of dispute. Eriuven in Wales and Ayre in Scotland claimed the honour, and each found advocates. Nowadays, however, the claim of Ireland to be considered the birthplace of John is universally admitted. All the evidence points that way, and leads us to conclude that when his contemporaries tauntingly referred to his having come to France from Ireland they meant not only that he was educated in the Isle of Saints but also that Ireland was his birthplace. Whatever doubt there may have been about the meaning of *Scotus*, there can be none as to the signification of the surname *Eriugena*.

LIFE.—What is known of the life of Eriugena is very soon told. About 847 he appeared in France at the court of Charles the Bald, was received with special favour by that prince, appointed head of the palace school, which seems to have had some kind of permanent location at Paris, and was commissioned by his royal patron to translate the works of Pseudo-Dionysius into Latin. This translation brought him into prominence in the world of letters and was the occasion of his entering into the theological controversies of the day, especially into those concerning predestination and the Eucharist. His knowledge of

Greek is evident from his translations, and is also proved by the poems which he wrote. It is doubtful, on the other hand, whether he possessed the knowledge of Hebrew and other Oriental languages which is sometimes ascribed to him. In any case there is no evidence of his having travelled extensively in Greece and Asia Minor. After leaving Ireland he spent the rest of his days in France, probably at Paris and Laon. There was, as we know from the MSS., an important colony of Irish scholars at the latter place. The tradition that after the death of Charles the Bald he went to England at the invitation of Alfred the Great, that he taught a school at Malmesbury, and was there put to death by his pupils, has no support in contemporary documents and may well have arisen from some confusion of names on the part of later historians. It is probable that he died in France, but the date is unknown. From the evidence available it is impossible to determine whether he was a cleric or a layman, although it is difficult to deny that the general conditions of the time make it more than probable that he was a cleric and perhaps a monk.

Writings.—1. Translations of the works of Pseudo-Dionysius: "De Cœlesti Hierarchiâ"; "De Ecclesiasticâ Hierarchiâ" "De Divinis Nominibus"; "De Mysticâ Theologiâ"; "Epistolæ"; translations of the "Ambigua" of St. Maximus.—2. Commentaries: "Homilia in prologum S. Evangelii sec. Joannem", and a commentary on the Gospel of St. John, of which a few fragments only have come down to us; commentaries on the "Celestial Hierarchy" and the "Ecclesiastical Hierarchy" of Pseudo-Dionysius; glosses on the work of Martianus Capella (still in MS.), and on the theological opuscula of Boethius (Rand ed., Munich, 1906), with which is connected a brief "Life" of Boethius (Pieper ed., "Consolatio Philos.", Leipzig, 1871).—3. Theological works: "Liber de Prædestinatione", and very probably a work on the Eucharist, though it is certain that the tract "De Corpore et Sanguine Domini", at one time believed to be Eriugena's, is the work of Paschasius Radbertus.—4. Philosophical works: "De Divisione Naturæ", his principal work, and a treatise, "De Egressu et Regressu Animæ ad Deum", of which we possess only a few fragments.—5. Poems: These are written partly in Latin and partly in Greek. Many of them are dedicated to Charles the Bald. The most complete edition of Eriugena's works is that of Dr. Floss, which is printed as Vol. CXXII of Migne's P. L. A new edition embodying the results of recent discoveries of manuscripts is often spoken of, and will doubtless be forthcoming before long.

Doctrines.—Although the errors into which Eriugena fell both in theology and in philosophy were many and serious, there can be no doubt that he himself abhorred heresy, was disposed to treat the heretic with no small degree of harshness (as is evident from his strictures on Gotteschalk), and all through his life believed himself an unswervingly loyal son of the Church. Taking for granted the authenticity of the works ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite, he considered that the doctrines he discovered in them were not only philosophically true, but also theologically acceptable, since they carried with them the authority of the distinguished Athenian convert of St. Paul. He did not for a moment suspect that in those writings he had to deal with a loosely articulated system of thought in which Christian teachings were mingled with the tenets of a subtle but profoundly anti-Christian pantheism. To this remark should be added another in order that we may fully understand Eriugena's attitude towards orthodoxy. He was accused by his contemporaries of leaning too much towards the Greeks. And, in fact, the Greek Fathers were his favourite authors, especially Gregory the Theologian, and Basil the Great. Of the Latins he prized Augustine most highly. The influence of these on the temperament of the venturesome Celt was towards freedom and not towards restraint in theological speculation. This freedom he reconciled with his respect for the teaching authority of the Church as he understood it. However, in the actual exercise of the freedom of speculation which he allowed himself, he fell into many errors which are incompatible with orthodox Christianity.

The "*De Prædestinatione*" seems to have been written after the translation of the works of Pseudo-Dionysius. Nevertheless there is in it only one allusion to the authority of the Greek Fathers and very little of the obtrusion of Greek words and phrases which so abound in the later works. It deals with the problem raised by Gotteschalk regarding the doctrine of predestination, and, more specifically, undertakes to prove that predestination is single, not double—in other words, that there is no predestination to sin and punishment but only to grace and eternal happiness. The authority of Augustine is used very extensively. In the philosophical setting of the problem, however—namely, the discussion of the true nature of evil—Eriugena appears to go back farther than St. Augustine and to hold the radical neo-Platonic view that evil is non-existent. He is thus compelled to go even farther than St. Augustine in rejecting the doctrine of a double predestination. That he exceeded the bounds of orthodoxy is the contention of Prudentius of Troyes and Florus of Lyons who answered the "Liber de Prædestinatione" in works full of bitter personal attacks on Eriugena. Their views prevailed in the Councils of Valencia (855) and Langres (859), in which Eriugena's doctrine was condemned.

While the "*De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*" is not Eriugena's, though ascribed to him, there can be no doubt that in some work, now lost, on that subject he maintained doctrines at variance with the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation. From the fragment which has come down to us of his commentary on St. John we infer that he held the Eucharist to be merely a type or figure. At least he insists on the spiritual, to the exclusion, apparently, of the physical, "eating of the Flesh of the Son of Man".

In the "*De Divisione Naturæ*", his most important and systematic work, Eriugena treats in the form of a dialogue the principal problems of philosophy and theology. The meaning of the title is evident from the opening sentences in which he outlines the plan of the work. "Nature", he says, "is divided into four species": (1) "Nature which creates and is not created"—this is God, the Source and Principle of all things; (2) "Nature which is created and creates"—this is the world of primordial causes or (Platonic) ideas; (3) "Nature which is created and does not create"—this is the world of phenomena, the world of contingent, sense-perceived things; (4) "Nature which neither creates nor is created"—this is God, the Term to which all things are returning.

(1) "Nature", then, is synonymous with reality, and also with God. For, whatever reality the world of ideas and the world of phenomena possess, is, in the truest and most literal sense, the reality of God Himself. "The being of all things is the over-being of God" (*esse omnium est superesse Divinitatis*) is a saying which he never tires of quoting from the works of Pseudo-Dionysius. So supremely perfect is the essence of the Divinity that God is incomprehensible not only to us but also to Himself. For if He knew Himself in any adequate sense He should place Himself in some category of thought, which would be to limit Himself. God is above all categories. When, therefore, we speak about Him we are safer in using the negative (ἀποφατική) than the positive (καταφατική) mode of predication. That is, we are safer in predicating what He is not than in venturing to predicate what He is. If we have recourse to positive predication, we must use the prefix *hyper* and say God is *hypersubstantia*, i. e. more-than-

substance, etc. Similarly, when we say that God is the "Creator" of all things we should understand that predicate in a sense altogether distinct from the meaning which we attach to the predicate "maker" or "producer" when applied to finite agents or causes. The "creation" of the world is in reality a *theophania*, or showing forth of the Essence of God in the things created. Just as He reveals Himself to the mind and the soul in higher intellectual and spiritual truth, so He reveals Himself to the senses in the created world around us. Creation is, therefore, a process of unfolding of the Divine Nature, and if we retain the word *Creator* in the sense of "one who makes things out of nothing", we must understand that God "makes" the world out of His own Essence, which, because of its incomprehensibility, may be said to be "nothing".

(2) Nature in the second sense, "Nature which creates and is created", is the world of primordial causes, or ideas, which the Father "created" in the Son, and which in turn "create", that is determine the generic and specific natures of concrete visible things. These, says Eriugena, were called "prototypes", *θεῖα θελήματα*, and "ideas", by the Greeks. Their function is that of exemplar and efficient causes. For since they are, though created, identical with God, and since their *locus* is the Word of God, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, they are operative causes and not merely static types. They are coeternal with the Word of God. From this, however, it is not necessary to infer, as some critics have done, that according to Eriugena the primordial causes are identical with the Word. As examples of primordial causes Eriugena enumerates goodness, wisdom, intuition (insight), understanding, virtue, greatness, power, etc. These are united in God, partly separate or scattered in the Word, and fully separate or scattered in the world of phenomena. For there is underlying all Eriugena's doctrine of the origin of things the image to which he often referred, namely, that of a circle, the radii of which are united at the centre. The centre is God, the radii at a point near the centre are the primordial causes, the radii at the circumference are phenomena.

(3) These phenomena are "Nature" in the third sense, "which is created and does not create". The stream of reality, setting out from the centre, God, passing through the ideas in the Word, passes next through all the *genera suprema*, *media*, and *infima* of logic, then enters the region of number and the realm of space and time, where the ideas become subject to multiplicity, change, imperfection, and decay. In this last stage they are no longer pure ideas but only the appearances of reality, that is phenomena. In the region of number the ideas become angels, pure incorporeal spirits. In the realm of space and time the ideas take on the burden of matter, which is the source of suffering, sickness, and sin. The material world, therefore, of our experience is composed of ideas clothed in matter—here Eriugena attempts a reconciliation of Platonism with Aristotelean notions. Man, too, is composed of idea and matter, soul and body. He is the culmination of the process of things from God, and with him, as we shall see, begins the process of return of all things to God. He is the image of the Trinity in so far as he unites in one soul being, wisdom, and love. In the state of innocence in which he was created, he was perfect in body as well as in soul, independent of bodily needs, and without differentiation of sex. The dependence of man's mind on the body and the subjection of the body to the world of sense, as well as the distinction of male and female in the human kind, are all the results of original sin. This downward tendency of the soul towards the conditions of animal existence has only one remedy, Divine grace. By means of this heavenly gift man is enabled to rise superior to the needs of the sensuous body, to place the demands of reason above those of bodily appetite, and from reason to ascend through contemplation to ideas, and thence by intuition to God Himself. The three faculties here alluded to as reason, contemplation, and intuition are designated by Eriugena as internal sense (*διάνοια*), ratiocination (*λόγος*), and intellect (*νοῦς*). These are the three degrees of mental perfection which man must attain if he is to free himself from the bondage into which he was cast by sin, and attain that union with God in which salvation consists.

(4) Not only man, however, but everything else in nature is destined to return to God. This universal resurrection of nature is the subject of the last portion of Eriugena's work, in which he treats of "Nature which neither creates nor is created". This is God, the final Term, or Goal, of all existence. When Christ became man, He took on Himself body, soul, senses, and intellect, and when, ascending into Heaven, He took these with Him, not only the soul of man but his senses, his body, the animal and the vegetative natures, and even the elements were redeemed, and the final return of all things to God was begun. Now, as Heraclitus taught, the upward and the downward ways are the same. The return to God proceeds in the inverse order through all the steps which marked the downward course, or process of things from God. The elements become light, light becomes life, life becomes sense, sense becomes reason, reason becomes intellect, intellect becomes ideas in Christ, the Word of God, and through Christ returns to the oneness of God from which all the processes of nature began. This "incorporation" in Christ takes place by means of Divine grace in the Church, of which Christ is the invisible head. The doctrine of the final return of all things to God shows very clearly the influence of Origen. In general, the system of thought just outlined is a combination of neo-Platonic mysticism, emanationism, and pantheism which Eriugena strove in vain to reconcile with Aristotelean empiricism, Christian creationism, and theism. The result is a body of doctrines loosely articulated, in which the mystic and idealistic elements predominate, and in which there is much that is irreconcilable with Catholic dogma.

INFLUENCE.—Eriugena's influence on the theological thought of his own and immediately subsequent generations was doubtless checked by the condemnations to which his doctrines of predestination and of the Eucharist were subjected in the Councils of Valencia (855), Langres (859), and Vercelli (1050). The general trend of his thought, so far as it was discernible at the time of his translations of Pseudo-Dionysius, was referred to with suspicion in a letter addressed by Pope Nicholas I to Charles the Bald in 859. It was not, however, until the beginning of the thirteenth century that the pantheism of the "De Divisione Naturæ" was formally condemned. The Council of Paris (1225) coupled the condemnation of Eriugena's work with the previous condemnations (1210) of the doctrines of Amalric of Chartres and David of Dinant, and there can be no doubt that the pantheists of that time were using Eriugena's treatise. While the great Scholastic teachers, Abelard, Alexander of Hales, St. Bonaventure, St. Thomas, and Albert the Great knew nothing, apparently, of Eriugena and his pantheism, certain groups of mystical theologians, even as early as the thirteenth century, were interested in his work and drew their doctrines from it. The Albigenses, too, sought inspiration from him. Later, the Mystics, especially Meister Eckhart, were influenced by him. And in recent times the great transcendental idealists, especially the Germans, recognize in him a kindred spirit and speak of him in the highest terms.

MIGNE, *P. L.*, CXXII; RAND, *Johannes Scotus* (Munich, 1906); GARDNER, *Studies in John the Scot* (London, 1900); POOLE, *Illustrations of the History of Medieval Thought* (London, 1884), 53 sq., 311 sq.; TOWNSEND, *The Great Schoolmen* (London, 1881), 35 sq.; STAUDENMAIER, *Johannes Scotus Erigena* (Frankfort, 1834); CHRISTLIEB, *Leben und Lehre des J. S. E.*

(Gotha, 1860); HUBER, *Johannes Scotus Erigena* (Munich, 1861); DRÄSKE, *Johannes Scotus Erigena*, etc. (Leipzig, 1902); SCHMITT, *Zwei noch unbenützte Handschriften des J. S. E.* (Bamberg, 1900); NOACK, *Johannes Scotus Erigena* (Leipzig, 1876); SAINT-RENÉ TAILLANDIER, *Scot Erigène et la phil. scol.* (Strasburg, 1843); JACQUIN, *Le néo-platonisme de Jean Scot* in *Rev. des sciences phil. et théol.*, Oct. 1907; TURNER, *Hist. of Phil.* (Boston, 1903), 246 sqq.

WILLIAM TURNER.

Erlau. See AGRIA.

Ermland, or ERMELAND (VARMIENSIS, WARMIA), a district of East Prussia and an exempt bishopric. St. Adalbert of Prague (d. 997) and St. Bruno of Querfurt (d. 1009) converted the early inhabitants of this region, the heathen Prussians, to Christianity and two centuries later Teutonic Knights and members of the Cistercian Order introduced civilization also into the land. Among these latter was the saintly Bishop Christian of Oliva (d. 1245). In 1243 the territorial possessions of the Teutonic Knights were divided into the Dioceses of Culm, Pomesanien, Ermland, and Samland. Albert Suerber, who came from Cologne, and who had been Archbishop of Armagh, Ireland, was appointed Archbishop of Prussia. In 1251 he took Riga for his see, a choice which was confirmed by Alexander IV, who in 1255 made Riga the metropolitan of the four dioceses just mentioned. A priest of the Order of Teutontic Knights, Heinrich of Strateich, was selected as the first Bishop of Ermland, but he was not able to enter upon his office. It was not until 28 August, 1251, that the first actual Bishop of Ermland, Anselm of Meissen, who was also a priest belonging to the Order of Teutonic Knights, was consecrated at Valenciennes by the papal legate Pietro of Albano. The diocese included the whole of the old Prussian districts of Warmien, Natangen, Barten, and Galindien, the northern half of Pomesanien and the southern halves of Nadrauen and Sudauen. The bishop was given one-third of this territory as personal property for his support, and in this district he was the secular ruler and a prince of the Holy Roman Empire; these rights of the bishop were confirmed in the Golden Bull of the Emperor Charles IV. In 1260 Bishop Anselm founded a chapter of sixteen canons attached to the cathedral of St. Andreas at Braunsberg and transferred to the chapter the right of electing the bishop. But Braunsberg was ravaged by the heathen Prussians in 1262, and the second bishop, Heinrich I (1278–1300), was obliged in 1280 to transfer the chapter to Frauenburg where it has remained ever since.

From the thirteenth century to the fifteenth the history of Ermland was one of constant wars. Repeated rebellions of the native Prussians, incursions of the Lithuanians, and frequent wars with Poland, in which the bishop was always the faithful ally of the Teutonic Order, checked the development of Christianity and the cultivation of the soil. To these disorders were added the constant encroachments and violence of the Teutonic Knights who sought to bring Ermland, like the other Prussian dioceses, under the dominion of the order. Ermland, however, defended its rights with great determination against such efforts, and would not allow the order to influence in any way the election of the bishops and the chapter. Yet in everything else the bishops held faithfully to the order, even when its star began to decline, and the whole territory ruled by the knights revolted in the so-called War of the Cities (1454–66). It was in this period that the celebrated Cardinal Enea Silvio de' Piccolomini (Æneas Silvius) was elected (1457) Bishop of Ermland; in the following year, however, he ascended the papal throne as Pius II. The Peace of Thorn (1466) removed the diocese from the protectorate of the Teutonic Knights and placed it under the sovereignty of the King of Poland. This transfer caused the discord to break out afresh, for the King of Poland claimed for himself in Ermland the same right he exercised in the rest of his kingdom, that of naming the bishop. Bishop Nikolaus of Tüngen (1467–89) and especially the determined Lukas Watzelrode (1489–1512) energetically opposed these unjust claims and guarded the right of a free election of the bishop. In 1512 the latter bishop obtained from Pope Julius II the release of his diocese from its suffragan connexion, always a loose one, with the metropolitan See of Riga. When this relationship was dissolved Ermland was declared an exempt bishopric and has remained such ever since. Bishop Watzelrode was equally successful in regulating the internal affairs of his diocese. On 20 February, 1497, he held a diocesan synod at Heilsberg, where the bishops resided until 1800; in 1503 he made new laws for his domain, reorganized the cathedral school at Frauenburg, selecting for it excellent teachers, among whom was his celebrated nephew Copernicus, published the Breviary (Nuremberg, 1494) and the Missal (Strasburg, 1497), etc. His weak successor Fabian of Lozainen (1512–23), however, in the Treaty of Piotrkow (7 December, 1512), conceded to the King of Poland a limited influence in the election of bishops. Existing conditions were, however, entirely changed by the defection to Protestantism of Albrecht of Brandenburg, Grand Master of the Teutonic Knights, and the two bishops of the order who ruled Samland and Pomesanien, and the secularization of the dominion of the order by the Peace of Cracow (1525). Two-thirds of the former 220 parishes of Ermland went to the two apostate bishops. In these troubled times excellent episcopal rulers saved the diocese from complete defection; among these bishops was the energetic Moriz Ferber (1523–37), who by the ordinances issued in 1526 restored order to his desolated territory; another such bishop was Joannes Dantiscus (1537–48), a noted poet and diplomat, who conscientiously fulfilled his duties as bishop and raised the intellectual life of his clergy (concerning Dantiscus cf. Czaplicki, De vitâ et carminibus J. de Curiis Dantisci, Breslau, 1855; Geistliche Gedichte des Dantiscus übersetzt und herausgegeben von Franz Hipler, Münster, 1857).

But the bishops who deserve the greatest praise for holding the diocese to the Catholic Faith when threatened by the surrounding Protestantism were Stanislaus Hosius (1551–79), later a cardinal, who was distinguished for learning and virtue, and Martin Kromer (1579–89), a noted historian. Among the means successfully used for the maintenance of the Faith were the assembling of various diocesan synods, of which the most important was the one held by Hosius in 1565 for the purpose of carrying out the decisions of the Council of Trent; yearly visitations, and above all the founding of the Jesuit College at Braunsberg in 1565 [cf. Duhr, Geschichte der Jesuiten in den Ländern deutscher Zunge (Freiburg im Br., 1907), I, 179 sqq., 307 sqq.]. In addition to these the Congregation of St. Catherine (*Katharinerinnen*), founded at Braunsberg in 1571 by Regina Prothmann, did effective work in the instruction and training of girls; since the annulment of the right of teaching at the time of the *Kulturkampf* the congregation has devoted itself almost entirely to the nursing of the sick. In the seventeenth century (1626–30, 1655–56), and at the beginning of the eighteenth century (1703–09), the diocese was repeatedly ravaged by the Swedes, who forcibly suppressed the Catholic Church services and carried away its literary and artistic treasures. At the time of the First Partition of Poland (1772) the whole of Ermland fell to the share of the Kingdom of Prussia. In the Treaty of Warsaw (18 September, 1773), King Friedrich II, it is true, guaranteed the *status quo* and the free exercise of religion for the Catholics of the annexed provinces, nevertheless all schools and institutions for education and training under religious control were gradually suppressed, and the landed property of the Church secularized.

The Bull "De salute animarum", of 16 July, 1820,

readjusted ecclesiastical relations for Ermland as well as for the whole of Prussia. The Diocese of Ermland now received not only the territory which had been forcibly taken from it at the time of the Reformation, but there were incorporated in it as well the whole of the former Diocese of Samland, five deaneries of the former Diocese of Pomesanien, and, in 1854, the country surrounding Marienwerder. Among the more important Bishops of Ermland during the nineteenth century were: Philippus Krementz (1867–85), later cardinal and Archbishop of Cologne, and the successor of Bishop Krementz, Andreas Thiel (1885–1908); after the death of the latter (17 July, 1908), Professor August Bludau of Münster, a native of Ermland, was elected bishop of the diocese (26 Nov., 1908).

STATISTICS.—The Diocese of Ermland includes the whole province of East Prussia, which is composed of the government districts of Allenstein, Königsberg, and Gumbinnen, but those parts are excepted of the circles (subdivisions of a district) of Neidenburg and Osterode that belong to the Diocese of Culm; in the province of West Prussia Ermland includes the urban and rural circles of Elbing and the circle of Marienburg, all of which are in the government district of Danzig; also the whole circle of Stuhm and a part of the circle of Marienwerder in the government district of Marienwerder belong to the diocese. It is also divided into the following sixteen deaneries, each of which is under the direction of an archpriest: Allenstein, Braunsberg, Elbing, Guttstadt, Heilsberg, Littauen, Marienburg, Masuren, Mehlsack, Neuteich, Rössel, Samland, Seeburg, Stuhm, Wartenburg, Wormditt. In 1908 there were 141 parishes; 37 curacies and vicariates; 67 chaplaincies; 335 diocesan priests viz.: 171 parish priests and curates, 98 assistants, chaplains, and holders of benefices, 66 priests in other positions. *Religious*—Sisters of St. Catherine, 4 mother-houses (Braunsberg, Heilsberg, Rössel, Wormditt), 82 branch houses, and 364 religious; Grey Sisters (Sisters of St. Elizabeth), 4 houses and 69 religious; Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul, 2 houses, 17 religious. The Catholic higher schools of learning are, the Royal Lyceum Hosianum with philosophical and theological faculties, opened in 1818; at the close of 1908 the lyceum had 9 regular professors, 1 adjunct professor, 1 *Privatdozent* (instructor), 39 students; the seminary for priests at Braunsberg, reorganized in 1832; the gymnasium at Braunsberg, reopened in 1811; the progymnasium (studies not carried so far as in a gymnasium) at Rössel, founded in 1833, and the episcopal seminaries for boys at Braunsberg and Rössel, which are carried on in connexion with the last two institutions. The cathedral chapter is established at Frauenburg in the circle (subdistrict) of Braunsberg; since 1800 this city has also been the see of the bishop. The chapter consists of 8 canons, including the two dignitaries, a cathedral provost and a cathedral dean, 4 honorary canons, 5 cathedral vicars. Pope Benedict XIV granted the pallium and the *crux gestatoria* to the bishops. In 1901 Dr. Eduard Herrmann, a canon of the cathedral, was appointed auxiliary bishop and titular of the See of Cybistra. The Catholics number 327,567 in a total population of about 2,000,000. The most important building of the diocese is the Cathedral of the Assumption at Frauenburg. It is a splendid Gothic structure built of brick and begun by Bishop Heinrich II (1329–34); the choir was consecrated in 1342 and the nave, commenced in 1355, was completed in 1388 when the fine vestibule was finished. The best-known and most visited place of pilgrimage in the diocese is Heiligelinde.

TRETERUS, *De episcopatu et episcopis ecclesiæ Varmiensis* (Cracow, 1637); TYLKOWSKI, *Aræ gratitudinis: Elogia episcoporum Varmiensium* (Braunsberg, 1653); WYDZGA, *Series episcoporum Varmiensium* (Oliva, 1631); BECKMANN, *De primo episcopo Varmiæ commentatio* (Braunsberg, 1854); HIST. SOC. OF ERMLAND, *Monumenta historiæ Warmiensis oder Quellensammlung zur Geschichte Ermlands* (Mainz and Braunsberg, 1858–1906); HIPLER, *Literaturgeschichte des Bisthums Ermland* (Braunsberg and Leipzig, 1873); DITTRICH, *Die mittelalterliche Kunst im Ordensland Preussen* (Cologne, 1887); BRÜNING, *Stellung des Bistums Ermland zum deutschen Orden im 13jährigen Städtekriege* in *Altpreussische Monatsschrift* (Königsberg, 1892), XXIX; (Königsberg, 1895), XXXII; BÖTTICHER, *Bau- und Kunstdenkmäler der Provinz Ostpreussen* (Königsberg, 1894), Pt. IV: *Das Ermland;* BUCHHOLZ, *Abriss einer Geschichte Ermlands* (Braunsberg, 1903).

GREGOR REINHOLD.

Ernan, name of four Irish saints. O'Hanlon enumerates twenty-five saints bearing the name Ernan, Ernain, or Ernin; it is, therefore, not surprising that their Acts have become confused.

(1) ST. ERNAN, SON OF EOGAN, d. about 640. He is mentioned in the Martyrology of Tallagh on 1 January. He was a nephew of St. Columba, Feilim or Feidhlimidh (St. Columba's father) being his paternal grandfather. Owing to this relationship, some writers have mistaken our saint for Ernan of Hinba, an uncle of St. Columba. His monastery in Ireland was at Druim-Tomma in the district of Drumhome, County Donegal. Adamnan relates the wonderful vision he had on the night St. Columba died (Vit. S. Col., III, 23). Ernan, with some companions, was fishing in the River Finn, in Donegal. Suddenly at midnight he beheld the whole sky brightly illuminated. Looking towards the east he perceived an immense pillar of fire shining as the sun at noonday. This marvellous light then passed into the heavens, and a great darkness followed, as after the setting of the sun. This wonderful occurrence was related to Adamnan by Ernan himself, who at the time is described as "a very old man, a servant of Christ, whose name may be rendered Ferreolus, but in Irish Ernene (of the clan Mocufirroide), who, himself also a holy monk, is buried in the Ridge of Tomma (Drumhome) among the remains of other monks of St. Columba, awaiting the resurrection of the saints". Some writers style this St. Ernan, Abbot of Druim Tomma. It is uncertain whether he visited Scotland, nevertheless he is regarded as patron saint of Killernan, in Ross-shire; and it may be that the dedications of Kilviceuen (church of the son of Eogan) in Mull, and of Kilearnadale in Jura, Argyleshire, are in his honour. In the "Scottish Kalendars", collected by Bishop Forbes, his name appears as Ethernanus, and his commemoration is assigned to 21 and 22 December (pp. 170, 222, 243).

COLGAN, *Acta SS. Hib.*, 1 Jan.; FORBES, *Kalendars of Scottish Saints;* O'HANLON, *Lives of the Irish Saints* (Dublin, 1875), I, 21; ADAMNAN, ed. REEVES, *Life of St. Columba*, III, 23; GAMMACK in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.

(2) ST. ERNAN, ABBOT OF HINBA, lived in the sixth century. He was uncle of St. Columba, and one of the twelve who accompanied him from Ireland to Iona. He was brother of Ethnea, St. Columba's mother, and son of Dima, the son of Noe of the race of Cathaeir Ivor (Reeves, notes, p. 263). St. Columba appointed him superior of the community which he himself had established on the island of Hinba. The identity of Hinba has not been established with certainty. It may be Canna, about four miles N. W. of Rum (ibid., p. 264); but more likely it is Eilean-na-Naoimh, one of the Gaveloch Isles, between Scarba and Mull (Fowler's Adamnan, p. 87). Hinba was a favourite place of resort for St. Columba. There he was visited by St. Comgall, St. Cannich, St. Brendan, and St. Cormac. At the request of these holy men, St. Columba celebrated Mass, during which St. Brendan beheld a luminous globe of fire above St. Columba's head. It continued burning and rising up like a column of flame, till the Holy Mysteries had been completed (Adamnan, III, xvii). On another occasion, while visiting St. Ernan's monastery in Hinba, St. Columba was favoured with heavenly visions and revelations which lasted three days and nights (Adamnan, III, xviii). The death of St. Ernan was tragic. Being seized with an illness, he desired to be carried to Iona. St. Columba, greatly

rejoiced at his coming, started to meet him. Ernan likewise hastened, but when he was twenty-four paces from his nephew he fell to the earth and died. Thus was the prophecy of St. Columba fulfilled, that he would never again see Ernan alive (Adamnan, I, xlv).

(3) St. Ernan of Cluvain-Deoghra in Meath (or in County Longford), sixth or seventh century. He is commemorated on 11 January in the Martyrology of Tallagh. When St. Fechin visited St. Ernan at Cluvain-Deoghra the grinding noise of the mill outside the guest-house gave him much annoyance. St. Fechin blessed the mill, and it is said that in consequence thereof the noise ceased to be heard in the guest-house for the future.

O'Hanlon, *Lives of the Irish Saints*, I, 174; Colgan, *Acta SS. Hib.*, 138.

(4) St. Ernan of Torach, d. 17 August, about 650. He was son of Colman of the race of Eogan, son of Niall, and is numbered by some among the disciples of St. Columba. The latter saint founded a church and monastery on the island of Torach or Tory, off the N. W. coast of Donegal. It is uncertain whether St. Ernan actually accompanied St. Columba thither (the chronology would seem to preclude it), but he was chosen to be its abbot, and in after years was regarded as the local patron. Colgan has erroneously identified him with Ernan of Cluvain-Deoghra. It has been conjectured that this Ernan is identical with the Ernan whose name appears in the epistle of John, the pope-elect, to the prelates of North Ireland in 640. If this be so, he must have been a person of some importance. The whole question of the separate identity of the last three Ernans, as discussed by Colgan, Lanigan, and O'Hanlon, is exceedingly complex and obscure.

O'Hanlon, *Lives of the Irish Saints* (Dublin, 1875), I, 174; VIII, 239.

Columba Edmonds.

Ernin, Saint. See Mernoc.

Ernst of Hesse-Rheinfels, landgrave, b. 9 Dec., 1623, at Cassel; d. 12 May, 1693, at Cologne. He was the sixth son of Moritz, Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, after whose resignation of the government in 1627 to his son Wilhelm V, Ernst and his brother Hermann respectively founded the collateral lines of Hesse-Rheinfels and Hesse-Rotenburg. He figures prominently in the religious history of his country on account of the controversial literature called forth by his conversion to the Catholic Faith. Under the strict discipline of his mother his instruction in the principles of the Reformed Church received the utmost attention. After considerable travel he chose, in 1641, the military career. In 1642 he entered the Hessian army, proving himself an able commander of the Hessian troops who fought on the side of Sweden during the Thirty Years' War. While visiting the Hessian General Geyso, who was in prison at Gesecke, he was himself arrested and taken prisoner to Paderborn. His social intercourse here with the royal army chaplain laid the foundation of his conversion. After the Peace of Westphalia he took up the government of his portion of Hesse. His desire to establish a collateral line independent of Cassel brought him in 1650 to Vienna, where his conversion to the Catholic Church was effected by the Augustinian Alfons Staimos. Before his formal reception into the Church, he returned to Rheinfels and challenged the Hessian theologians, George Calixtus of Helmstadt, Crocius of Marburg, and Haberkorn of Giessen, to a public disputation on certain points of doctrine, with the Capuchin Valerian Magnus. After the disputation the landgrave made a formal profession of the Catholic Faith and gave the reasons for his conversion in the work: "Conversionis ad fidem Catholicam motiva S. et C. Principis ac Dom. Ernesti Hassiæ Landgravii" (Cologne, 1652). This work gave rise to a long and bitter controversy in which he himself took an active part, defending fearlessly in various writings against his opponents the course he had taken. His character as a prince is best described by himself in "Pourtraict ou description de la vie du Prince Ernest" (1669).

Koennecke in *Allgem. deut. Biogr.*, IV, 284; Hurter, *Nomenclator*. A list of the controversial literature is given by Streber in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.

Joseph Schroeder.

Ernulf, architect, b. at Beauvais, France, in 1040; d. 1124. He studied under Lanfranc at the monastery of Bec, entered the Benedictine Order, and lived long as a brother in the monastery of St-Lucien, Beauvais. At the suggestion of Lanfranc he went to England, sometime after 1070, and joined the monks of Christ Church, Canterbury. He was made prior by Archbishop Anselm, and in 1107 Abbot of Peterborough; in 1114 he was appointed Bishop of Rochester. While at Canterbury, he had taken down the eastern part of the church which Lanfranc had built, and erected a far more magnificent structure. This included the famous crypt (Our Lady of the Undercroft), as far as Trinity Tower. The chancel was finished by his successor Conrad. The chapel of St. Andrew is also part of Ernulf's work. At Peterborough and Rochester, Ernulf had the old buildings torn down and erected new dormitories, refectories, chapter house, etc. He is the author of "Textus Roffensis" (a large collection of documents relating to the Church of Rochester); "Collectanea de rebus eccl. Ruffensis" in P. L., CLXIII, 1443 sqq., also of several canonical and theological treatises in D'Achéry, "Spicileg.", III, 404 sqq.

Willis, *The Architectural History of Canterbury Cathedral* (London, 1854); Wright, *Biographia Britannica Literaria* (London, 1856); *MS. Cotton. Vespas, E. III, Bibl. Bodl., MS. Laud No. 40;* William of Malmesbury, *De Gest. Pontif.*, 234; *Hist. lit. de France*, Vol. X; R. L. Poole in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; Bateson, *Mediæval England* (London, 1904); Cox, *Canterbury* (London, 1905).

Thomas H. Poole.

Errington, William, priest, founder of Sedgley Park School, b. 17 July, 1716; d. 28 September, 1768. He was son of Mark Errington of Wiltshire, a descendant of the Erringtons of Walwick Grange, Northumberland; his mother's maiden name was Martha Baker. In 1737 he went to Douai, took the mission oath 28 December, 1741, and was ordained a priest in December, 1747. If he acted as professor at Douai after his ordination, as is generally stated, it could only have been for a very short time, as he left there for England, 26 March, 1748 (manuscript list of Douai clergy in the Westminster archives). On arrival in London he took up his residence with Bishop Challoner, then coadjutor to Bishop Petre. Kirk states that Dr. Challoner "had a high opinion of Mr. Errington, both as an active and zealous missionary and as a man of business". It was on account of these qualities that when the bishop wished to found a good middle-class school in England he induced Errington to undertake the work. It was a most difficult undertaking, and Errington made three unsuccessful attempts, the first in Buckinghamshire, the second in Wales, and the third at Betley near Newcastle-under-Lyne in Staffordshire, before he succeeded in founding a permanent school at Sedgley Park in the neighbourhood of Wolverhampton. On Lady-Day, 1763, he opened this school with twelve boys in the house known as the Park Hall, till then the residence of John, Lord Ward, afterwards Viscount Dudley and Ward. The little foundation was at once attacked in Parliament, but Lord Dudley successfully defended himself. The school was not interfered with; it developed into the famous Sedgley Park School which did good service to the Church for over a century, and is now represented by St. Wilfrid's College, Oakmoor, near Cheadle. Having founded the school, Errington's work there was done, and as soon as he secured the appointment of the Rev. Hugh Kendall as head-master in May, 1763, he returned to

Bishop Challoner in London. He was appointed archdeacon and treasurer of the "Old Chapter" and held these offices till his death.

Memoir of Errington in HUSENBETH, *Memoirs of Parkers* preserved (unpublished) at St. Wilfrid's College; KIRK, *Biographies of Eighteenth Century Catholics*, written early in the nineteenth century (London, 1908); HUSENBETH, *History of Sedgley Park School* (London, 1856); GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, II, 178; COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.

EDWIN BURTON.

Error, reduplicatively regarded, is in one way or another the product of ignorance. But besides the lack of information which it implies, it adds the positive element of a mental judgment, by which something false is held to be true, or something true avouched to be false. The subject-matter of error so far as morals go, like that of the want of knowledge whence it proceeds, is either (1) the law itself, or (2) a fact, or circumstance of a fact. In the first instance, one is astray in affirming or denying the existence of a law, or at any rate the inclusion of some individual case under its operation. In the second, one is labouring under an equal misapprehension, but with regard to some fact or aspect of a fact. Thus, for example, a Catholic, who in some unaccountable way would persuade himself that there was no law of abstinence on Friday, would be in error as to the law. If, although well aware of the precept of the Church, he is under the mistaken impression that a particular day, which happens to be Friday, is not Friday, he is in error as to the fact.

Taking account of the person in whom the error exists, it is said to be either vincible or invincible. Error is deemed to be invincible when, in spite of what is called moral diligence in the premises, it still persists. This may happen either because one has never been touched with any doubt as to the validity of one's stand, or as to the necessity of an inquiry, or it may be that one having, with full honesty of purpose, used such efforts as are demanded by the importance of the question at issue, is nevertheless unable to discover the truth. Much depends on the value to be attached to the phrase "moral diligence". It is not easy to state it in any set formula, unless it be this, that it is the diligence which prudent persons are accustomed to bring to bear upon the settlement of like matters. This notion may be set forth more in detail by the following considerations: (1) The moral diligence required does not mean that a person is to have recourse to every conceivable expedient. (2) It does imply that the endeavours made by an agent, to set himself right, should be such as are exacted by the seriousness of the business involved, as well as bear a proper ratio to his capacity and resources. Error is reckoned morally vincible as often as it is chargeable to the failure to exercise these ordinary and necessary precautions.

When an agent deliberately omits means calculated to dispel his error, or purposely fosters it, it is called affected. It is not so styled to indicate that it is simulated, but rather to point out that the erroneous tenet has been studiously aimed at. When the error is the offspring of sheer unrelieved negligence, it is termed crass. The influence of error on moral responsibility may be determined as follows. An act done in invincible error, whether the latter regard the fact or the law, is never impeachable as a sin. The reason is that, in this hypothesis, there is no knowledge of, and consequently no volition of, evil. On the contrary, what is done in morally vincible error is esteemed properly imputable to the agent. This is so, because the error itself is then of the agent's own choosing, and he is therefore accountable for its outcome. It is obvious, however, that the moral delinquency which has its rise in vincible error will have various degrees of guilt, in proportion to the greater or lesser culpability of the error itself.

SLATER, *Manual of Moral Theology* (New York, 1908); BALLERINI, *Opus Theologicum Morale* (Prato, 1898); MEYER, *Institutiones Juris Naturalis* (Freiburg, 1885); OJETTI, *Synopsis Rerum Moralium et Juris Pontificii* (Prato, 1904).

JOSEPH F. DELANY.

Erskine, CHARLES, Cardinal, b. at Rome, 13 Feb., 1739; d. at Paris, 20 March, 1811. He was the son of Colin Erskine of the Erskine family, who were Earls of Kellie and Mar; his mother was Agatha Gigli of the noble family of Gigli of Anagni. He was educated by Cardinal Henry, Duke of York, at the Scots College, Rome, and was afterwards a successful advocate, becoming Doctor of Laws in 1770. Pope Pius VI made him pro-auditor and Promoter of the Faith in 1782, also a domestic prelate, canon of St. Peter's, and dean of the college of consistorial advocates. He was ordained subdeacon, 28 August, 1783. In October, 1793, he was sent as papal envoy to England. By his tact and ability Mgr. Erskine established excellent relations with the Court and the ministry, diminished the dissensions among Catholics, and avoided stirring up any anti-Catholic demonstration against himself. During his stay in London the pope named him auditor, and in 1795 gave him additional powers as envoy extraordinary. He left London in 1801 and returned to Rome, where in January, 1803, he was created cardinal. As a member of the Propaganda he was still useful to English Catholics, and was made protector of Scotland. On the French invasion of Rome in 1808 he was made pro-secretary of Briefs, and was shut up in the Quirinal with the pope. When Pius VII was taken prisoner Erskine was allowed to go free, but his property was now lost and he would have been reduced to beggary if his Protestant relations had not made him an allowance. In 1809 Napoleon ordered him to Paris and though ill he was forced from Rome in January, 1810. Shortly after his arrival in Paris he fell into a gradual decline and soon died. He was buried in the church of Saint-Geneviève, now the Pantheon.

BRADY, *Memoirs of Cardinal Erskine* in *Anglo-Roman Papers* (London, 1890), from a MS. life by the cardinal's secretary, DEL MEDICO, now in the Ghislieri college, Rome; WARD, *Dawn of the Catholic Revival* (London, 1909).

EDWIN BURTON.

Erthal, FRANZ LUDWIG VON, Prince-Bishop of Würzburg and Bamberg, b. at Lohr on the Main, 16 September, 1730; d. at Würzburg, 16 February, 1795. After studying theology at Mainz, Würzburg, and Rome, and jurisprudence at Vienna he became president of the secular Government of Würzburg in 1762. When he was sent in 1768 as Ambassador to Vienna to get the imperial investiture for Adam Friedrich, Count von Seinsheim, the Prince-Bishop of Würzburg, Emperor Joseph II made him imperial privy councillor and inspector of the Imperial Chamber (Supreme Court of the empire) at Wetzlar. In 1776 he took part as imperial commissioner in the Diet of Ratisbon. He succeeded Adam Friedrich as Prince-Bishop of Würzburg, 18 March, 1779, and as Prince-Bishop of Bamberg on the following 12 April. His rule was a blessing for Church and State. Being himself deeply religious, he endeavoured to imbue his clergy and people with the spirit of true faith and piety. As far as the Church and his episcopal position permitted, he yielded to the rationalistic tendencies of the age, but was a stanch defender of papal rights against the adherents of Febronianism. As temporal ruler he never allowed personal considerations to outweigh the welfare of the people, and used his private means for the erection and improvement of charitable institutions. At Bamberg he founded a hospital which at that time was a model of its kind, and at Würzburg he greatly improved and partly rebuilt the already existing hospital of St. Julius. He improved the entire educational system, bettered the economic conditions of rural life and of the civil administration, and set the finances of his

principalities on a firm basis. Von Erthal is the author of a work in German, refuting the revolutionary principles of his age, which is entitled: "Ueber den herrschenden Geist dieser Zeiten und über das Verhalten des rechtschaffenen Christen bei denselben" (Würzburg, 1793). Some of his sermons were collected and published after his death (Bamberg, 1797).

LEITSCHUH, *Franz Ludwig von Erthal, Fürstbischof von Bamberg und Würzburg, Herzog von Franken* (Bamberg, 1894); Earlier biographies were written by SPRENKE (Würzburg, 1826), BERNHARD (Tübingen, 1852), ROTHLAUF (Bamberg, 1865), MÖLLER (Passau, 1880).

MICHAEL OTT.

Erthal, FRIEDRICH KARL JOSEPH, Freiherr von, last Elector and Archbishop of Mainz, b. 3 Jan., 1719, at Mainz; d. 25 July, 1802, at Aschaffenburg. He was an unworthy brother of Franz Ludwig, the Prince-Bishop of Bamberg and Würzburg, received his education at Reims, held prebends in Bamberg and Mainz at an early age, became canon at the cathedral of Mainz in 1753, rector of the university in 1754, president of the Aulic Council in 1758, and custos of the cathedral in 1768. From 1769–1774 he was plenipotentiary of the Electorate of Mainz at the imperial court of Vienna. On 18 July, 1774, he succeeded the deceased von Breidbach-Bürresheim as Elector and Archbishop of Mainz and eight days later as Prince-Bishop of Worms. He was ordained priest on 11 Sept., 1774, and received episcopal consecration the following year on 14 May. At the beginning of his reign it appeared as if he would try to stem the tide of rationalism which had swept over the Church of Mainz during the weak rule of von Breidbach-Bürresheim. One of his first acts as bishop was the dismissal of the free-thinking councillors of his predecessor. Soon, however, he became one of the most notable supporters of free-thought in theology and of Febronianism in the government of the Church. George Förster, a Protestant, became his librarian and William Heinse, another Protestant, and author of the the lascivious romance "Ardinghello", was his official reader. Erthal suppressed the Carthusian monastery and two nunneries at Mainz and used their revenues to meet the expenses of the university, in which he appointed numerous Protestants and free-thinkers as professors. Notorious unbelievers such as Anthony Blau and others were invited to the university in 1784 to supplant the Jesuits in the faculty of theology.

As a spiritual ruler, Erthal was guided by the principles of Febronianism. In union with the Archbishops Max Franz of Cologne, Clemens Wenzeslaus of Trier, and Hieronymus Joseph of Salzburg he convoked the Congress of Ems at which twenty-three antipapal articles, known as the "Punctation of Ems", were drawn up and signed by the plenipotentiaries of the four archbishops on 25 August, 1786. The purpose of the Punctation was to lower the papal dignity to a merely honorary primacy and to make the pope a *primus inter pares*, with practically no authority over the territories of the archbishops. In order to increase his political influence he joined (25 October, 1785) the Confederation of Princes which was established by King Frederick the Great. In 1787 he apparently receded from the schismatic position of the Punctation of Ems and applied to Rome for a renewal of his quinquennial faculties and for the approbation of his new coadjutor, Karl Theodor von Dalberg. Somewhat later, however, he resumed his opposition to papal authority and continued to adhere to the Punctation even after the other archbishops had rejected it. His opposition was made futile by the revolutionary wars which raged in his electorate from 1792–1801. By the treaty of Campo-Formio in 1797 Erthal was deprived of his possessions west of the Rhine and by the Concordat of 1801 he lost also spiritual jurisdiction over that part of his diocese. The negotiations concerning the reimbursement of Erthal for the loss of his territory west of the Rhine were not yet completed when he died.

FLIEDNER, *Gedächtnissrede auf Friedrich Karl Joseph* (Frankfort, 1802); BRÜCK, *Die rationalist. Bestrebungen im kath. Deutschland* (Mainz, 1865); IDEM, *Gesch. der kath. Kirche in Deutschland im neunzehnten Jahrh.* (Mainz, 1902), I, 9 sqq. et passim; BOCKENHEIMER, *Kurmainz im Fürstenbunde* (Mainz, 1905); IDEM, *Die Restauration der Mainzer Hochschule* (Mainz, 1885); HENNES, *Erzbischöfe von Mainz* (Mainz, 1879), 327 sqq.; SENNER, *Der Dom zu Mainz* (Mainz, 1827), III, 230 sqq.

MICHAEL OTT.

Erwin of Steinbach, one of the architects of the Strasburg cathedral, date of birth unknown; d. at Strasburg, 17 January, 1318. According to a tradition which arose in a later age he was called Erwin of Steinbach, and a monument has been erected to him in the village of Steinbach near Baden-Baden. Two of his sons, Erwin and Johannes, after them his grandson Gerlach, from 1341–71 and, up to 1382, another scion of the family named Kuntze, were also superintending architects. Hence they were heads of the Strasburg guild of stone-masons, the influence of which extended as far as Bavaria, Austria, and the borders of Italy. No written account exists as to the training for his work which the elder Erwin received. It must, however, be taken for granted that he had proved his abilities as a master-builder in other places before he was entrusted with the construction of the façade of the cathedral of Strasburg about the year 1277. His work on the cathedral shows the influence of the French Gothic. When Erwin took charge of the construction the cathedral was completed except the porch of the tower, and reflected in its parts the development of architectural styles from the first quarter of the eleventh century. As a matter of fact, the west front was now built by three masters, of whom one was Erwin. At the same time a part of the nave that had been badly damaged by fire in 1298 had to be repaired. Three plans of the façade are still in existence; according to Dehio the best design belongs to Erwin, to whom it is customary to ascribe the entire construction. Eichborn, it is true, has tried to prove that Erwin drew the weakest of the three plans. In any case the three master-architects by their joint work deserve the praise that, especially since Goethe, has been assigned to Erwin alone; they are not responsible, however, for the ungraceful central screen of the third story between the towers, nor for the pinnacle of the north tower. This front offers a happy combination of horizontal members in the French style with the German principle of daring height. The rose-window, also French in design and placed in the central one of the nine fields, gives a welcome point of rest to the eye. The somewhat peculiar ornamentation consists of a double tracery of bars and geometrical designs which covers the façade like a net dividing and filling the large surfaces. By the novelty and the daring of the new style the individual members of this façade are in marked contrast to the older parts of the building; the front, moreover, is connected directly with the body of the cathedral. The ornamental sculpture of the building, which is richer than that ordinarily found in German cathedrals, is attributed to Erwin's workshop, from which came also the monument to Conrad of Lichtenberg in the chapel of St. John. In this chapel the early Gothic forms correspond to the carving in the chapter-hall. Erwin's last work was the construction of the beautiful chapel of the Blessed Virgin. The legend of the woman sculptor, Savina, who, it is asserted, was a daughter of Erwin, rests on a mistaken interpretation of the words of a scroll. The inscriptions referring to Erwin, which along with tradition are our only sources of information, have also given rise to various doubts.

WOLTMANN, *Geschichte der deutschen Kunst im Elsass* (Leipzig, 1876), v–vi and Supplement; IDEM, *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* (1876), I; KRAUS, *ibid.*; IDEM in *Kunstchronik*, XI; IDEM, *Kunst und Altertum in Elsass-Lothringen* (1877);

LEITSCHUH, *Strassburg* (Bielefeld, 1903); DEHIO, *Kirchliche Baukunst des Abendlands* (1892–1901).

G. GIETMANN.

Erythræ, a titular see in Asia Minor. According to legend the city was founded by colonists from Crete. The name must have been derived from the red stone common in the country. Ruled by kings at first, the city passed through periods of oligarchy and democracy, became tributary to Crœsus and Cyrus, submitted to Athens, then to Sparta, and finally obtained independence. After Alexander, it had various masters until 191 B. C., when it took sides with the Romans, though still preserving its autonomy. Finally it was incorporated with the province of Asia. Erythræ was famous for its Sibyl Herophile and its temples of Hercules, Athena Polias, etc. At an early date it became a suffragan of Ephesus; to the bishops mentioned by Lequien (Or. christ., I, 727): Eutychius (431), Dracontius (451), Theoctistus (553), Eustathius (787), Arsaphius (868), may be added Michael in 1229 (Revue des études grecques, VII, 80). By the sixteenth century the see had disappeared, together with the city and its port. A new village has arisen on its site, Litri or Rithri, not far from Tshesmé, in the vilayet of Aidin or Smyrna. The ruins include walls which are about three miles in circuit, a theatre, aqueducts, columns, and a Byzantine fortress.

TEXIER, *Asie Mineure*, 366–369; LAMPRECHT, *De rebus Erythræorum publicis* (Berlin, 1871); GÆBLER, *Erythræ* (Berlin, 1892); BUERCHNER in PAULY-WISSOWA, *Real-Encyc.*, s. v.; SMITH, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Geog.* (London, 1878), I, 850–52.

S. VAILHÉ.

JACOB BEING BLESSED BY ISAAC
Raphael, Vatican Loggie

Erzerum (THEODOSIOPOLIS), DIOCESE OF (ERZERUMIENSIS ARMENIORUM). The native name, Garin (Gr. Καρηνῖτις; Arab. Kalikelah), is still used by the Armenians. The kings of Armenia established here their summer residence. Later Garin fell into the power of the Byzantines, who named it Theodosiopolis (415), under which title it is still a Latin titular see. It became then a Greek bishopric, suffragan to Cæsarea of Cappadocia. Three bishops are known at this period, Peter (448), Manasses (451), and another Peter (553). (See Lequien, Or. christ., I, 437.) This ecclesiastical situation lasted at least until the ninth century. In the eleventh century, owing to a confusion with another Theodosiopolis in Mesopotamia, the see passed under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Antioch. From 622 to 633, a great council, which brought about a temporary union of the Armenian and Greek Churches, was held at Garin; the Emperor Heraclius attended with the Armenian and Greek patriarchs and many bishops of both Churches (Hefele, III, 73, 132). In 1201 the city was plundered by the Seljuk Turks, who named it Erzerum, which appears to mean "the country of the Romans", that is to say of the Greeks, though some think that the name is a corruption of Arzen er-Roum, Arzen being an ancient Armenian city in the neighbourhood. Erzerum was captured in 1214 by the sultans of Iconium, in 1387 by Timur-Leng, in 1400 by the Osmanli Turks. In 1430 it fell into the power of local dynasties, which held it under the hegemony of Persia until 1514, when it passed again to the Osmanlis. In 1828 and 1878 it was occupied by the Russians. In 1859 it was almost destroyed by an earthquake.

Erzerum is built at an altitude of over six thousand feet on a hill, which is surrounded by mountains of some ten thousand feet in height. The climate is healthful, but rigorous. Winter lasts eight and summer only four months. The Western Euphrates (Kara Su) is about four miles from the city. Garin is the capital of a vilayet and has a population of about 40,000, of whom 27,000 are Turks, the rest Armenians, Greeks, and a few Europeans (about 900 Catholics, mostly Armenians). The city is divided into three parts: the citadel, near the centre of the city, the city proper surrounded by a double wall, and four suburbs. There are 65 mosques, many churches, and several large bazaars. The chief industries are blacksmiths' and coppersmiths' work. Besides the Greek metropolitan, still subject to the Patriarch of Antioch, Gregorian and Catholic Armenian bishops reside at Erzerum. The Diocese of Theodosiopolis (Erzerum) was re-established in 1850 and on 10 July, 1883, divided into the Dioceses of Erzerum and Mush. The former diocese has (1909) 10,000 faithful, 38 priests, 30 parishes, 66 churches or chapels, a seminary, 19 schools with about 1000 pupils, and a hospital. Armenian Sisters of the Immaculate Conception have a monastery. Two Capuchins conduct the Latin mission.

CURZON, *A Year of Erzeroum* (London, 1854); MILLINGEN, *La Turquie sous Abd-ul-Aziz* (1868), ch. xvi; CUINET, *La Turquie d'Asie* (Paris, 1892), I, 180–191; *Missiones catholicæ* (Rome, 1907), 753; WEBER, *Kath. Kirche in Armenien* (Freiburg, 1903), 386.

S. VAILHÉ.

Esau (עֵשָׂו, hairy), the eldest son of Isaac and Rebecca, the twin-brother of Jacob. The struggle of the two brothers, when still within Rebecca's womb, was prophetic of the lifelong opposition, deepening at times into hatred, which marked the relations between Esau and Jacob (Gen., xxv, 22 sq.). Esau, who came forth first, when grown up, became a skilful hunter, and was much loved by Isaac, who ate of his hunting (Gen., xxv, 24–28). "Coming faint out of the field", and much moved by the sight and savour of the pottage boiled by his brother, Esau said to Jacob, "Give me of this red pottage". No doubt already informed as to the import of the oracle revealed to Rebecca, Jacob was quick to draw advantage from the greed of his famished brother. Consenting to the condition imposed, Esau not only exchanged his first birthright for the red pottage, but even confirmed the sale by an oath, saying, "Lo, I die; what will the first birthright avail me? . . . . . And so taking bread and the pottage of lentils, he ate, and drank, and went his way; making little account of having sold his first birthright" (Gen., xxv, 29–34). That this transaction was widely known is justly inferred from the very name (*Edom*, red), which, though rarely given to Esau himself, is almost universally applied to his descendants. "Esau, being forty years old, married wives, Judith, the daughter of Beeri the

Hethite, and Basemath the daughter of Elon of the same place'' (Gen., xxvi, 34). This selection of Chanaanite wives, who "both offended the mind of Isaac and Rebecca'' (Gen., xxvi, 35), seemed to have caused peculiar suffering to Rebecca, who, speaking with her husband, declared, "I am weary of my life because of the daughters of Heth: if Jacob take a wife of the stock of this land, I choose not to live'' (Gen., xxvii, 46). Old and with eyes so dim he could not see, Isaac ordered Esau to take quiver and bow, so that after having prepared a savoury dish with the fruit of his hunting, he might receive the parting blessing, belonging to the eldest son. Esau, yielding ready obedience, went "into the field to fulfil his father's commandment''. (Gen., xxvii, 1–5.) Meanwhile, clothed with the very good garments of his older brother, with hands and neck so carefully covered under the tender hides of the kids as to resemble the hairy skin of Esau, Jacob, following in every detail the advice of Rebecca, knelt before Isaac, offered the savoury dish, and begged and obtained the coveted blessing. Great then was the astonishment, and genuine the indignation, of the disappointed Esau, who "roared out with a great cry'', on hearing the deceived Isaac declare, "thy brother came deceitfully and got thy blessing''. Though sympathizing with his grief-stricken son, Isaac, realizing more fully the import of the oracle communicated to Rebecca, felt impelled to add: "I have blessed him, and he shall be blessed''; "I have appointed him thy lord, and have made all his brethren his servants''. (Gen., xxvii, 6–37.) The restraining influence of the father's presence is admirably portrayed in the few words uttered by Esau: "the days will come of the mourning of my father, and I will kill my brother Jacob'' (Gen., xxvii, 41). That this exclamation revealed a deep-seated purpose, the evident anxiety of Rebecca, the hasty flight of Jacob to Haran, and his long stay with his uncle Laban, clearly demonstrated. (Gen., xxvii, 42–xxxi, 38.) Indeed, even after a self-imposed exile of twenty years, the carefully instructed messengers sent to Esau in the land of Seir (Gen., xxxii, 3) and the strategic division of his household and flocks into two companies clearly indicate Jacob's abiding sense of distrust (Gen., xxxii, 4–8).

After extending a cordial welcome to his returning brother, Esau parted from Jacob and "returned, that day, the way that he came, to Seir'' (Gen., xxxiii, 1–16), where he and his descendants became exceedingly rich (Gen., xxxvi, 1–8). The very name *Edomite*, given to the descendants of Esau (Edom), has served to perpetuate the remembrance of the circumstances attending Esau's birth and the sale of his first birthright. From the noteworthy preference of Jacob to Esau (Gen., xxv, 22 sq.), St. Paul (Rom., ix, 4–16) shows that in the mystery of election and grace God is bound to no particular nation and is influenced by no prerogative of birth or antecedent merit. When Isaac, old and full of days, had died, we find Esau with Jacob at Hebron, there to bury their father in the cave of Machpelah (Gen., xxxv, 28–29).

PALIS in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v.; COWAN in HASTINGS, *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v.; DODS, *Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph* (London, 1880).

DANIEL P. DUFFY.

Esch (ESCHIUS), NICOLAUS VAN, a famous mystical theologian, b. in Oisterwijk near Hertogenbosch (Bois-le-Duc), Holland, in 1507; d. 19 July, 1578. After finishing his classical studies in the school of the Hieronymites, he studied philosophy, theology, and canon law at Louvain, but refused to take his doctor's degree. In 1530 he was ordained priest, and then settled in Cologne in order to devote himself to higher studies and the practice of Christian perfection. At the same time he became the private tutor of a number of young men, mainly university students. Blessed Peter Canisius and Lawrence Surius are the most celebrated of his pupils. In Cologne, too, he contracted a close friendship with several members of the Carthusian Order, among whom Johann Landsberger, Gerhard Hamontanus, and Theodorich and Bruno Loher are worthy of special mention. Though his feeble health did not allow him to become a member of the order, he lived in the monastery, for a time at least, and followed its rule of life as closely as possible. In 1538 Nicolaus was appointed pastor of the Béguinage at Diest; after a year he surrendered his charge for a time, but took it up again with such success that after his death he was commonly spoken of as the saintly Father Eschius. He was also instrumental in founding several diocesan seminaries according to the rules laid down by the Council of Trent. Among his literary works the following are worthy of note: "Introductio in vitam introversam'', which is really an introduction to a new edition of the "Templum animæ'' (Antwerp, 1563 etc.); "Exercitia theologiæ mysticæ, seu exercitia quædam pia, quæ compendio hominem ad vitam perfectam instituendam juvare possunt'' (Antwerp, 1563).

HURTER, *Nomenclator* (Innsbruck, 1892); HERMES in *Kirchenlexikon* (Freiburg, 1886), IV, 888.

A. J. MAAS.

Eschatology, that branch of systematic theology which deals with the doctrines of the last things (*τὰ ἔσχατα*). The Greek title is of comparatively recent introduction, but in modern usage it has largely supplanted its Latin equivalent *De Novissimis*. As the numerous doctrinal subjects belonging to this section of theology will be treated *ex professo* under their several proper titles, it is proposed in this article merely to take such a view of the whole field as will serve to indicate the place of eschatology in the general framework of religion, explain its subject-matter and the outlines of its content in the various religions of mankind, and illustrate by comparison the superiority of Christian eschatological teaching.

As a preliminary indication of the subject-matter, a distinction may be made between the eschatology of the individual and that of the race and the universe at large. The former, setting out from the doctrine of personal immortality, or at least of survival in some form after death, seeks to ascertain the fate or condition, temporary or eternal, of individual souls, and how far the issues of the future depend on the present life. The latter deals with events like the resurrection and the general judgment, in which, according to Christian Revelation, all men will participate, and with the signs and portents in the moral and physical order that are to precede and accompany those events. Both aspects—the individual and the universal—belong to the adequate concept of eschatology; but it is only in Christian teaching that both receive due and proportionate recognition. Jewish eschatology only attained its completion in the teaching of Christ and the Apostles; while in ethnic religions eschatology seldom rose above the individual view, and even then was often so vague, and so little bound up with any adequate notion of Divine justice and of moral retribution, that it barely deserves to be ranked as religious teaching.

I. ETHNIC ESCHATOLOGIES.—(1) Even among the lower—savage and barbarian—races the universality of religious beliefs, including belief in some kind of existence after death, is very generally admitted by modern anthropologists. Some exceptions, it is true, have been claimed to exist; but on closer scrutiny the evidence for this claim has broken down in so many cases that we are justified in presuming against any exception. Among the lower races the truth and purity of eschatological beliefs vary, as a rule, with the purity of the idea of God and of the moral standards that prevail. Some savages seem to limit existence after death to the good (with extinction for the wicked), as the Nicaraguas, or to men of rank, as the

l'ongas; while the Greenlanders, New Guinea negroes, and others seem to hold the possibility of a second death, in the other world or on the way to it. The next world itself is variously located—on the earth, in the skies, in the sun or moon—but most commonly under the earth; while the life led there is conceived either as a dull and shadowy and more or less impotent existence, or as an active continuation in a higher or idealized form of the pursuits and pleasures of earthly life. In most savage religions there is no very high or definite doctrine of moral retribution after death; but it is only in the case of a few of the most degraded races, whose condition is admittedly the result of degeneration, that the notion of retribution is claimed to be altogether wanting. Sometimes mere physical prowess, as bravery or skill in the hunt or in war, takes the place of a strictly ethical standard; but, on the other hand, some savage religions contain unexpectedly clear and elevated ideas of many primary moral duties.

(2) Coming to the higher or civilized races, we shall glance briefly at the eschatology of the Babylonian and Assyrian, Egyptian, Indian, Persian, and Greek religions. Confucianism can hardly be said to have an eschatology, except the very indefinite belief involved in the worship of ancestors, whose happiness was held to depend on the conduct of their living descendants. Mohammedan eschatology contains nothing distinctive except the glorification of barbaric sensuality.

(a) *Babylonian and Assyrian.*—In the ancient Babylonian religion (with which the Assyrian is substantially identical) eschatology never attained, in the historical period, any high degree of development. Retribution is confined almost, if not quite, entirely to the present life, virtue being rewarded by the Divine bestowal of strength, prosperity, long life, numerous offspring, and the like, and wickedness punished by contrary temporal calamities. Yet the existence of an hereafter is believed in. A kind of semi-material ghost, or shade, or double (*ekimmu*), survives the death of the body, and when the body is buried (or, less commonly, cremated) the ghost descends to the underworld to join the company of the departed. In the "Lay of Ishtar" this underworld, to which she descended in search of her deceased lover and of the "waters of life", is described in gloomy colours; and the same is true of the other descriptions we possess. It is the "pit", the "land of no return", the "house of darkness", the "place where dust is their bread, and their food is mud"; and it is infested with demons, who, at least in Ishtar's case, are empowered to inflict various chastisements for sins committed in the upper world.

Though Ishtar's case is held by some to be typical in this respect, there is otherwise no clear indication of a doctrine of moral penalties for the wicked, and no promise of rewards for the good. Good and bad are involved in a common dismal fate. The location of the region of the dead is a subject of controversy among Assyriologists, while the suggestion of a brighter hope in the form of a resurrection (or rather of a return to earth) from the dead, which some would infer from the belief in the "waters of life" and from references to Marduk, or Merodach, as "one who brings the dead to life", is an extremely doubtful conjecture. On the whole there is nothing hopeful or satisfying in the eschatology of this ancient religion.

(b) *Egyptian.*—On the other hand, in the Egyptian religion, which for antiquity competes with the Babylonian, we meet with a highly developed and comparatively elevated eschatology. Leaving aside such difficult questions as the relative priority and influence of different, and even conflicting, elements in the Egyptian religion, it will suffice for the present purpose to refer to what is most prominent in Egyptian eschatology taken at its highest and best. In the first place, then, life in its fullness, unending life with Osiris, the sun-god, who journeys daily through the underworld, even identification with the god, with the right to be called by his name, is what the pious Egyptian looked forward to as the ultimate goal after death. The departed are habitually called the "living"; the coffin is the "chest of the living", and the tomb the "lord of life". It is not merely the disembodied spirit, the soul as we understand it, that continues to live, but the soul with certain bodily organs and functions suited to the conditions of the new life. In the elaborate anthropology which underlies Egyptian eschatology, and which we find it hard to understand, several constituents of the human person are distinguished, the most important of which is the *Kâ*, a kind of semi-material double; and to the justified who pass the judgment after death the use of these several constituents, separated by death, is restored.

This judgment which each undergoes is described in detail in chapter cxxv of the Book of the Dead. The examination covers a great variety of personal, social, and religious duties and observances; the deceased must be able to deny his guilt in regard to forty-two great categories of sins, and his heart (the symbol of conscience and morality) must stand the test of being weighed in the balance against the image of Maāt, goddess of truth or justice. But the new life that begins after a favourable judgment is not at first any better or more spiritual than life on earth. The justified is still a wayfarer with a long and difficult journey to accomplish before he reaches bliss and security in the fertile fields of Aalu. On this journey he is exposed to a variety of disasters, for the avoidance of which he depends on the use of his revivified powers and on the knowledge he has gained in life of the directions and magical charms recorded in the Book of the Dead, and also, and perhaps most of all, on the aids provided by surviving friends on earth. It is they who secure the preservation of his corpse that he may return and use it, who provide an indestructible tomb as a home or shelter for his Kâ, who supply food and drink for his sustenance, offer up prayers and sacrifices for his benefit, and aid his memory by inscribing on the walls of the tomb, or writing on rolls of papyrus enclosed in the wrappings of the mummy, chapters from the Book of the Dead. It does not, indeed, appear that the dead were ever supposed to reach a state in which they were independent of these earthly aids. At any rate they were always considered free to revisit the earthly tomb, and in making the journey to and fro the blessed had the power of transforming themselves at will into various animal-shapes. It was this belief which, at the degenerate stage at which he encountered it, Herodotus mistook for the doctrine of the transmigration of souls. It should be added that the identification of the blessed with Osiris ("Osiris N. N." is a usual form of inscription) did not, at least in the earlier and higher stage of Egyptian religion, imply pantheistic absorption in the deity or the loss of individual personality. Regarding the fate of those who fail in the judgment after death, or succumb in the second probation, Egyptian eschatology is less definite in its teaching. "Second death" and other expressions applied to them might seem to suggest annihilation; but it is sufficiently clear from the evidence as a whole that continued existence in a condition of darkness and misery was believed to be their portion. And as there were degrees in the happiness of the blessed, so also in the punishment of the lost (see Book of the Dead, tr. Budge, London, 1901).

(c) *Indian.*—In the Vedic, the earliest historical form of the Indian religion, eschatological belief is simpler and purer than in the Brahministic and Buddhistic forms that succeeded it. Individual immortality is clearly taught. There is a kingdom of the dead under the rule of Yama, with distinct realms for the good and the wicked. The good dwell in a realm

of light and share in the feasts of the gods; the wicked are banished to a place of "nethermost darkness". Already, however, in the later Vedas, where these beliefs find developed expression, retribution begins to be ruled more by ceremonial observances than by strictly moral tests. On the other hand, there is no trace as yet of the dreary doctrine of transmigration, but critics profess to discover the germs of later pantheism.

In Brahminism (q. v.) retribution gains in prominence and severity, but becomes hopelessly involved in transmigration, and is made more and more dependent either on sacrificial observances or on theosophical knowledge. Though after death there are numerous heavens and hells for the reward and punishment of every degree of merit and demerit, these are not final states, but only so many preludes to further rebirths in higher or lower forms. Pantheistic absorption in Brahma, the world-soul and only reality, with the consequent extinction of individual personality—this is the only final solution of the problem of existence, the only salvation to which man may ultimately look forward. But it is a salvation which only a few may hope to reach after the present life, the few who have acquired a perfect knowledge of Brahma. The bulk of men who cannot rise to this high philosophic wisdom may succeed, by means of sacrificial observances, in gaining a temporary heaven, but they are destined to further births and deaths.

Buddhist eschatology still further develops and modifies the philosophical side of the Brahministic doctrine of salvation, and culminates in what is, strictly speaking, the negation of eschatology and of all theology—a religion without a God, and a lofty moral code without hope of reward or fear of punishment hereafter. Existence itself, or at least individual existence, is the primary evil; and the craving for existence, with the many forms of desire it begets, is the source of all the misery in which life is inextricably involved. Salvation, or the state of Nirvana, is to be attained by the utter extinction of every kind of desire; and this is possible by knowledge—not the knowledge of God or the soul, as in Brahminism, but the purely philosophical knowledge of the real truth of things. For all who do not reach this state of philosophic enlightenment or who fail to live up to its requirements—that is to say for the vast bulk of mankind—there is nothing in prospect save a dreary cycle of deaths and rebirths with intercalated heavens and hells; and in Buddhism this doctrine takes on a still more dread and inexorable character than in pre-Buddhistic Brahminism. (See BUDDHISM.)

(d) *Persian.*—In the ancient Persian religion (Zoroastrianism, Mazdaism, Parseeism) we meet with what is perhaps, in its better elements, the highest type of ethnic eschatology. But as we know it in the Parsee literature, it contains elements that were probably borrowed from other religions; and as some of this literature is certainly post-Christian, the possibility of Jewish and even Christian ideas having influenced the later eschatological developments is not to be lost sight of. The radical defect of the Persian religion was its dualistic conception of deity. The physical and moral world is the theatre of a perpetual conflict between Ahura Mazda (Ormuzd), the good, and Angra-Mainyu (Ahriman), the evil, principle, co-creators of the universe and of man. Yet the evil principle is not eternal *ex parte post;* he will finally be vanquished and exterminated. A pure monotheistic Providence promises at times to replace dualism, but never quite succeeds—the latest effort in this direction being the belief in Zvran Akarana, or Boundless Time, as the supreme deity above both Ahriman and Ormuzd. Morality has its sanction not merely in future retribution, but in the present assurance that every good and pious deed is a victory for the cause of Ahura Mazda; but the call to the individual to be active in this cause, though vigorous and definite enough, is never quite free from ritual and ceremonial conditions, and as time goes on becomes more and more complicated by these observances, especially by the laws of purity. Certain elements are holy (fire, earth, water), certain others unholy or impure (dead bodies, the breath, and all that leaves the body, etc.); and to defile oneself or the holy elements by contact with the impure is one of the deadliest sins. Consequently corpses could not be buried or cremated, and were accordingly exposed on platforms erected for the purpose, so that birds of prey might devour them. When the soul leaves the body it has to cross the bridge of Chinvat (or Kinvad), the bridge of the Gatherer, or Accountant. For three days good and evil spirits contend for the possession of the soul, after which the reckoning is taken, and the just man is rejoiced by the apparition, in the form of a fair maiden, of his good deeds, words, and thoughts, and passes over safely to a paradise of bliss; while the wicked man is confronted by a hideous apparition of his evil deeds, and is dragged down to hell. If the judgment is neutral the soul is reserved in an intermediate state (so at least in the Pahlavi books) till the decision at the last day. The developed conception of the last days, as it appears in the later literature, has certain remarkable affinities with Jewish Messianic and millennial expectations. A time during which Ahriman will gain the ascendancy is to be followed by two millennial periods, in each of which a great prophet will appear to herald the coming of Soshyant (or Sosioch), the Conqueror and Judge, who will raise the dead to life. The resurrection will occupy fifty-seven years and will be followed by the general judgment, the separation of the good from the wicked, and the passing of both through a purgatorial fire, gentle for the just, terrible for sinners, but leading to the restoration of all. Next will follow the final combat between the good and the evil spirits, in which the latter will perish, all except Ahriman and the serpent Azhi, whose destruction is reserved to Ahura Mazda and Scraosha, the priest-god. And last of all hell itself will be purged, and the earth renewed by purifying fire.

(e) *Greek.*—Greek eschatology as reflected in the Homeric poems remains at a low level. It is only very vaguely retributive and is altogether cheerless in its outlook. Life on earth, for all its shortcomings, is the highest good for men, and death the worst of evils. Yet death is not extinction. The ψυχή survives—not the purely spiritual soul of later Greek and Christian thought, but an attenuated, semi-material ghost, or shade, or image, of the earthly man; and the life of this shade in the underworld is a dull, impoverished, almost functionless existence. Nor is there any distinction of fates either by way of happiness or of misery in Hades. The judicial office of Minos is illusory, and has nothing to do with earthly conduct; and there is only one allusion to the Furies suggestive of their activity among the dead (Iliad, XIX, 258–60). Tartarus, the lower hell, is reserved for a few special rebels against the gods, and the Elysian Fields for a few special favourites chosen by divine caprice.

In later Greek thought touching the future life there are notable advances beyond the Homeric stage, but it is doubtful whether the average popular faith ever reached a much higher level. Among early philosophers Anaxagoras contributes to the notion of a purely spiritual soul; but a more directly religious contribution is made by the Eleusinian and Orphic Mysteries, to the influence of which in brightening and moralizing the hope of a future life we have the concurrent witness of philosophers, poets, and historians. In the Eleusinian Mysteries there seems to have been no definite doctrinal teaching—merely the promise or assurance for the initiated of the fullness of life hereafter. With the Orphic, on the other hand, the divine origin and pre-existence of the soul, for

which the body is but a temporary prison, and the doctrine of a retributive transmigration are more or less closely associated. It is hard to say how far the common belief of the people was influenced by these mysteries, but in poetical and philosophical literature their influence is unmistakable. This is seen especially in Pindar among the poets, and in Plato among the philosophers. Pindar has a definite promise of a future life of bliss for the good or the initiated, and not merely for a few, but for all. Even for the wicked who descend to Hades there is hope; having purged their wickedness they obtain rebirth on earth, and if, during three successive existences, they prove themselves worthy of the boon, they will finally attain to happiness in the Isles of the Blest. Though Plato's teaching is vitiated by the doctrine of pre-existence, metempsychosis, and other serious errors, it represents the highest achievement of pagan philosophic speculation on the subject of the future life. The divine dignity, spirituality, and essential immortality of the soul being established, the issues of the future for every soul are made clearly dependent on its moral conduct in the present life in the body. There is a divine judgment after death, a heaven, a hell, and an intermediate state for penance and purification; and rewards and punishments are graduated according to the merits and demerits of each. The incurably wicked are condemned to everlasting punishment in Tartarus; the less wicked or indifferent go also to Tartarus or to the Acherusian Lake, but only for a time; those eminent for goodness go to a happy home, the highest reward of all being for those who have purified themselves by philosophy.

From the foregoing sketch we are able to judge both of the merits and defects of ethnic systems of eschatology. Their merits are perhaps enhanced when they are presented, as above, in isolation from the other features of the religions to which they belonged. Yet their defects are obvious enough; and even those of them that were best and most promising turned out, historically, to be failures. The precious elements of eschatological truth contained in the Egyptian religion were associated with error and superstition, and were unable to save the religion from sinking to the state of utter degeneration in which it is found at the approach of the Christian Era. Similarly, the still richer and more profound eschatology of the Persian religion, vitiated by dualism and other corrupting influences, failed to realize the promise it contained, and has survived only as a ruin in modern Parseeism. Plato's speculative teaching failed to influence in any notable degree the popular religion of the Græco-Roman world; it failed to convert even the philosophical few; and in the hands of those who did profess to adopt it, Platonism, uncorrected by Christianity, ran to seed in Pantheism and other forms of error.

II. Old-Testament Eschatology.—Without going into details either by way of exposition or of criticism, it will be sufficient to point out how Old-Testament eschatology compares with ethnic systems, and how, notwithstanding its deficiencies in point of clearness and completeness, it was not an unworthy preparation for the fullness of Christian Revelation.

(1) Old-Testament eschatology, even in its earliest and most imperfect form, shares in the distinctive character which belongs to O.-T. religion generally. In the first place, as a negative distinction, we note the entire absence of certain erroneous ideas and tendencies that have a large place in ethnic religions. There is no pantheism or dualism, no doctrine of pre-existence (Wisdom, viii, 17–20, does not necessarily imply this doctrine, as has sometimes been contended) or of metempsychosis; nor is there any trace, as might have been expected, of Egyptian ideas or practices. In the next place, on the positive side, the O. T. stands apart from ethnic religions in its doctrine of God, and of man in relation to God. Its doctrine of God is pure and uncompromising monotheism; the universe is ruled by the wisdom, justice, and omnipotence of the one, true God. And man is created by God in His own image and likeness, and destined to relations of friendship and fellowship with Him. Here we have revealed in clear and definite terms the basal doctrines which are at the root of eschatological truth, and which, once they had taken hold of the life of a people, were bound, even without new additions to the revelation, to safeguard the purity of an inadequate eschatology and to lead in time to richer and higher developments. Such additions and developments occur in O.-T. teaching; but before noticing them it is well to call attention to the two chief defects, or limitations, which attach to the earlier eschatology and continue, by their persistence in popular belief, to hinder more or less the correct understanding and acceptance by the Jewish people as a whole of the highest eschatological utterances of their own inspired teachers.

(2) The first of these defects is the silence of the earlier and of some of the later books on the subject of moral retribution after death, or at least the extreme vagueness of such passages in these books as might be understood to refer to this subject. Death is not extinction; but Sheol, the underworld of the dead, in early Hebrew thought is not very different from the Babylonian Arâlû or the Homeric Hades, except that Jahve is God even there. It is a dreary abode in which all that is prized in life, including friendly intercourse with God, comes to an end without any definite promise of renewal. Dishonour, incurred in life or in death, clings to a man in Sheol, like the honour he may have won by a virtuous life on earth; but otherwise conditions in Sheol are not represented as retributive, except in the vaguest way. Not that a more definite retribution or the hope of renewal to a life of blessedness is formally denied and excluded; it simply fails to find utterance in earlier O.-T. records. Religion is pre-eminently an affair of this life, and retribution works out here on earth. This idea, which to us seems so strange, must, to be fairly appreciated, be taken in conjunction with the national as opposed to the individual viewpoint [see under (3) of this section]; and allowance must also be made for its pedagogic value for a people like the early Hebrews. Christ Himself explains why Moses permitted divorce ("by reason of the hardness of your heart"—Matt., xix, 8); revelation and legislation had to be tempered to the capacity of a singularly practical and unimaginative people, who were more effectively confirmed in the worship and service of God by a vivid sense of His retributive providence here on earth than they would have been by a higher and fuller doctrine of future immortality with its postponement of moral awards. Nor must we exaggerate the insufficiency of this early point of view. It gave a deep religious value and significance to every event of the present life, and raised morality above the narrow, utilitarian standpoint. Not worldly prosperity as such was the ideal of the pious Israelite, but prosperity bestowed by God as the gracious reward of fidelity in keeping His Commandments. Yet, when all has been said, the inadequacy of this belief for the satisfaction of individual aspirations must be admitted; and this inadequacy was bound to prove itself sooner or later in experience. Even the substitution of the national for the individual standpoint could not indefinitely hinder this result.

(3) The tendency to sink the individual in the nation and to treat the latter as the religious unit was one of the most marked characteristics of Hebrew faith. And this helped very much to support and prolong the other limitation just noticed, according to which retribution was looked for in this life. Deferred and disappointed personal hopes could be solaced by the thought of their present or future realization in the nation. It was only when the national calamities, culminating in the exile, had shattered for a time the

people's hope of a glorious theocratic kingdom that the eschatology of the individual became prominent; and with the restoration there was a tendency to revert to the national point of view. It is true of the O. T. as a whole that the eschatology of the people overshadows that of the individual, though it is true at the same time that, in and through the former, the latter advances to a clear and definite assurance of a personal resurrection from the dead, at least for the children of Israel who are to share, if found worthy, in the glories of the Messianic Age.

It is beyond the scope of this article to attempt to trace the growth or describe the several phases of this national eschatology, which centres in the hope of the establishment of a theocratic and Messianic kingdom on earth (see MESSIAS). However spiritually this idea may be found expressed in O.-T. prophecies, as we read them now in the light of their progressive fulfilment in the N.-T. Dispensation, the Jewish people as a whole clung to a material and political interpretation of the kingdom, coupling their own domination as a people with the triumph of God and the worldwide establishment of His rule. There is much, indeed, to account for this in the obscurity of the prophecies themselves. The Messias as a distinct person is not always mentioned in connexion with the inauguration of the kingdom, which leaves room for the expectation of a theophany of Jahve in the character of judge and ruler. But even when the person and place of the Messias are distinctly foreshadowed, the fusion together in prophecy of what we have learned to distinguish as His first and His second coming tends to give to the whole picture of the Messianic kingdom an eschatological character that belongs in reality only to its final stage. It is thus the resurrection of the dead in Isaias, xxvi, 19, and Daniel, xii, 2, is introduced; and many of the descriptions foretelling "the day of the Lord", the judgment on Jews and Gentiles, the renovation of the earth and other phenomena that usher in that day, while applicable in a limited sense to contemporary events and to the inauguration of the Christian Era, are much more appropriately understood of the end of the world. It is not, therefore, surprising that the religious hopes of the Jewish nation should have become so predominantly eschatological, and that the popular imagination, foreshortening the perspective of Divine Revelation, should have learned to look for the establishment on earth of the glorious Kingdom of God, which Christians are assured will be realized only in heaven at the close of the present dispensation.

(4) Passing from these general observations which seem necessary for the true understanding of O.-T. eschatology, a brief reference will be made to the passages which exhibit the growth of a higher and fuller doctrine of immortality. The recognition of individual as opposed to mere corporate responsibility and retribution may be reckoned, at least remotely, as a gain to eschatology, even when retribution is confined chiefly to this life; and this principle is repeatedly recognized in the earliest books. (See Gen., xviii, 25; Ex., xxxii, 33; Num., xvi, 22; Deut., vii, 10; xxiv, 16; II K., xxiv, 17; IV K., xiv, 6; Is., iii, 10 sq.; xxxiii, 15 sqq.; Jer., xii, 1 sq.; xvii, 5–10; xxxii, 18 sq.; Ezech., xiv, 12–20; xviii, 4, 18 sqq.; Psalms, *passim;* Prov., ii, 21 sq.; x, 2; xi, 19, 31; etc.) It is recognized also in the very terms of the problem dealt with in the Book of Job.

But, coming to higher things, we find in the Psalms and in Job the clear expression of a hope or assurance for the just of a life of blessedness after death. Here is voiced, under Divine inspiration, the innate craving of the righteous soul for everlasting fellowship with God, the protest of a strong and vivid faith against the popular conception of Sheol. Omitting doubtful passages, it is enough to refer to Psalms xv (A.V. xvi), xvi (A.V. xvii), xlviii (A.V. xlix), and lxxii (A.V. lxxiii). Of these it is not impossible to explain the first two as prayers for deliverance from some imminent danger of death, but the assurance they express is too absolute and universal to admit this interpretation as the most natural. And this assurance becomes still more definite in the other two psalms, by reason of the contrast which death is asserted to introduce between the fates of the just and the impious. The same faith emerges in the Book of Job, first as a hope somewhat questionably expressed, and then as an assured conviction. Despairing of vindication in this life and rebelling against the thought that righteousness should remain finally unrewarded, the sufferer seeks consolation in the hope of a renewal of God's friendship beyond the grave: "O that thou wouldest hide me in Sheol, that thou wouldest keep me secret, until thy wrath be past, that thou wouldest appoint me a set time, and remember me. If a man die, shall he live again? All the days of my warfare would I wait, till my release should come" (xiv, 13 sq.). In xvi, 18–xvii, 9, the expression of this hope is more absolute; and in xix, 23–27, it takes the form of a definite certainty that he will see God, his Redeemer: "But I know that my Redeemer liveth and that he shall stand up at the last upon the earth [dust]; and after this my skin has been destroyed, yet from [*al.* without] my flesh shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself and my eyes shall behold, and not another" (25–27). In his risen body he will see God, according to the Vulgate (LXX) reading: "and in the last day I shall rise out of the earth. And I shall be clothed again with my skin, and in my flesh I shall see my God" (25–26).

The doctrine of the resurrection finds definite expression in the Prophets; and in Isaias, xxvi, 19: "thy dead shall live, my dead bodies shall rise again. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust" etc.; and Daniel, xii, 2: "and many of those that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake: some unto everlasting life, and others unto everlasting shame and contempt" etc., it is clearly a personal resurrection that is taught —in Isaias a resurrection of righteous Israelites; in Daniel, of both the righteous and the wicked. The judgment, which in Daniel is connected with the resurrection, is also personal; and the same is true of the judgment of the living (Jews and Gentiles) which in various forms the prophecies connect with the "day of the Lord". Some of the Psalms (e. g. xlviii) seem to imply a judgment of individuals, good and bad, after death; and the certainty of a future judgment of "every work, whether it be good or evil", is the final solution of the moral enigmas of earthly life offered by Ecclesiastes (xii, 13–14; cf. iii, 17). Coming to the later (deuterocanonical) books of the O. T. we have clear evidence in II Mach. of Jewish faith not only in the resurrection of the body (vii, 9–14), but in the efficacy of prayers and sacrifices for the dead who have died in godliness (xii, 43 sqq.). And in the second and first centuries B. C., in the Jewish apocryphal literature, new eschatological developments appear, chiefly in the direction of a more definite doctrine of retribution after death. The word *Sheol* is still most commonly understood of the general abode of the departed awaiting the resurrection, this abode having different divisions for the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked; in reference to the latter, *Sheol* is sometimes simply equivalent to *hell*. *Gehenna* is the name usually applied to the final place of punishment of the wicked after the last judgment, or even immediately after death; while *paradise* is often used to designate the intermediate abode of the souls of the just, and *heaven* their home of final blessedness (for detailed references to apocryphal literature see Charles, article "Eschatology" in "Encycl. Biblica", §§ 63, 70). Christ's use of these terms shows that the Jews of His day were sufficiently familiar with their N.-T. meanings.

III. CATHOLIC ESCHATOLOGY.—In this article there

is no critical discussion of N.-T. eschatology nor any attempt to trace the historical developments of Catholic teaching from Scriptural and traditional data; only a brief conspectus is given of the developed Catholic system. For critical and historical details and for the refutation of opposing views the reader is referred to the special articles dealing with the various doctrines. The eschatological summary which speaks of the "four last things" (death, judgment, heaven, and hell) is popular rather than scientific. For systematic treatment it is best to distinguish between (A) individual and (B) universal and cosmic eschatology, including under (A): (1) death; (2) the particular judgment; (3) heaven, or eternal happiness; (4) purgatory, or the intermediate state; (5) hell, or eternal punishment; and under (B): (6) the approach of the end of the world; (7) the resurrection of the body; (8) the general judgment; and (9) the final consummation of all things. The superiority of Catholic eschatology consists in the fact that, without professing to answer every question that idle curiosity may suggest, it gives a clear, consistent, satisfying statement of all that need at present be known, or can profitably be understood, regarding the eternal issues of life and death for each of us personally, and the final consummation of the cosmos of which we are a part.

(A) *Individual Eschatology.*—(1) Death, which consists in the separation of soul and body, is presented under many aspects in Catholic teaching, but chiefly (a) as being actually and historically, in the present order of supernatural Providence, the consequence and penalty of Adam's sin (Gen., ii, 17; Rom., v, 12, etc.); (b) as being the end of man's period of probation, the event which decides his eternal destiny (II Cor., v, 10; John, ix, 4; Luke, xii, 40; xvi, 19 sqq.; etc.), though it does not exclude an intermediate state of purification for the imperfect who die in God's grace; and (c) as being universal, though as to its absolute universality (for those living at the end of the world) there is some room for doubt because of I Thess., iv, 14 sqq.; I Cor., xv, 51; II Tim., iv, 1.

(2) That a particular judgment of each soul takes place at death is implied in many passages of the N. T. (Luke, xvi, 22 sqq.; xxiii, 43; Acts, i, 25; etc.), and in the teaching of the Council of Florence (Denzinger, Enchiridion, no. 588) regarding the speedy entry of each soul into heaven, purgatory, or hell. (See JUDGMENT, PARTICULAR.)

(3) Heaven is the abode of the blessed, where (after the resurrection with glorified bodies) they enjoy, in the company of Christ and the angels, the immediate vision of God face to face, being supernaturally elevated by the light of glory so as to be capable of such a vision. There are infinite degrees of glory corresponding to degrees of merit, but all are unspeakably happy in the eternal possession of God. Only the perfectly pure and holy can enter heaven; but for those who have attained that state, either at death or after a course of purification in purgatory, entry into heaven is not deferred, as has sometimes been erroneously held, till after the General Judgment.

(4) Purgatory is the intermediate state of unknown duration in which those who die imperfect, but not in unrepented mortal sin, undergo a course of penal purification, to qualify for admission into heaven. They share in the communion of saints (q. v.) and are benefited by our prayers and good works (see DEAD, PRAYERS FOR THE). The denial of purgatory by the Reformers introduced a dismal blank in their eschatology and, after the manner of extremes, has led to extreme reactions. (See PURGATORY.)

(5) Hell, in Catholic teaching, designates the place or state of men (and angels) who, because of sin, are excluded for ever from the Beatific Vision. In this wide sense it applies to the state of those who die with only original sin on their souls (Council of Florence, Denzinger, no. 588), although this is not a state of misery or of subjective punishment of any kind, but merely implies the objective privation of supernatural bliss, which is compatible with a condition of perfect natural happiness. But in the narrower sense in which the name is ordinarily used, hell is the state of those who are punished eternally for unrepented personal mortal sin. Beyond affirming the existence of such a state, with varying degrees of punishment corresponding to degrees of guilt and its eternal or unending duration, Catholic doctrine does not go. It is a terrible and mysterious truth, but it is clearly and emphatically taught by Christ and the Apostles. Rationalists may deny the eternity of hell in spite of the authority of Christ, and professing Christians, who are unwilling to admit it, may try to explain away Christ's words; but it remains as the Divinely revealed solution of the problem of moral evil. (See HELL.) Rival solutions have been sought for in some form of the theory of restitution or, less commonly, in the theory of annihilation or conditional immortality. The restitutionist view, which in its Origenist form was condemned at the Council of Constantinople in 543, and later at the Fifth General Council (see APOCATASTASIS), is the cardinal dogma of modern Universalism (q. v.), and is favoured more or less by liberal Protestants and Anglicans. Based on an exaggerated optimism for which present experience offers no guarantee, this view assumes the all-conquering efficacy of the ministry of grace in a life of probation after death, and looks forward to the ultimate conversion of all sinners and the voluntary disappearance of moral evil from the universe. Annihilationists, on the other hand, failing to find either in reason or Revelation any grounds for such optimism, and considering immortality itself to be a grace and not the natural attribute of the soul, believe that the finally impenitent will be annihilated or cease to exist—that God will thus ultimately be compelled to confess the failure of His purpose and power.

(B) *Universal and Cosmic Eschatology.*—(6) Notwithstanding Christ's express refusal to specify the time of the end (Mark, xiii, 32; Acts, i, 6 sq.), it was a common belief among early Christians that the end of the world was near. This seemed to have some support in certain sayings of Christ in reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, which are set down in the Gospels side by side with prophecies relating to the end (Matt., xxiv; Luke, xxi), and in certain passages of the Apostolic writings, which might, not unnaturally, have been so understood (but see II Thess., ii, 2 sqq., where St. Paul corrects this impression). On the other hand, Christ had clearly stated that the Gospel was to be preached to all nations before the end (Matt., xxiv, 14), and St. Paul looked forward to the ultimate conversion of the Jewish people as a remote event to be preceded by the conversion of the Gentiles (Rom., xi, 25 sqq.). Various other signs are spoken of as preceding or ushering in the end, as a great apostasy (II Thess., ii, 3 sqq.), or falling away from faith or charity (Luke, xviii, 8; xvii, 26; Matt., xxiv, 12), the reign of Antichrist (q. v.), and great social calamities and terrifying physical convulsions. Yet the end will come unexpectedly and take the living by surprise.

(7) The visible coming (*parousia*) of Christ in power and glory will be the signal for the rising of the dead (see RESURRECTION). It is Catholic teaching that all the dead who are to be judged will rise, the wicked as well as the just, and that they will rise with the bodies they had in this life. But nothing is defined as to what is required to constitute this identity of the risen and transformed with the present body. Though not formally defined, it is sufficiently certain that there is to be only one general resurrection, simultaneous for the good and the bad. (See MILLENNIUM.) Regarding the qualities of the risen bodies in the case of the just we have St. Paul's description in I Cor., xv (cf. Matt., xiii, 43; Phil., iii, 21) as a basis for theological

speculation; but in the case of the damned we can only affirm that their bodies will be incorruptible.

(8) Regarding the general judgment there is nothing of importance to be added here to the graphic description of the event given by Christ Himself, who is to be Judge (Matt., xxv; etc.). (See JUDGMENT, GENERAL.)

(9) There is mention also of the physical universe sharing in the general consummation (II Pet., iii, 13; Rom., viii, 19 sqq.; Apoc., xxi, 1 sqq.). The present heaven and earth will be destroyed, and a new heaven and earth take their place. But what, precisely, this process will involve, or what purpose the renovated world will serve is not revealed. It may possibly be part of the glorious Kingdom of Christ of which "there shall be no end". Christ's militant reign is to cease with the accomplishment of His office as Judge (I Cor., xv, 24 sqq.), but as King of the elect whom He has saved He will reign with them in glory for ever.

A good bibliography of older works is given in ALGER, *A Critical History of the Doctrine of the Future Life with complete Bibliography by Ezra Abbott* (New York, 1871). SALMOND, *Christian Doctrine of Immortality* (5th ed., Edinburgh, 1903)—very complete; OESTERLY, *The Doctrine of the Last Things* (London, 1908). For ethnic eschatologies the reader is referred for a fuller bibliography to the special articles on the various religions mentioned; it is enough to refer here, for the lower races, to pertinent sections in LUBBOCK, *On the Origin of Civilisation and the Primitive Condition of Man* (5th ed., London, 1890); TYLOR, *Primitive Culture* (3rd ed., London, 1891); RÉVILLE, *Les religions des peuples non-civilisés* (Paris, 1883); for higher races, to JASTROW, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (Boston, 1898); JEREMIAS, *Die babylonisch-assyrischen Vorstellungen vom Zustand nach dem Tode* (Leipzig, 1887); BUDGE, *Egyptian Ideas of the Future Life* (London, 1901); PETRIE, *Religion and Conscience in Ancient Egypt* (London, 1898); SAYCE, *The Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia* (*Gifford Lectures, 1901*); RHYS-DAVIDS, *Buddhism* (London, 1882); JACKSON, *Zoroaster, the Prophet of Ancient Iran* (New York, 1898); ROHDE, *Psyche, Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen* (2nd ed., Freiburg, 1898); besides general works on ancient religions like those of TIELE, DE LA SAUSSAYE, etc. For biblical eschatology, see DAVIDSON-CHARLES-SALMOND in HAST., *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v.; CHARLES, *Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism and in Christianity* (London, 1899); IDEM in *Encyclopædia Biblica*, s. v. (this author is to be read with caution; he is extremely arbitrary in dating and interpreting documents); ATZBERGER, *Die christliche Eschatologie in den Stadien ihrer Offenbarung im Alten und Neuen Testamente* (Freiburg im Br., 1890); MANGENOT, *Fin du Monde* in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible*. For the history of Catholic eschatology see ATZBERGER, *Geschichte der christlichen Eschatologie innerhalb der vornicänischen Zeit* (Freiburg im Br., 1896); and for modern eschatological problems and controversies see bibliography of the several articles referred to in the last section of this article.

P. J. TONER.

Eschenbach, WOLFRAM VON. See WOLFRAM.

Escobar, MARINA DE, VENERABLE, mystic and foundress of a modified branch of the Brigittine Order b. at Valladolid, Spain, 8 Feb., 1554; d. there 9 June, 1633. Her father, Iago de Escobar, was professor of civil and canon law and for a time governor of Osuna, a man noted for his learning and his saintly life; her mother was Margaret Montana, daughter of Charles V's physician. She was an apt scholar and even in youth showed powers of reflection beyond her age. Until her forty-fifth year her attention was given mainly to her own perfection, then she devoted herself more to promoting the piety of others. At fifty her continual bodily afflictions became so severe that she was confined to her bed for the remainder of her life. Providence provided her with an admirable spiritual guide, in the Venerable Luis de Ponte (1554–1624). The special external work entrusted to her was to establish a branch of the Order of the Holy Saviour or Brigittines but with the rules greatly modified to suit the times and the country. With the revelation of the work came the knowledge that she would not live to see its accomplishment. By divine command, as she believed, she wrote her revelations, and when too feeble she dictated them. Luis de Ponte arranged them and left them for publication after her death. In his preface he declares his belief in their genuineness because she advanced in virtue and was preserved free from temptations against purity, showed no pride, and had peace in prayer, feared deception, desired no extraordinary favours, loved suffering, was zealous for souls and, lastly, was obedient to her confessor. The writings were published in one large volume and are divided into six books containing his remarks and her own, interspersed between the visions themselves. Book I treats of the extraordinary means by which God had led her; II contains revelations about the mysteries of redemption; III about God and the Blessed Trinity; IV about Guardian Angels and the B. V. Mary's prerogatives; V gives means to help souls in purgatory and to save souls on earth; and VI reveals her perfection as shown under terrible sufferings. The style of the work is free and flowing and she speaks with simplicity and naïve frankness. The visions, always picturesque, and pleasing or alarming according to their subject, are all instructive and at times distinctly curious; but the descriptions are mere outlines, leaving much to the imagination, and never going into details. Their variety is great. For some the following would have special interest: Daily communion and Satan's objection to it; mystic espousals; how the bodies of saints can appear in visions; internal stigmata; some saints with whom modern hagiographers have dealt harshly, as St. Christopher. Their brevity of detail may account in part for the oblivion into which they have fallen. Her life, so far as de Ponte had prepared it, was published at Madrid in 1664; the second part appeared there in 1673. It was translated into Latin by M. Hanel, S. J., and published again at Prague in 1672–1688, and in an enlarged edition at Naples 1690. All these editions are now very rare. A German translation, in four volumes, appeared in 1861. (See BRIGITTINES.)

EDWARD P. GRAHAM.

Escobar y Mendoza, ANTONIO, b. at Valladolid in 1589; d. there 4 July, 1669. In his sixteenth year he entered the Society of Jesus. Talent and untiring labour won him distinction for scholarship among the leaders of ecclesiastical science in his age. His writings are recognized as classical and challenge criticism as far as their orthodoxy is concerned. For this reason Pascal's efforts (fifth and sixth Provincial Letters) to fasten the charge of laxism on Escobar's "Manual of Cases of Conscience", together with his unscrupulous insinuations of adroit hypocrisy on Escobar's part, are too base and cowardly to merit serious consideration. At the same time, it is only fair to add that Escobar's writings are not entirely beyond the pale of criticism. Unprejudiced critics find him inexact in quotations, subtle in discussion, obscure and loose in reasoning. Besides the "Manual", Escobar's chief works are: "Summula casuum conscientiæ" (Pamplona, 1626); "Examen et praxis confessariorum" (Lyons, 1647); "Theologia Moralis" (Lyons, 1650; Venice, 1652); "Universæ Theologicæ Moralis receptæ sententiæ" (Lyons, 1663); "De Triplici Statu Ecclesiastico" (Lyons, 1663); "De Justitiâ et de legibus" (Lyons, 1663).

Escobar was also a preacher of note. For fifty consecutive years he delivered a series of Lenten sermons with signal success.

HURTER, *Nomenclator*, II, 264 sqq.; BAUER in *Kirchenlex.*, IV, 1892; BUCHBERGER, *Kirchliches Handlex.*, s. v.; CAT in *La Grande Encyc.*, s.v.

J. D. O'NEILL.

Escorial, THE, a remarkable building in Spain situated on the south-eastern slope of the Sierra Guadarrama about twenty-seven miles north-west of Madrid. Its proper title is El real Monasterio de San Lorenzo del Escorial, Escorial being the name of a small town in the vicinity. The structure comprises a monastery, church, pantheon or royal mausoleum, a palace intended as summer and autumn residence of the court, college, library, art-galleries, etc., and is called by Spaniards the eighth wonder of the world. It was begun in 1563, at the order of Philip II, by the

THE ESCORIAL, SITUATED ABOUT TWENTY-SEVEN MILES NORTHWEST OF MADRID

CALLED THE EIGHTH WONDER OF THE WORLD

architect Juan Bautista de Toledo, assisted by Lucas de Escalante and Pedro de Tolosa, and was intended to commemorate the Spanish victory over the French at the battle of St-Quentin in 1557. Probably another reason was that Philip II was obliged by the will of Charles V to erect a royal mausoleum.

Bautista's plan was ambitious and eccentric; he was influenced by Renaissance ideals and used the Doric style in its severest forms. He died in 1567 and was succeeded by Juan de Herrera and Juan de Minjores. The plan of the building is somewhat in the shape of a gridiron, and is thought thus to commemorate the fate of its patron saint, St. Laurence, upon whose feast day, 10 August, the battle of St-Quentin was fought. The church was consecrated in 1586, and the pantheon was completed in 1654. Charles III built some additions and the building generally was restored under Ferdinand VII. The Escorial has twice been devastated by fire, and in 1807 it was looted by the French troops. It is built of a light-coloured stone resembling granite, for the most part highly polished. The general plan is a parallelogram with a perimeter of 3000 feet; its area is about 500,000 square feet. There are four façades, the finest external aspect being on the southern side. The western or principal front is 744 feet long and 72 feet high, while the towers at each end rise about 200 feet. The main entrance is in the centre of this façade. Monegro's figure of Saint Laurence stands above the door. The vestibule is about eighty feet wide and leads into the Court of the Kings. To the right are the library, refectory, and convent; the college is on the left. The church is the finest of the several buildings contained within the walls of the Escorial. Its tall towers on either side, the immense dome, with its superimposed massive lantern and cross, and the portals of the vestibule, at once attract attention. The church is of stone throughout, huge in plan, and severe in its Doric simplicity. Pompeo Leoni designed and cast the metal statues that ornament the splendid screen. A hall behind the ante-choir is known as the library. On the south side of the church is the Court of the Evangelists, a square of 166 feet with two-storied cloisters in the Grecian style. Adjoining it is the monastery of Saint Laurence. Both the monastery and the church were served by Hieronymite monks until 1835; in 1885 Augustinians took charge. The Augustinian monks also conduct the college, the building of which formed an important part of the great structure. On 10 Feb., 1909, it was slightly damaged by fire. The small room which Philip II occupied during the latter part of his life and in which he died adjoins the choir of the church. Through an opening in the wall he could see the celebration of the Mass when ill. The corridor of the Hall of the Caryatides is supposed to represent the handle of the gridiron.

The Escorial is a treasure-house of art and learning. The civilized world was searched to stock the library with great books and fine manuscripts. Greece, Arabia, and Palestine contributed, and the collection was at one time the finest in Europe, the Arabic documents being among the most remarkable of the manuscripts. From the Inquisition the library received about one hundred and forty works. It contains 7000 engravings and 35,006 volumes, including 4627 manuscripts; among the last named are 1886 Arabic, 582 Greek, and 73 Hebrew manuscripts, besides 2086 in Latin and other languages (cf. Casiri, Bibliotheca arab.-hisp. Escur., Madrid, 1760–1770, 2 vols.). Among its manuscript treasures are a copy of the Gospels illuminated in gold on vellum, and the Apocalypse of Saint John richly illustrated. It also contains a large collection of church music, included in which are compositions of the monks, del Valle, Torrijos, and Corduba, besides many of the musical works of Antonio Soler. The most important tapestries of the Escorial are in the palace; many of them were designed by Goya and Maella. The weaving was done chiefly in Madrid, but those designed by Teniers were made in Holland. Since 1837 the finest pictures of the large collection of paintings have been placed in the museum at Madrid. Among the famous artists whose works were or still are in the Escorial are: Carducci, Giordano, Goya, Holbein, Pantoja, Reni, Ribera, Teniers, Tibaldo, Tintoretto, Titian, Velazquez, Zuccaro, Zurbarán.

CALVERT, *The Escorial* (London and New York, 1907); HAMLIN, *History of Architecture* (London and New York, 1904), 351; B. AND B. F. BANISTER, *A History of Architecture* (London and New York, 1905), 537, 539; SMITH, *Architecture, Gothic and Renaissance* (London), 232.

THOMAS H. POOLE.

Esdras.—I. A famous priest and scribe connected with Israel's restoration after the Exile. The chief sources of information touching his life are the canonical books of Esdras and Nehemias. A group of apocryphal writings is also much concerned with him, but they can hardly be relied upon, as they relate rather the legendary tales of a later age. Esdras was of priestly descent and belonged to the line of Sadoc (I Esd., vii, 1–5). He styles himself "son of Saraias" (vii, 1), an expression which is by many understood in a broad sense, as purporting that Saraias, the chief-priest, spoken of in IV K., xxv, 18–21, was one of Esdras's ancestors. Nevertheless he is known rather as "the scribe" than as "priest": he was "a ready scribe [a scribe skilled] in the law of Moses", and therefore especially qualified for the task to which he was destined among his people.

The chronological relation of Esdras's work with that of Nehemias is, among the questions connected with the history of the Jewish Restoration, one of the most mooted. Many Biblical scholars still cling to the view suggested by the traditional order of the sacred text (due allowance being made for the break in the narrative—I Esd., iv, 6–23), and place the mission of Esdras before that of Nehemias. Others, among whom we may mention Professor Van Hoonacker of Louvain, Dr. T. K. Cheyne in England, and Professor C. F. Kent in America, to do away with the numberless difficulties arising from the interpretation of the main sources of this history, maintain that Nehemias's mission preceded that of Esdras. The former view holds that Esdras came to Jerusalem about 458 B.C., and Nehemias first in 444 and the second time about 430 B.C.; whereas, according to the opposite opinion, Esdras's mission might have taken place as late as 397 B.C. However this may be, since we are here concerned only with Esdras, we will limit ourselves to summarizing the principal features of his life and work, without regard to the problems involved, which it suffices to have mentioned.

Many years had elapsed after permission had been given to the Jews to return to Palestine; amidst difficulties and obstacles the restored community had settled down again in their ancient home and built a new temple; but their condition, both from the political and the religious point of view, was most precarious: they chafed under the oppression of the Persian satraps and had grown indifferent and unobservant of the Law. From Babylon, where this state of affairs was well known, Esdras longed to go to Jerusalem and use his authority as a priest and interpreter of the Law to restore things to a better condition. He was in favour at the court of the Persian king; he not only obtained permission to visit Judea, but a royal edict clothing him with ample authority to carry out his purpose, and ample support from the royal treasury. The rescript, moreover, ordered the satraps "beyond the river" to assist Esdras liberally and enacted that all Jewish temple officials should be exempt from toll, tribute, or custom. "And thou, Esdras, appoint judges and magistrates, that they may judge all the people, that is beyond the river" (I Esd., vii, 25). Finally, the Law of God and the law of the king were

alike to be enforced by severe penalties. The edict left all Jews who felt so inclined free to go back to their own country. Some 1800 men, including a certain number of priests, Levites, and Nathinites, started with Esdras from Babylon, and after five months the company safely reached Jerusalem. Long-neglected abuses had taken root in the sacred city. These Esdras set himself vigorously to correct, after the silver and gold he had carried from Babylon were brought into the Temple and sacrifices offered. The first task which confronted him was that of dealing with mixed marriages. Regardless of the Law of Moses, many, even the leading Jews and priests, had intermarried with the idolatrous inhabitants of the country. Horror-stricken by the discovery of this abuse—the extent of which was very likely unknown heretofore to Esdras—he gave utterance to his feelings in a prayer which made such an impression upon the people that Sechenias, in their names, proposed that the Israelites should put away their foreign wives and the children born of them. Esdras seized his opportunity, and exacted from the congregation an oath that they would comply with this proposition. A general assembly of the people was called by the princes and the ancients; but the business could not be transacted easily at such a meeting and a special commission, with Esdras at its head, was appointed to take the matter in hand. For three full months this commission held its sessions; at the end of that time the "strange wives" were dismissed.

What was the outcome of this drastic measure we are not told; Esdras's memoirs are interrupted here. Nor do we know whether, his task accomplished, he returned to Babylon or remained in Jerusalem. At any rate we find him again in the latter city at the reading of the Law which took place after the rebuilding of the walls. No doubt this event had kindled the enthusiasm of the people; and to comply with the popular demand, Esdras brought the Book of the Law. On the first day of the seventh month (Tishri), a great meeting was held "in the street that was before the watergate", for the purpose of reading the Law. Standing on a platform, Esdras read the book aloud "from the morning until midday". At hearing the words of the Law, which they had so much transgressed, the congregation broke forth into lamentations unsuited to the holiness of the day; Nehemias therefore adjourned the assembly. The reading was resumed on the next day by Esdras, and they found in the Law the directions concerning the feast of the Tabernacles. Thereupon steps were at once taken for the due celebration of this feast, which was to last seven days, from the fifteenth to the twenty-second day of Tishri. Esdras continued the public reading of the Law every day of the feast; and two days after its close a strict fast was held, and "they stood, and confessed their sins, and the iniquities of their fathers" (II Esd., ix, 2). There was a good opportunity to renew solemnly the covenant between the people and God. This covenant pledged the community to the observance of the Law, the abstention from intermarriage with heathens, the careful keeping of the Sabbath and of the feasts, and to various regulations agreed to for the care of the Temple, its service, and the payment of the tithes. It was formally recited by the princes, the Levites, and the priests, and signed by Nehemias and chosen representatives of the priests, the Levites, and the people (strange as it may appear, Esdras's name is not to be found in the list of the subscribers—II Esd., x, 1–27). Henceforth no mention whatever is made of Esdras in the canonical literature. He is not spoken of in connexion with the second mission of Nehemias to Jerusalem, and this has led many to suppose that he was dead at the time. In fact both the time and place of his death are unknown, although there is on the banks of the Tigris, near the place where this river joins the Euphrates, a monument purporting to be Esdras's tomb, and which, for centuries, has been a place of pilgrimage for the Jews.

Esdras's rôle in the restoration of the Jews after the exile left a lasting impression upon the minds of the people. This is due mostly to the fact that henceforth Jewish life was shaped on the lines laid down by him, and in a way from which, in the main, it never departed. There is probably a great deal of truth in the tradition which attributes to him the organization of the synagogues and the determination of the books hallowed as canonical among the Jews. Esdras's activity seems to have extended still further. He is credited by the Talmud with having compiled "his own book" (that is to say Esd.-Nehem.), "and the genealogies of the book of Chronicles as far as himself" (Treat. "Baba bathra", 15ª). Modern scholars, however, differ widely as to the extent of his literary work: some regard him as the last editor of the Hexateuch, whereas, on the other hand, his part in the composition of Esdras-Nehemias and Paralipomenon is doubted. At any rate, it is certain that he had nothing to do with the composition of the so-called Third and Fourth Books of Esdras. As is the case with many men who played an important part at momentous epochs in history, in the course of time Esdras's personality and activity assumed, in the minds of the people, gigantic proportions; legend blended with history and supplied the scantiness of information concerning his life; he was looked upon as a second Moses to whom were attributed all institutions which could not possibly be ascribed to the former. According to Jewish traditions, he restored from memory—an achievement little short of miraculous—all the books of the O. T., which were believed to have perished during the Exile; he likewise replaced, in the copying of Holy Writ, the old Phœnician writing by the alphabet still in use. Until the Middle Ages, and even the Renaissance, the crop of legendary achievements attributed to him grew up; it was then that Esdras was hailed as the organizer of the famous Great Synagogue—the very existence of which seems to be a myth—and the inventor of the Hebrew vocal signs.

Ryle, *Ezra and Nehemiah* (Cambridge, 1893); Clair, *Esdras et Nehemias* (Paris, 1882); Lagrange, *Néhémie-Esdras* in *Revue Biblique* (1895), 193; Van Hoonacker, *Néhémie en l'an 20 d'Artaxerxès I; Esdras en l'an 7 d'Artaxerxès II* (Ghent, 1892); Idem, *Zorobabel et le second temple* (Ghent, 1892); Idem, *Nouvelles études sur la restauration juive après l'exil de Babylone* (Paris and Louvain, 1896); Idem, *Néhémie-Esdras* in *Revue Biblique* (1895), 186; Schürer, *Gesch. des jud. Volkes im Zeitalter J. C.* (Leipzig, 1901); Kosters, *Het Herstel van Israel in het perzische Tijdvak* (Leyden, 1894); Kuenen, *De Chronologie van het perzische Tijdvak der Joodsche geschiedenis* (Amsterdam, 1890).

II. Books of Esdras.—Not a little confusion arises from the titles of these books. Esdras A of the Septuagint is III Esdras of St. Jerome, whereas the Greek Esdras B corresponds to I and II Esdras of the Vulgate, which were originally united into one book. Protestant writers, after the Geneva Bible, call I and II Esdras of the Vulgate respectively Ezra and Nehemiah, and III and IV Esdras of the Vulgate respectively I and II Esdras. It would be desirable to have uniformity of titles. We shall follow here the terminology of St. Jerome.

I Esdras (Gr. Esdras B, first part; A.V. Ezra).—As remarked above, this book formed in the Jewish canon, together with II Esd., a single volume. But Christian writers of the fourth century adopted the custom—the origin of which is not easy to assign—of considering them as two distinct works. This custom prevailed to such an extent that it found its way even into the Hebrew Bible, where it has remained in use. On the other hand, the many and close resemblances undeniably existing between Esd.-Neh. and Par., and usually accounted for by unity of authorship, have suggested that possibly all these books formed, in the beginning, one single volume, for which the title of "Ecclesiastical Chronicle of Jerusalem" has been pro-

posed as fairly expressing its contents. Should these books be regarded as independent, or as parts of a larger work? There is little discussion as to the union of I and II Esd., which may well be considered as a single book. As to the opinion holding Esd.-Neh. and Par. to be only one work, although it seems gaining ground among Biblical students, yet it is still strongly opposed by many who deem its arguments unable to outweigh the evidence in the opposite direction. We should not expect to find in I Esd., any more than in II Esd., a complete account of the events connected with the Restoration, even a complete record of the lives of Esdras and Nehemias. The reason for this lies in the author's purpose of simply narrating the principal steps taken in the re-establishment of the theocracy in Jerusalem. Thus, in two parallel parts, our book deals (1) with the return of the Jews under the leadership of Zorobabel; (2) with the return of another band commanded by Esdras. In the former, with the decree of Cyrus (i, 1–4) and the enumeration of the most prominent members of the caravan (ii), we read a detailed account of the rebuilding of the Temple and its successful completion, in spite of bitter opposition (iii-vi). The events therein contained cover twenty-one years (536–515). The latter part deals with facts belonging to a much later date (458 or 397). Opening with the decree of Artaxerxes (vii) and the census of the members of the party, it briefly relates the journey across the desert (viii), and gives all the facts connected with the enforcement of the law concerning marriages with foreign women (ix-x).

I Esd. is a compilation the various parts of which differ in nature, in origin, and even in language. At least three of the parts may be recognized: (1) the personal memoirs of Esdras (vii, 27–ix, 15); (2) lists very likely taken from public documents (ii, 1–70; vii, 1–5); (3) Aramaic writings (iv, 7–vi, 18; vii, 12–26), supposed with some probability to be a portion of "a more comprehensive history of the restored community" (Stade). These the compiler put together into the present shape, adding, of course, now and then some remarks of his own, or some facts borrowed from sources otherwise unknown to us. This compilatory character does not, as some might believe, lessen in any way the high historical value of the work. True, the compiler was very likely not endowed with a keen sense of criticism, and he has indiscriminatingly transcribed side by side all his sources "as if all were alike trustworthy" (L. W. Batten); but we should not forget that he has preserved to us pages of the highest value; even those that might be deemed of inferior trustworthiness are the only documents available with which to reconstruct the history of those times; and the compiler, even from the standpoint of modern scientific research, could hardly do anything more praiseworthy than place within our reach, as he did, the sources of information at his disposal. The composition of the work has long been attributed without discussion to Esdras himself. This view, taught by the Talmud, and still admitted by scholars of good standing, is, however, abandoned by several modern Biblical students, who, although their opinions are widely at variance on the question of the date, fairly agree, nevertheless, that the book is later than 330 B. C.

II Esdras.—See NEHEMIAS.

III Esdras (Gr. Esdras A; Prot. writers, I Esdras).—Although not belonging to the Canon of the Sacred Scriptures, this book is usually found, *ne prorsus intereat*, in an appendix to the editions of the Vulgate. It is made up almost entirely from materials existing in canonical books. The following scheme will show sufficiently the contents and point out the canonical parallels:—

III Esd., i=II Par., xxxv, xxxvi.—History of the Kingdom of Juda from the great Passover of Josias to the Captivity.

III Esd., ii, 1–15 (Greek text, 14)=I Esd., i.—Cyrus's decree. Return of Sassabasar.

III Esd., ii, 16 (Gr. 15)–31 (Gr. 25)=I Esd., iv, 6–24.—Opposition to the rebuilding of the Temple.

III Esd., iii, 1–v, 6.—Original portion. Story of the three pages. Return of Zorobabel.

III Esd., v, 7–46 (Gr. 45)=I Esd., ii.—List of those returning with Zorobabel.

III Esd., v, 47 (Gr. 46)–73 (Gr. 70)=I Esd., iii, 1–iv, 5.—Altar of holocausts. Foundation of the Temple laid. Opposition.

III Esd., vi, vii=I Esd., v, vi.—Completion of the Temple.

III Esd., viii, 1–ix, 36=I Esd., vii–x.—Return of Esdras.

III Esd., ix, 37–56 (Gr. 55)=II Esd., vii, 73–viii, 12.—Reading of the Law by Esdras.

The book is incomplete, and breaks off in the middle of a sentence. True, the Latin version completes the broken phrase of the Greek; but the book in its entirety probably contained also the narrative of the feast of Tabernacles (II Esd., viii). A very strange feature in the work is its absolute disregard of chronological order; the history, indeed, runs directly backwards, mentioning first Artaxerxes (ii, 16–31), then Darius (iii–v, 6), finally Cyrus (v, 7–73). All this makes it difficult to detect the real object of the book and the purpose of the compiler. It has been suggested that we possess here a history of the Temple from the time of Josias down to Nehemias, and this view is well supported by the subscription of the Old Latin version. Others suppose that, in the main, the book is rather an early translation of the chronicler's work, made at a time when Par., Esd., and Neh. still formed one continuous volume. Be this as it may, there seems to have been, up to St. Jerome, some hesitation with regard to the reception of the book into the Canon; it was freely quoted by the early Fathers, and included in Origen's "Hexapla". This might be accounted for by the fact that III Esd. may be considered as another recension of canonical Scriptures. Unquestionably our book cannot claim to be Esdras's work. From certain particulars, such as the close resemblance of the Greek with that of the translation of Daniel, some details of vocabulary, etc., scholars are led to believe that III Esd. was compiled, probably in Lower Egypt, during the second century B. C. Of the author nothing can be said except, perhaps, that the above-noted resemblance of style to Dan. might incline one to conclude that both works are possibly from the same hand.

HOWORTH, *The Real Character and the Importance of the First Book of Esdras* in *The Academy*, Jan.-June, 1893; CALMET, *Dissertation sur le troisième livre d'Esdras* in *Commentaire littéral* (Paris, 1724), III; SCHÜRER, *Apokryphen des A.T.* in *Realencyklopädie für prot. Theol. und Kirche* (Leipzig, 1896).

IV Esdras.—Such is the title of the book in most Latin MSS.; the (Prot.) English Apocrypha, however, give it as II Esd., from the opening words: "The second book of the prophet Esdras". Modern authors often call it also the Apocalypse of Esdras. This remarkable work has not been preserved in the original Greek text; but we possess translations of it in Latin, Syriac, Arabic (two independent versions), Ethiopian, and Armenian. The Latin text is usually printed in the appendix to the editions of the Vulgate; but these editions miss seventy verses between vii, 35, and vii, 36. The missing fragment, which was read in the other versions, was discovered in a Latin MS. by R. L. Bensly, in 1874, and has been since repeatedly printed. In the Latin the book is divided into sixteen chapters. The two opening (i, ii) and the two concluding (xv, xvi) chapters, however, which are not to be found in the Eastern translations, are unhesitatingly regarded by all as later additions, foreign to the primitive work.

The body of the Fourth Book, the unity of which appears to be unquestionable, is made up of seven visions which Esdras is supposed to have seen at Baby-

lon, the thirtieth year after the destruction of Jerusalem (the date given is wrong by about a century). In the first vision (iii, 1–v, 20), Esdras is lamenting over the affliction of his people. Why does not God fulfil his promises? Is not Israel the elect nation, and better, despite her "evil heart", than her heathen neighbours? The Angel Uriel chides Esdras for inquiring into things beyond his understanding; the "prophet" is told that the time that is past exceeds the time to come, and the signs of the end are given him.—In another vision (v, 21–vi, 34), he learns, with new signs of the end, why God "doeth not all at once".—Then follows (vi, 35–ix, 25) a glowing picture of the Messianic age. "My son" shall come in his glory, attended by those who did not taste death, Moses, Henoch, Elias, and Esdras himself; they shall reign 400 years, then "my son" and all the living shall die; after seven days of "the old silence", the Resurrection and the Judgment.—Next (ix, 26–x, 60) Esdras beholds, in the appearance of a woman mourning for her son who died on his wedding day, an apocalyptic description of the past and future of Jerusalem.—This vision is followed by another (xi, 1–xii, 39) representing the Roman Empire, under the figure of an eagle, and by a third (xiii) describing the rise of the Messianic kingdom.—The last chapter (xiv) narrates how Esdras restored the twenty-four books of the O. T. that were lost, and wrote seventy books of mysteries for the wise among the people.

The Fourth Book of Esdras is reckoned among the most beautiful productions of Jewish literature. Widely known in the early Christian ages and frequently quoted by the Fathers (especially St. Ambrose), it may be said to have framed the popular belief of the Middle Ages concerning the last things. The liturgical use shows its popularity. The second chapter has furnished the verse *Requiem æternam* to the Office of the Dead (24–25), the response *Lux perpetua lucebit sanctis tuis* of the Office of the Martyrs during Easter time (35), the introit *Accipite jucunditatem* for Whit-Tuesday (36–37), the words *Modo coronantur* of the Office of the Apostles (45); in like manner the verse *Crastina die* for Christmas eve, is borrowed from xvi, 53. However beautiful and popular the book, its origin is shrouded in mystery. The introductory and concluding chapters, containing evident traces of Christianity, are assigned to the third century (about A.D. 201–268). The main portion (iii-xiv) is undoubtedly the work of a Jew—whether Roman, or Alexandrian, or Palestinian, no one can tell; as to its date, authors are mostly widely at variance, and all dates have been suggested, from 30 B. C. to A. D. 218; scholars, however, seem to rally more and more around the year A. D. 97.

BENSLY, *The Missing Fragment of the Latin Translation of the Fourth Book of Ezra* (Cambridge, 1875); HILGENFELD, *Messias Judæorum* (Leipzig, 1869), IV; KABISCH, *Das IV Buch Esra auf seine Quellen untersucht* (Göttingen, 1889); SCHÜRER, *Apokryphen des A.T.* in *Realencyklopädie für prot. Theol. und Kirche* (Leipzig, 1896); LAGRANGE, *Notes sur le Messianisme au temps de Jésus* in *Revue Biblique* (1905), 486–501; IDEM, *Le Messianisme chez les Juifs* (Paris, 1909); LE HIR, *Le quatrième livre d'Esdras* in *Etudes Bibliques* (Paris, 1869), I; RENAN, *L'Apocalypse de l'an 97* in *Revue des Deux Mondes* (1875), 1 March.

CHARLES L. SOUVAY.

Esglis, LOUIS-PHILIPPE MARIAUCHAU D', eighth Bishop of Quebec, Canada; b. Quebec, 24 April, 1710; d. 4 June, 1788. After completing his studies at the Quebec Seminary, he was ordained priest in 1734 and appointed pastor of Saint-Pierre-d'Orléans. After thirty-five years of humble ministry, he was called to the episcopate and consecrated coadjutor of Quebec, 12 July, 1772, the first native of Canada to attain to the dignity of bishop. On the resignation of Bishop Briand, he succeeded to the See of Quebec 29 Nov., 1784. In his first pastoral letter he alludes to the appointment of a coadjutor, a precaution justified by age, infirmity, and the necessity of securing a successor. Bishop Jean-François Hubert was nominated coadjutor that same year, but the approval of the British Government was withheld till 1786. Bishop d'Esglis tried unsuccessfully to supply the dearth of clergy by obtaining priests from France. The British Government favoured preferably the emigration of priests for the settlements in Upper Canada and the Maritime Provinces. Pending the arrival of a missionary for the Acadians, a layman was authorized to baptize and witness marriage contracts. Bishop d'Esglis issued (1787) a pastoral letter to all the faithful of the lower provinces, exhorting them to union and steadfastness in the Faith. He died in the fifty-fifth year of his priesthood and was buried at Saint-Pierre.

TÊTU, *Les Evêques de Québec* (Quebec, 1889); Archives of the Archdiocese of Quebec; *Le Canada Ecclésiastique* (Montreal, 1908).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

Eskil, Archbishop of Lund, Skåne, Sweden; b. about 1100; d. at Clairvaux, 6 (7?) Sept., 1181; one of the most capable and prominent princes of the Church in Scandinavia. A man of profound piety, he was always zealous for the welfare of the church, and was a courageous and unselfish defender of the rights of the hierarchy in its struggle against the civil power and clerical usurpers. His father Christian was descended from an illustrious dynastic family of Jutland and was related to several royal families. When twelve years of age the young Eskil was received into the renowned cathedral school at Hildesheim. Here, during a dangerous illness, he was honoured by a vision of the Mother of God, who, chiding him with his frivolous conduct, saved him from imminent perdition and restored his health, demanding five measures of different varieties of corn as a thank-offering. This vision was interpreted to mean that Eskil would attain high ecclesiastical dignity and establish five confraternities. In 1131, his uncle, Asser (Asger), the first Archbishop of Lund, nominated him provost of the cathedral. In 1134 he was consecrated Bishop of Roskilde, and after Asser's death (1137) succeeded him as archbishop. He successfully defended the metropolitan rights of his see in spite of the protestations of the archbishops of Bremen. He received the pallium from Innocent II through the papal legate, Cardinal Theodignus, who, with many Scandinavian bishops, was present at the provincial Synod of Lund (1139). Eskil completed the new cathedral (Romanesque), which he consecrated in 1145. On this occasion he increased the membership and the endowments of the cathedral chapter, and improved the condition of the cathedral school.

On various occasions Eskil was involved in the internal political disputes of rival kings, even to the extent of being temporarily held captive in his own cathedral, for which he was, however, later indemnified by various land-grants. During the Crusades, Eskil, animated by the example of St. Bernard, also preached a crusade against the pagan Wends, which, unfortunately, proved unsuccessful. He, nevertheless, continued his campaign with youthful ardour, even in his old age, till, after the conquest of Rügen, the Wends accepted Christianity. In 1152 Cardinal Nicholas Breakspear, as papal legate, was sent to Scandinavia to settle ecclesiastical affairs. Norway was constituted a separate ecclesiastical province with its metropolitan see at Trondhjem (Nidaros). Eskil remained Archbishop of Lund. He was also nominated Primate of Sweden and papal legate for the North. By a proper selection of persons for the higher ecclesiastical offices he effected an immense improvement in the standard of religious life. In 1161 he drew up a code of canon law for Skåne, which, ten years later, was introduced into Seeland. The monastic orders are especially indebted to Eskil. As Bishop of Roskilde he called the Benedictines to Næstved; and the monastery of the Regular Augus-

tinians at Eskilsö near Roskilde most probably traces its origin to him. Later he established the Premonstratensian monastery in Tommerup, Skåne; the Knights of St. John also settled in Lund during his time. There was also, in Seeland, an establishment of Carthusian monks, but only for a short time. The Cistercian monks were especial favourites of Eskil, who founded their first monastery in 1144 at Herivadum near Helsingborg, which was soon followed by one at Esrom in Nordseeland (1154). From both of these various branches were established. Eskil corresponded with St. Bernard, whom he admired and revered. With a view to being admitted to the Cistercian Order he visited St. Bernard at Clairvaux in 1152. Bernard refused him admission, pointing out that his services as bishop would be more beneficial to the Church at large.

Hearing of Bernard's death (1153), Eskil made a pilgrimage to the saint's grave and thence to Rome, where all his archiepiscopal privileges were ratified by Pope Adrian IV (Breakspear). Returning he was imprisoned at Thionville (at the instigation of the Archbishop of Bremen?). In a dignified letter to the kings and the bishops of Denmark Eskil expressed his willingness rather to suffer innocently in defence of the Church's prerogatives than to be ransomed. Having obtained his liberty in 1158, Eskil returned home, where he found King Waldemar sole sovereign. When the latter took the part of Victor, the antipope, Eskil, faithful to Alexander III, took refuge in foreign parts. Excepting a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, he lived in France (Clairvaux), in close proximity to the pope. In 1164 he consecrated Stephen of Alvastra, a Cistercian monk, first Archbishop of Upsala. After Waldemar's reconciliation with Alexander III, Eskil returned home (1168). Subsequent to the solemn translation of the relics of the canonized (1169) martyr-duke, Knud Lavard (d. 1131), Waldemar's father, Eskil crowned the king's seven-year-old son at Ringsted, 1170. After another sojourn at Clairvaux (1174–76), the venerable archbishop received permission from the pope to resign and to nominate a successor. In the spring of 1177, in the presence of the king, numerous prelates, and a great concourse of people assembled in the cathedral of Lund, Eskil, having read the papal decree, declared that he resigned on his own initiative, laid the official insignia on the altar, and, all consenting, designated Bishop Absalon of Roskilde as his successor. He then retired to Clairvaux, spending his last days as a simple monk. The Cistercians honour him as venerable. The question whether Eskil was married and had a daughter is a subject of controversy. Although the celibacy of the clergy did not generally obtain during his time, we may, nevertheless, infer from his strictly religious principles that Eskil did not ignore the provisions of canon law by marrying after his admission to Sacred orders.

Henriquez, *Menologium Cisterciense* (Antwerp, 1630); Sommelius, *Disputationes historicæ de meritis et fatis Eskilli* (Lund, 1764–65); Langebek, *Scriptores Rerum Danicarum* (Copenhagen, 1772–3), I, 43, II, 619 sq.; Suhm, *Historie af Danmark* (Copenhagen, 1792–1800), V, VI, VII; Helveg, *Den danske Kirkes Historie* (Copenhagen, 1862), I, 333–436; Olrik, *Konge og Præstestand i Danmark* (Copenhagen, 1895), II, 20–92; Jörgensen, *Historiske Afhandlinger* (Copenhagen, 1898), I, 5–58; Steenstrup, *Danmarks Riges Historie* (Copenhagen, 1901–4), I, 554–646.

Philipp Baron von Kettenburg.

Eskimo, a littoral race occupying the entire Arctic coast and outlying islands of America from below Cook Inlet in Alaska to the mouth of the St. Lawrence, a distance of more than five thousand miles, including the coasts of Labrador, Baffin Land, and Ellesmere Land, with the west and south-east coasts of Greenland, the northern shores of Hudson Bay, and the Aleutian Islands, while one body, the Yuit, has even crossed Bering Strait, and is now permanently established on the extreme point of Siberia. Traditional and historical evidence go to show that the Eskimo formerly extended considerably farther south along Hudson Bay and the St. Lawrence, and perhaps even into New England. With the exception of the Aleut, who differ very considerably from the rest, the various small bands scattered throughout the vast stretch of territory are practically homogeneous, both linguistically and ethnologically, indicating long ages of slow development under similar and highly specialized conditions. In physique they are of medium stature, but strong and hardy, with yellow-brown skin and features, suggesting the Mongolian rather than the Indian, although there is no reason to suppose them of other than American origin. The only apparent admixture with the Indian occurs on their extreme southern frontier in Alaska. Owing to their constant exposure in the chilling waters, they are not long-lived. In character they are generally peaceable, cheerful, and honest, but with the common savage disregard of morality. The Aleut of the Alaskan peninsula and the Aleutian Islands speak a distinct language in two dialects, while all the others, including the Yuit of Siberia, speak practically but one language, in several dialects. The name by which they are commonly known is derived from an Algonkian term signifying "eaters of raw flesh". They call themselves Inuit, in various dialectic forms, meaning simply "people".

Living in a land of perpetual snow and ice, the Eskimo depend entirely upon hunting and fishing for a living, while the seafaring habit has made them perhaps the most expert and daring boatmen in the world. In summer they hunt the caribou and musk-ox on land; in winter they hunt the seal and polar bear in the water or on the ice floes. In travelling by sledge, and to some extent in hunting and sealing, they rely much upon an intelligent breed of dogs trained to harness. Their houses are grouped into little settlements never more than a day's journey from the ocean. Those for temporary summer use are generally simple tents of deer or seal-skin. Their winter homes are either subterranean excavations roofed over with sod and earth laid upon a framework of timber or whale ribs, or are dome-shaped structures built of blocks cut from the hardened snow, with passage-ways and smaller rooms of the same material, with sheets of clear ice for windows. The roof of the snow-house is sometimes lined on the inside with skins to prevent dripping from the melting snow. Besides the bed platforms extending around the sides of the rooms, with the spears, harpoons, and other hunting equipment, the most important items of furniture are the stone lamps, fed with whale oil, for heating, lighting, and cooking purposes. The characteristic woman's tool is the *ulu* or skin-dressing knife.

Their clothing is of skins with the hair outside, or of the intestinal membranes of the larger sea animals, there being little difference between the costumes of men and women. Tattooing is common among the women, labrets are used in some tribes, but trinkets are seldom worn and the face is not painted. Their food consists of meat and fish, commonly boiled in a stone kettle, with an abundance of blubber and oil, together with berries gathered in the short summer season. From lack of running water, crowded quarters, and greasy environment, they are as a rule extremely filthy in person and habit. They are very ingenious and expert in the dressing of skins, the shaping of their fishing and hunting implements, and the construction of their skin canoes; they also display great artistic instinct and ability in the carving of designs in walrus ivory. The peculiar Eskimo *kaiak* or skin boat, made of dressed seal hides stretched around a framework of whale ribs or wood, with an opening in the top only large enough to accommodate the sitting body of one man, is one of the most perfect contrivances in the world for water travel, being light, swift,

and practically unsinkable. It is propelled by means of a double paddle. The sledge is commonly a framework of drift-wood, but is sometimes made from the rib bones of whales, or even of a cigar-shaped mass of dried salmon wrapped in skins and frozen solid. The social organization is very simple, each little village community being usually distinct and independent from the others, with little of tribal cohesion or chiefly authority, the head man being rather an adviser than a ruler. Established custom, however, has all the force of law. The bond of affection between parent and children is very strong, children being seldom corrected or punished, and old people being held in respect. Monogamy is the rule, but polygamy and polyandry are sometimes found. Violations of law, including murder, are punished by the injured individual or his nearest relations.

Their religion, like that of most primitive peoples, is a simple animism, interpreted by the *angakoks* or medicine-men and enforced by numerous taboos. All the powers of nature, animate and inanimate, on sea and land, are invoked or propitiated as the occasion arises. A special deity in the central region is an old woman of the sea, who presides over storms and sea-animals, the latter having been created from her own fingers. Some tribes believe in two souls, one of which remains near the dead body until it can enter that of a little child, while the other goes to one of several soul lands, either above or below the earth. There are numerous hunting and eating taboos and ceremonial precautions. Singing, music, story-telling, hand-games, mask-dances, and athletic competitions make up a large part of the home life. A peculiar institution among the central and eastern tribes is that of the so-called "nith song" (Norse *nith*, contention), or duel of satire, in which two rivals exhaust upon each other their capacity for ridicule until one or the other is declared victor by the company.

The history of the Eskimo goes back beyond the Columbian period as far at least as their first contact with the Scandinavians about the year 1000, almost simultaneously in Greenland and on the coast of Labrador or New England. They do not seem to have approached the neighbourhood of the Scandinavian settlements in South Greenland until about the end of the thirteenth century. In 1379 they made their first attack upon the Greenland colony, and a war began, of which all details are lost, but which ended in the complete destruction of the colony towards the close of the next century, so that even the way to Greenland was entirely forgotten, and on the second discovery of the island in 1585, by Davis, it was found occupied only by Eskimo, who remained in sole possession until the second colonization from Denmark in 1721, under the leadership of the missionary Hans Egede. Since then most of the Greenland Eskimo have been gradually civilized and Christianized under Lutheran and Moravian auspices.

In 1752 a Moravian missionary party made a landing on the Eskimo coast of Labrador, but was at once attacked by the natives, who killed six of them. In 1771, however, they attempted a mission settlement at Nain, this time with success, Nain now being the chief station on the Labrador coast, with five other subordinate stations, counting altogether some 1200 Christian Eskimo. Regular mission work in Alaska was begun among the Aleut by the Russian Orthodox church in 1794, resulting in a few years in the complete Christianization of the Aleut, who had already, however, been terribly reduced by the wanton cruelty of the fur traders. Russian mission work is still carried on successfully both on the islands and along the west coast of Alaska. Protestant workers entered the field about 1880, beginning with the Presbyterians, followed successively by the Moravians, Episcopalians, the Swedish Evangelical Union, Congregationalists, Lutherans, and Friends, numbering now altogether about fifteen stations along the Eskimo coast of Alaska, besides others among the neighbouring Indians. Of special note in connexion with this work is the successful introduction of Siberian reindeer by Rev. Sheldon Jackson, Presbyterian, under government patronage, to supplement the diminishing food supply of the natives. In 1865 the noted Oblate missionary explorer Father Emil Petitot, descending the Mackenzie, visited the Eskimo at the mouth of the Anderson River on the Arctic coast of the British North-West, preached to them, and afterwards to those at the mouths of Mackenzie and Peel Rivers, and crossed over in 1870 into Alaska. Among the ethnologic results of his work in this region are a grammar and vocabulary of the Tchighit Eskimo (Paris, 1876). In 1886 the Jesuits entered Alaska, establishing their first mission among the Indians at Nulato on the Yukon, and proceeding later to the Eskimo, among whom they have now a number of flourishing stations, the principal being those of Holy Cross (Koserefsky), St. Mary's (Akularak), and one at Nome. They are assisted by the Sisters of St. Anne and the Lamennais Brothers, and count some 1300 converts among the Eskimo, exclusive of Indians. The Eskimo grammar and dictionary of Father Francis Barnum, S.J. (1901) ranks as standard. No permanent mission work has ever been attempted by any denomination along the Arctic and Hudson Bay coast from Alaska to Labrador (see ALASKA). The total number of Eskimo is estimated at about 29,000, viz. Greenland 11,000; Labrador 1400; Central Region 1100; Alaska Eskimo proper 13,000; Aleut 1000; Yuit of Siberia 1200.

BARNUM, *The Innuit Language* (Boston, 1901); BOAS, *The Central Eskimo* in *Sixth Report, Bureau Am. Ethnology* (Washington, 1888); *Report, Director of Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions* (Washington, 1907); CRANZ, *Hist. of Greenland*, 2 vols., tr. from Ger. (London, 1767); DALL, *Tribes of the Extreme Northwest* in *Cont. N. Am. Ethnology* (Washington, 1877), II; EGEDE, *Description of Greenland*, tr. from Ger. (London, 1818); JACKSON, *Facts about Alaska* (New York, 1903); *Labrador Missionen der Brüder Unität* (Spandau, 1871); MOONEY, *Missions* in HODGE, *Handbook of Amer. Indians* (Washington, 1907); MURDOCH, *The Point Barrow Exped.* in *Ninth Rept. Bur. Am. Ethn.* (Washington, 1892); NELSON, *The Eskimo about Bering Strait* in *Eighteenth Rept. Bur. Am. Ethn.* (Washington, 1899); PETITOT, *Vocabulaire Français-Esquimau*, etc. (Paris, 1876); RINK, *Tales and Traditions of the Eskimo—Greenland* (London, 1875); THALBITZER, *A Phonetical Study of the Eskimo Language* (Copenhagen, 1904); TURNER, *Ethnology of the Ungava District* in *Eleventh Rept. Bur. Am. Ethn.* (Washington, 1894).

JAMES MOONEY.

Esnambuc, PIERRE BÉLAIN, SIEUR D', captain in the French marine, b. 1565, at Allouville, near Yvetot (Seine-Inférieure); d. at St. Christopher in Dec., 1636. He was the founder of the French colonies in the Antilles, and their first governor. Sailing from Dieppe, in 1625, on a brigantine of four guns with a crew of thirty-five men, he took possession of the island of St. Christopher. Returning to France in the following year he brought about the formation by Richelieu of the Company of the American Islands (Oct., 1626). At this time he was authorized to occupy St. Christopher and Barbadoes. Once established at St. Christopher he wished to make the influence of France felt throughout the Antilles, and for ten years directed all his energies to the accomplishment of this great work. Owing to his efforts, colonists were recruited throughout Lower Normandy, chiefly in the vicinity of Dieppe, Honfleur, and Havre-de-Grâce, and these established flourishing settlements in Guadeloupe, Dominica, Les Saintes, and Marie Galante. In September, 1635, d'Esnambuc recruited at St. Christopher one hundred and fifty determined men, and landing at Martinique, built in the following year the town of St.-Pierre. He died in the same year at St. Christopher, leaving to his nephews the government of the kingdom beyond the sea, which he had merely inaugurated. On hearing of his death Richelieu declared that the king and his realm had lost one of their best servants.

DU TERTRE, *Histoire Générale des isles de Saint-Christophe, de*

la Guadeloupe, etc. (Paris, 1654), 4, 45–46; MOREAU DE SAINT-MÉRY, *Lois et constitutions des colonies françaises*, I, 18, 29, 33, 36, 51; MARGRY, *Bélain d'Esnambuc et les Normands aux Antilles* (1863); IDEM, *Les Seigneurs de la Martinique* in *Revue mar. et colon.* (Paris, 1878); BRÉARD, *Documents relatifs à la marine Normande* (Rouen, 1889), 147, 179, 181, 190.

J. EDMOND ROY.

Espejo, ANTONIO, a Spanish explorer, whose fame rests upon a notable expedition which he conducted into New Mexico and Arizona in 1582–3. According to his own statement, he was b. in Cordova, but the dates both of his b. and d. are unknown. Following the reports brought to Mexico from the north by Cabeza de Vaca and the Franciscan monk, Marcos de Nizza, a powerful expedition had been fitted out under the governor, Coronado, in 1540, which after passing through the territories of the Pueblo tribes of the Rio Grande, had penetrated as far as the province of Quivira, probably the country of the Wichita Indians on the Middle Arkansas, returning in the summer of 1542. Two Franciscan volunteers, Father Juan de Padilla and a lay brother, Luis, remained behind, of whom the first was afterwards murdered by the tribe —the first missionary martyr of the United States— while of the fate of the other nothing was ever known. Forty years later three other Franciscans undertook to establish missions among the Tigua, about the present Bernalillo, New Mexico. Soon rumours of their death at the hands of the Indians came back to Mexico, and finding the authorities dilatory in the matter, Espejo, a wealthy mining proprietor, offered to equip and lead a search expedition at his own expense. The offer was accepted and, being regularly commissioned, with only fourteen soldiers, a number of Christian Indians, and a cavalcade of horses and mules, he left San Bartolomé, Chihuahua, for the north on 10 Nov., 1582. From the junction of the Concho with the Rio Grande he ascended the latter stream, through populous tribes, to the pueblo of Puara, where he learned definitely of the murder of the three missionaries. Fearing punishment, the Indians had deserted their pueblo, and fled to the mountains.

Having accomplished his first purpose, Espejo determined to explore the unknown country beyond. After visiting several of the neighbouring pueblos he crossed over to the Zuñi, near the present Arizona line, where he found three Christian Indians of Coronado's earlier expedition. Here several of the party decided to return, and with only nine soldiers and a party of Indians he pushed on to the Hopi (Moqui) villages in northern Arizona, where he met a friendly reception and was given guides to a mountain country farther on—apparently some fifty miles northward from the site of Prescott—where he procured some rich specimens of silver ore. Returning to the Rio Grande, he visited several other pueblos farther up the river and then went over to the Pecos, noting other mines by the way. In consequence of the threatening attitude of the Tanos tribe he finally decided to return to Mexico, arriving at his starting-point in September, 1583, having accomplished, without bloodshed and with a handful of men, as great results as had been obtained by Coronado with a whole army and at the cost of an exterminating warfare upon the Indians. He soon afterwards submitted a report, with a map of the regions explored, but his later proposition to organize a colonizing expedition was defeated by the jealousy of the viceroy.

ESPEJO, *Relacion del viage*, etc. in PACHECO, *Colección de Documentos inéditos* (Madrid, 1864–1881), XV; also a variant version, Spanish and English, in HAKLUYT, *Voyages* (London, 1600), III; SHEA, *The Catholic Church in Colonial Days* (New York, 1886); H. H. BANCROFT, *History of Arizona and New Mexico* (San Francisco, 1889), XVII of complete works.

JAMES MOONEY.

Espen, ZEGER BERNHARD VAN, also called ESPENIUS, a Belgian canonist, b. at Louvain, 9 July, 1646; d. at Amersfoort, Netherlands, 2 Oct., 1728. He completed his higher studies at Louvain, became priest in 1673, and doctor of civil and canon law in 1675. He soon began to teach canon law at the University of Louvain where he was obliged to lecture only for six weeks during the summer vacation; the professor might explain one or other important chapter of the decretals, at his choice. He never accepted any other chair at the university, and he resigned even this position in order to devote himself entirely to study. He was consulted by all classes on account of his profound learning in canon law, and his famous work, "Jus canonicum universum", although it raised numerous just criticisms, still remains remarkable. The author is accused, not without reason, of having borrowed considerably from the works of his predecessors, notably from Thomassin, yet it must be recognized that Van Espen possessed the art of setting forth in a lucid and intelligible way the discipline of the ancient Church; he also cast light upon questions which up to his time had been very obscure. His clear and concise style gives to his work a value which the labours of his predecessors do not possess. He collected the most recent legislative decisions of the Church and discussed them with judgment, except where party spirit blinded him. He had also the incontestable merit of showing with precision the special law of Belgium. Benedict XIV recognized his authority in this matter. On the other hand he was a strenuous defender of the Gallican theories. He misconstrued the right of religious authority and exaggerated beyond measure the right of the civil power. It may be added, however, that he exalted and combated in turn all power, even the civil power. He exalted the power of the bishops in order to lessen that of the religious orders, and the rights of an extinct chapter in order to combat the powers of the pope. He gained for himself unpleasant notoriety in the Jansenist conflicts, by denying the importance of the famous distinction between right and fact with regard to the doctrine of Jansen; he declared that it was of little consequence to admit that Jansen had taught the propositions condemned by the Bull "Unigenitus" (1713) provided the doctrine itself was rejected.

The Jansenist quarrels led to Van Espen's ruin. On being consulted by the Jansenists of Holland with regard to the ordination of the Jansenist Bishop of Utrecht, Cornelius Steenoven, he pronounced in favour of this ordination, which had been performed without the authorization of the Holy See. An unsuccessful attempt has been made to justify Van Espen's conduct in this matter, on the ground that he merely declared that episcopal ordination performed by a single bishop was valid. This was not the whole question, nor was it indeed the principal question, viz. to determine whether an episcopal ordination, performed without the pope's consent, was admissible. His action in this matter and his Jansenist doctrines brought about his suspension *a divinis* by the Bishop of Mechlin. The latter summoned him to make a declaration of orthodox faith. At the order of the civil power, the University of Louvain condemned and deprived (1728) Van Espen of his university functions. In the meantime he fled, and took refuge first at Maastricht, and afterwards at Amersfoort, where he found protection in the Jansenist community, and where he died. The Augustinian Désirant, professor at the University of Louvain, is accused of having fabricated false documents in the controversy with Van Espen. This struggle is known as the "Forgery of Louvain". Désirant was condemned by the academical authorities and banished forever from his native country. The best edition of the works of Van Espen, all of which are on the Index, is that published in four volumes at Louvain, 1753. A fifth volume, "Supplementum ad varias collec-

tiones operum", was published at Brussels in 1768, and contains numerous biographical details.

DU PAC DE BELLEGARDE, *Vie de Van Espen* (Brussels, 1767); LAURENT, *Van Espen* (Paris, 1860); DE BAVAY, *Van Espen, jurisconsulte et canoniste Belge* in *Belgique Judiciaire* (Brussels, 1846), IV, 1463; VERHOEVEN, *Van Espen* in *Revue Catholique* (Louvain, 1846–47), IV, 497; DE RAM in BAKHUISEN, *Acta Zegeri Bernardi Van Espen circa missionem Hollandicam* (Mechlin, 1827).

A. VAN HOVE.

Espence (ESPENCÆUS), CLAUDE D', a French theologian, b. in 1511 at Châlons-sur-Marne; d. 5 Oct., 1571, at Paris. He entered the Collège de Navarre in 1536, and four years later was made rector of the University of Paris, even before receiving the doctorate, which was conferred on him in 1542. He was then called to the court of Cardinal de Lorraine. Some propositions in his Lenten sermons of 1543 were referred to the Sorbonne, and d'Espence was asked to explain or retract them. He was one of the theologians called to the consultation held at Mélun in 1544 in relation to the Council of Trent. In 1547, having been sent to the council itself, then transferred to Bologna, he returned to France almost immediately, as the council was again adjourned. He went to another consultation held at Orléans in 1560. At the Conference of Poissy (1561) he argued against Beza in favour of tradition, the infallibility of the Church, the Sacrament of Order, etc. The same year an anonymous work was published on the veneration of images. This work was censured by the Sorbonne, and as d'Espence was believed to be its author, he was required to subscribe to the sixteenth article of the faculty, which was directed against Protestants.

D'Espence's works, collected in one volume (Paris, 1619), are: "Traité contre l'erreur vieil et renouvelé des Prédestinés" (Lyons, 1548); "Institution d'un prince chrétien" (Lyons, 1548), dedicated to Henry II; "De clandestinis matrimoniis" (Paris, 1561), in which the parents' consent is held to be necessary for the validity of marriage; "Cinq sermons ou traités . . ." (Paris, 1562); "Libellus de privatâ et publicâ missâ", which shows that in the primitive Church Mass was not celebrated unless some of the faithful were present; "De continentiâ" (Paris, 1565); "Commentarius in epistolam primam ad Timotheum" (Paris, 1561); "Comm. in posteriorem epist. ad Timotheum" (Paris, 1564); "Comm. in epist. ad Titum" (Paris, 1568). To these are added a few other works, treatises, discourses, sermons, conferences, and poems.

HURTER, *Nomenclator*, I, 6; DUPIN, *Nouvelle Bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques* (Paris, 1710), XVI, 104; SIMON, *Hist. crit. des. principaux commentaires du N. T.* (Rotterdam, 1693), 591; KERKER in *Kirchenlex.*, IV, 906; BARTHÉLEMY, *Etude biog. sur Claude d'Espence* (Châlons-sur-Marne, 1853).

C. A. DUBRAY.

Espinel, VICENTE, poet and novelist; b. at Ronda (Malaga), Spain, 1544; d. at Madrid, 1634. He studied at Salamanca and while still young went as a soldier to Italy and Flanders. Returning to Ronda, he took Holy orders and was made chaplain of the hospital at that place. Later, he went to Madrid, where he lived with Lope de Vega whose friend and teacher he was, and died there in poverty, as we are told by Lope in his "Laurel de Apolo". In 1618 he published at Barcelona a romance descriptive of Spanish manners entitled "Relaciones de la Vida y Hechos del Escudero Marcos de Obregón". The work attracted attention at the time, and afterwards became famous because of several imitations and because of the controversies which it caused. It has been thought that many of the adventures of the hero are to a great extent drawn from those in the life of Espinel himself. The work is admirably written, is filled with wise maxims, and the language is pure and simple. Le Sage, the author of "Gil Blas de Santillana", has been accused of borrowing many incidents and characters from Espinel's work. As a poet, Espinel also enjoyed some reputation. He translated Horace's "Art of Poetry", and published his own "Diversas Rimas" in Madrid in 1591. He was the inventor of the measure known at first as the "espinela" and later as the "decima", because it has ten syllables. He was also noted for his musical taste. He added the fifth string to the national guitar. The "Marcos de Obregón" was translated into English by Algernon Langton (London, 1816), into German by Tieck (Breslau, 1827), with a preface and notes, and into French by Vidal d'Audiguier (1816).

TIECK, *Kritische Schriften* (1848); *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles* (1848–86).

VENTURA FUENTES.

Espinosa, ALONSO DE, Spanish priest and historian of the sixteenth century. Little is known of his early life. He is first heard of towards the end of the sixteenth century in Guatemala where he had become a Dominican. It was while he was in Central America that he first heard of the miracles of Our Lady of Candelaria. This was an image of the Virgin and Child that had been among the Guanches of Tenerife since long before their conversion to Christianity, and had been venerated not only by the Guanches, but later by their conquerors, the Spaniards. Inspired by the fame of this image, Espinosa soon found a member of the fraternity which had possession of it, and resolved to make researches and write a history of the image and its miracles. The result was his "Guanches of Tenerife" published at Seville in 1594. Although the author's main purpose was to record the history of Our Lady of Candelaria, the work is important as being on the whole the best account of the Guanches, a lost race which has left scarcely any remains, even of their language; and also, though less significant, because he gives a good account of the conquest and settlement of the Canary Islands by the Spaniards. He divides his work into four books, in the first of which he describes the Island of Tenerife, gives its early history, and an account of its inhabitants, their customs, food and dress, marriages, training for war, and mode of interment. The second book gives a detailed history of the image, from its mysterious appearance, on the east coast of the island, to Espinosa's own time. The third book is devoted to the invasion, conquest, and settlement of the island by the Spaniards. The fourth and last book contains an enumeration of various cures and other miracles performed by the image. A reprint of Espinosa's book appeared at Santa Cruz in 1848, as one of the "Biblioteca Isleña" series. A translation by Sir Clements Markham was published by the Hakluyt Society in London in 1907.

VENTURA FUENTES.

Espirito-Santo, DIOCESE OF. See SPIRITO SANTO.

Espousals, a contract of future marriage between a man and a woman, who are thereby affianced. The ecclesiastical law governing this contract was amended by the pontifical decree "Ne Temere", on espousals and marriages, which was published 2 Aug., 1907, and took effect 19 April (Easter), 1908. For the old legislation see BETROTHAL; the present article will be confined to the new. Regarding espousals the decree enacts as follows: "Only those espousals are held to be valid and to beget canonical effects which are made in writing, signed by both parties, and either by the parish priest or the ordinary of the place, or at least by two witnesses. In case one or both of the parties be unable to write, this fact is to be noted in the document, and another witness is to add his signature to the contract as above, together with that of the parish priest or the ordinary of the place, or the two witnesses. Until Easter of 1908, there was no written document prescribed for espousals, except for Spain. Like other contracts, the promise of marriage was supposed to bind the parties making it according to prevailing law

or custom. That caused many difficulties which necessitated this law. Private, clandestine espousals are henceforth of no value in the eyes of the Church. In the United States engagements were, as a rule, not considered effective enough to entail the impediment of public honesty which, unless the engagement were properly revoked, would render null and void the marriage of either affianced party with a blood-relation in the first degree of the other affianced party, and make sinful marriage with any other person not so related, unless the engagement had been rightly broken. These are the canonical effects which are not begotten unless the espousals are made in writing, whether by filling out a blank formula or by writing the document entirely.

As to the obligation of contracting espousals in writing, it is to be noted that the law does not concern itself with the promise of marriage as a matter of conscience; only with establishing the fact that espousals have no legal value and will not be considered in case of contention by ecclesiastical courts, unless they are in writing. Hence, *in foro interno* the Church leaves the matter to the confessor. The law suggests no particular formula for the contract of espousals. It must, however, express the promise of future marriage. There must be no condition attached contrary to the nature or laws of Christian marriage. No time is assigned by the law within which the promise must be fulfilled; still the time should be reasonable and accord with the common teaching of competent authorities. The document must be signed by both parties—man and woman—promising to marry each other on or within some definite date. If either or both are unable to write their names, that must be noted in the document. They must, of course, affix their signatures somehow, which must be attested by a special witness. In addition, either the parish priest or ordinary must sign it; both need not sign it; the signature of one only is required. By ordinary is meant the bishop of the diocese where the parties happen to be, or his vicar-general, or any one exercising episcopal jurisdiction, as for instance, the administrator when the see is vacant. By parish priest, as used in the present decree, is to be understood not only the priest who legitimately presides over a parish that is canonically erected, but also, in localities where parishes are not canonically erected, the priest to whom the care of souls has been legitimately entrusted in any specified district, and who is equivalent to a parish priest; and also, in missions where the territory has not yet been perfectly divided, every priest generally deputed for the care of souls in any station by the superior of the mission. The ordinary or parish priest cannot depute any other priest to sign in their stead (Reply of S. Congregation of Council, 30 March, 1908). If the signature of the ordinary or of the parish priest cannot be obtained, then at least two witnesses must sign. Their signatures are not needed if either of the foregoing have signed. The witnesses should of course be competent, though they differ in age and sex. The local ecclesiastical authorities are to decide where the document is to be deposited. The new law does not provide for the annulment of espousals. The reasons that formerly sufficed to annul them still remain. If espousals were made as prescribed by the new law, their binding force continues until they shall have been dissolved by proof of either or both parties claiming their dissolution.

McNicholas, *The New Marriage Legislation* (1908), 15–21; Devine, *The Law of Christian Marriage*, 283 sqq.; Cronin, *The New Matrimonial Legislation*, 32–40; De Becker, *Legislatio Nova*, 13–21.

Joseph Selinger.

Espousals of the Blessed Virgin Mary (Desponsatio Beatæ Mariæ Virginis), a feast of the Latin Church. It is certain that a real matrimony was contracted by Joseph and Mary. Still Mary is called "espoused" to Joseph ("his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph", Matt., i, 18) because the matrimony was never consummated. The term *spouse* is applied to married people until their marriage is consummated (Colvenerius, Cal. Marian., 23 Jan.). Peter d'Ailly, chancellor of the University of Paris (d. 1420), and his famous disciple, Jean Charlier, called Gerson, were the first energetic propagators of the devotion in honour of St. Joseph. Gerson worked many years to effect the institution of a special votive feast (Thursday of ember week in Advent), the object of which should be the virginal espousal of Mary and Joseph. Gerson's friend, Henry Chicoti, canon of the cathedral chapter of Chartres, had bequeathed a certain sum for the celebration in the cathedral of this votive feast, for which Gerson had composed a proper Office. It seems that Gerson carried out the will of his friend, but tradition does not tell us on what day the feast was celebrated.

The first definite knowledge of a feast in honour of the espousals of Mary dates from 29 Aug., 1517, when with nine other Masses in honour of Mary, it was granted by Leo X to the Nuns of the Annunciation, founded by Sainte Jeanne de Valois. This feast was celebrated on 22 October as a double of the second class. Its Mass, however, honoured the Blessed Virgin exclusively; it hardly mentioned St. Joseph and therefore did not correspond to the idea of Gerson. Also purely as a feast of Mary it appears in the Missal of the Franciscans, to whom it was granted 21 Aug., 1537, for 7 March (double major). About the same time the Servites obtained the feast for 8 March. The Office of the Nativity of Mary was recited, changing the word *Nativitas* to *Desponsatio*. After the religious orders, among the dioceses which adopted the feast of the Espousals of Mary, Arras takes the lead. It has been kept there since 23 Jan., 1556. The first proper Office was composed by Pierre Doré, O.P. (d. 1569), confessor of Duke Claude of Lorraine. This Office followed the outlines given by Gerson and commemorated both Joseph and Mary. Pierre Doré in 1546 unsuccessfully petitioned Paul III to extend the feast of the *Desponsatio B.M.V.* to the Universal Church. But even without the recommendation of the Apostolic See, the feast was adopted by many Churches. In Moravia it was in the sixteenth century kept on 18 July. In subsequent times Rome did not favour any further extension of the feast, but after it had been refused (1655) to the King of Spain, it was granted to the German Emperor for Austria, 27 Jan., 1678 (23 Jan.); in 1680 it was conceded to Spain, but transferred (13 July, 1682) to 26 Nov., because in Spain the feast of St. Ildephonsus or St. Raymond is kept 23 Jan. In 1680 it was extended to the entire German Empire, 1689 to the Holy Land (double, second class), 1702 to the Cistercians (20 Feb.), 1720 to Tuscany, and 1725 to the Pontifical States. In our days it is kept in nearly the entire Latin Church on 23 Jan., in the Spanish-speaking countries on 26 Nov., but it has never been extended to the Universal Church. Since Pius V abolished the Office of Pierre Doré and introduced the modern Office, it is again a feast of Mary. The commemoration of St. Joseph in Mass, Vespers, Lauds (decree 5 May, 1736) can only be made by a special privilege.

Seitz, *Die Verehrung des hl. Joseph* (Freiburg, 1908); Holweck, *Fasti Mariani* (Freiburg, 1892).

Frederick G. Holweck.

Essence and Existence (Lat. *essentia, existentia*).—Since they are transcendentals, it is not possible to put forward a strict definition of either of the subjects of the present article. Essence, however, is properly described as that whereby a thing is what it is, an equivalent of the τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι of Aristotle (Metaph., VII, 7). The essence is thus the radical or ground from which the various properties of a thing emanate

and to which they are necessarily referred. Thus the notion of the essence is seen to be the abstract counterpart of the concrete entity; the latter signifying that which is or may be (*ens actu, ens potentiâ*), while the former points to the reason or ground why it is precisely what it is. As furnishing in this manner an answer to the question What? (*Quid?*)—as, e. g., What is man?—essence is equivalent to *quiddity;* and thus, as St. Thomas remarks (I, Q. iii, a. 3), the essence of a thing is that which is expressed by its definition. Essence and nature express the same reality envisaged in the two points of view as being or acting. As the essence is that whereby any given thing is that which it is, the ground of its characteristics and the principle of its being, so its nature is that whereby it acts as it does, the essence considered as the foundation and principle of its operation. Hence again St. Thomas: "Nature is seen to signify the essence of a thing according as it has relation to its proper operation" (De ente et essentiâ, cap. i). Furthermore, essence is also in a manner synonymous with form, since it is chiefly by their formal principle that beings are segregated into one or other of the species. Thus, while created spiritual things, because they are not composed of matter and form, are specifically what they are by reason of their essences or "forms" alone, the compounded beings of the corporeal world receive their specification and determination of nature, or essence, principally from their substantial forms. A further synonym of essence is species; but it is to be carefully noted that essence in this connexion is used rather with a logical or metaphysical connotation than with a real or physical one. This distinction is of considerable importance. The real or physical essence of compound entities consists in, or results from, the union of the constituent parts. Thus if we consider man as a being composed of matter and form, body and soul, the physical essence will be the body and soul. Apart from any act of abstraction, body and soul exist in the physical order as the constituents of man. On the other hand, we may consider man as the result of a composition of *genus proximum* and *differentia ultima*, i. e. of his animality and his rationality. Here the essence, humanity, is metaphysical or logical. Thus, while the real essence, to speak still only of composite beings, consists in the collection of all those physical component parts that are required to constitute the entity what it is, either actually or potentially existent, without which it can be neither actual nor potential, the logical essence is no more than the composition of ideas or notions, abstracted mentally and referred together in what are known as "second intentions".

This consideration provides a basis for the distinction of essences according to the degree of physical and metaphysical complexity or simplicity which they severally display. The Supreme Being has—or rather is—a unique and utterly simple essence, free from all composition, whether physical or metaphysical. Moreover, in God—otherwise, as we shall see, than in creatures—there is no distinction of any kind between His essence and His existence. Spiritual created beings, however, as free from the composition of matter and form, have physically simple essences; yet they are composite in that their essences are the result of a union of genus and differentia, and are not identical with their existence. In the angel the essence is the species consequent on this union. Corporeal creatures not only share in metaphysical complexity of essence, but have, on account of their material composition, a physical complexity as well.

The characteristic attributes of the essence are immutability, indivisibility, necessity, and infinity.—Since the essence of anything is that whereby the thing is what it is, it follows directly from the principle of contradiction that essences must be immutable. This, of course, is not true in the sense that physical essences cannot be brought into being or cease to exist, nor that they cannot be decomposed into their constituent parts, nor yet that they are not subject to accidental modification. The essence of God alone, as stated above, is so entirely free from any sort of composition that it is in the strictest sense immutable. Every essence, however, is immutable in this, that it cannot be changed or broken up into its constituent parts and yet remain the same essence. The attribute is transcendental and is applied to essence precisely as it is essence. Thus, while the essence of any given man may be broken up into body and soul, animality and rationality, man as man and humanity as humanity is changeless. One individual ceases to exist; the essence itself, whether verified or not in concrete actuality, persists. The definition, "man is a rational animal", is an eternally immutable truth, verifiable whenever and wherever the subject man is given, either as a concrete and existent entity, or as a mere potentiality. Similarly, essences are said to be indivisible; that is to say, an essence ceases to be what it is when it is broken up into its constituents. Neither body nor soul alone is man. Neither animality nor rationality, taken separately, is humanity. Therefore, precisely as essence, it is indivisible. In like manner necessity is predicated of essences. They are necessary in that, though they may be merely possible and contingent, each must of necessity always be itself. In the order of actual being, the real essence is necessarily what it is, since it is that whereby the thing is what it is; in the order of the merely possible, it must necessarily be identical with itself. Finally, essences are said to be eternal and infinite in the negative sense that, as essences, there is no reason for their non-existence, nor for their limitation to a given number of individuals in any species. From what has been said, the distinction between essence considered as physical and as metaphysical will be apparent. It is the metaphysical essence that is eternal, immutable, indivisible, necessary, etc.; the physical essence that is temporal, contingent, etc. In other words, the metaphysical essence is a formal universal, while the physical essence is that real particularization of the universal that provides the basis for the abstraction.

So far the present article has been occupied in exhibiting the Scholastic view with regard to essence, and in obtaining a certain precision of thought rather than in raising any problems intimately connected with the subject. Notice must be taken, however, of a philosophical tradition which has found adherents mainly among British philosophers and which is at variance with the Scholastic. This tradition would treat as futile and illusory any investigation or discussion concerning the essences of things. By those who hold it, either the fact of essence is flatly denied and what we conceive of under that name is relegated to the region of purely mental phenomena; or, what practically amounts to the same thing, that fact is judged to be doubtful and consequently irrelevant; or again, while the fact itself may be fully admitted, essence is declared to be unknowable, except in so far as we may be said to know that it is a fact. Of those who take up one or other of these positions with regard to the essence of things, the most prominent may be cited. Hobbes and Locke, Mill, Hume, Reid, and Bain, the Positivists and the Agnostics generally, together with a considerable number of scientists of the present day, would not improperly be described as either doubtful or dogmatically negative as to the reality, meaning, and cognoscibility of essence. The proponents and defenders of such a position are by no means always consistent. While they make statements of their case, based for the most part on purely subjective views of the nature of reality, that the essences of beings are nonentities, or at least unknowable, and, as a consequence, that the whole science of metaphysics is no more than a jargon of meaningless

terms and exploded theories, they, on the other hand, express opinions and make implicit admissions that tell strongly against their own thesis. Indeed, it would generally seem that these philosophers, to some extent at least, misunderstand the position which they attack, that they combat a sort of intuitive knowledge of essences, erroneously supposed by them to be claimed by Scholastics, and do not at all grasp the theory of the natures of things as derived from a painstaking consideration of their characteristic properties. Thus even Bain admits that there may in all probability be some one fundamental property to which all the others might be referred; and he even uses the words "real essence" to designate that property. Mill tells us that "to penetrate to the more hidden agreement on which these more obvious and superficial agreements (the differentiæ leading to the greatest number of interesting propria) depend, is often one of the most difficult of scientific problems. And as it is among the most difficult, so it seldom fails to be among the most important". Father Rickaby in his "General Metaphysics" gives the citations from both Mill and Bain, as well as an important admission from Comte, that the natural tendency of man is to inquire for persistent types, a synonym, in this context, for essences. The philosophical tradition, or school, to which allusion is made—although we have anticipated its assertions by the admissions into which its professors have allowed themselves to be drawn by the exigencies of reason and human language—may be divided roughly into two main classes, with their representatives in Locke and Mill. Locke got rid of the old doctrine by making the "supposed essences" no more than the bare significations of their names. He does not, indeed, deny that there are real essences; on the contrary, he fully admits this. But he asserts that we are incapable of knowing more than the nominal or logical essences which we form mentally for ourselves. Mill, though, as we have seen, he occasionally abandons his standpoint for one more in keeping with the Scholastic view, professedly goes further than Locke in utterly rejecting real essences, a rejection quite in keeping with his general theory of knowledge, which eliminates substance, causality, and necessary truth.

The considerations previously advanced will serve to indicate a line of argument used against scepticism in this matter. The Scholastics do not and never have claimed any direct or perfect acquaintance with the intimate essences of all things. They recognize that, in very many cases, no more than an approximate knowledge can be obtained, and this only through accidental characteristics and consequently by a very indirect method. Still, though the existence of the concrete beings, of which the essences are in question, is contingent and mutable, human knowledge, especially in the field of mathematics, reaches out to the absolute and necessary. For example, the properties of a circle or triangle are deducible from its essence. That the one differs specifically from the other, and each from other figures, that their diverse and necessary attributes, their characteristic properties, are dependent upon their several natures and can be inferred by a mathematical process from these—so much we know. The deductive character of certain geometrical proofs, proceeding from essential definitions, may at least be urged as an indication that the human mind is capable of grasping and of dealing with essences.

Similarly, and even from the admissions of the opponents of the Scholastic tradition given above, it may reasonably be maintained that we have a direct knowledge of essence, and also an indirect, or inductive knowledge of the physical natures existent in the world about us. The essences thus known do not necessarily point to the fact of existence; they may or may not exist; but they certify to us what the things in question are. The knowledge and reality of essences emerges also from the doctrine of universals, which, although formally subjective in character, are true expressions of the objective realities from which they are abstracted. As Father Rickaby remarks: "In the rough the form of expression could hardly be rejected, that science seeks to arrive at the very nature of things and has some measure of success in the enterprise"; and again, "In short, the very admission that there is such a thing as physical science, and that science is *cognitio rerum per causas*—a knowledge of things, according to the *rationale* of them—is tantamount to saying that some manner of acquaintance with essences is possible; that the world does present its objects ranged according to at least a certain number of different kinds, and that we can do something to mark off one kind from another." (General Metaphysics, c. III.)

Existence is that whereby the essence is an actuality in the line of being. By its actuation the essence is removed from the merely possible, is placed outside its causes, and exists in the world of actual things. St. Thomas describes it as the first or primary act of the essence as contrasted with its secondary act or operation (I Sent., dist. xxxiii, Q. i, a. 1, ad 1); and again, as "the actuality of all form or nature" (Summa, I, Q. iii, a. 4). Whereas the essence or quiddity gives an answer to the question as to what the thing is, the existence is the affirmative to the question as to whether it is. Thus, while created essences are divided into both possible and actual, existence is always actual and opposed by its nature to simple potentiality. With regard to the existence of things, the question has been raised as to whether, in the ideal order, the possible is antecedent to the actual. The consideration here does not touch on the real or physical order, in which it is conceded by Scholastics that the potentiality of creatures precedes their actuality. The unique actuality, pure and simple (as against such theorists as von Hartmann, maintaining an absolute primitive potentiality of *all* existence), that necessarily precedes all potentiality, is that of God, in Whom essence and existence are identical. We are concerned with the question: Is the concept of a possible entity prior to that of an existing one? Rosmini answers this question in the affirmative. The School generally takes the opposite view, maintaining the thesis that the primitive idea is of existent entity—that is, essence as actualized and placed outside of its causes—in the concrete, though confused and indeterminate. Such an idea is of narrow intension, but extensively it embraces all being. The thesis is supported by various considerations, such as that the essence is related to its existence as potential to actual, that the act generally is prior to potentiality, and that this latter is known, and only known, through its corresponding actuality. Or, we know the possible being as that which may be, or may exist; and this necessary relation to actual existence, without which the possible is not presented to the mind, indicates the priority, in the line of thought, of the actually existent over the merely possible. Existence is thus seen to be in some sense distinguished from the essence which it actuates.

The question agitated in the School arises at this point: What is the nature of the distinction that obtains between the physical essence and the existence of creatures? It is to be borne in mind that the controversy turns not upon a distinction between the merely possible essence and the same essence as actualized, and thus physically existent; but on the far different and extremely nice point as to the nature of the distinction to be drawn between the actualized and physically existent essence and its existence or actuality, by which it is existent in the physical order. That there is no such distinction in God is conceded by all. With regard to creatures, several opinions have been advanced. Many Thomists hold that a real distinction obtains here and that the essence and exist-

ence of creatures differ as different entities. Others, among them Dominicus Soto, Lepidi, etc., seem to prefer a distinction other than real. The Scotists, affirming their "formal distinction", which is neither precisely logical nor real, but practically equivalent to virtual, decide the point against a real distinction. Suarez, with many of his school, teaches that the distinction to be made is a logical one. The principal arguments in favour of the two chief views may be summarized as follows:—

Thomists: (a) If essence and existence were but one thing, we should be unable to conceive thê one without conceiving the other. But we are as a fact able to conceive of essence by itself. (b) If there be no real distinction between the two, then the essence is identical with the existence. But in God alone are these identical.

Suarez: (a) A real physical essence is actual in the line of being and not merely possible. But this actuality must belong to it, as a physical essence; for it is, *ex hypothesi*, neither nothing nor merely possible, and the actuality of an essence is its existence. Cardinal Franzelin cast the argument in this form: "Est omnino evidens in re positâ extra suas causas, in statu actualitatis, ne ratione quidem abstrahi posse formalem existentiam" (De Verbo Incarnato). (b) It is inconceivable how the existence of a real or physical essence should differ from the essence of its existence.

These positions are maintained, not only by argument, but by reference to the authority and teaching of St. Thomas, as to whose genuine doctrine there is considerable difference of opinion and interpretation. It does not, however, appear to be a matter of great moment, as Soto remarks, whether one holds or rejects the doctrine of a real distinction between essence and existence, so long as the difference between God and His creatures is safe-guarded, in that existence is admitted to be of the essence of God and not of the essence of creatures. And this would seem to be sufficiently provided for even in the supposition that created essences are not distinct from their existences as one thing is from another, but as a thing from its mode.

BLANC, *Dict. de Phil.* (Paris, 1906); EGIDIUS, *Tractatus de ente et essentiâ* (Thomist); FELDNER, *Jahrb. für Phil.*, II, VII; FRICK, *Ontologia* (Freiburg im Br., 1897); KLEUTGEN, *Die Philosophie der Vorzeit* (Innsbruck, 1878); LAHOUSSE, *Prælectiones Logicæ et Ontologiæ* (Louvain, 1899); LEPIDI, *Elementa Philosophiæ Christianæ* (Louvain, 1873); LIBERATORE, *Institutiones Philosophiæ* (Prati, 1883); LIMBOURG, *De distinctione essentiæ ab existentiâ Theses Quattuor;* LOCKE, *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* in *Works* (London, 1714); LORENZELLI, *Philosophiæ Theoreticæ Institutiones* (Paris, 1896); MARTINEAU, *Types of Ethical Theory* (1885); MERCIER, *Ontologie* (Paris, 1902); MILL, *System of Logic* (1843); REID, ed. HAMILTON, *Works* (1872); RICKABY, *General Metaphysics* (London, 1898); RITTLER, *Wesenheit und Dasein in den Geschöpfen;* SUAREZ, *Disputationes Metaphysicæ.*

FRANCIS AVELING.

Essenes, one of three leading Jewish sects mentioned by Josephus as flourishing in the second century B. C., the two others being the Pharisees and the Sadducees. Concerning their origin, history, and tenets there has been much inconclusive controversy. The only ancient authorities we have are a few paragraphs in Philo Judæus, a somewhat lengthy description in Josephus, and a scanty notice in Pliny. The following synopsis is derived mainly from the first two. They are styled *Essæi* by Philo, who derives it from ὅσιος, "holy", and *Essæi* and *Esseni* by Josephus. Their number according to both authors was about 4000 and their chief place of residence along the west side, but away from the shore, of the Dead Sea. They also dwelt in other, mostly secluded, parts and small towns of Palestine; yet some were found in cities. The sect arose about 150 B. C. (the first-named Essene is Judas, 110 B. C.) and disappeared towards the end of the first century A. D. They worshipped one God, Creator and Ruler of all things, omnipotent and omniscient. Moses was held in very high esteem and to blaspheme his name meant death. The sun was held in such reverence as to awaken a suspicion of idolatry. An all-disposing Fate was admitted, yet free will, apparently, was not denied. They refused to join in the Temple sacrifices through fear of pollution, though they sent gifts thither; it seems that no blood-sacrifice was offered by them, as they claimed that a reverent mind was the best offering to God. The Sabbath was observed with most rigorous exactitude, not even the calls of nature being answered. Assembled in their meeting-places, where they sat according to seniority, the Scripture was read and explained, generally in an allegorical manner, by some wise member. They washed frequently, as extreme importance was attached to ceremonial purity, and they followed scrupulously the prescriptions against Levitical defilements; even for a junior to touch a senior was pollution to the latter. What their esoteric doctrines were is not known. Death was welcomed, as they held "that bodies are corruptible and the matter composing them is not lasting, but souls are immortal and live for ever, and proceeding from the most subtle ether have been drawn into bodies as into prisons by some natural longing. But when they are set free from the bonds of the flesh then they rejoice as being freed from a long servitude and mount upwards. And agreeing with the opinions of the Greeks, they declare that the good dwell beyond the ocean in a place which is never oppressed by snow or rain-storms or intense heat, but is always calm and refreshed by a cool breeze breathing from the ocean. To the bad souls they allot a gloomy, tempestuous cave full of never-ending torments" (Jos., Bell. Jud., I, ii, 8). Some conclude from the words just quoted that the Essenes disbelieved in the resurrection of the body.

Among the virtues the Essenes cultivated especially obedience, truthfulness, continence, justice, and temperance; they paid great attention to the sick, respect to the aged, and showed marked kindness and hospitality to strangers. All men were regarded as equal, and slavery was abhorred as contrary to the law of nature. Those guilty of great crimes were punished by long exclusion or perpetual excommunication which, since they were not allowed to eat anything prepared by outsiders, entailed always great hardship and often death. Philosophy was neglected as useless and beyond man's capacity, but ethics was studied with zeal. They searched for medicinal remedies in nature, as they devoted special care to the sick irrespective of creed, and investigated the properties of minerals. They laid claim to magical powers and ability to predict. For the latter some cases are given by Josephus, among them that of the Essene, Manahem, who foretold Herod the Great's kingship when he was but a boy without any royal prospects. All things were held in common, their very houses not being their own. They laboured principally at agricultural pursuits or made farm implements and household articles, but never weapons of war, which they were not allowed to carry, except a staff for defence when travelling. Harvests and wages went to the stewards, who gave as each needed. Clothes and shoes were retained until worn out. No trading was allowed except barter. Anointing with oil was considered a defilement. Servants were forbidden as tempting men to injustice. Their rulers or presidents were elected, likewise their priests—if they can be so called—and their stewards. In towns an officer was appointed to look after travelling brethren. One hundred members constituted a court of justice whose unanimous decision was irrevocable. The members were divided into four classes. The daily routine is given as follows: They were up before daybreak and spoke of no profane subject before the sun, and to it they addressed a prayer as if soliciting it to rise. Each

was sent then to his appointed employment at which he worked until the fifth hour, i. e. eleven o'clock, when all assembled and having bathed in water specially exorcised, and clothed themselves in white, they entered the common dining-room quietly and silently. Before each were placed some bread and a dish of one sort of food. A priest said grace and then, but not before, they might eat. At the end of the repast prayer was again said, the white garments laid aside, and resuming their ordinary attire they worked until evening, when they supped in the same manner. At the noonday meal, which was regarded apparently as a sacrificial feast, being prepared by their priests, no stranger was admitted, but at supper it was otherwise. As they spoke only in turn and observed great moderation in food and drink the silence at the meals appeared to outsiders, so we are told, something very solemn and mysterious. Many of the Essenes reached a great age and they acquired such fortitude of mind and body that the worst torments inflicted on them by the Romans failed to shake their constancy and they met death with a smile.

Most of the Essenes rejected marriage, not on account of any wrong in it but because they did not trust women and desired peace and harmony. They perpetuated their sect by adopting children and admitting adults who were "weary of battling with the rough sea of life", as Pliny says. At their coming they received an apron to wear during their ablutions, a white garment, and a little spade-like instrument with which to dig a hole and cover their excrement from the rays of the sun. For one year their temperance was tested by observing outside the community its ascetic rules. Then came a fresh trial of two years, during which they shared in the lustral rites, but not in the meals, of the initiated. If found satisfactory they were chosen full members and bound themselves by fearful oaths to honour God, observe justice, to be loyal to all, but especially to those in authority, and if ever in authority themselves not to outshine others by dress, to love truth and honesty, to conceal nothing from their fellows, and to reveal nothing to strangers, also to keep secret at all costs their books and the names of their angels. This was the only time when Essenes took oaths, their word being regarded by all as so sacred that Herod excused them from the oath of allegiance. Some of them observed the same rules yet married, but merely for the order's sake and only after three years' probation and if the woman appeared healthy and likely to bear children.

The Essenes have received an amount of attention during the last three centuries out of all proportion to their numbers, their influence upon contemporary life, or their importance as factors in religious development. This sprang from two causes, one external and the other internal. The latter was the curious mixture of Jewish and foreign elements in their tenets and customs. This peculiarity aroused the curiosity and exercised the ingenuity of the learned to account for the combination. That the Essenes were really Jews, though speaking very likely Greek (Jews by *race*, says Josephus), is admitted. Their belief in one God, reverence for Moses, strict observance of the Sabbath, fanatic adherence to circumcision (Hippolytus), etc. all show this; while their attitude towards the sun, election of priests, their mode of life, likened to the Pythagorean by Josephus himself, etc. seem to show outside influence. The source of this influence, like everything Essenic, begets controversy, but so far no one has succeeded in determining it satisfactorily. Buddhism, Parseeism, Pythagoreanism (old, new, and Orphic), Hellenism, etc. have all had their claims put forth as one of the parents of this hybrid sect. Suffice it to say that Persian-Babylonian influence through the Captivity, and Hellenism filtering in through Alexandria and the use of the Greek tongue can amply account for foreign elements. The claim that these elements, if divested of their Grecian appearance, could be proved to have their roots in Biblical ground is not lightly to be set aside. The external cause of attention was the bias of English deists and Continental rationalists who strove to metamorphize the Essenes into predecessors from whom gradually and quite naturally Christians developed; and Freemasons pretended to find in Essenism pure Christianity. In reference to such chimeras it is enough to say that between Essenism in certain aspects and Christianity there are some points of resemblance; it could not very well be otherwise because Essenism was Judaic in its foundation and Christianity was not destructive but progressive. On the other hand, the differences are fundamental. That John the Baptist and Christ were Essenes are mere assumptions based on similarities which spring naturally and independently from asceticism and voluntary poverty. So likewise the vaunted dependence between Essenism and monasticism can be resolved into necessary traits of any ascetic, communistic life (see "Wuku" in "Studien u. Mittheilungen d. Ben. Cist. Ordens", 1890, I, 223–30; Berlière in "Revue Bénéd.", 1891, VIII, 12–190). "The attitude of Jesus and His disciples is altogether anti-Essenic" (Jewish Encyc.). The strict silence about any Messias is due partly perhaps to the secrecy of the Essenes and mainly no doubt to His rejection by their chronicler, Josephus. In fine, our present knowledge of the Essenes is slight and not all of it trustworthy, as its sources are scanty, coloured, and unreliable.

ANCIENT AUTHORITIES: PHILO, *Quod Omnis Probus Liber*, xii, also extracts from his *Apologia Jud.* in EUSEBIUS, *Præp. Evang.*, VIII, xi; JOSEPHUS, *Bell. Jud.*, II, viii; I, iii, 5; II, vii, 3; IDEM, *Ant. Jud.*, XIII, v, 9; XV, x, 4–5; XVIII, i, 5, etc., in tr. *Complete Works* (Paris, 1875), ed. DINDORF; PLINY, *Hist. Nat.*, V, xvi–xvii; HIPPOLYTUS, *Philosophumena* (Göttingen, 1859), IX; EPIPHANIUS, *Hæreses*, xix.

MODERN LITERATURE.—This is very extensive. See: LIGHTFOOT, *Colossians and Philemon* (London, 1884); EDERSHEIM, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* (New York, 1896), I; RIGGS, *Hist. of the Jew. People* (New York, 1900); MORRISON, *The Jews under Roman Rule* (New York, 1890); OESTERLEY AND BOX, *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue* (New York, 1907), vi; KEIM, *Hist. of Jesus of Nazara* (London, 1873); PRIDEAUX, *Connection of the O. and N. Test.*; CARPZOVIUS, *Apparatus Hist.-Crit.* (Leipzig, 1748), 31, 215; SCHÜRER, *A Hist. of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ* (tr. Edinburgh, 1886), a full bibliography; GRAETZ, *Gesch. d. Juden* (1905), III (tr. London, 1892); DÖLLINGER, *Heidenthum u. Judenthum* (1857), tr. *The Gentile and Jew* (London); EWALD, *Gesch. d. Volk. Israel* (1868), tr. *Hist. of Israel* (London, 1870); KRÜGER, *Beiträge zur Kennt. d. Pharisäer u. Essener* in *Theol. Quart.* (Tübingen, 1894); FRIEDLÄNDER, *Zur Entstehungsgesch. d. Christenthums* (Vienna, 1894); IDEM, *Die religiösen Bewegungen d. Judent. im Zeit. Jesu* (Berlin, 1905); SMITH, *Dict. of the Bible;* GINSBURG in *Dict. Christ. Biog.;* CONYBEARE in HAST., *Dict. of Bible*, s. v.; IDEM, *Dict. of Christ and the Gospels*, s. v.; KÖNIG in *Kirchenlex.; The Jewish Encyclopedia.*

E. P. GRAHAM.

Est (ESTIUS), WILLEM HESSELS VAN, a famous commentator on the Pauline Epistles, b. at Gorcum, Holland, in 1542; d. at Douai, 20 Sept., 1613. Gorcum at that time contained about 5000 inhabitants, among whom the most illustrious belonged to the family of Est, both on his father's and mother's side. Est was born at a time of great excitement, and though the mildest of men his whole life was spent amidst scenes of controversy and civil war. Luther was still in full vigour, though he had only four years to live, Calvin was active at Geneva, and Europe was flooded with books and pamphlets violently attacking the Church. Very few writers did more to show (and that in quite an unostentatious manner) the hollowness of the reformers' Biblical arguments than Est. He received his early education at home, after which he went to Utrecht, where he studied classics and thence proceeded to Louvain, where he spent about twenty years in the study of philosophy, theology, and Holy Scripture. During the last ten years there he was professor of philosophy in one of the colleges. In 1580 he received the degree of Doctor of Theology. He was throughout distinguished by sincere piety, great ability, and application to study. During this

time he was frequently the bearer of pecuniary aid to his uncle, Nicolas Pieck, O.S.F., who was giving missions in Belgium; but the latter would never accept any help. In 1572, while Est was still at Louvain, a great catastrophe befell his native town, which was captured by the Calvinists. His father, brother, and uncle were made prisoners and were in imminent danger of their lives. The father and brother escaped, but Nicolas Pieck, who was then Superior of the Franciscan convent at Gorcum, and eighteen other ecclesiastics, were taken to Brielle, on the sea-coast, and put to death for the Catholic Faith with revolting brutality. Est wrote what is considered the best history of the Martyrs of Gorcum, who were canonized by Pius IX in 1867. From this history we learn many details about Est and his relatives.

When Est first arrived at Louvain he found the place in a ferment owing to the recently broached opinions of Baius (q. v.), one of the professors of Holy Scripture, and who held a leading position in the university all the time that Est was there. Violent controversy raged round the person of Baius during all that time. It is evident from the commentaries of Est that he was much influenced on questions of grace and free will by the teaching of his old professor, Baius; and on these points he has to be read with some caution. After having been made doctor, he continued teaching philosophy at Louvain two years longer. In 1582 he was made professor of theology at Douai, a position which he retained for thirty-one years. He was also for many years rector of the diocesan seminary and during the last eighteen years of his life chancellor of the University of Douai. He was noted for his piety, modesty, and compassion for the poor, and greatly admired for his vast learning, solid judgment, and eloquence. He was afterwards styled *doctor fundatissimus* by the learned Pope Benedict XIV. Soon after he left Louvain a fresh controversy broke out there, into which he appears to have been drawn. About 1586 Lessius began to refute the errors of Baius in his ordinary course of lectures. The friends of Baius, who admired him for his edifying life, great learning, and manly submission, felt annoyed that his shortcomings should have been thus pointedly accentuated by their opponents. They attacked certain propositions of Lessius, resembling those of Molina and Suarez, and had them condemned by the university as savouring of Semipelagianism. The sister university of Douai added its condemnation (said to have been obtained under a misapprehension), and its terms were in still more violent language. It has been said, though on no very clear evidence, that the form of condemnation was drawn up by Est. There can be little doubt but that he was in favour of the condemnation. The whole controversy finally led up to the Congregatio de Auxiliis (q.v.). On maturer examination the teaching of Lessius on grace etc. was found to be innocuous.

Most of Est's works, which were written in Latin, were not published until after his death. His greatest work is his "In omnes Divi Pauli et Catholicas Epistolas Commentarii" (Douai, 1614–15; Mainz, 1858–60). There are several later editions, that of Mainz (1841–45, 7 vols.) being one of the best. To this work was prefixed the author's protestation of loyalty to the Church in which he declares that he desires to submit all things to the judgment of the Catholic Church and its supreme pastor and judge on earth, the Roman pontiff, and if anything has been spoken in error that it be considered as unsaid. In his commentaries he everywhere endeavours to arrive at the literal meaning of the author, with great judgment, acumen, and erudition. He refutes objections, as occasion arises, with calmness and freedom from passion. No serious student of the Epistles can afford to neglect this work. Horne, a Protestant writer (Introd., London, 1834, II, 293), says that it is "a most valuable work, which Romanists and Protestants alike concur to recommend as an excellent critical help to the exposition of the Apostolic Epistles. The prefaces of Est are particularly valuable." His other works are: "Commentarii in IV libros Sententiarum Petri Lombardi" (Douai, 1615); "Annotationes in præcipua et difficiliora S. Scripturæ loca" (Douai, 1617); "Historia Martyrum Gorcomiensium" (Douai, 1603; also in the "Acta SS." for July, II, 754–847). He also translated the life of Blessed Edmund Campion, S.J., from French into Latin, and left copious notes for a new edition of the works of St. Augustine.

Historia Martyrum Gorcomiensium (Douai, 1603); MEUFFELS, *Les Martyrs de Gorcum* (Paris, 1908); short *Life* prefixed to the Louvain ed. of his commentary, and the *Eulogium* by HOY, *ibid.*; HURTER, *Nomenclator*, s. v. *Estius* and *Lessius*; RAPIN, *Histoire du Jansénisme* (Paris, 1840), i.

C. AHERNE.

Establishment (or ESTABLISHED CHURCH), THE.—The union of Church and State setting up a definite and distinctive relation between the two is frequently expressed in English by the use of the word "establishment", applied to such union in both Catholic and Protestant States, in spite of the fundamental differences of principle which characterize them. "The Establishment", or "the Established Church" is often used as a distinctive name for the ecclesiastical system established by law in Scotland, in Ireland (until 1869), but especially in England. The pre-Reformation Church of England was the religion of the people and its establishment was the spontaneous act of the people; the distinctive feature of the post-Reformation Church is that it was imposed upon the people by legal enactment, and based upon the principle of royal supremacy. Papal jurisdiction was not simply swept away but was transferred entire to the Crown. And except for the brief return to Catholic unity under Mary (1553–1558) and during the Commonwealth (1649–1660), the arrangements then made have continued to limit the liberty of action of the Anglican body alike in matters doctrinal and disciplinary. Convocation cannot meet, discuss, or enact new canons without royal permission (25 Hen. VIII, c. 19); the effective nomination of archbishops and bishops, etc., rests with the Crown (25 Hen. VIII, c. 19); supreme spiritual and ecclesiastical jurisdiction is annexed to the Crown (25 Hen. VIII, 19, cf. 1 Eliz., c. 1). Moreover, no modification of its formularies or doctrines has been permitted without the sanction of an act of Parliament. The term "by law established", as applied to the Church of England, is first met with in the canons of the Convocation of 1604 (c. iii), which declares "that the Church of England by law established under the King's Majesty" is a true and Apostolic Church. It is of frequent occurrence in subsequent statutes. The term "established" was applied to the prescribing and settling by law of the liturgical formularies of the English Church in the Act of Uniformity, 1558 (1 Eliz., c. 2, §27). (See ANGLICANISM; CONVOCATION OF THE ENGLISH CLERGY.)

GIBSON, *Codex Juris Ecclesiastici Anglicani* (London, 1713); NEWMAN, *Present Position of Catholics in England* (London, 1851), Lect. ii; PHILLIMORE, *The Ecclesiastical Law of the Church of England* (London, 1895); HENSON, *Cross-Bench Views of Current Church Questions* (London, 1902); MCMULLAN AND ELLIS, *The Reformation Settlement* (London, 1903); ACTON, *History of Freedom and other Essays* (London, 1907); HENSON, *Our National Church* (London, 1908).

BERNARD WARD.

Estaing JEAN-BAPTISTE-CHARLES-HENRI-HECTOR, COMTE D', MARQUIS DE SAILLANS, a French admiral, b. at the château de Ravel (Auvergne), 28 November, 1729; d. at Paris, 28 April, 1794. He first served in the army as a colonel of infantry. In 1757, having obtained the rank of brigadier-general, he went to the East Indies, with Lally-Tollendal. Made a prisoner at the siege of Madras (1759), he was set free

on parole, entered the service of the French East India Company, and (with two vessels) destroyed the British factories in Sumatra and the Persian Gulf. He was on his way to France, in 1760, when he fell into the hands of the English and was sent to Plymouth. Released a second time, he was appointed lieutenant-general of the navy in 1763, and vice-admiral in 1777. One year later, he left Toulon in command of a fleet of twelve battleships and fourteen frigates with the intention of assisting the struggling American colonies against Great Britain. Unfavourable winds delayed him and so Admiral Howe's fleet escaped his pursuit and d'Estaing took possession of Newport (8 August). A great naval battle was about to take place, when a violent storm arose and dispersed the two fleets. After a short sojourn in Boston harbour, he sailed to the West Indies where he took St. Vincent and Grenada (4 July, 1779) and badly damaged Admiral Byron's fleet. His attempts to retake Savannah, in concert with the Americans, were unsuccessful; a severe wound obliged him to give up the enterprise. On his return to France, in 1780, he fell into disfavour at the court. Three years later, however, he was placed at the head of the Franco-Spanish fleet assembled before Cadiz, but peace was signed and no operations took place. He was then made a grandee of Spain. When the French Revolution broke out, he favoured the new ideas. A member of the Assembly of Notables, he was named commandant of the National Guard at Versailles in 1789, and admiral in 1792. He constantly endeavoured to protect the king, and at the trial of Marie Antoinette in 1793 spoke in her favour. He was charged with being a reactionary and was sent to the scaffold, 28 April, 1794. In his moments of leisure, he wrote a poem, "Le Rêve" (1755), a tragedy, "Les Thermopyles" (1789), and a book on the colonies.

JAL, *Dictionnaire critique de biographie et d'histoire* (Paris, 1872); *Extrait du journal d'un officier de la marine de l'escadre de M. le Comte d'Estaing* (Paris, 1782); LEVOT, *Le Comte d'Estaing* (Paris, 1857).

LOUIS N. DELAMARRE.

THE TRIUMPH OF MARDOCHAI

THE CORONATION OF ESTHER

ESTHER BEING PRESENTED TO KING ASSUERUS

SCENES FROM THE LIFE OF ESTHER
Paolo Caliari (Veronese), Church of San Sebastiano, Venice

Esther (Heb. אסתר, star, happiness; Sept. Ἐσθήρ), Queen of Persia and wife of Assuerus, who is identified with Xerxes (485–465 B. C.). She was a Jewess of the tribe of Benjamin, daughter of Abihail, and bore before her accession to the throne the name of Edissa (הדסה, *Hádássāh*, myrtle). Her family had been deported from Jerusalem to Babylon in the time of Jechonias (599 B. C.). On the death of her parents she was adopted by her father's brother, Mardochai, who then dwelt in Susan, the capital of Persia. King Assuerus being angered at the refusal of his wife Vasthi to respond to his invitation to attend a banquet that he gave in the third year of his reign, divorced her and ordered the most attractive maidens of the kingdom brought before him that he might select her successor from among them. Among these was Esther, whose rare beauty captivated the king and moved him to place her on the throne. Her uncle Mardochai remained constantly near the palace so that he might advise and counsel her. While at the gate of the palace he discovered a plot of two of the king's eunuchs to kill their royal master. This plot he revealed to Esther, who in turn informed the king. The plotters were executed, and a record of the services of Mardochai was entered in the chronicles of the kingdom. Not long thereafter, Aman, a royal favourite before whom the king had ordered all to bow, having frequently observed Mardochai at the gate of the palace and noticed that he refused to prostrate himself before him, cunningly obtained the king's consent for a general massacre in one day of all the Jews in the kingdom. Following a Persian custom, Aman determined by lot (*pûr*, pl. *pûrîm*), that the massacre should take place a twelvemonth hence. A royal decree was thereupon sent throughout the Kingdom of Persia. Mardochai informed Esther of this and begged her to use her influence with the king and thus avert the threatening danger. At first she feared to enter the presence of the king unsummoned, for to do so was a capital offence. But, on the earnest entreaty of her uncle, she consented to approach after three days, which with her maids she would pass in fasting and prayer, and during which she requested her uncle to have all the Jews in the city fast and pray.

On the third day Esther appeared before the king, who received her graciously and promised to grant her request whatever it might be. She then asked him and Aman to dine with her. At the banquet they accepted her invitation to dine with her again on the following day. Aman, carried away by the joy that this honour gave him, issued orders for the erection of a gallows on which he purposed to hang the hated Mardochai. But that night the king, being sleepless, ordered the chronicles of the nation to be read to him. Learning that Mardochai had never been rewarded for his service in revealing the plot of the eunuchs, he asked Aman, the next day, to suggest a suitable reward for one "whom the king desired to honour". Thinking it was himself that the king had in mind, Aman suggested the use of the king's apparel and insignia. These the king ordered to be bestowed on Mardochai. At the second banquet, when the king repeated to Esther his offer to grant her whatever she might ask, she informed him of the plot of Aman which involved the destruction of the whole Jewish

people to which she belonged, and pleaded that they should be spared. The king ordered that Aman should be hanged on the gibbet prepared for Mardochai, and, confiscating his property, bestowed it upon the intended victim. He charged Mardochai to address to all the governors of Persia letters authorizing the Jews to defend themselves and to kill all those who, by virtue of the previous decree, should attack them. During two days the Jews took a bloody revenge on their enemies in Susan and other cities. Mardochai then instituted the feast of Purim (lots) which he exhorted the Jews to celebrate in memory of the day which Aman had determined for their destruction, but which had been turned by Esther into a day of triumph. The foregoing story of Esther is taken from the Book of Esther as found in the Vulgate. Jewish traditions place the tomb of Esther at Hamadân (Ecbatana). The Fathers of the Church considered Esther as a type of the Blessed Virgin Mary. In her poets have found a favourite subject. (R. Schwartz, Esther im deutschen u. neulateinischen Drama des Reformationszeitalters, Oldenburg, 1894.)

Book of Esther.—In the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint the Book of Esther bears only the word "Esther" as title. But the Jewish rabbis called it also the "volume of Esther", or simply "the volume" (*megillah*) to distinguish it from the other four volumes (*megilloth*), written on separate rolls, which were read in the synagogues on certain feast days. As this one was read on the feast of Purim and consisted largely of epistles (cf. Esth., ix, 20, 29), it was called by the Jews of Alexandria the "Epistle of Purim". In the Hebrew canon the book was among the Hagiographa and placed after Ecclesiastes. In the Latin Vulgate it has always been classed with Tobias and Judith, after which it is placed. The Hebrew text that has come down to us varies considerably from those of the Septuagint and the Vulgate. The Septuagint, besides showing many unimportant divergencies, contains several additions in the body of the book or at the end. The additions are the portion of the Vulgate text after ch. x, 3. Although no trace of these fragments is found in the Hebrew Bible, they are most probably translations from an original Hebrew or Chaldaic text. Origen tells us that they existed in Theodotion's version, and that they were used by Josephus in his "Antiquities" (XVI). St. Jerome, finding them in the Septuagint and the Old Latin version, placed them at the end of his almost literal translation of the existing Hebrew text, and indicated the place they occupied in the Septuagint. The chapters being thus rearranged, the book may be divided into two parts: the first relating the events which preceded and led up to the decree authorizing the extermination of the Jews (i-iii, 15; xi, 2; xiii, 7); the second showing how the Jews escaped from their enemies and avenged themselves (iv-v, 8; xiii-xv).

The Book of Esther, thus taken in part from the Hebrew Canon and in part from the Septuagint, found a place in the Christian Canon of the O. T. The chapters taken from the Septuagint were considered deuterocanonical, and, after St. Jerome, were separated from the ten chapters taken from the Hebrew which were called protocanonical (see Canon of the Holy Scriptures). A great many of the early Fathers clearly considered the entire work as inspired, although no one among them found it to his purpose to write a commentary on it. Its omission in some of the early catalogues of the Scriptures was accidental or unimportant. The first to reject the book was Luther, who declared that he so hated it that he wished that it did not exist (Table Talk, 59). His first followers wished only to reject the deuterocanonical parts, whereupon these, as well as other deuterocanonical parts of the Scriptures, were declared by the Council of Trent (Sess. IV, de Can. Scripturæ) to be canonical and inspired. With the rise of rationalism the opinion of Luther found many supporters. When modern rationalists argue that the Book of Esther is irreligious in character, unlike the other books of the O. T., and therefore to be rejected, they have in mind only the first or protocanonical part, not the entire book, which is manifestly religious. But, although the first part is not explicitly religious, it contains nothing unworthy of a place in the Sacred Scriptures. And any way, as Driver points out (Introduc. to the Lit. of the O. T.), there is no reason why every part of the Biblical record should show the "same degree of subordination of human interests to the spirit of God".

As to the authorship of the Book of Esther there is nothing but conjecture. The Talmud (Baba Bathra 15ª) assigns it to the Great Synagogue; St. Clement of Alexandria ascribes it to Mardochai; St. Augustine suggests Esdras as the author. Many, noting the writer's familiarity with Persian customs and institutions and with the character of Assuerus, hold that he was a contemporary of Mardochai, whose memoirs he used. But such memoirs and other contemporary documents showing this familiar knowledge could have been used by a writer at a later period. And, although the absence in the text of allusion to Jerusalem seems to lead to the conclusion that the book was written and published in Persia at the end of the reign of Xerxes I (485–465 B. C.) or during the reign of his son Artaxerxes I (465–425 B. C.), the text seems to offer several facts which may be adduced with some show of reason in favour of a later date. They are: (1) an implied statement that Susan had ceased to be the capital of Persia, and a vague description of the extent of the kingdom (i, 1); (2) an explanation of Persian usages that implies unfamiliarity with them on the part of the readers (i, 13, 19; iv, 11; viii, 8); (3) the revengeful attitude of the Jews towards the Gentiles, by whom they felt they had been wronged, and with whom they wished to have little to do (iii, 8 sqq.); (4) a diction showing many late words and a deterioration in syntax; (5) references to "the Macedonians" and to the plot of Aman as an attempt to transfer "the kingdom of the Persians to the Macedonians" (xvi, 10, 14). On the strength of these passages various modern critics have assigned late dates for the authorship of the book, as, 135 B. C., 167 B. C., 238 B. C., the beginning of the third century B. C., or the early years of the Greek period which began 332 B. C. The majority accept the last opinion.

Some of the modern critics who have fixed upon late dates for the composition of the book deny that it has any historical value whatever, and declare it to be a work of the imagination, written for the purpose of popularizing the feast of Purim. In support of their contention they point out in the text what appear to be historical improbabilities, and attempt to show that the narrative has all the characteristics of a romance, the various incidents being artfully arranged so as to form a series of contrasts and to develop into a climax. But what seem to be historical improbabilities are in many cases trivial. Even advanced critics do not agree as to those which seem quite serious. While some, for instance, consider it wholly improbable that Assuerus and Aman should have been ignorant of the nationality of Esther, who was in frequent communication with Mardochai, a well-known Jew, others maintain that it was quite possible and probable that a young woman, known to be a Jewess, should be taken into the harem of a Persian king, and that with the assistance of a relative she should avert the ruin of her people, which a high official had endeavoured to effect. The seeming improbability of other passages, if not entirely explained, can be sufficiently explained to destroy the conclusion, on this ground, that the book is not historical. As to artful contrasts and climax to which appeal is made as evidences that the book is the work

of a mere romancer, it may be said with Driver (op. cit.) that fact is stranger than fiction, and that a conclusion based upon such appearances is precarious. There is undoubtedly an exercise of art in the composition of the work, but no more than any historian may use in accumulating and arranging the incidents of his history. A more generally accepted opinion among contemporary critics is that the work is substantially historical. Recognizing the author's close acquaintance with Persian customs and institutions, they hold that the main elements of the work were supplied to him by tradition, but that, to satisfy his taste for dramatic effect, he introduced details which were not strictly historical. But the opinion held by most Catholics and by some Protestants is, that the work is historical in substance and in detail. They base their conclusions especially on the following: (1) the vivacity and simplicity of the narrative; (2) the precise and circumstantial details, as, particularly, the naming of unimportant personages, the noting of dates and events; (3) the references to the annals of the Persians; (4) the absence of anachronisms; (5) the agreement of proper names with the time in which the story is placed; (6) the confirmation of details by history and archæology; (7) the celebration of the feast of Purim in commemoration of the deliverance of the Jews by Esther and Mardochai at the time of the Machabees (II Mach., xv, 37), at the time of Josephus (Antiq of the Jews, XI, vi, § 13), and since. The explanation of Kautzsch (An Outline of the Hist. of the Lit. of the O. T., p. 131) that the story of Esther was engrafted on a Jewish feast already existing and probably connected with a Persian festival, is only a surmise. Nor has any one else succeeded better in offering an explanation of the feast than that it had its origin as stated in the Book of Esther.

HERODOTUS, *History*, VII, 8, 24, 35, 37–39; IX, 108; RAWLINSON, *Hist. Illus. of the O. T.* (Chicago, 1880), 208 sqq.; EWALD, *Hist. of Israel;* Dictionaries of the Bible, s. v.; DIEULAFOI, *Le Livre d'Esther et le palais d'Assuérus* in *Rev. des Etudes Juives* (1888); ROHART and VIGOUROUX in *Dict. de la Bib.*, s. v.; GIGOT, *Special Introduction to the Scriptures* (1903); DAVIDSON, *Introduction* (1863). Commentaries by CALMET, A LAPIDE, MENOCHIUS in MIGNE, *Script. Sacr. Cursus Comp.*, XIII. SCHOLZ (1892); SEISENBERGER (1901). PROTESTANT: PATON, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Esther*, (New York, 1908) in *Int. Crit. Com.;* STREANE, *The Book of Esther* (Oxford, 1908); WILDEBAER (MARTI), *Die fünf Megillot* (1898); SIEGFRIED (NOWACK) (1901).

A. L. MCMAHON.

Estiennot de la Serre, CLAUDE, Benedictine of the Congregation of Saint-Maur, b. at Varennes, France, 1639; d. at Rome, 1699. He joined the Benedictines at Vendôme and was professed there in 1658. After teaching humanities for a short time to the junior monks at Pontlevoy, he was, at the instance of Dom Luc d'Achéry, sent to the Abbey of St-Germain-des-Prés, Paris, where his aptitude for study and research was quickly discovered by Dom Mabillon, whose intimate friend and fellow-worker he became. Together they journeyed on foot through Flanders, visiting all its chief monastic libraries. In 1670 he was made sub-prior of St-Martin's, Pontoise, a history of which abbey, in three volumes, was his first published work. Between 1673 and 1682 he compiled his chief work, entitled "Antiquités Bénédictines", in which the monastic traditions of France are treated under the headings of the different dioceses. In 1684 he was appointed procurator for his congregation in the Curia Romana, which post required his residence in Rome for the remainder of his life. On his way thither from Paris he visited numerous monasteries and collected a great quantity of literary material, which he sent back to Dom Mabillon and most of which found its way into the "Annales O.S.B." or the "Gallia Christiana". During the fifteen years he lived in Italy he laboured fruitfully on behalf of his congregation, and he was also greatly trusted by the French bishops, for whom he acted in many matters of ecclesiastical business. He enjoyed the entire confidence of several popes and other high officials of the Church, and he is described as combining all the qualities of a man of letters with great business ability. Besides the history of Pontoise and the "Antiquités", already mentioned, he collected sixteen volumes of "Fragments historiques", but though he did not publish much under his own name, he worked incessantly in the chief libraries of Italy, all of which were open to him, and the results of his researches he forwarded to Dom Mabillon and others at St-Germain-des-Prés, to whom they were of great service. He was buried in the church of the Minims of SS. Trinità de' Monti.

TASSIN, *Hist. lit. de la cong. de St-Maur* (Brussels, 1770).

G. CYPRIAN ALSTON.

Esztergom, DIOCESE OF. See GRAN.

Eternal Gospel. See JOACHIM OF FLORA.

Eternity (*æternum*, originally *æviternum*, *αἰώνιον*, æon-long) is defined by Boetius (De Consol. Phil., V, vi) as "possession, without succession and perfect, of interminable life" (interminabilis vitæ tota simul et perfecta possessio). The definition, which was adopted by the Schoolmen, at least as applying to eternity properly so called, that of God, implies four things: that eternity is (1) a life, (2) without beginning or end, (3) or succession, and (4) of the most perfect kind. God not only is or exists, but lives. The notion of life, like all notions however abstract or spiritual, is, when applied to God, but analogous. He not only does not live precisely as anything else with which we are acquainted lives; He does not even exist as anything else exists. Our notions of life and existence are derived from creatures, in which life implies change, and existence is something added to essence, thus involving composition. In God there can be no composition or change or imperfection of any kind, but all is pure act or being. The agnostic, however, is not thereby justified in saying that we can know nothing and should predicate nothing of God. It is true that, however we conceive Him or in whatever terms we speak of Him, our ideas and terminology are utterly beneath and unworthy of Him. Yet, even while arguing in this way, the agnostic thinks and speaks of Him as really as we do; nor can he or we do otherwise, compelled as we are to trace things back to their first cause. Yielding to this necessity, we can but think and speak of Him in the highest and most spiritual terms known to us; not merely as existing, for instance, but as living; correcting at once, as far as we can, the form of our thought and predication, by adding that the Divine life is perfect, free from the least trace of defect. That is how and why we represent the Divine existence as a life. It is a life, moreover, not only without beginning or end but also without succession —*tota simul*, that is without past or future; a never-changing instant or "now". It is not so difficult to form some faint notion of a duration which never began and shall never end. We hope that our own life shall be endless; and materialists have accustomed us to the notion of a series stretching backward without limit in time, to the notion of a material universe that never came into being but was always there. The Divine existence is that and much more; excluding all succession, past and future time—indeed all time, which is succession—and to be conceived as an ever-enduring and unchanging "now".

In forming this notion of eternity it is well to think of the Divine immensity in its relation to space and extended things. One may conceive first a broken straight line—a line of separate dots; then a continuous line within two limits, beginning and end. The line can be, but is not, divided into parts, shorter lines or dots, and the whole is finite both ways. It is like and yet unlike a finite spirit; like, since it has no actual parts or divisions and is limited; yet unlike since it

may be divided, whereas a spirit cannot be divided. Spirit exists whole and entire wherever it exists at all; and though it may fill the space occupied by a human body, let us say, it is whole and entire in every possible part of it; not quite unlike the continuous line. If we further think of the end or limits of the line as removed, of the earth's axis, for instance, as extending indefinitely into space, the line is not only continuous or unbroken but infinite, without end or beginning, yet still divisible; like, but so unlike, the immensity of God. For God is a spirit, and as the human soul fills the space occupied by the body to which it is united, yet is whole and entire in every possible part of that space, so God fills all space whatsoever, extending without limit in all directions, and yet is whole and entire everywhere, in the smallest conceivable point, in the very loose or improper sense in which we may think or speak of God as being "whole". Even the spatial relations of the soul to the body are coarse as compared to those which God's existence bears to that of creatures and the spaces in which they exist or may exist. For however free from extension created spirits may be, they are not incapable of real internal change, real motion of some kind within themselves; whereas God, filling all space, is incapable of the least change or motion, but is so truly the same throughout that He is best conceived as an infinitely extended point, the same here, there, everywhere.

If, now, we apply to the time-line what we have been attempting in that of space, the infinite, unchangeable point which was immensity becomes eternity; not a real succession of separate acts or changes (which is known as "time"); nor even the continuous duration of a being which is changeless in its substance, however it may vary in its actions (which is what St. Thomas understands by an *œvum*); but an endless line of existence and action which not only is not actually interrupted, but is incapable of interruption or of the least change or movement whatsoever. And as, if one instant should pass away and another succeed, the present becoming past and the future present, there is necessarily a change or movement of instants; so, if we are not to be irreverent in our concept of God, but to represent Him as best we can, we must try to conceive Him as excluding all, even the least, change or succession; and his duration, consequently, as being without even a possible past or future, but a never beginning and never-ending, absolutely unchangeable "now". That is how eternity is presented in Catholic philosophy and theology. The notion is of special interest in helping us to realize, however faintly, the relations of God to created things, especially with regard to His foreknowledge. In Him there is no before or after, and therefore no foreknowledge, objectively; the distinction which we are wont to draw between His knowledge of intelligence or science or prescience and His knowledge of vision is merely our way of representing things, natural enough to us, but not by any means objective or real in Him. There is no real objective difference between His intelligence and His vision, nor between either of these and the Divine substance, in which there is no possibility of difference or change. That infinitely perfect substantial intelligence, immense as it is eternal, and withal existing entire and immutable as an indivisible point in space and as an indivisible instant in time, is coextensive, in the sense of being intimately present, with the space-extension and the time-succession of all creatures; not beside them, nor parallel with them, nor before or after them; but present in and with them, sustaining them, co-operating with them, and therefore seeing—not foreseeing—what they may do at any particular point of the space-extension, or at any instant of the time-extension, in which they may exist or operate. God may be considered as an immovable point in the centre of a world which, whether as a more or less closely connected group of granulated individuals, or as an absolutely continuous ether mass, turns round Him as a sphere may be supposed to turn in all directions round its centre (St. Thomas, Cont. Gent., I, c. lxvi). The imagery, however, must be corrected by noting that while in the time-line God's duration is an ever-enduring point or "now", his immensity in the space-line is not at all like the centre of a circle or sphere; but is a point, rather, which is coextensive with, in the sense of being intimately present to, every other point, actual or possible, in the continuous or discontinuous mass that is supposed to move around Him.

Bearing this correcting notion well in mind, we may conceive Him as this immovable point in the centre of an ever-moving, though here and there continuous, circle or sphere. The space and time relations are constantly changing between Him and the moving things around Him, not through any change in Him, but only by reason of the constant change in them. In them there is before and after, but not in Him, Who is equally present to them all, no matter how or when they may have come into being, or how they may succeed one another in time or in space. Some of them are free acts; and almost from the time the human mind began to speculate on these questions, and wherever still there are any even rudimentary speculations, the question has arisen and does arise as to how an act can be free not to happen if, as we suppose, God's absolutely infallible foresight saw from all eternity that it was to be. To this Catholic philosophy supplies the only answer which can be given; that it is not true to say that God either saw or foresaw anything, or that He will see it, but only that He sees it. And as my seeing you act does not interfere with your freedom of action, but I see you acting freely or necessarily, as the case may be, so God sees all finite things, quiescent or active, acting of necessity or freely, according to what may be objectively real, without in the least interfering thereby with the mode or quality of their existence or of their action. Here again, however, care must be taken not to conceive the Divine knowledge as being determined by what the finite may be or do; somewhat as we see things because the knowledge is borne in upon us from what we see. It is not from the finite that God gets His knowledge, but from His own Divine essence, in which all things are represented or mirrored as they are, existing or merely possible, necessary or free. On this aspect of the question see GOD. When, therefore, one is asked or tempted to ask, what God did or where He was before time and place began, with the creation of the world, the answer must be a denial of the legitimacy of the supposition that He was "before". It is only in relation to the finite and mutable that there can be a before and after. And when we say, that, as faith teaches, the world was created in time and was not from eternity, our meaning should not be that the existence of the Creator stretched back infinitely before He brought the world into being; but rather that while His existence remains an unchangeable present, without possibility of before or after, of change or succession, as regards itself, the succession outside the Divine existence, to each instant of which it corresponds as the centre does to any point in the circumference, had a beginning, and might have extended indefinitely further backward, without, however, escaping the omnipresence of the eternal "now" (See Billot, De Deo Uno et Trino, q. 10, p. 122).

So far for the strict or proper notion of eternity, as applying solely to the Divine existence. There is a wide or improper sense in which we are wont to represent as eternal what is merely endless succession in time, and this even though the time in question should have had a beginning, as when we speak of the reward of the good and the punishment of the wicked as eternal, meaning by eternity only time or succession without end or limit in the future. In the Apocalypse there is a well-known passage in which a great angel is

represented as standing with one foot on sea and one on land, and swearing by Him that liveth forever that time shall be no more. Whatever the meaning of the oath may be, it has found an echo in our religious terminology, and we are wont to think and say that with death, and especially with the Last Judgment, time shall cease. The meaning is not that there will be no more succession of any kind; but that there will be no substantial change or corruption in what survives death, the soul; or in the body that shall have been raised from the dead; or in the heavens and earth as they shall be renewed after Christ's second coming. There is, moreover, an implication or connotation of the doctrine that in the future life of souls, whether in heaven or in hell, succession will be accidental, the act in which their essential happiness or misery will consist being continuous and unbroken vision and love, or blinded wrong vision and hatred, of God. This kind of duration is in our ordinary language spoken of as life or death eternal, by a kind of participation, in a wide or improper sense, in the character of the Divine eternity (Billot, op. cit., 119). Questions of the greatest importance have been raised as to the possibility of an eternal world, in the sense of a world of matter, such as we know, having never had a beginning and therefore not needing a first cause; also as to the possibility of eternal creation, in the sense of a being, with or without succession, having had no beginning of existence and yet having been created by God (see CREATION). For other questions as to eternity see HEAVEN, HELL. "Eternal life" is a term sometimes applied to the state and life of grace, even before death; this being the initial stage or seed, as it were, of the never-ending life of bliss in heaven, which, by a species of metonymy, is regarded as being present in its first stage, that of grace. This, if we are true to ourselves and to God, is sure to pass into the second stage, the life eternal.

The basis of all later treatment of the question of eternity is that of ST. THOMAS, I, Q. x. For a fuller exposition see SUAREZ, *De Deo*, I, iv; IDEM, *Metaphysica*, disp. l, ss. 4 sq.; LESSIUS, *De perfectionibus divinis*, IV. For the teaching of early non-Christian philosophers (PLATO, ARISTOTLE, and the NEO-PLATONISTS), as also of the FATHERS, see PETAVIUS, *De Deo*, III, iii, iv. In the same chapters he discusses the meaning of the term *ævum*. For the testimony of the FATHERS as to the possibility of creation from eternity, see PETAVIUS, *op. cit.*, vi. Briefer expositions may be found in the ordinary handbooks of philosophy, on ontology and natural theology; also in the various treatises *De Deo Uno*.

WALTER MCDONALD.

Ethelbert, SAINT, date of birth unknown; d. 794; King of the East Angles, was, according to the "Speculum Historiale" of Richard of Cirencester (d. about 1401), the son of King Ethelred and Leofrana, a lady of Mercia. Brought up in piety, he was elected king on Ethelred's death, ruled wisely, and was a man of singular humility. Urged to marry, he declared his preference for a life of celibacy, but at length consented to woo Altrida (Alfrida), daughter of Offa, King of the Mercians. Leofrana foreboded evil and tried to dissuade Ethelbert; but in spite of an earthquake, an eclipse of the sun, and a warning vision, he proceeded from Bury St. Edmunds to Villa Australis, where Offa resided. On his arrival Altrida expressed her admiration for Ethelbert, declaring that Offa ought to accept him as suzerain. Cynethryth, the queen-mother, urged by hatred of Ethelbert, so poisoned Offa's mind against him, that he accepted the offer of a certain Grimbert to murder their guest. Ethelbert, having come for an interview with Offa, was bound and beheaded by Grimbert. The body was buried ignominiously, but, revealing itself by a heavenly light, was translated to the cathedral at Hereford, where many miracles attested Ethelbert's sanctity. The head was enshrined at Westminster Abbey.

The "Chronicon" of John Brompton (fl. 1437) adds a few particulars: the body with the head was first buried on the banks of the Lugg. On the third night the saint commanded one Brithfrid, a nobleman, to convey his relics to Stratus-way. During the journey the head fell out of the cart and healed a man who had been blind for eleven years. Finally the body was entombed at Fernley, the present Hereford. According to Brompton, Altrida became a recluse at Croyland. Offa repented of his sin (Matthew of Paris represents Offa as ignorant of the plot till after Ethelbert's murder), gave much land to the martyr, "which the church of Hereford holds to the present day", founded St. Albans and other monasteries, and made his historic pilgrimage to Rome.

St. Ethelbert figures largely in the Missal, Breviary, and Hymnal of the Use of Hereford. His feast is on 20 May. Thirteen English churches, besides Hereford cathedral, are dedicated in honour of Ethelbert; and one of the gateways of Norwich cathedral bears his name.

Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, sub anno 792; RICHARD OF CIRENCESTER, *Speculum Historiale*, in *R. S.*, I, 262 sqq.; *Chronicle* of BROMPTON, in TWYSDEN, 748 sqq.; *Acta SS.*, May, V, 271; *Bibl. Hag. Lat.*, 394; BREWER, *Opera Girald. Cambren.*, III, 407, V, pp. xlv and 407; WHARTON, *Anglia Sacra*, II, p. xxii; HARDY, *Catalogue of Materials*, I, 495; STUBBS in *Dict. of Christian Biography*, II, 215; CHEVALIER, *Répertoire*, I, 1365; HUNT in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, XVIII, 17; STANTON, *Menology*.

PATRICK RYAN.

Ethelbert, SAINT, King of Kent, b. 552; d. 24 February, 616; son of Eormenric, through whom he was descended from Hengest. He succeeded his father, in 560, as King of Kent and made an unsuccessful attempt to win from Ceawlin of Wessex the overlordship of Britain. His political importance was doubtless advanced by his marriage with Bertha, daughter of Charibert, King of the Franks (see BERTHA. I). A noble disposition to fair dealing is argued by his giving her the old Roman church of St. Martin in his capital of Cantwaraburh (Canterbury) and affording her every opportunity for the exercise of her religion, although he himself had been reared, and remained, a worshipper of Odin. The same natural virtue, combined with a quaint spiritual caution and, on the other hand, a large instinct of hospitality, appears in his message to St. Augustine when, in 597, the Apostle of England landed on the Kentish coast (see AUGUSTINE OF CANTERBURY).

In the interval between Ethelbert's defeat by Ceawlin and the arrival of the Roman missionaries, the death of the Wessex king had left Ethelbert, at least virtually, supreme in southern Britain, and his baptism, which took place on Whitsunday next following the landing of Augustine (2 June, 597) had such an effect in deciding the minds of his wavering countrymen that as many as 10,000 are said to have followed his example within a few months. Thenceforward Ethelbert became the watchful father of the infant Anglo-Saxon Church. He founded the church which in after-ages was to be the primatial cathedral of all England, besides other churches at Rochester and Canterbury. But, although he permitted, and even helped, Augustine to convert a heathen temple into the church of St. Pancras (Canterbury), he never compelled his heathen subjects to accept baptism. Moreover, as the lawgiver who issued their first written laws to the English people (the ninety "Dooms of Ethelbert", A. D. 604) he holds in English history a place thoroughly consistent with his character as the temporal founder of that see which did more than any other for the upbuilding of free and orderly political institutions in Christendom. When St. Mellitus had converted Sæbert, King of the East Saxons, whose capital was London, and it was proposed to make that see the metropolitan, Ethelbert, supported by Augustine, successfully resisted the attempt, and thus fixed for more than nine centuries the individual character of the English Church. He left three children, of whom the only son, Eadbald, lived and died a pagan.

STUBBS in *Dict. Christ. Biogr.*, s. v.; HUNT in *Dict. Nat. Biogr.*, s. v.; BEDE, *Hist. Eccl.*, I, II; GREGORY OF TOURS, *Historia Francorum*, IV, IX; *Acta SS.*; BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, 24 Feb.

E. MACPHERSON.

Ethelbert, ARCHBISHOP OF YORK, England, date of birth uncertain; d. 8 Nov., 781 or 782. The name also appears as ALBERT, ADALBERHT, ÆLBERHT, ALDBERHT, ALUBERHT, EADBERHT and ELCHBERT. He was the teacher and intimate friend of Alcuin, whose poem on the saints and prelates of the Church of York, "De Sanctis et Pontificibus Ecclesiæ Eboracensis", is the principal source of information concerning Ethelbert's life. He was a kinsman of his predecessor Archbishop Egbert (brother to Eadberht, King of Northumbria) and a pupil in the school which Egbert founded at York. When he reached man's estate, Egbert ordained him priest and made him master of the school. Among his pupils was Alcuin, who has left us an affectionate description of him, from which we learn how varied his erudition was—grammar, rhetoric, law, poetry, astronomy, natural history, and Sacred Scripture being all mentioned as subjects in which he instructed his pupils. He is described as severe to the stubborn, gentle to the docile, while of those who were scholars after his own heart it is said "Hos sibi conjunxit, docuit, nutrivit, amavit". His ready sympathy won the affection of his students, while his strenuous energy urged them on to further progress. Even after Egbert became archbishop, he reserved to himself the duty of lecturing on the New Testament, while he entrusted the work of explaining the Old Testament to Ethelbert. As a keen scholar he loved books ardently and spared no pains in forming a library at York, which was probably the largest collection of books to be found outside Rome. Alcuin, in enumerating many of these, mentions several Latin and Greek classical authors, as well as the Fathers and other Christian writers. Ethelbert, in his search for books, travelled far, and we know that he visited Rome among other places. Everywhere his learning and power of sympathy won for him friends, so that his influence for good was widespread and he ranks as one of the foremost among the promoters of education in the eighth century.

In 766 Archbishop Egbert died, and Ethelbert was unanimously chosen to succeed him. He was consecrated 24 April, 767, and received the pallium from Adrian I in 773. As archbishop he continued his simple and laborious life, working with such success that he is regarded as one of the founders of the Church of York. He set himself to rebuild the minster which had been destroyed by fire in 741. It is impossible to obtain certain information as to the extent of his work, but Alcuin speaks as though he began, finished, and consecrated it:—

Ast nova basilicæ miræ structura diebus
Præsulis hujus erat jam cæpta, peracta, sacrata.

He speaks of its magnificence, the columns and crypts, bright windows and ceilings, the tall crucifix of precious metals, the thirty altars it contained, and the gold, silver, and jewels employed in the decoration of sacred vessels and altars. Eanbald and Alcuin were employed by the archbishop to superintend its construction. From York Ethelbert developed both missionary work and educational effort. He sent out from his school both preachers and teachers, the latter of whom founded new schools while the former spread the truths of Christianity among the heathen. Thus we find Ethelbert holding a council in Northumbria at which it was decided to send Willehad as a missionary to the Frisians and Saxons. From the York school, too, came Alubert and Liudger, the Apostles of North Germany.

In 780 Ethelbert, desiring to prepare for death, consecrated Eanbald as his coadjutor bishop and committed to Alcuin the care of the school and library. He then retired to a cell where he spent some time in devotion. Shortly before his death, in the autumn of 781 or 782, he appeared once more in public that he might consecrate the cathedral which was now complete. Ten days later he died and was buried in his church at York. Alcuin mourned his loss as that of a father, and composed in his honour the splendid panegyric (lines 1394–1595) which is the gem of the poem on the Church of York. To him Ethelbert—or Ælbert, as he calls him—was both pontiff and saint, "Jam cui Christus amor, potus, cibus, omnia Christus".

ALCUIN, *Poema de Pontificibus et Sanctis Ecclesiæ Eboracensis* in *P. L.*, CI, 814 sqq., also in *The Historians of the Church of York and its Archbishops* (*Rolls Series*, London, 1879), I. In Vol. II of the same publication there are short notices from three medieval chronicles. See also RAINE in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, II, 217. Ethelbert is referred to in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.* as Æthelberht, s. v. *Eanbald I*, but has no separate notice.

EDWIN BURTON.

Etheldreda, SAINT, Queen of Northumbria, b. (probably) about 630; d. at Ely, 23 June, 679. While still very young she was given in marriage by her father, Anna, King of East Anglia, to a certain Tonbert, a subordinate prince, from whom she received as morning gift a tract of land locally known as the Isle of Ely. She never lived in wedlock with Tonbert, however, and for five years after his early death was left to foster her vocation to religion. Her father then arranged for her a marriage of political convenience with Egfrid, son and heir to Oswy, King of Northumbria. From this second bridegroom, who is said to have been only fourteen years of age, she received certain lands at Hexham; through St. Wilfrid of York she gave these lands to found the minster of St. Andrew. St. Wilfrid was her friend and spiritual guide, but it was to him that Egfrid, on succeeding his father, appealed for the enforcement of his marital rights as against Etheldreda's religious vocation. The bishop succeeded at first in persuading Egfrid to consent that Etheldreda should live for some time in peace as a sister of the Coldingham nunnery, founded by her aunt, St. Ebba, in what is now Berwickshire. But at last the imminent danger of being forcibly carried off by the king drove her to wander southwards, with only two women in attendance. They made their way to Etheldreda's own estate of Ely, not, tradition said, without the interposition of miracles, and, on a spot hemmed in by morasses and the waters of the Ouse, the foundation of Ely Minster was begun. This region was Etheldreda's native home, and her royal East Anglian relatives gave her the material means necessary for the execution of her holy design. St. Wilfrid had not yet returned from Rome, where he had obtained extraordinary privileges for her foundation from Benedict II, when she died of a plague which she herself, it is said, had circumstantially foretold. Her body was, throughout many succeeding centuries, an object of devout veneration in the famous church which grew up on her foundation. (See ELY, ANCIENT DIOCESE OF.) One hand of the saint is now venerated in the church of St. Etheldreda, Ely Place, London, which enjoys the distinction of being the first—and at present (1909) the only—pre-Reformation church in Great Britain restored to Catholic worship. Built in the thirteenth century as a private chapel attached to the town residence of the Bishop of Ely, the structure of St. Etheldreda's passed through many vicissitudes during the centuries following its desecration, until, in 1873–74, it was purchased by Father William Lockhart and occupied by the Institute of Charity, of whose English mission Father Lockhart was then superior.

DODD, *Church History of England;* SCHRÖDL in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Edilthryde;* BEDE, *Hist. Eccl.*, IV—with the historian's Latin poem in her honour; MABILLON, *Acta SS. Ord. Bened.;* LOCKHART, *S. Etheldreda's and Old London* (2nd ed., London, 1890).

E. MACPHERSON.

Ethelhard (ÆTHELHEARD, ETHELHEARD), fourteenth Archbishop of Canterbury, England, date of birth unknown; d. 12 May, 805. Much obscurity surrounds the details of his life previous to his election. He is described by Symeon of Durham as "Abbas Hludensis Monasterii", but it is uncertain what monastery is thus designated. It has been variously located at Louth in Lincolnshire (the most probable identification), Lydd, and Luddersdown in Kent, and at Malmesbury. William of Malmesbury is certainly mistaken in identifying him with Ethelhard, ninth Bishop of Winchester.

The rise of Offa, King of the Mercians (757–796), had divided England into three great states: Northumbria, Mercia, and Wessex. The king sought to consolidate his kingdom by giving it an independent ecclesiastical organization; for although Northumbria had its own archbishopric at York, Mercia, after conquering Kent, was still ecclesiastically subject to the powerful see of Canterbury, then ruled over by Jaenbert (766–791). Offa's scheme was to weaken Canterbury's influence by dividing the southern province, and creating a Mercian archbishopric at Lichfield: this he successfully accomplished when on the occasion of the Legatine visit of George and Theophylact, sent by Pope Hadrian I (772–795) in 786–788, Higbert received the pallium as Archbishop of Lichfield, and Canterbury was left with only London, Winchester, Sherborne, Rochester, and Selsey as suffragan sees. On the death of Jaenbert (12 Aug., 791), Ethelhard was raised to the see through the influence of Offa, which makes it likely that he was a Mercian abbot. Although he was elected in 791, his consecration only took place on 21 July, 793: the delay being probably due to the unwillingness of the Kentish clergy and people to receive a Mercian archbishop, and to his being consecrated by the Archbishop of Lichfield. Had Offa's policy of separate ecclesiastical organization prevailed, it would have impeded the attainment of national unity, and its defeat by Ethelhard is an event of the greatest importance in the history of the making of the English nation. During Offa's lifetime little could be done to restore Canterbury's rights and prestige. The year 796 was full of incident: the nobles of Kent rose in arms, and rallying round Eadbert Praen, a cleric and a member of their royal house, endeavoured to shake off the yoke of the Mercian Offa. As Ethelhard's difficulties increased Alcuin exhorted him not to desert his Church; but after taking severe ecclesiastical measures against the recalcitrant cleric he was obliged to flee. Offa died on 26 July. His successor Egfrith died after a very short reign, about 13 Dec.; Cenwulf succeeded in Mercia, but the struggle continued in Kent until the capture of Eadbert in 798.

The co-operation of Ethelhard and Cenwulf in deposing Eadbert, and in upholding the Mercian cause in Kent, increased the importance of Canterbury, and the archiepiscopal authority of Higbert waned. Cenwulf restored an estate taken from Canterbury by Offa, and wrote in 798 to Pope Leo asking him to examine into the question of the diminution of the rights of that see, and enclosing a letter from Ethelhard and his suffragans. Ethelhard meanwhile had returned to his see, and Alcuin wrote exhorting him to do penance for having deserted it. The success of Abbot Wada's mission to Rome, the tone of the letter of Leo III to Cenwulf, and the successful conference with Eanbald II of York, with reference to the restoration of the rights of his see, determined Ethelhard to set out for Rome in 801. Alcuin's friendship once more stood him in good stead; he sent a servant to meet him at St. Josse-sur-mer, and furnished him with letters of recommendation to Charles the Great. Success attended his efforts in Rome. Pope Leo III (795–816) granted his request, and ended the dispute between Canterbury and Lichfield by depriving Lichfield of its recently acquired honours and powers. The pope's decision was officially acknowledged by the Council of Clovesho on 12 Oct., 803, in presence of Cenwulf and his Witan, and Higbert was deprived of his pallium, in spite of Alcuin's plea that so good a man should be spared that humiliation.

It is during Ethelhard's occupancy of the See of Canterbury that we first meet with official records of the profession of faith and obedience made by the English bishops-elect to their metropolitan. The first document of that type is the profession of obedience to the See of Canterbury made in 796 by Bishop Eadulf of Linsey, who, as a suffragan of Lichfield, ought to have been consecrated by Higbert: it would appear to coincide with the collapse of Higbert's archiepiscopal authority at the death of Offa.

SYMEON OF DURHAM (*Rolls Series*), II, 53; WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY, *Gesta Pontificum* (*Rolls Series*), 57–59; STUBBS, s. v. *Ethelhard* in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*; HUNT in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* The extant documents concerning Ethelhard are collected in HADDAN AND STUBBS, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents*, III, 467–555 (Oxford, 1871).

EDWARD MYERS.

Ethelwold, SAINT, Bishop of Winchester was born there of good parentage in the early years of the tenth century; d. 1 Aug., 984. After a youth spent at the court of King Athelstan, Ethelwold placed himself under Elphege the Bald, Bishop of Winchester, who gave him the tonsure and ordained him priest along with Dunstan. At Glastonbury, where he was dean under Saint Dunstan, he was a mirror of perfection. In 955 he became Abbot of Abingdon; and 29 November, 963, was consecrated Bishop of Winchester by Dunstan, with whom and Oswald of Worcester he worked zealously in combating the general corruption occasioned by the Danish inroads. At Winchester, both in the old and in his new minster (see SWITHIN, SAINT), he replaced the evil-living seculars with monks and refounded the ancient nunnery. His labours extended to Chertsey, Milton (Dorsetshire), Ely, Peterborough, and Thorney; expelling the unworthy, rebuilding and restoring; to the rebellious "terrible as a lion", to the meek "gentler than a dove". The epithets "father of monks" and "benevolent bishop" summarize Ethelwold's character as reformer and friend of Christ's poor. Though he suffered much from ill-health, his life as scholar, teacher, prelate, and royal counsellor was ever austere. He was buried in Winchester cathedral, his body being translated later by Elphege, his successor. Abingdon monastery in the twelfth century had relics of Ethelwold. He is said to have written a treatise on the circle and to have translated the "Regularis Concordia". His feast is kept on 1 August.

Not to be confounded with the foregoing are (2) St. Ethelwold, monk of Ripon, anchoret at Lindisfarne, d. about 720; feast kept 23 March; and (3) St. Ethelwold, Abbot of Melrose, Bishop of Lindisfarne, d. c. 740; feast kept 12 February.

Primary sources for Ethelwold of Winchester are *Chronicon de Abingdon*, in Rolls Series, passim, especially his *Life*, by ÆLFRIC, II, 255; and the *Life* ascribed to WULFSTAN, precentor of Winchester, in *Acta SS.*, August, I, 83 sqq. Cf. also *Memorials of Dunstan*, in Rolls Series, 6; DUGDALE, *Monasticon*, I, 190; BOLLANDISTS, *Bibl. hag. lat.*, 398; CHEVALIER, *Répertoire*, 1367; STANTON, 375; HUNT, in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, XVIII, 37. For Ethelwold's Benedictional, see *Archæologia*, XXIV.

For (2) *Acta SS.*, March, III, 463, with citations from BEDE, *Life of St. Cuthbert;* STANTON, *Menology;* CHEVALIER, *Répertoire*, 1367 (bis).

For (3) *Acta SS.*, Feb., II, 604; STANTON, 63; CHEVALIER.

PATRICK RYAN.

Etherianus, HUGH and LEO, brothers, Tuscans by birth, employed at the court of Constantinople under the Emperor Manuel I (Comnenus, 1143–1180). Their name is spelled in various ways: Ætherianus, Heterianus, Eretrianus, etc. Leo is of little importance. We know from his brother (Adv. Græc., I, 20) that he was "occupied in translating the imperial

letters", evidently an interpreter for Latin correspondence. Hugh, who does not seem to have held any official post at court, but was a very learned theologian, had many opportunities of discussing the questions at issue between the Orthodox and Catholics (so he tells us: Adv. Græc., Præf. I., Migne, P. L., CCII, 165). As a result of these disputes he wrote a work in three books: "De hæresibus quas Græci in Latinos devolvunt, sive quod Spiritus Sanctus ex utroque Patre et Filio procedit" (P. L., CCII, generally quoted as "Adv. Græcos"). This work, the first exhaustive and scientific defence of the *Filioque*, was composed in both languages, Latin and Greek. The author sent copies to the Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch, Aimerikos, and to Pope Alexander III (1159–1181), whose letter of acknowledgment is still extant (Ep. xlix, Baronius, an. 1177, n. 37, 38). Hugh Etherianus by this treatise obtains a very important place among Catholic controversialists against the Eastern Church. It appears that the emperor, who was well disposed towards Latins, had suggested that he should write it, having asked him whether they have "any authorities of saints who say that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son" (ib., Præf. I, CCII, col. 165). Hugh had used his knowledge of Greek and his opportunities of studying their Fathers so well that he was able to produce texts from nearly all the recognized authorities on both sides. He quotes especially Sts. Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, John Damascene, etc. From the Latins he produced witnesses from Sts. Augustine, Jerome, Gregory I, Ambrose, Hilary. He was also well acquainted with the writings of his adversaries and quotes Photius, Nicetas of Thessalonica, Theophylactus of Achrida, etc. The Latin version is very corrupt and untrustworthy. There are also some incorrect expressions noted by the later editors, such as that God the Father is the cause of the Son (this is a concession to the Greeks that was, however, tolerated by the Council of Florence; Denzinger, Enchiridion, n. 586). Nevertheless, since it was written this work has been the foundation of nearly all Latin controversy with the Greeks. St. Thomas Aquinas used it for his "Opusc. I, contra errores Græcorum" and Cardinal Bessarion refers to it with great praise (Ep. ad Alex., P. L., CLXI, 328). Hugh Etherianus also wrote a treatise "De regressu animarum ab inferis", in answer to a petition of the clergy of Pisa, and (probably) a short work "De Græcorum malis consuetudinibus". A "Liber de immortali Deo", written by him, is lost.

MIGNE, *P. L.*, CCII; HERGENRÖTHER, *Photius* (Ratisbon, 1867–1869), II, 646; III, 175 sqq., 814 sqq., etc.; WERNER, *Thomas von Aquin* (Ratisbon, 1858), 731–738.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Ethics.—I. DEFINITION.—Many writers regard ethics (Gr. ἠθική) as any scientific treatment of the moral order and divide it into theological, or Christian, ethics (moral theology) and philosophical ethics (moral philosophy). What is usually understood by ethics, however, is philosophical ethics, or moral philosophy, and in this sense the present article will treat the subject. Moral philosophy is a division of practical philosophy. Theoretical, or speculative, philosophy has to do with being, or with the order of things not dependent upon reason, and its object is to attain by the natural light of reason a knowledge of this order in its ultimate causes. Practical philosophy, on the other hand, concerns itself with what *ought to be*, or with the order of acts which are human and which therefore depend upon our reason. It is also divided into logic and ethics. The former rightly orders the intellectual activities and teaches the proper method in the acquirement of truth, while the latter directs the activities of the will; the object of the former is the true; that of the latter, the good. Hence ethics may be defined as the science of the moral rectitude of human acts in accordance with the first principles of natural reason. Logic and ethics are normative and practical sciences, because they prescribe norms or rules for human activities and show how, according to these norms, a man ought to direct his actions. Ethics is pre-eminently practical and directive; for it orders the activities of the will, and the latter it is which sets all the other faculties of man in motion. Hence, to order the will is the same as to order the whole man. Moreover, ethics not only directs a man how to act if he wishes to be morally good, but sets before him the absolute obligation he is under of doing good and avoiding evil.

A distinction must be made between ethics and morals, or morality. Every people, even the most uncivilized and uncultured, has its own morality or sum of prescriptions which govern its moral conduct. Nature has so provided that each man establishes for himself a code of moral concepts and principles which are applicable to the details of practical life, without the necessity of awaiting the conclusions of science. Ethics is the scientific or philosophical treatment of morality. The subject-matter proper of ethics is the deliberate, free actions of man; for these alone are in our power, and concerning these alone can rules be prescribed, not concerning those actions which are performed without deliberation, or through ignorance or coercion. Besides this, the scope of ethics includes whatever has reference to free human acts, whether as principle or cause of action (law, conscience, virtue), or as effect or circumstance of action (merit, punishment, etc.). The particular aspect (formal object) under which ethics considers free acts is that of their moral goodness or the rectitude of order involved in them as human acts. A man may be a good artist or orator and at the same time a morally bad man, or, conversely, a morally good man and a poor artist or technician. Ethics has merely to do with the order which relates to man as man, and which makes of him a morally good man.

Like ethics, moral theology also deals with the moral actions of man; but unlike ethics, it has its origin in supernaturally revealed truth. It presupposes man's elevation to the supernatural order, and, though it avails itself of the scientific conclusions of ethics, it draws its knowledge for the most part from Christian Revelation. Ethics is distinguished from the other natural sciences which deal with moral conduct of man, as jurisprudence and pedagogy, in this, that the latter do not ascend to first principles, but borrow their fundamental notions from ethics, and are therefore subordinate to it. To investigate what constitutes good or bad, just or unjust, what is virtue, law, conscience, duty, etc., what obligations are common to all men, does not lie within the scope of jurisprudence or pedagogy, but of ethics; and yet these notions and principles must be presupposed by the former, must serve them as a ground-work and guide; hence they are subordinated to ethics. The same is true of political economy. The latter is indeed immediately concerned with man's social activity inasmuch as it treats of the production, distribution, and consumption of material commodities, but this activity is not independent of ethics; industrial life must develop in accordance with the moral law and must be dominated by justice, equity, and love. Political economy was wholly wrong in trying to emancipate itself from the requirements of ethics. Sociology is at the present day considered by many as a science distinct from ethics. If, however, by sociology is meant a philosophical treatment of society, it is a division of ethics; for the inquiry into the nature of society in general, into the origin, nature, object, and purpose of natural societies (the family, the state) and their relations to one another forms an essential part of Ethics. If, on the other hand, sociology be regarded as the aggregate of the sciences which have reference to the social

life of man, it is not a single science but a complexus of sciences; and among these, so far as the natural order is concerned, ethics has the first claim.

II. Sources and Methods of Ethics.—The sources of ethics are partly man's own experience and partly the principles and truths proposed by other philosophical disciplines (logic and metaphysics). Ethics takes its origin from the empirical fact that certain general principles and concepts of the moral order are common to all peoples at all times. This fact has indeed been frequently disputed, but recent ethnological research has placed it beyond the possibility of doubt. All nations distinguish between what is good and what is bad, between good men and bad men, between virtue and vice; they are all agreed in this: that the good is worth striving for, and that evil must be shunned, that the one deserves praise, the other, blame. Though in individual cases they may not be one in denominating the same thing good or evil, they are nevertheless agreed as to the general principle, that good is to be done and evil avoided. Vice everywhere seeks to hide itself or to put on the mask of virtue; it is a universally recognized principle, that we should not do to others what we would not wish them to do to us. With the aid of the truths laid down in logic and metaphysics, ethics proceeds to give a thorough explanation of this undeniable fact, to trace it back to its ultimate causes, then to gather from fundamental moral principles certain conclusions which will direct man, in the various circumstances and relations of life, how to shape his own conduct towards the attainment of the end for which he was created. Thus the proper method of ethics is at once speculative and empirical; it draws upon experience and metaphysics. Supernatural Christian Revelation is not a proper source of ethics. Only those conclusions properly belong to ethics which can be reached with the help of experience and philosophical principles. The Christian philosopher, however, may not ignore supernatural revelation, but must at least recognize it as a negative norm, inasmuch as he is not to advance any assertion in evident contradiction to the revealed truth of Christianity. God is the fountain-head of all truth—whether natural, as made known by Creation, or supernatural as revealed through Christ and the Prophets. As our intellect is an image of the Divine Intellect, so is all certain scientific knowledge the reflex and interpretation of the Creator's thoughts embodied in His creatures, a participation in His eternal wisdom. God cannot reveal supernaturally and command us to believe on His authority anything that contradicts the thoughts expressed by Him in His creatures, and which, with the aid of the faculty of reason which He has given us, we can discern in His works. To assert the contrary would be to deny God's omniscience and veracity, or to suppose that God was not the source of all truth. A conflict, therefore, between faith and science is impossible, and hence the Christian philosopher has to refrain from advancing any assertion which would be evidently antagonistic to certain revealed truth. Should his researches lead to conclusions out of harmony with faith, he is to take it for granted that some error has crept into his deductions, just as the mathematician whose calculations openly contradict the facts of experience must be satisfied that his demonstration is at fault.

After what has been said, the following methods of ethics must be rejected as unsound. (1) Pure Rationalism.—This system makes reason the sole source of truth, and therefore at the very outset excludes every reference to Christian Revelation, branding any such reference as degrading and hampering free scientific investigation. The supreme law of science is not freedom, but truth. It is not derogatory to the true dignity and freedom of science to abstain from asserting what, according to Christian Revelation, is manifestly erroneous. (2) Pure Empiricism, which would erect the entire structure of ethics exclusively on the foundation of experience, must also be rejected. Experience can tell us merely of present or past phenomena; but as to what, of necessity, and universally, must, or ought to, happen in the future, experience can give us no clue without bringing in the aid of necessary and universal principles. Closely allied to Empiricism is Historicism, which considers history as the exclusive source of ethics. What has been said of Empiricism may also be applied to Historicism. History is concerned with what has happened in the past and only too often has to rehearse the moral aberrations of mankind. (3) Positivism is a variety of Empiricism; it seeks to emancipate ethics from metaphysics and base it on facts alone. No science can be constructed on the mere foundation of facts, and independently of metaphysics. Every science must set out from evident principles, which form the basis of all certain cognition. Ethics especially is impossible without metaphysics, since it is according to the metaphysical view we take of the world that ethics shapes itself. Whoever considers man as nothing else than a more highly developed brute will hold different ethical views from one who discerns in man a creature fashioned to the image and likeness of God, possessing a spiritual, immortal soul and destined to eternal life; whoever refuses to recognize the freedom of the will destroys the very foundation of ethics. Whether man was created by God or possesses a spiritual, immortal soul which is endowed with free will, or is essentially different from brute creation, all these are questions pertaining to metaphysics. Anthropology, moreover, is necessarily presupposed by ethics. No rules can be prescribed for man's actions, unless his nature is clearly understood. (4) Another untenable system is Traditionalism, which in France, during the first half of the nineteenth century, counted many adherents (among others, de Bonald, Bautain), and which advanced the doctrine that complete certainty in religious and moral questions was not to be attained by the aid of reason alone, but only by the light of revelation as made known to us through tradition. They failed to see that for all reasonable belief certain knowledge of the existence of God and of the fact of revelation is necessarily presupposed, and this knowledge cannot be gathered from revelation. Fideism, or, as Paulsen designated it, the Irrationalism of many Protestants, also denies the ability of reason to furnish certainty in matters relating to God and religion. With Kant, it teaches that reason does not rise above the phenomena of the visible world; faith alone can lead us into the realm of the supersensible and instruct us in matters moral and religious. This faith, however, is not the acceptance of truth on the strength of external authority, but rather consists in certain appreciative judgments, i.e. assumptions or convictions which are the result of each one's own inner experiences, and which have, therefore, for him a precise worth, and correspond to his own peculiar temperament. Since these persuasions are not supposed to come within the range of reason, exception to them cannot be taken on scientific grounds. According to this opinion, religion and morals are relegated to pure subjectivism and lose all their objectivity and universality of value.

III. Historical View of Ethics.—As ethics is the philosophical treatment of the moral order, its history does not consist in narrating the views of morality entertained by different nations at different times; this is properly the scope of the history of civilization, and of ethnology. The history of ethics is concerned solely with the various philosophical systems which in the course of time have been elaborated with reference to the moral order. Hence the opinions advanced by the wise men of antiquity, such as Pythagoras (582–500 B. C.), Heraclitus (535–475 B. C.), Confucius (558–479 B. C.), scarcely belong to the history

of ethics; for, though they proposed various moral truths and principles, they did so in a dogmatic and didactic, and not in a philosophically systematic manner. Ethics properly so called is first met with among the Greeks, i. e. in the teaching of Socrates (470–399 B. C.). According to him, the ultimate object of human activity is happiness, and the necessary means to reach it, virtue. Since everybody necessarily seeks happiness, no one is deliberately corrupt. All evil arises from ignorance, and the virtues are one and all but so many kinds of prudence. Virtue can, therefore, be imparted by instruction. The disciple of Socrates, Plato (427–347 B. C.), declares that the *summum bonum* consists in the perfect imitation of God, the Absolute Good, an imitation which cannot be fully realized in this life. Virtue enables man to order his conduct, as he properly should, according to the dictates of reason, and acting thus he becomes like unto God. But Plato differed from Socrates in that he did not consider virtue to consist in wisdom alone, but in justice, temperance, and fortitude as well, these constituting the proper harmony of man's activities. In a sense, the State is man writ large, and its function is to train its citizens in virtue. For his ideal State he proposed the community of goods and of wives and the public education of children. Though Socrates and Plato had been to the fore in this mighty work and had contributed much valuable material to the upbuilding of ethics; nevertheless, Plato's illustrious disciple, Aristotle (384–322 B. C.), must be considered the real founder of systematic ethics. With characteristic keenness he solved, in his ethical and political writings, most of the problems with which ethics concerns itself. Unlike Plato, who began with ideas as the basis of his observations, Aristotle chose rather to take the facts of experience as his starting-point; these he analysed accurately, and sought to trace to their highest and ultimate causes. He sets out from the fact that all men tend to happiness as the ultimate object of all their endeavours, as the highest good, which is sought for its own sake, and to which all other goods merely serve as means. This happiness cannot consist in external goods, but only in the activity proper to human nature—not indeed in such a lower activity of the vegetative and sensitive life as man possesses in common with plants and brutes, but in the highest and most perfect activity of his reason, which springs in turn from virtue. This activity, however, has to be exercised in a perfect and enduring life. The highest pleasure is naturally bound up with this activity, yet, to constitute perfect happiness, external goods must also supply their share. True happiness, though prepared for him by the gods as the object and the reward of virtue, can be attained only through a man's own individual exertion. With keen penetration Aristotle thereupon proceeds to investigate in turn each of the intellectual and moral virtues, and his treatment of them must, even at the present time, be regarded as in great part correct. The nature of the State and of the family were, in the main, rightly explained by him. The only pity is that his vision did not penetrate beyond this earthly life, and that he never saw clearly the relations of man to God.

A more hedonistic (ἡδονή, "pleasure") turn in ethics begins with Democritus (about 460–370 B. C.), who considers a perpetually joyous and cheerful disposition as the highest good and happiness of man. The means thereto is virtue, which makes us independent of external goods—so far as that is possible—and which wisely discriminates between the pleasures that are to be sought after and those that are to be shunned. Pure Sensualism or Hedonism was first taught by Aristippus of Cyrene (435–354 B. C.), according to whom the greatest possible pleasure, especially sensual pleasure, is the end and supreme good of human endeavour. Epicurus (341–270 B. C.) differs from Aristippus in holding that the largest sum total possible of spiritual and sensual enjoyments, with the greatest possible freedom from displeasure and pain, is man's highest good. Virtue is the proper directive norm in the attainment of this end.

The Cynics, Antisthenes (444–369 B. C.) and Diogenes of Sinope (414–324 B. C.), taught the direct contrary of Hedonism, namely, that virtue alone suffices for happiness, that pleasure is an evil, and that the truly wise man is above human laws. This teaching soon degenerated into haughty arrogance and open contempt for law and for the remainder of men (Cynicism). The Stoics, Zeno (336–264 B. C.) and his disciples, Cleanthes, Chrysippus, and others, strove to refine and perfect the views of Antisthenes. Virtue, in their opinion, consists in man's living according to the dictates of his rational nature, and, as each one's individual nature is but a part of the entire natural order, virtue is, therefore, the harmonious agreement with the Divine Reason, which shapes the whole course of nature. Whether they conceived this relation of God to the world in a pantheistic or a theistic sense, is not altogether clear. Virtue is to be sought for its own sake, and it suffices for man's happiness. All other things are indifferent and are, as circumstances require, to be striven after or shunned. The passions and affections are bad, and the wise man is independent of them. Among the Roman Stoics were Seneca (4 B. C.–A. D. 65), Epictetus (born about A. D. 50), and the Emperor Marcus Aurelius (A. D. 121–180), upon whom, however, at least upon the latter two, Christian influences had already begun to make themselves felt. Cicero (106–43 B. C.) elaborated no new philosophical system of his own, but chose those particular views from the various systems of Grecian philosophy which appeared best to him. He maintained that moral goodness, which is the general object of all virtues, consists in what is becoming to man as a rational being distinct from the brute. Actions are often good or bad, just or unjust, not because of human institutions or customs, but of their own intrinsic nature. Above and beyond human laws, there is a natural law embracing all nations and all times, the expression of the rational will of the Most High God, from obedience to which no human authority can exempt us. Cicero gives an exhaustive exposition of the cardinal virtues and the obligations connected with them; he insists especially on devotion to the gods, without which human society could not exist.

Parallel with the above-mentioned Greek and Roman ethical systems runs a sceptical tendency, which rejects every natural moral law, bases the whole moral order on custom or human arbitrariness, and frees the wise man from subjection to the ordinary precepts of the moral order. This tendency was furthered by the Sophists, against whom Socrates and Plato arrayed themselves, and later on by Carneades, Theodore of Cyrene, and others.

A new epoch in ethics begins with the dawn of Christianity. Ancient paganism never had a clear and definite concept of the relation between God and the world, of the unity of the human race, of the destiny of man, of the nature and meaning of the moral law. Christianity first shed full light on these and similar questions. As St. Paul teaches (Rom., ii, 24 sq.), God has written His moral law in the hearts of all men, even of those outside the influence of Christian Revelation; this law manifests itself in the conscience of every man and is the norm according to which the whole human race will be judged on the day of reckoning. In consequence of their perverse inclinations, this law had to a great extent become obscured and distorted among the pagans; Christianity, however, restored it to its pristine integrity. Thus, too, ethics received its richest and most fruitful stimulus. Proper ethical methods were now unfolded, and philosophy was in a position to follow up and

develop these methods by means supplied from its own store-house. This course was soon adopted in the early ages of the Church by the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers, as Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, but especially the illustrious Doctors of the Church, Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine, who, in the exposition and defence of Christian truth, made use of the principles laid down by the pagan philosophers. True, the Fathers had no occasion to treat moral questions from a purely philosophical standpoint, and independently of Christian Revelation; but in the explanation of Catholic doctrine their discussions naturally led to philosophical investigations. This is particularly true of St. Augustine, who proceeded to thoroughly develop along philosophical lines and to establish firmly most of the truths of Christian morality. The eternal law (*lex æterna*), the original type and source of all temporal laws, the natural law, conscience, the ultimate end of man, the cardinal virtues, sin, marriage, etc. were treated by him in the clearest and most penetrating manner. Hardly a single portion of ethics does he present to us but is enriched with his keen philosophical commentaries. Later ecclesiastical writers followed in his footsteps.

A sharper line of separation between philosophy and theology, and in particular between ethics and moral theology, is first met with in the works of the great Schoolmen of the Middle Ages, especially of Albert the Great (1193–1280), Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274), Bonaventure (1221–1274), and Duns Scotus (1274–1308). Philosophy and, by means of it, theology reaped abundant fruit from the works of Aristotle, which had until then been a sealed treasure to Western civilization, and were first elucidated by the detailed and profound commentaries of Bl. Albert the Great and St. Thomas Aquinas, and pressed into the service of Christian philosophy. The same is particularly true as regards ethics. St. Thomas, in his commentaries on the political and ethical writings of the Stagirite, in his "Summa contra Gentiles" and his "Quæstiones disputatæ", treated with his wonted clearness and penetration nearly the whole range of ethics in a purely philosophical manner, so that even to the present day his works are an inexhaustible source whence ethics draws its supply. On the foundations laid by him the Catholic philosophers and theologians of succeeding ages have continued to build. It is true that in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, thanks especially to the influence of the so-called Nominalists, a period of stagnation and decline in philosophy set in, but the sixteenth century is marked by a revival. Ethical questions, also, though largely treated in connexion with theology, are again made the subject of careful investigation. We mention as examples the great theologians Victoria, Dominicus Soto, L. Molina, Suarez, Lessius, and De Lugo. Since the sixteenth century special chairs of ethics (moral philosophy) have been erected in many Catholic universities. The larger, purely philosophical works on ethics, however, do not appear until the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as an example of which we may instance the production of Ign. Schwarz, "Institutiones juris universalis naturæ et gentium" (1743).

Far different from Catholic ethical methods were those adopted for the most part by Protestants. With the rejection of the Church's teaching authority, each individual became on principle his own supreme teacher and arbiter in matters appertaining to faith and morals. True it is that the Reformers held fast to Holy Writ as the infallible source of revelation, but as to what belongs or does not belong to it, whether, and how far, it is inspired, and what is its meaning—all this was left to the final decision of the individual. The inevitable result was that philosophy arrogantly threw to the winds all regard for revealed truth, and in many cases became involved in the most pernicious errors. Melanchthon, in his "Elementa philosophiæ moralis", still clung to the Aristotelean philosophy; so, too, did Hugo Grotius, in his work, "De jure belli et pacis". But Cumberland and his follower, Samuel Pufendorf, set out along rather devious paths in matters ethical, inasmuch as they identified moral goodness with the utilitarian interests of human society. Pufendorf, moreover, assumed, with Descartes, that the ultimate ground for every distinction between good and evil lay in the free determination of God's Will, a view which renders the philosophical treatment of ethics fundamentally impossible. Quite an influential factor in the development of ethics was Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679). He supposes that the human race originally existed in a rude condition (*status naturæ*) in which every man was free to act as he pleased, and possessed a right to all things, whence arose a war of all against all. Lest destruction should be the result, it was decided to abandon this condition of nature and to found a state in which, by agreement, all were to be subject to one common will (one ruler). This authority ordains, by the law of the State, what is to be considered by all as good and as evil, and only then does there arise a distinction between good and evil of universal binding force on all. The Pantheist Baruch Spinoza (1632–1677) considers the impulse to self-preservation as the foundation of virtue. Every being is endowed with the necessary impulse to assert itself, and, as reason demands nothing contrary to nature, it requires each one to follow this impulse and to strive after whatever is useful to him. And each individual possesses power and virtue just in so far as he obeys this impulse. Freedom of the will consists merely in the ability to follow unrestrainedly this natural impulse. Shaftesbury (1671–1713) bases ethics on the affections or inclinations of man. There are sympathetic, idiopathic, and unnatural inclinations. The first of these regard the common good, the second the private good of the agent, the third are opposed to the other two. To lead a morally good life, war must be waged upon the unnatural impulses, while the idiopathic and sympathetic inclinations must be made to harmonize. This harmony constitutes virtue. In the attainment of virtue the subjective guiding principle of knowledge is the "moral sense", a sort of moral instinct. This "moral sense" theory was further developed by Hutcheson (1694–1747); meanwhile, "common sense" was suggested by Thomas Reid (1710–1796) as the highest norm of moral conduct. In France the materialistic philosophers of the eighteenth century—as Helvetius, de la Mettrie, Holbach, Condillac, and others—disseminated the teachings of Sensualism and Hedonism as understood by Epicurus.

A complete revolution in ethics was introduced by Immanuel Kant (1724–1804). From the wreck of pure theoretical reason he turned for rescue to practical reason, in which he found an absolute, universal, and categorical moral law. This law is not to be conceived as an enactment of external authority, for this would be heteronomy, which is foreign to true morality; it is rather the law of our own reason, which is, therefore, autonomous, that is, it must be observed for its own sake, without regard to any pleasure or utility arising therefrom. Only that will is morally good which obeys the moral law under the influence of such a subjective principle or motive as can be willed by the individual to become the universal law for all men. The followers of Kant have selected now one now another doctrine from his ethics and combined therewith various pantheistical systems. Fichte places man's supreme good and destiny in absolute spontaneity and liberty; Schleiermacher, in co-operating with the progressive civilization of mankind. A similar view recurs substantially in the writings of Wilhelm Wundt and, to a certain extent, in those of the pessimist, Ed-

ward von Hartmann, though the latter regards culture and progress merely as means to the ultimate end, which, according to him, consists in delivering the Absolute from the torment of existence.

The system of Cumberland, who maintained the common good of mankind to be the end and criterion of moral conduct, was renewed on a positivistic basis in the nineteenth century by Auguste Comte and has counted many adherents, e. g., in England, John Stuart Mill, Henry Sidgwick, Alexander Bain; in Germany, G. T. Fechner, F. E. Beneke, F. Paulsen, and others. Herbert Spencer (1820–1903) sought to effect a compromise between social Utilitarianism (Altruism) and private Utilitarianism (Egoism) in accordance with the theory of evolution. In his opinion, that conduct is good which serves to augment life and pleasure without any admixture of displeasure. In consequence, however, of man's lack of adaptation to the conditions of life, such absolute goodness of conduct is not as yet possible, and hence various compromises must be made between Altruism and Egoism. With the progress of evolution, however, this adaptability to existing conditions will become more and more perfect, and consequently the benefits accruing to the individual from his own conduct will be most useful to society at large. In particular, sympathy (in joy) will enable us to take pleasure in altruistic actions.

The great majority of non-Christian moral philosophers have followed the path trodden by Spencer. Starting with the assumption that man, by a series of transformations, was gradually evolved from the brute, and therefore differs from it in degree only, they seek the first traces and beginnings of moral ideas in the brute itself. Charles Darwin had done some preparatory work along these lines, and Spencer did not hesitate to descant on brute-ethics, on the prehuman justice, conscience, and self-control of brutes. Present-day Evolutionists follow his view and attempt to show how animal morality has in man continually become more perfect. With the aid of analogies taken from ethnology, they relate how mankind originally wandered over the face of the earth in semi-savage hordes, knew nothing of marriage or the family, and only by degrees reached a higher level of morality. These are the merest creations of fancy. If man is nothing more than a highly developed brute, he cannot possess a spiritual and immortal soul, and there can no longer be question of the freedom of the will, of the future retribution of good and evil, nor can man in consequence be hindered from ordering his life as he pleases and regarding the well-being of others only in so far as it redounds to his own profit.

As the Evolutionists, so too the Socialists favour the theory of evolution from their ethical viewpoint; yet the latter do not base their observations on scientific principles, but on social and economical considerations. According to K. Marx, F. Engels, and other exponents of the so-called "materialistic interpretation of history", all moral, religious, juridical, and philosophical concepts are but the reflex of the economical conditions of society in the minds of men. Now these social relations are subject to constant change; hence the ideas of morality, religion, etc. are also continually changing. Every age, every people, and even each class in a given people forms its moral and religious ideas in accordance with its own peculiar economical situation. Hence, no universal code of morality exists binding on all men at all times; the morality of the present day is not of Divine origin, but the product of history, and will soon have to make room for another system of morality. Allied to this materialistic historical interpretation, though derived from other sources, is the system of Relativism, which recognizes no absolute and unchangeable truths in regard either to ethics or to anything else. Those who follow this opinion aver that nothing objectively true can be known by us. Men differ from one another and are subject to change, and with them, the manner and means of viewing the world about them also change. Moreover the judgments passed on matters religious and moral depend essentially upon the inclinations, interests, and character of the person judging, while these latter in turn are constantly varying. Pragmatism differs from Relativism inasmuch as that only is to be considered true which is proven by experience to be useful; and, since the same thing is not always useful, unchangeable truth is impossible.

In view of the chaos of opinions and systems just described, it need not surprise us that, as regards ethical problems, scepticism is extending its sway to the utmost limits, in fact many exhibit a formal contempt for the traditional morality. According to Max Nordau, moral precepts are nothing but "conventional lies"; according to Max Stirner, that alone is good which serves my interests, whereas the common good, the love for all men, etc. are but empty phantoms. Men of genius and superiority in particular are coming more and more to be regarded as exempt from the moral law. Nietzsche is the originator of a school whose doctrines are founded on these principles. According to him, goodness was originally identified with nobility and gentility of rank. Whatever the man of rank and power did, whatever inclinations he possessed, were good. The down-trodden proletariat, on the other hand, were bad, i.e. lowly and ignoble, without any other derogatory meaning being given to the word *bad*. It was only by a gradual process that the oppressed multitude through hatred and envy evolved the distinction between good and bad, in the moral sense, by denominating the characteristics and conduct of those in power and rank as bad, and their own behaviour as good. And thus arose the opposition between the morality of the master and that of the slave. Those in power still continued to look upon their own egoistic inclinations as noble and good, while the oppressed populace lauded the "instincts of the common herd", i.e. all those qualities necessary and useful to its existence—as patience, meekness, obedience, and love of one's neighbour. Weakness became goodness, cringing obsequiousness became humility, subjection to hated oppressors was obedience, cowardice meant patience. "All morality is one long and audacious deception." Hence, the value attached to the prevailing concepts of morality must be entirely re-arranged. Intellectual superiority is above and beyond good and evil as understood in the traditional sense. There is no higher moral order to which men of such calibre are amenable. The end of society is not the common good of its members; the intellectual aristocracy (the over-man) is its own end; in its behalf the common herd, the "too many", must be reduced to slavery and decimated. As it rests with each individual to decide who belongs to this intellectual aristocracy, so each one is at liberty to emancipate himself from the existing moral order.

In conclusion, one other tendency in ethics may be noted, which has manifested itself far and wide: namely, the effort to make morality independent of all religion. It is clear that many of the above-mentioned ethical systems essentially exclude all regard for God and religion, and this is true especially of materialistic, agnostic, and, in the last analysis, of all pantheistic systems. Apart, also, from these systems, "independent morality", called also "lay morality", has gained many followers and defenders. Kant's ideas formed the basis of this tendency, for he himself founded a code of morality on the categorical imperative and expressly declared that morality is sufficient for itself, and therefore has no need of religion. Many modern moral philosophers—Herbart, Eduard von Hartmann, Zeller, Wundt, Paulsen, Ziegler, and a number of others—have followed Kant in this respect. For several decades practical attempts have been made

to emancipate morality from religion. In France religious instruction was banished from the schools in 1882 and moral instruction substituted. This tendency manifests a lively activity in what is known as the "ethical movement", whose home, properly speaking, is in the United States. In 1876, Felix Adler, professor at Cornell University, founded the "Society for Ethical Culture", in New York City. Similar societies were formed in other cities. These were consolidated in 1887 into the "Union of the Societies for Ethical Culture". Besides Adler, the chief propagators of the movement by word of mouth and writing, were W. M. Salter and Stanton Coit. The purpose of these societies is declared to be "the improvement of the moral life of the members of the societies and of the community to which they belong, without any regard to theological or philosophical opinions". In most of the European countries ethical societies were founded on the model of the American organization. All these were combined in 1894 into the "International Ethical Association". Their purpose, i. e. the amelioration of man's moral condition, is indeed praiseworthy, but it is erroneous to suppose that any such moral improvement can be brought about without taking religion into consideration. In fact many members of the ethical societies are openly antagonistic to all religions, and would therefore do away with denominational schools and supplant religious teaching by mere moral instruction. Even upon purely ethical considerations such attempts must be unhesitatingly rejected. If it be true that even in the case of adults moral instruction without religion, without any higher obligation or sanction, is a nonentity, a meaningless sham, how much more so is it in the case of the young? It is evident that, judged from the standpoint of Christianity, these efforts must meet with a still more decided condemnation. Christians are bound to observe not only the prescriptions of the natural law, but also all the precepts given by Christ concerning faith, hope, love, Divine worship, and the imitation of Himself. The Christian, moreover, knows that without Divine grace and, hence, without prayer and the frequent reception of the sacraments, a morally good life for any considerable length of time is impossible. From their earliest years, therefore, the young must not only receive thorough instruction in all the Commandments, but must be exercised and trained in the practical use of the means of grace. Religion must be the soil and atmosphere in which education develops and flourishes.

While, among non-Catholics ever since the Reformation, and especially since Kant, there has been an increasing tendency to divorce ethics from religion, and to dissolve it into countless venturesome and frequently contradictory systems, Catholics for the most part have remained free from these errors, because, in the Church's infallible teaching authority, the guardian of Christian Revelation, they have always found secure orientation. It is true that towards the end of the eighteenth, and at the beginning of the nineteenth century, Illuminism and Rationalism penetrated here and there into Catholic circles and attempted to replace moral theology by purely philosophical ethics, and in turn to transform the latter according to the Kantian autonomy. This movement, however, was but a passing phase. With a reawakening of the Church's activity, fresh impetus was given to Catholic science, which was of benefit to ethics also and produced in its domain some excellent fruits. Recourse was again had to the illustrious past of Catholicism, while, at the same time, modern ethical systems gave occasion to a thorough investigation and verification of principles of the moral order. Taparelli d'Azeglio led the way with his great work "Saggio teoretico di diritto naturale appoggiato sul fatto" (1840–43). Then followed, in Italy, Audisio, Rosmini, Liberatore, Sanseverino, Roselli, Zigliara, Signoriello, Schiffini, Ferretti, Talamo, and others. In Spain this revival of ethics was due to, among others, J. Balmes, Donoso Cortés, Zefirio Gonzalez, Mendive, R. de Cepeda; in France and Belgium, to de Lehen (Institutes de droit naturel), de Margerie, Onclair, Ath, Vallet, Charles Périn, Piat, de Pascal, Moulart, Castelein; in England and America, to Joseph Rickaby, Jouin, Russo, Hollaind, J. J. Ming. In German-speaking countries the reawakening of Scholasticism in general begins with Kleutgen (Theologie der Vorzeit, 1853; Philosophie der Vorzeit, 1860), and of ethics in particular with Th. Meyer (Die Grundsätze der Sittlichkeit und des Rechts, 1868; Institutiones juris naturalis seu philosophiæ moralis universæ, 1885–1900). After them came A. Stöckl, Ferd. Walter, Moy de Sons, C. Gutberlet, Fr. J. Stein, Brandis, Costa-Rossetti, A. M. Weiss, Renninger, Lehmen, Willems, V. Frins, Heinrich Pesch, and others. We pass over numerous Catholic writers, who have made a specialty of sociology and political economy.

IV. Outlines of Ethics.—It is clear that the following statement cannot pretend to treat thoroughly all ethical questions; it is intended rather to afford the reader an insight into the most important problems dealt with by ethics, as well as into the methods adopted in their treatment. Ethics is usually divided into two parts: general, or theoretical ethics, and special, or applied ethics. General ethics expounds and verifies the general principles and concepts of the moral order; special ethics applies these general principles to the various relations of man, and determines his duties in particular.

Reason itself can rise from the knowledge of the visible creation to the certain knowledge of the existence of God, the origin and end of all things. On this fundamental truth the structure of ethics must be based. God created man, as He created all things else, for His own honour and glory. The ultimate end is the proper motive of the will's activity. If God were not the ultimate object and end of His own activity, He would depend upon His creatures, and would not be infinitely perfect. He is, then, the ultimate end of all things, they are created for His sake, not, indeed, that He can derive any benefit from them, which would be repugnant to an infinitely perfect being, but for His glory. They are to manifest His goodness and perfection. Irrational creatures cannot of themselves directly glorify God, for they are incapable of knowing Him. They are intended as means to the end for which rational man was created. The end of man, however, is to know God, to love Him and serve Him, and thereby attain to perfect and unending happiness. Every man has within him an irresistible, indestructible desire for perfect happiness; he seeks to be free from every evil and to possess every obtainable good. This impulse to happiness is founded on man's nature; it is implanted there by his Maker; and hence will be duly realized, if nothing is wanting on the part of man's own individual endeavour. But perfect happiness is unattainable in the present life, if for no other reason, at least for this, that inexorable death puts an early end to all earthly happiness. There is reserved for man a better life, if he freely chooses to glorify God here on earth. It will be the crown of victory to be conferred upon him hereafter, if at present he remains subject to God and keeps His Commandments. Only from the viewpoint of eternity do this earthly life and the moral order acquire their proper significance and value. But how does man, considered in the natural order, or apart from every influence of supernatural revelation, come to know what God requires of him here below, or how he is to serve and glorify Him, in order to arrive at eternal happiness?—By means of the natural law.

From eternity there existed in the mind of God the idea of the world, which He freely determined to create, as well as the plan of government according to

which He wished to rule the world and direct it to its end. This ordination existing in the mind of God from all eternity, and depending on the nature and essential relations of rational beings, is the eternal law of God (*lex æterna Dei*), the source from which all temporal laws take their rise. God does not move and govern His creatures by a mere external directive impetus, as the archer does the arrow, but by means of internal impulses and inclinations, which he has bound up with their natures. Irrational creatures are urged, by means of physical forces or natural impulses and instincts, to exercise the activity peculiar to them and keep the order designed for them. Man, on the other hand, is a being endowed with reason and free will; as such, he cannot be led by blind impulses and instincts in a manner conformable to his nature, but must needs depend upon practical principles and judgments, which point out to him how he is to order his conduct. These principles must somehow or other be manifested to him by nature. All created things have implanted in their natures certain guiding principles, necessary to their corresponding activities. Man must be no exception to this rule. He must be led by a natural, inborn light, manifesting to him what he is to do or not to do. This natural light is the natural law. When we speak of man as possessing a natural, inborn light, it is not to be understood in the sense that man has innate ideas. Innate ideas do not exist. It is true, nevertheless, that the Creator has endowed man with the ability and the inclination to form many concepts and develop principles. As soon as he comes to the use of reason, he forms, by a natural necessity, on the basis of experience, certain general concepts of theoretical reason—e. g. those of being and not being, of cause and effect, of space and time—and so he arrives at universal principles, e. g. that "nothing can exist and not exist at the same time", that "every effect has its cause", etc. As it is in the theoretical, so also in the practical order. As soon as reason has been sufficiently developed, and the individual can somehow or other practically judge that he is something more than a mere animal, by an intrinsic necessity of his nature he forms the concept of good and evil, i. e. of something which is proper to the rational nature which distinguishes him from the brute, and which is therefore worth striving for, and something which is unbecoming and therefore to be avoided. And, as by nature he feels himself attracted by what is good and repelled by what is evil, he naturally forms the judgments, that "good is to be done and evil avoided", that "man ought to live according to the dictates of reason", etc. From his own reflections, especially when assisted by instruction from others, he easily comes to the conclusion that in these judgments the will of a superior being, of the Creator and Designer of nature, has its expression. Around about him he perceives that all things are well ordered, so that it is very easy for him to discern in them the handiwork of a superior and all-wise power. He himself has been appointed to occupy in the domain of nature the position of lord and master; he, too, must lead a well regulated life, as befits a rational being, not merely because he himself chooses to do so, but also in obedience to his Creator. Man did not give himself his nature with all its faculties and inclinations; he received it from a superior being, whose wisdom and power are everywhere manifest to him in Creation.

The general practical judgments and principles: "Do good and avoid evil", "Lead a life regulated according to reason", etc., from which all the Commandments of the Decalogue are derived, are the basis of the natural law, of which St. Paul (Rom., ii, 14) says, that it is written in the hearts of all men. This law is an emanation of the Divine law, made known to all men by nature herself; it is the expression of the will of nature's Author, a participation of the created rational being in the eternal law of God. Hence the obligation it imposes does not arise from man's own autonomy, as Kant held, nor from any other human authority, but from the Will of the Creator; and man cannot violate it without rebelling against God, his master, offending Him, and becoming amenable to His justice. How deeply rooted among all nations this conviction of the higher origin of the natural law was, is shown by the fact that for various violations of it (as murder, adultery, perjury, etc.) they did their utmost to propitiate the angered deity by means of prayers and sacrifices. Hence they looked upon the deity as the guardian and protector of the moral order, who would not allow the contempt of it to go unpunished. The same conviction is manifested by the value all nations have attached to the moral order, a value far surpassing that of all other earthly goods. The noblest among the nations maintained that it was better to undergo any hardship, even death itself, rather than prove recreant to one's duty. They understood, therefore, that, over and above earthly treasures, there were higher and more lasting goods whose attainment was dependent upon the observance of the moral order, and this not by reason of any ordinance of man, but because of the law of God. This being premised, it is clearly impossible to divorce morality from religion without robbing it of its true obligation and sanction, of its sanctity and inviolability and of its importance as transcending every other earthly consideration.

The natural law consists of general practical principles (commands and prohibitions) and the conclusions necessarily flowing therefrom. It is the peculiar function of man to formulate these conclusions himself, though instruction and training are to assist him in doing so. Besides this, each individual has to take these principles as the guide of his conduct and apply them to his particular actions. This, to a certain extent, everybody does spontaneously, by virtue of an innate tendency. As in the case of all practical things, so in regard to what concerns the moral order, reason uses syllogistic processes. When a person, e. g., is on the point of telling a lie, or saying what is contrary to his convictions, there rises before his mental vision the general precept of the natural law: "Lying is wrong and forbidden." Hence he avails himself, at least virtually, of the following syllogism: "Lying is forbidden; what you are about to say is a lie; therefore, what you are about to say is forbidden." The conclusion thus arrived at is our conscience, the proximate norm of our conduct. Conscience, therefore, is not an obscure feeling or a sort of moral instinct, but a practical judgment of our reason on the moral character of individual acts. If we follow the voice of conscience, our reward is peace and calm of soul; if we resist this voice, we experience disquiet and remorse.

The natural law is the foundation of all human laws and precepts. It is only because we recognize the necessity of authority for human society, and because the natural law enjoins obedience to regularly constituted authority, that it is possible for a human superior to impose laws and commands binding in conscience. Indeed all human laws and precepts are fundamentally the conclusions, or more minute determinations, of the general principles of the natural law, and for this very reason every deliberate infraction of a law or precept binding in conscience is a sin, i. e. the violation of a Divine commandment, a rebellion against God, an offence against Him, which will not escape punishment in this life or in the next, unless duly repented of before death.

The problems hitherto mentioned belong to general, or theoretical, ethics, and their investigations in nearly all cases bear upon the natural law, whose origin, nature, subject-matter, obligation, and properties it is the scope of ethics to explain thoroughly and verify. The general philosophical doctrine of right is usually treated in general ethics. Under no circumstances may the example of Kant and others be imitated in

severing the doctrine of right from ethics, or moral philosophy, and developing it as a separate and independent science. The juridical order is but a part of the moral order, even as justice is but one of the moral virtues. The first principles of right: "Give every man his due"; "Commit no injustice"; and the necessary conclusions from these: "Thou shalt not kill"; "Thou shalt not commit adultery", and the like, belong to the natural law, and cannot be deviated from without violating one's duty and one's neighbour's rights, and staining one's conscience with guilt in the sight of God.

Special ethics applies the principles of general, or theoretical, ethics to the various relations of man, and thus deduces his duties in particular. General ethics teaches that man must do good and avoid evil, and must inflict injury upon no one. Special ethics descends to particulars and demonstrates what is good or bad, right or wrong, and therefore to be done or avoided in the various relations of human life. First of all, it treats of man as an individual in his relations to God, to himself, and to his fellow-men. God is the Creator, Master, and ultimate end of man; from these relations arise man's duties toward God. Presupposing his own individual efforts, he is, with God's assistance, to hope for eternal happiness from Him; he must love God above all things as the highest, infinite good, in such a manner that no creature shall be preferred to Him; he must acknowledge Him as his absolute lord and master, adore and reverence Him, and resign himself entirely to His holy Will. The first, highest, and most essential business of man is to serve God. In case it is God's good pleasure to reveal a supernatural religion and to determine in detail the manner and means of our worship of Him, man is bound by the natural law to accept this revelation in a spirit of faith, and to order his life accordingly. Here, too, it is plain that to divorce morality from religion is impossible. Religious duties, those, namely, which have direct reference to God, are man's principal and most essential moral duties. Linked to these duties to God are man's duties regarding himself. Man loves himself by an intrinsic necessity of his nature. From this fact Schopenhauer drew the conclusion that the commandment concerning self-love was superfluous. This would be true, if it were a matter of indifference how man loved himself. But such is not the case; he must love himself with a well-ordered love. He is to be solicitous for the welfare of His soul and to do what is necessary to attain to eternal happiness. He is not his own master, but was created for the service of God; hence the deliberate arbitrary destruction of one's own life (suicide), as well as the freely intended mutilation of self, is a criminal attack upon the proprietary right God has to man's person. Furthermore, every man is supposed to take a reasonable care to preserve his health. He has certain duties also as regards temperance; for the body must not be his master, but an instrument in the service of the soul, and hence must be cared for in so far only as is conducive to this purpose. A further duty concerns the acquisition of external material goods, as far as they are necessary for man's support and the fulfilment of his other obligations. This again involves the obligation to work; furthermore, God has endowed man with the capacity for work in order that he might prove himself a beneficial member of society; for idleness is the root of all evil. Besides these self-regarding duties, there are similar ones regarding our fellow-men: duties of love, justice, fidelity, truthfulness, gratitude, etc. The commandment of the love of our neighbour first received its true appreciation in the Christian Dispensation. Though doubtlessly contained to a certain extent in the natural law, the pagans had so lost sight of the unity of the human race, and of the fact that all men are members of one vast family dependent upon God, that they looked upon every stranger as an enemy. Christianity restored to mankind the consciousness of its unity and solidarity, and supernaturally transfigured the natural precept to love our neighbour, by demonstrating that all men are children of the same Father in heaven, were redeemed by the blood of the same Saviour, and are destined to the same supernatural salvation. And, better still, Christianity provided man with the grace necessary to the fulfilment of this precept and thus renewed the face of the earth. In man's intercourse with his fellow-men the precepts of justice and of the other allied virtues go hand in hand with the precept of love. There exists in man the natural tendency to assert himself when there is question of his goods or property. He expects his fellow-men to respect what belongs to him, and instinctively resists any unjust attempt to violate this proprietorship. He will brook an injury from no one in all that regards his life or health, his wife or child, his honour or good name; he resents faithlessness and ingratitude on the part of others, and the lie by which they would lead him into error. Yet he clearly understands that only then can he reasonably expect others to respect his rights when he in turn respects theirs. Hence the general maxim: "Do not do to others, what you would not wish them to do to you"; from which are naturally deduced the general commandments known to all men: "Thou shalt not kill, nor commit adultery, nor steal, nor bear false witness against thy neighbour", etc. In this part of ethics it is customary to investigate the principles of right as regards private ownership. Has every man the right to acquire property? Or, at least, may not society (the State) abolish private ownership and assume possession and control of all material goods either wholly or in part, in order thus to distribute among the members of the community the products of their joint industry? This latter question is answered in the affirmative by the Socialists; and yet, it is the experience of all ages that the community of goods and of ownership is altogether impracticable in larger commonwealths, and would, if realized in any case, involve widespread slavery.

The second part of special, or applied, ethics, called by many sociology, considers man as a member of society, as far as this can be made the subject of philosophical investigation. Man is by nature a social being; out of his innate needs, inclinations, and tendencies the family and State necessarily arise. And first of all the Creator had to provide for the preservation and propagation of the human race. Man's life is brief; were no provision made for the perpetuation of the human species, the world would soon become an uninhabited solitude, a well-appointed abode without occupants. Hence God has given man the power and propensity to propagate his kind. The generative function was not primarily intended for man's individual well-being, but for the general good of his species, and in its exercise, therefore, he must be guided accordingly. This general good cannot be perfectly realized except in a lasting, indissoluble monogamy. The unity and indissolubility of the marriage bond are requirements of the natural law, at least in the sense that man may not on his own authority set them aside. Marriage is a Divine institution, for which God Himself has provided by means of definite laws, and in regard to which, therefore, man has not the power to make any change. The Creator might, of course, dispense for a time from the unity and indissolubility of the marriage tie; for, though the perfection of the married state demands these qualities, they are not of absolute necessity; the principal end of marriage may be attained to a certain degree without them. God could, therefore, for wise reasons grant a dispensation in regard to them for a certain length of time. Christ, however, restored marriage to the original perfection consonant with its nature. Moreover, He raised marriage to the dignity of a sacrament and made it symbolic of His own union with the Church; and had He done nothing more in

this respect than restore the natural law to its pristine integrity, mankind would be bound to Him by an eternal debt of gratitude. For it was chiefly by means of the unity and indissolubility of the married life that the sanctuary of the Christian family was established, from which mankind has reaped the choicest blessings, and compared with which paganism has no equivalent to offer. This exposition of the nature of marriage from a theistic standpoint is diametrically opposed to the views of modern Darwinists. According to them, men did not primitively recognize any such institution as the married state, but lived together in complete promiscuity. Marriage was the result of gradual development, woman was originally the centre about which the family crystallized, and from this latter circumstance there arises an explanation of the fact that many savage tribes reckon heredity and kinship between families according to the lineal descent of the female. We cannot dwell long upon these fantastic speculations, because they do not consider man as essentially different from the brute, but as gradually developed from a purely animal origin. Although marriage is of Divine institution, not every individual is obliged, as a human being, to embrace the married state. God intends marriage for the propagation of the human race. To achieve this purpose it is by no means necessary for each and every member of the human family to enter upon marriage, and this particularly at the present time, when the question of over-population presents so many grave difficulties to social economists. In this connexion certain other considerations from a Christian point of view arise, which do not, however, belong to philosophical ethics. Since the principal end of marriage is the procreation and education of children, it is incumbent upon both parents to co-operate according to the requirements of sex in the attainment of this end. From this it may readily be gathered what duties mutually exist between husband and wife, and between parents and their children.

The second natural society, the State, is the logical and necessary outcome of the family. A completely isolated family could scarcely support itself, at all events it could never rise above the lowest grade of civilization. Hence we see that at all times and in all places, owing to natural needs and tendencies, larger groups of families are formed. A division of labour takes place. Each family devotes itself to some industry in which it may improve and develop its resources, and then exchanges its products for those of other families. And now the way is opened to civilization and progress. This grouping of families, in order to be permanent, has need of authority, which makes for security, order, and peace, and in general provides for what is necessary to the common good. Since God intends men to live together in harmony and order, He likewise desires such authority in the community as will have the right to procure what is needful for the common good. This authority, considered in itself and apart from the human vehicle in which it is placed, comes immediately from God, and hence, within its proper sphere, it imposes upon the consciences of the subjects the duty of obedience. In the light of this interpretation, the exercise of public power is vested with its proper dignity and inviolability, and at the same time is circumscribed by necessary limitations. A group of families under a common authoritative head, and not subject to any similar aggregation, forms the primitive State, however small this may be. By further development, or by coalition with other States, larger States gradually come into existence. It is not the purpose of the State to supplant the families, but to safeguard their rights, to protect them, and to supplement their efforts. It is not to forfeit their rights or to abandon their proper functions that individuals and families combine to form the State, but to be secured in these rights, and to find support and encouragement in the discharge of the various duties assigned them. Hence the State may not deprive the family of its right to educate and instruct the children, but must simply lend its assistance by supplying, wherever needful, opportunities for the better accomplishment of this duty. Only so far as the order and prosperity of the body politic requires it, may the State circumscribe individual effort and activity. In other words, the State is to posit the conditions under which, provided private endeavour be not lacking, each individual and each family may attain to true earthly happiness. By true earthly happiness is meant such as not only does not interfere with the free performance of the individual's moral duties, but even upholds and encourages him therein.

Having defined the end and aim of the State, we are now in a position to examine in detail its various functions and their extent. Private morality is not subject to State interference; but it is the proper function of the State to concern itself with the interests of public morality. It must not only prevent vice from parading in public and becoming a snare to many (e. g. through immoral literature, theatres, plays, or other means of seduction), but also see to it that the public ordinances and laws facilitate and advance morally good behaviour. The State may not affect indifference as regards religion; the obligation to honour God publicly is binding upon the State as such. It is true that the direct supervision of religious matters in the present supernatural order was entrusted by Christ to His Church; nevertheless, it is the duty of the Christian State to protect and uphold the Church, the one true Church founded by Christ. Of course, owing to the unfortunate division of Christians into numerous religious systems, such an intimate relation between Church and State is at the present day but rarely maintained. The separation of Church and State, with complete liberty of conscience and worship, is often the only practical *modus vivendi*. In circumstances such as these the State must be satisfied to leave the affairs of religion to the various bodies, and to protect the latter in those rights which have reference to the general public order. The education and instruction of children belongs *per se* to the family, and should not be monopolized by the State. The latter has, however, the right and the duty to suppress schools which disseminate immoral doctrine or foster the practice of vice; beyond such control it may not set limits to free individual endeavour. It may, however, assist the individual in his efforts to secure an education, and, in case these do not suffice, it may establish schools and institutions for his benefit. Finally, the State has to exercise important economical functions. It must protect private property and see to it that in man's industrial life the laws affecting justice be carried out in all their force and vigour. But its duties do not stop here. It should pass such laws as will enable its subjects to procure what is needed for their respectable sustenance and even to attain a moderate competency. Both excessive wealth and extreme poverty involve many dangers to the individual and to society. Hence, the State should pass such laws as will favour the sturdy middle class of citizens and add to their numbers. Much can be done to bring about this desirable condition by the enactment of proper tax and inheritance laws, of laws which protect the labouring, manufacturing, and agricultural interests, and which supervise and control trusts, syndicates, etc.

Although the authority of the State comes immediately from God, the person who exercises it is not immediately designated by Him. This determination is left to the circumstances of men's progress and development or of their modes of social aggregation. According as the supreme power resides in one individual, or in a privileged class, or in the people collectively, governments are divided into three forms: the

monarchy; the aristocracy; the democracy. The monarchy is hereditary or elective, according as succession to supreme power follows the right of primogeniture of a family (dynasty) or is subject to suffrage. At the present day the only existing kind of monarchy is the hereditary, the elective monarchies, such as Poland and the old German Sovereignty, having long since disappeared. Those States in which the sovereign power resides in the body of the people, are called polycracies, or more commonly, republics, and are divided into aristocracies and democracies. In republics the sovereignty is vested in the people. The latter elect from their number representatives who frame their laws and administer the affairs of government in their name. The almost universally prevailing form of government in Europe, fashioned upon the model created by England, is the constitutional monarchy, a mixture of the monarchical, aristocratic, and democratic forms. The law-making power is vested in the king and two chambers. The members of one chamber represent the aristocratic and conservative element, while the other chamber, elected from the body of citizens, represents the democratic element. The monarch himself is responsible to no one, yet his governmental acts require the counter-signature of the ministers, who in turn are responsible to the chamber.

With regard to its appointed functions the government of the State is divided into the legislative, judiciary, and executive powers. It is of primary importance that the State enact general and stable laws governing the activities of its subjects, as far as this is required for the good order and well-being of the whole body. For this purpose it must possess the right to legislate; it must, moreover, carry out these laws and provide, by means of the administrative, or rather executive, power for what is needful to the general good of the community; finally, it has to punish infractions of the laws and authoritatively settle legal disputes, and for this purpose it has need of the judiciary power (in civil and criminal courts). This right of the State to impose penalties is founded on the necessity of preserving good order and of providing for the security of the whole body politic. In a community there are always found those who can in no other way be effectually forced to observe the laws and respect the rights of others than by the infliction of punishment. Hence the State must have the right to enact penal statutes, calculated to deter its subjects from violating the laws, and the right, moreover, to actually inflict punishment after the violation has occurred. Among the legitimate modes of punishment is capital punishment. It is considered, and rightly so, a step forward in civilization, that nowadays a milder practice has been adopted in this regard, and that capital punishment is more rarely inflicted, and then only for such heinous crimes as murder and high treason. Nevertheless, humanitarian sentimentalism has no doubt been carried to an exaggerated degree, so much so that many would on principle do away with capital punishment altogether. And yet, this is the only sanction sufficiently effective to deter some men from committing the gravest crimes.

When it is asserted, with Aristotle, that the State is a society sufficient for itself, this is to be considered true in the sense that the State needs no further development to complete its organization, but not in the sense that it is independent in every respect. The greater the advance of mankind in progress and civilization, the more necessary and frequent the communication between nations becomes. Hence the question arises as to what rights and duties mutually exist between nation and nation. That portion of ethics which treats this question from a philosophical standpoint is called the theory of international law, or of the law of nations. Of course, many writers of the present day deny the propriety of a philosophical treatment of international law. According to them the only international rights and duties are those which have been established by some positive measure either implicitly or explicitly agreed upon. This, indeed, is the position that must be taken by all who reject the natural law. On the other hand, this position precludes the possibility of any positive international law whatever; for lasting and binding compacts between various States are possible only when the primary principle of right is recognized—that it is just and obligatory to stand by lawful agreements. Now this is a principle of natural law; hence, those who deny the existence of the natural law (e. g. E. von Hartmann) must consequently reject any international law properly so called. In their opinion international agreements are mere conventions, which each one observes as long as he finds it necessary or advantageous. And so we are eventually led back to the principles of ancient paganism, which, in the intercourse between nations, too often identified right with might. But Christianity brought the nations into a closer union and broke down the barriers of narrow-minded policy. It proclaimed, moreover, the duties of love and justice as binding on all nations, thus restoring and perfecting the natural law. The fundamental principles: "Give each one his due", "Do injury to no man", "Do not to others what you would not have them do to you", etc., have an absolute and universal value, and hence must obtain also in the intercourse between nations. Purely natural duties and rights are common to all nations; the acquired or positive ones may vary considerably. Various, too, are the rights and duties of nations in peace and in war. Since, however, there are, under this head, many details of a doubtful and changeable character, the codification of international law is a most urgent desideratum. Besides this an international court should be established to attend to the execution of the various measures promulgated by the law and to arbitrate in case of dispute. The foundations of such an international court of arbitration have been laid at The Hague; unfortunately, its competence has been hitherto very much restricted, and besides, it exercises its functions only when the Powers at variance appeal to it of their own accord. In the codification of international law no one would be more competent to lend effective cooperation and to maintain the principles of justice and love which should exist between nations in their intercourse with one another, than the pope. No one can offer sounder guarantees for the righteousness of the principles to be laid down, and no one can exert greater moral influence towards carrying them into effect. This is even recognized by unprejudiced Protestants. At the Vatican Council not only the many Catholic bishops present, but the Protestant David Urquhart appealed to the pope to draw up a schedule of the more important principles of international law, which were to be binding on all Christian nations. Religious prejudice, however, places many difficulties in the way of realizing this plan.

MEYER, *Institutiones juris naturalis seu philosophiæ moralis universæ* (Freiburg, 2d ed., 1906,), I; (1900), II; SCHIFFINI, *Disputationes philosophiæ moralis* (Turin, 1891), II; COSTA-ROSSETTI, *Philosophia moralis* (Innsbruck, 2d ed., 1886); FRINS, *De actibus humanis* (Freiburg, 2 vols., 1897–1904); FERRETTI, *Institutiones philosophiæ moralis* (Rome, 3 vols., 1st ed., 1885); CASTELEIN, *Institutiones philosophiæ moralis et socialis* (Brussels, 1899); ID., *Droit naturel* (Paris, 1903); GUTBERLET, *Ethik und Naturrecht* (Münster, 3d ed., 1901); DE PASCAL, *Philosophie morale et sociale* (Paris, 1894–95); ZIGLIARA, *Summa philosophica:* III, *Philosophia moralis* (Lyons, 3d ed., 1880); LIBERATORE, *Institutiones ethicæ et juris naturalis* (Prato, 7th ed., 1880); AUSTIN, *The Duties and Rights of Man* (London, 2d ed., 1888); MING, *The Data of Modern Ethics Examined* (New York, 2d ed., 1897); RUSSO, *De philosophiâ morali prælectiones* (1891); JOSEPH RICKABY, *Moral Philosophy* (London, 1888); STÖCKL, *Lehrbuch der Philosophie:* III, *Ethik, Social- und Rechtsphilosophie* (Mainz, 7th ed., 1892); LEHMEN, *Lehrbuch der Philosophie:* IV, *Moralphilosophie* (Freiburg, 1906); WILLEMS, *Philosophia moralis* (Trier, 1908); ROSMINI, *Storia comparativa e critica dei sistemi intorno al principio della morale* (Milan, 1837); WERNER, *Grundriss einer Geschichte der Moralphilosophie*

(Vienna, 1859); SCHNEIDER, *Göttliche Weltordnung und religionslose Sittlichkeit* (Paderborn, 1900); CATHREIN, *Moralphilosophie* (Freiburg, 4th ed., 1904); SIDGWICK, *The Methods of Ethics* (London, 1891); ID., *Outlines of the History of Ethics* (London, 3d ed., 1892); BAIN, *Mental and Moral Science* (London, many editions); SPENCER, *Principles of Ethics* (London, 2 vols.); CALDERWOOD, *Handbook of Moral Philosophy* (London, 14th ed.); JANET, *Histoire de la philosophie morale* (Paris); FOUILLÉE, *Critique des systèmes de morale contemporaine* (Paris, 2d ed., 1887); MARTENSEN, *Christliche Ethik* (2 vols.; I, 6th ed., 1892; II, 4th ed., 1894); KÖSTLIN, *Christliche Ethik* (Berlin, 1898); HÖFFDING, *Ethik* (Leipzig, 1888); PAULSEN, *System der Ethik* (Berlin, 7th and 8th ed., 1906); WUNDT, *Ethik* (Stuttgart, 3d ed., 1903); JODL, *Geschichte der Ethik in der neuern Philosophie* (Stuttgart, 2 vols., 1882–89); ZIEGLER, *Die Ethik der Griechen und Römer* (Bonn, 1886); *Geschichte der christlichen Ethik* (Strasburg, 1892).

V. CATHREIN.

Ethiopia.—The name of this region has been derived, through the Greek form *αἰθιοπία*, from the two words *αἴθω*, "I burn", and *ὄψ*, "face". It would thus mean the coloured man's land—the land of the scorched faces. But a different origin is claimed for the name by many modern writers, some of whom say that the Greeks borrowed the word from the Egyptians, and that as early as the Twelfth Dynasty the Egyptians knew Ethiopia under the name of *Ksh*, or *Kshi*. One form of this word, with the *aleph* prefix, *Ekoshi* (the Coptic *eshoosh*, *eshôsh*, *ethosh*), would thus be the real root-word. Others again maintain that it is derived from the Arabic word *aṭyab*, the plural form of *ṭib*, which means "spices", "perfumes" (Glaser, "Die Abessinier in Arabien und Afrika", Munich, 1895), or from an Arabo-Sabean word, *aṭyub*, which has the same meaning. (Halévy in "Revue Sémitique", IV.)

Geography.—It is not easy to determine precisely to what part of the world the name of Ethiopia properly applies in the course of history. The territory it covered, and even the use of the word to denote a territory, have varied in various ages and at the hands of different writers. In the early pages of the Bible Ethiopia is used to designate the lands inhabited by the sons of Cush, and is therefore applied to all the scattered regions inhabited by that family. Such a use of the word is purely ethnographical. Elsewhere, however, in the Bible it is applied to a definite region of the globe without consideration of race, and is thus used geographically. It is in this sense that we find it mentioned in all Egyptian documents (Brugsch, Geographische Inschriften altägyptischer Denkmäler). It denoted the region of Africa south of Egypt, and its boundaries were by no means constant. Generally speaking, it comprised the countries known in our own day as Nubia, Kordofan, Senaar, and Northern Abyssinia. It had one unvarying landmark, however: its northern boundary always began at Syene. We know from the writings of Pliny, Strabo, and Pomponius Mela that in the eyes of Greek geographers Ethiopia included not only all the territory south of Syene on the African Continent, but embraced all that part of Asia below the same parallel of latitude. Hence it came to pass that there were two regions with but one name: Eastern Ethiopia, including all the races dwelling to the east of the Red Sea as far as India; Western Ethiopia stretching southward from Egypt and westward as far as the southern boundary of Mauretania. Of all the vast tracts of country to which the name Ethiopia was given at one or other period of history, there are two to which the name has more peculiarly attached itself: the one is modern Nubia and the Egyptian Sudan (the ancient Ethiopia of the Pharaohs); the other modern Abyssinia (the Ethiopia of our own day), the last of all those regions to preserve the ancient name.

NUBIAN ETHIOPIA.—In Egyptian inscriptions the name Ethiopia is applied to the region of the Upper Nile lying between the First Cataract and the sources of the Atbara and of the Blue Nile. Greek writers often call this region the Kingdom of Napata, or of Meroë, after two cities that were successively the centres of its political life during the second period of its history. The name *Island of Meroë*, sometimes met with, is an allusion to the rivers which enclose it.

Ethnology.—The races which peopled these regions differed considerably. In the valley of Syene as far as the junction of the Atbara the population consisted for the most part of husbandmen of Egyptian extraction. In the plains of the Upper Nile, side by side with some negro tribes, were a people allied to the Himyarites, and who had migrated thither from Southern Arabia, while others again showed that they owed their origin to the Egyptians and Berbers.

History.—Of the history of this country we know only what has been handed down to us through the monuments of Egypt and those erected by the inhabitants of the country itself in the vicinity of the Cataracts. It was the almost unanimous opinion of ancient historians that this was the cradle of the people occupying all the Nile Valley; and in proof thereof they pointed out the evident analogy of manners and religion between the Kingdom of Meroë and Egypt proper. But to-day we know without a doubt that the Ethiopia known to the Greeks, far from being the cradle of Egyptian civilization, owed to Egypt all the civilization she ever had. The chronological evidence of the monuments makes this quite clear. Whereas the most ancient monuments are to be found along the Delta, those in the neighbourhood of Meroë are comparatively modern. The antiquity attributed to Ethiopian civilization was disproved as soon as the hieroglyphics had been interpreted. What its beginnings were, we do not know.

During the first five Egyptian Dynasties—i. e. for nearly thirteen centuries—its history is hidden behind a veil. It is only under the Sixth Dynasty that this country comes within the ken of history. At that time King Meryra, better known as Pepî I, marched as far south as the Second Cataract, but did not establish a permanent foothold. Ethiopia's real occupation by Egypt did not begin till the Twelfth Dynasty, when the Pharaohs, being once more in peaceful possession of the Nile Valley, began an era of conquest, and the country of the Cataracts became their earliest prey. Amenemhat I and his son Usertsen I, having driven out the priests of Amun-Ra who ruled at Thebes, and having exiled them beyond Philæ, continued their march as far as Wady-Halfa. Their successors, encouraged by these victories, carried on the work of conquest, and Usertsen III pushed as far as the Fourth Cataract and even beyond Napata, as far as the junction of the Atbara. At his death the frontiers of the Egyptian Empire extended as far as Semneh, and Ethiopia was a tributary province of Egypt. The darkness which envelops the history of the Thirteenth Dynasty does not permit of our tracing the results of this conquest, but it would seem that the victories of the Egyptian monarchs were far from decisive, and that Ethiopia always retained enough liberty to openly aspire to independence. Up to the time of the Eighteenth dynasty this aspiration persisted, if, indeed, the country did not at times enjoy independence.

After the advent of the Eighteenth Dynasty, and the overthrow of the Shepherd Kings, Egypt undertook a series of wars against her isolated neighbours. The tribes along the Upper Nile, though harassed by her troops, resisted stubbornly. In spite of the campaigns of Amenhotep I, son of Amosis, who advanced as far as Napata and Senaar—in spite of the violence of Thothmes I, his successor, who covered the country with devastation and ruin, it was not until the days of Thothmes II that Ethiopia seems to have become resigned to the loss of her liberty. The country was thereupon divided into *nomes* on the Egyptian system, and was placed under a viceroy whose power extended from the First Cataract to the Mountains of Abyssinia. The office, entrusted at first to high functiona-

ries, soon became one of the most important in the State, and the custom arose at court of nominating to it the heir presumptive to the throne, with the title of Prince of Cush. The glorious reigns of Rameses II, of the Nineteenth Dynasty, and of Rameses III, of the Twentieth Dynasty, served to consolidate this conquest for a time, but for a time only. Egypt, worn out, was weary of war, and even of victory, and the era of her campaigns ended with the Rameseid dynasty. Ethiopia, always alert to note the doings of her enemy, profited by this respite to recover her strength. She collected her forces, and soon, having won back her independence, an unexpected event left her mistress of her former conqueror.

The descendants of the royal priesthood of Amun-Ra, exiled from Thebes to Ethiopia by the Pharaohs of the Twenty-second Dynasty, had infused a new life into the land of their exile. They had reorganized its political institutions and centralized them at Napata, which city, in the hands of its new lords, became a sort of Ethiopian Thebes modelled on the Thebes of Egypt. With the co-operation of the native peoples Napata was soon reckoned among the great political powers. While Ethiopia was developing and flourishing, Egypt, so disintegrated as to be a mere collection of feudal States, was being more and more weakened by incessant revolutions. Certain Egyptian princes having at this period appealed to the King of Napata for help, he crossed over into the Thebaid, and established order there; then, to the surprise of those who had appealed to him, he continued his way northwards and went as far as Memphis, nor did he halt until he had subjugated the country and proclaimed the suzerainty of Ethiopia over the whole Nile Valley. Piankhy, to whom belongs the honour of this achievement, caused an account of it to be engraved at Jebel-Barkal, near Napata. After his reign the throne passed to a native family, and during the Twenty-fourth and Twenty-fifth Dynasties Ethiopia had the glory of giving birth to the Pharaohs who ruled all the land from Abyssinia to the shores of the Mediterranean.

But at the very time when the Ethiopian armies were advancing from the South to subdue the North, the victorious Assyrian armies of the King of Nineveh were already encamped on the borders of Phœnicia. Menaced by Sargon II in the days of Shabaka, Egypt was invaded for the first time by Sennacherib's army during the reign of Shabataka. Taharqa, his successor, was defeated by Esarhaddon, and forced to retreat as far as Napata, pursued by the Ninevite hosts. The victory, however, was dearly bought by the Assyrians, and the Ethiopians, even in retreat, proved so dangerous that the pursuit was abandoned. Taharqa, encouraged by the fear he inspired in his enemies, tried to win back the Nile Valley. He assumed the offensive a few years after this, and soon entered Memphis almost without striking a blow. But the princes of the Delta, of whom Nechao was the most powerful, far from extending him a welcome, joined forces with the King of Nineveh. Asurbanipal, who had now succeeded his father, Esarhaddon, straightway attacked Taharqa, and the King of Ethiopia fell back once more towards the Cataracts. His son-in-law, Tanuat-Amen, once more victorious, went up as far as Memphis, where he defeated the Delta princes, allies of the Assyrians, but a fresh expedition under Asurbanipal completely broke his power. Thereafter Tanuat-Amen remained in his Kingdom of Napata; and thus Ethiopian sway over Egypt was brought to a close.



Deserted Coptic Monastery at Assuan

Restricted to its natural limits, the Ethiopian kingdom did not cease to be a powerful State. Attacked by Psamettichus I and Psamettichus II, it was able to maintain its independence and break the ties which bound it to the northern kingdom. In the following century Cambyses, the conqueror of Egypt, attracted by the marvellous renown of the countries along the Upper Nile, set on foot an expedition against Ethiopia, but in spite of the numbers and prowess of his troops, he was obliged to retreat. When Artaxerxes II, surnamed *Ochus*, invaded the Delta, Nectanebo II, King of Egypt, could find no safer refuge than Ethiopia, and in the days of the Ptolemies one of its kings, Arq-Amen (the Ergamenes of Diodorus Siculus), was powerful enough to commemorate his exploits in the decorations of the temple at Philæ. Nevertheless these last rays of glory were to fade quickly. Abandoned to itself, removed from the civilizing influences of the North, the country fell back step by step into its primitive barbarism, and defeat is written upon the last page of its history. The last invasion of Ethiopia was by Roman legions; led by Petronius, they advanced as far as Napata, where a queen occupied the throne, and the city was destroyed. After this, darkness falls upon all these countries of the Upper Nile, and ancient Ethiopia disappears—to appear again transformed by a new civilization which begins with the history of modern Nubia.

Institutions.—The only civilization we know of in Ethiopia is that which was borrowed from Egypt. We find no record of really native institutions on any of the monuments that have come down to us, and the earliest records extant do not take us beyond the founding of the priestly dynasty of Thebes. At Napata Amun-Ra, King of the Gods, ruled supreme with Maut and Khonsu. The temple there was built on the model of the Karnak sanctuaries; the ceremonies performed were those of the Theban cult. The priest-kings, above all, as formerly in their native land, were the heads of a purely sacerdotal polity. It was only later in history that the monarchy became elective in Ethiopia. The election took place at Napata, in the great temple, under the supervision of the priests of Amun-Ra, and in the presence of a number of special delegates chosen by the magistrates, the *literati*, the soldiers, and the officers of the palace. The members of the reigning family, "the royal brethren", were brought into the sanctuary and presented one after another to the statue of the god, who indicated his choice by a signal previously agreed upon. The choice of the priests could undertake nothing without the priests' consent, and was subject to them for life. Arq-Amen seems to have broken through this tutelage and secured complete independence for the throne.

Language.—The tongues in the land of Cush were as varied as the peoples who dwelt there, but Egyptian is the language of the Ethiopian inscriptions. On a few monuments dating from the last epoch of Ethiopian history we find a special idiom. It is written by means of hieroglyphics, of which the alphabetical values, however, have been modified. Hitherto undecipherable, this language has recently been held to be related to Egyptian, with a large admixture of foreign (doubtless Nubian) words. The development of the study of demotic, as well as a more intimate knowledge of the speech of later times, will, perhaps, eventually bring a fuller knowledge of this idiom.

Abyssinian Ethiopia.—*Geography.*—This region corresponds to the group of territories nowadays known as Abyssinia, extending from the Italian colony of Eritrea to the shores of the Great Lakes. Yet the ancient empire of this name did not by any means permanently occupy the whole of this area, the boundaries of which rather indicate its greatest extent at any period of its history. Among all the countries that have been known under the name of Ethiopia, this alone took the name for itself, and calls itself by that name to this day. It rejects the name *Abyssinia* which is constantly given it by Arab writers. Western writers have often employed both terms, *Abyssinia* and *Ethiopia*, indifferently, but in our own day a distinction seems to be growing up in their use. It seems that with the name of *Ethiopia* we should connect that portion of the country's history the documents of which are supplied by Gheez literature alone; with that of *Abyssinia*, what belongs to the modern period since the definitive appearance of Amharic among the written languages.

Ethnology.—The modern Tigré, formerly the Kingdom of Axum, would seem to have been the kernel of this State. It was founded by refugees who came to the African continent when the Arsacidæ were extending their sway in the Arabian peninsula, and the power of the Ptolemies was declining in Egypt. These refugees belonged to the Sabean tribes engaged in the gold and spice trade between Arabia and the Roman Empire; their dealings with civilized races had developed them, and, thanks to their more advanced stage of mental culture, they acquired a preponderating influence over the people among whom they had come to dwell. Still, the descendants of these immigrants form a minority of the Ethiopian people, which is mainly composed of Cushite tribes, together with members of an aboriginal race called by the Ethiopians themselves *Shangala*.

History.—From native sources we know nothing accurately of the political beginnings of the State. Its annals open with the rule of monsters in that land, and for many centuries Aruë, the serpent, is the only ruler mentioned. Many writers see in this but a personification of idolatry or barbarism, and the explanation seems probable. According to certain tales written in Gheez, Ethiopia embraced the Jewish religion at the time of Solomon, and received a prince of that monarch's family to rule over it. The Queen of Saba (Sheba), spoken of in the First Book of Kings, was an Ethiopian queen, according to the legend of *Kebranagasht* (the glory of the kings), and it was through her that Ethiopia received this double honour. But this tradition is of comparatively recent origin, and finds no confirmation in the most ancient native documents, nor in any foreign writings. History still waits for some foundation on which to base this appropriation of the sacred text, as well as for proofs to justify the variants with which Ethiopian chroniclers have embellished it.

The first thing that we know with certainty as to the history of Ethiopia is its conversion to Christianity. This work was accomplished in the early half of the fourth century by St. Frumentius, known in that country as Abba Salama. Rufinus of Aquileia has preserved the story for us in his history. According to him, a Christian of Tyre, named Merope, had gone on a journey to India with two children, Edesius and Frumentius, his nephews. On their return journey the ship that carried them was captured by pirates off the Ethiopian coast, and every one on board was put to death except the two children. These were sent as captives to the king, and were afterwards appointed tutors to his son, whom they converted to Christianity. Later, they returned to their own country. But Frumentius had but one ambition: to be consecrated bishop by the Patriarch of Alexandria. This wish having been fulfilled, he returned to Axum, organized Christian worship, and, under the title of *Abba Salama*, became the first metropolitan of the Ethiopian Church. Missionary monks coming later from neighbouring countries (in the sixth century) completed the work of his apostolate by establishing the monastic life. National traditions speak of these missionaries as the Nine Saints; they are the *abbas* Alé, Shema, Aragawi, Garima, Pantalewon, Liqanos, Afsi, Gougo, and Yemata. Henceforth Ethiopia takes its place among the Christian States of the East. One of its kings, Caleb, contemporary with the Nine Saints, and canonized as St. Elesban, is famous in Oriental literature for an expedition he led against the Jewish kingdom of Yemen. The authority of the Ethiopian kings then extended over Tigré, Shoa, and Amhara, and the seat of government was the Kingdom of Axum.

But from this time forward the history of this country is enveloped in darkness, and remains almost unknown to us until the thirteenth century. We have nothing to guide us but long and, for the most part, mutually conflicting lists of kings with the indication of a dynastic revolution, which perhaps explains the brevity of the chronicles. Perhaps, in the midst of these troubles, the historical documents of preceding ages were purposely destroyed; and this seems likely since the foreign dynasty of the Zagues, which at that time usurped the throne of the pretended descendants of the son of Solomon, would feel constrained to destroy the prestige of the supplanted dynasty in order to establish itself. According to the abridged chronicle published by Bruce, the Falashas, a tribe professing Judaism, were the cause of this insurrection; but we have no other evidence in support of this assertion. The chronicles we have are silent about the matter; they merely tell us that at the close of the thirteenth century, in the reign of Yekuno Amlak, after a period of exile, the length of which we do not know, the Solo-

monian dynasty regained power through the aid of the monk Takla Hâymânot. After the restoration of the ancient national dynasty, the country, once more at peace within itself, had to concentrate its whole energy upon resisting the southward progress of Mohammedan conquest. For nearly three centuries Ethiopia had to wage wars without respite for liberty and faith, and it alone, of all the African kingdoms, was able to maintain both. The most famous of these wars was against the Emir of Harar, Aḥmed Ibn Ibraḥim, surnamed the Left-handed. It took place during the reigns of Kings Lebna Dengel (1508–40) and Galawdéwos (1540–59), and the exhausted country was only saved by the timely help of Portuguese armies. Delivered from its foes, it might have become a great power in the East, but it lacked a capable leader, and its people, deriving but little moral support from a corrupt religion, fell rapidly away until, after a long series of civil wars, Ethiopia became a land of anarchy.

Under Minas (1559–63), Sarṣa Dengel (1563–97), and Ya'eqob Za Dengel (1597–1607), civil war was incessant. There was a brief respite under Susneos (1607–32), but war broke out afresh under Fasiladas (1632–67), and the clergy, moreover, increased the trouble by their theological disputes as to the two natures of Christ. These disputes, often, indeed, but a cloak for ambitious intrigues, were always occasions of revolution. Under the successors of Fasiladas the general disorder passed beyond all bounds. Of the seven kings who followed him but two died a natural death. Then there was a short period of peace under Bakafa (1721–30), and Yasu II (1730–55), Yoas (1755) and Yoḥannes (1755–69) were again victims of an ever-spreading revolution. The end of the eighteenth century left Ethiopia a feudal kingdom. The land and its government belonged to its *Ras*, or provincial chieftains. The unity of the nation had disappeared, and its kings reigned, but did not govern. The Ras became veritable Mayors of the Palace, and the monarchs were content to be *rois fainéants*. Side by side with these kings who have left in history only their names, the real masters of events, as the popular whim happened to favour them, were Ras Mikael, Ras Abeto of the Godjam, Ras Gabriel of the Samen, Ras Ali of Begameder, Ras Gabra Masqal of Tigré, Ras Walda-Sellase of the Shoa, Ras Ali of Amhara, Ras Oubié of Tigré, and the like. But war among these chiefs was incessant; ever dissatisfied, jealous of each other's power, each one sought to be supreme, and it was only after a century of strife that peace was at length established. A son of the governor of Kowara, named Kasa, succeeded in bringing it about, to his own profit; and he made it permanent by causing himself to be proclaimed king under the name of Theodore (1855). With him the ancient Ethiopia took its place as one of the nations to be reckoned with in the international affairs of the West, and Abyssinia may be said to date its origin from his reign.

Religion.—Previous to the conversion of the country to Christianity, the worship of the serpent was perhaps the religion of a portion of Ethiopia, i. e. of the aboriginal Cushite tribes. From inscriptions at Axum and Adulis it would seem that the Semites, on the other hand, had a religion similar to that of Chaldea and Syria. Among the gods mentioned we find Astar, Beher, and Medr—perhaps representing the triad of sky, sea, and land. As to the Jewish religion, and its introduction in the time of Solomon, we have only the assertion found in some recent documents, which, as we have already said, cannot be received as history. The origin of the Judaistic tribe called the Falashas, who nowadays occupy the country, is quite hidden from us, and there is no reason to regard them as representatives of a national religion which has disappeared. After the evangelization by St. Frumentius, and in spite of the resulting general conversion of the people, Paganism always retained some adherents in Ethiopia, and has its representatives there even to this day. Moreover, at the time of the Mussulman wars Islam succeeded in securing a foothold here and there. Nevertheless Christianity has always been the really national religion, always practised and defended by the rulers of the nation.

Although converted to Christianity by missionaries of the Catholic Church, Ethiopia to-day professes Monophysitism. Being subject to the influence of Egypt, it has adopted in the course of time the theory of the Egyptian Church concerning the human nature of Christ. Our lack of information about the country prior to the thirteenth century hinders us from following the history of its separation from Rome, or even fixing the date of that event. Like the Egyptian, the Ethiopian Church anathematizes Eutyches

Interior of a Coptic Church

as a heretic, yet remains Monophysite and rejects the Catholic teaching as to the two natures. United in the statement of their belief, the Ethiopian theologians have divided into two great schools in its explanation. On the one hand, the *Walda-Qeb* ("Sons of Unction", as they are nowadays called) hold that the most radical unification (*tawahedo*) exists between the two natures, such being the absorption of the human by the Divine nature that the former may be said to be merely a fantasm. This unification is the work of the unction of the Son Himself according to the general teaching of the Walda-Qeb. Some among them, however, known as the *Qeb'at* (Unction), teach that it is the work of the Father. Others again, the *Ṣega-ledj*, or *Walda-ṣega* (Sons of Grace), hold that the unification takes place in such a way that the nature of Christ becomes a special nature (*bahrey*), and this is attributed to the Father, as in the teaching of the Qeb'at. But, as the mere fact of the unction does not effect a radical unification (for this school rejects absorption), the unification is made perfect, according to them, by what they call the adoptive birth of Christ—the ultimate result of the unction of the Father. In effect, they recognize in the Incarnation three kinds of birth: the first, the Word begotten of the Father; the second, Christ begotten of Mary; the third, the Son of Mary, begotten the Son of God the

Father by adoption, or by His elevation to the Divine dignity—the work of the Father anointing His Son with the Holy Spirit, whence the name *Sons of Grace*. However, while rejecting absorption, this latter school refuses to admit the distinction of the two natures. Both schools, moreover, assert that the unification takes place without any blending, without change, without confusion. It is contradiction itself set up as a dogma.

The difficulties following from this teaching in regard to the reality of Redemption, the Monophysite Church of Ethiopia calls mysteries; her theologians confess themselves unable to explain them, and simply dismiss them with the word *Ba faqadu;* it is so, they say, "by the will of God". In sympathy with the Church of Constantinople, as soon as it was separated from Rome, the Ethiopian Church in course of time adopted the Byzantine teaching as to the procession of the Holy Ghost; but this question never was as popular as the mystery of the Incarnation, and in reference to it the contradictions to be found in the texts of native theologians are even more numerous than those

The Nile at Assuan

touching on the question of the two natures. Adrift from the Catholic Church on the dogma of the humanity of Christ and the procession of the Holy Spirit, the Ethiopian Church professes all the other articles of faith professed by the Roman Church. We find there the seven sacraments, the cultus of the Blessed Virgin and of the saints; prayers for the dead are held in high honour, and fasts without number occur during the liturgical year.

The Bible, translated into Gheez, with a collection of decisions of the Councils, called the *Synodos*, make up the ground-work of all moral and dogmatic teaching. The work of translating the Bible began in Ethiopia about the end of the fifth century, according to some authorities (Guidi, G. Rossini), or, in the opinion of others (Méchineau), in the fourth century at the very beginning of the evangelization. Notwithstanding the native claims, their Old Testament is not a translation from the Hebrew, neither is its Arabic origin any more capable of demonstration; Old and New Testaments alike are derived from the Greek. The work was done by many translators, no doubt, and the unity of the version seems to have been brought about only by deliberate effort. At the time of the Solomonian restoration in the thirteenth century, the whole Bible was revised under the care of the Metropolitan Abba Salama (who is often confounded with St. Frumentius), and the text followed for the Old Testament was the Arabic of Rabbi Saadias Gaon of Fayûm. There was perhaps a second revision in the seventeenth century at the time of the Portuguese missions to the country; it has recently been noticed (Littmann, Geschichte der äthiopischen Litteratur). But, just as the great number of translators employed caused the Bible text to be unequal, so also the revision of it was not uniform and official, and consequently the number of variant readings became multiplied. Its canon, too, is practically unsettled and fluctuating. A host of apocryphal or falsely ascribed writings are placed on the same level as the inspired books, among the most esteemed of which we may mention the Book of Henoch, the *Kufale*, or Little Genesis, the Book of the Mysteries of Heaven and Earth, the Combat of Adam and Eve, the Ascension of Isaias. The "Hâymanotâ Abaw" (Faith of the Fathers), the "Maṣḥafa Meṣṭir" (Book of the Mystery), the "Maṣḥafa Ḥawi" (Book of the Compilation), "Qêrlos" (Cyrillus), "Zênâ hâymânot" (Tradition of the Faith) are among the principal works dealing with matters moral and dogmatic. But, besides the fact that many of the quotations from the Fathers in these works have been modified, many of the canons of the "Synodos" are, to say the least, not historical.

Liturgy.—In the general effect of its liturgical rules the Ethiopian Church is allied to the Coptic Rite. Numerous modifications, and especially additions, have, in the course of time, been introduced into its ritual; but the basic text remains that of Egypt, from which, in many places, it differs only in the language. Its calendar and the distribution of festivals are regulated as in the Coptic Church, though the Ethiopians do not follow the era of the martyrs. The year has 365 days, with a leap year every four years, as in the Julian calendar. Its ordinary year begins on 29 August of the Julian calendar, which corresponds to 11 September of the Gregorian calendar. After a leap year the new year begins on the 30th of August (our 12 September). The year has twelve months of 30 days each, and an added thirteenth month of six days or of five days—according as the year is a leap year or not. The era followed is seven years behind ours during the last four months of our year, and eight years during the remaining months. The calendar for each year is arranged in an ecclesiastical synod held in the springtime. It is at this gathering that the dates of the principal movable feasts are settled, as well as the periods for the fasts to be observed during the course of the year. The greater feasts of the Ethiopian Church are Christmas, the Baptism of Christ, Palm Sunday, Holy Week, Ascension Day, Pentecost, the Transfiguration. A great number of feasts are scattered throughout the year, either on fixed or movable dates, and their number, together with the two days every week (Saturday and Sunday) on which work is forbidden, reduces by almost one-third the working-days of the year. Fasts are observed every Wednesday and Friday, and five times annually during certain periods preceding the great festivals: the fast of Advent, is kept during forty days; of Niniveh, three days; of Lent, fifty-five days; of the Apostles, fifteen days; the fast of the Assumption, fifteen days. Most of the saints honoured in Ethiopia are to be found in the Roman Martyrology. Among the native saints (about forty in all), only a few are recognized by the Catholic Church —St. Frumentius, St. Elesban, the Nine Saints, and St. Taklu Hâymânot. But, deprived of religious instruction, the Ethiopian people mingle with their Christianity many practices which are often opposed to the teaching of the Gospel; some of these seem to have a Jewish origin, such, for instance, as the keeping of the Sabbath, the distinction of animals as clean and unclean, circumcision, and the custom of marrying a widow to the nearest relative of her deceased husband.

Ecclesiastical Hierarchy.—The Ethiopian hierarchy is subject to the Coptic Patriarch of Alexandria. This dependence on the Coptic Church is regulated by one of the Arabic canons found in the Coptic edition of the Council of Nicæa. A delegate from this patriarch, chosen from among the Egyptian bishops, and called the Abouna, governs the Church. All-powerful in

matters spiritual, his influence is nevertheless very limited in other directions, owing to the fact that he is a stranger. The administrative authority is vested in the Etchagué, who also has jurisdiction over the regular clergy. This functionary is always chosen from among the monks and is a native. Legislation concerning the clergy is always regulated by a special code, of which the fundamental principles are contained in the *Fetha nagosht*. Only the regular clergy observe celibacy, and the facility with which orders are conferred makes the number of priests very large.

Language and Literature.—Although the races inhabiting Ethiopia have very different origins, only the Semitic family of tongues is represented among them. This is one of the results of the conquest made in olden days by the immigrants from the African Continent. Two dialects were spoken by these tribes, the Gheez, which is akin to Sabean, and a speech more akin to Minean, the tongue which later developed into Amharic. In the course of time Gheez ceased to be a spoken language, but it gave rise to two vernacular dialects, Tigré and Tigraï, which have supplanted it. No longer in popular use, Gheez has always remained the language of the Church and of literature. Amharic did not become a literary language till much later. As for the other two, even in our own day they have hardly begun to be written. The beginnings of Gheez literature are connected with the evangelization of the country. The earliest document we possess is the translation of the Bible, which dates from the fifth, or perhaps the fourth, century. Christian in its origin, Gheez literature has remained so in its productions, most of which are apocrypha, hagiographical compositions, or theological works. History and poetry have only a secondary place in it, and these are the only subjects in which we find any original effort; almost everything else is translation from the Greek, Coptic, or Arabic. Most of its manuscripts have come down to us without date or author's name, and it is no easy task to follow the history of letters in this country. As far as we know at present, the fifteenth seems to have been the great literary century of Ethiopia. To the reign of Zar'a Ya'qob (1434–68) belong the principal compositions of which the history is known. The wars against Adal and against Ahmed Ibn Ibrahim, in the sixteenth century, arrested this literary movement. The decline began after the civil wars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and the coming of Amharic as a literary language completed it. The earliest writings in Amharic date from the fourteenth century, and about the time of the Portuguese missions it was beginning to supplant Gheez. The Jesuits made use of it to reach the people more surely, and henceforward Gheez tends to become almost exclusively a liturgical language. At the present day it is nothing else, Amharic having altogether taken its place in other departments, and it may be that at no distant date Amharic will supplant Gheez even as the language of the Church.

Job Ludolf, a German, in the seventeenth century, was the first to organize the study of Ethiopian subjects. To him we owe the first grammar and the first dictionary of the Gheez language. After a period of neglect these studies were taken up once more in the second half of the nineteenth century by Professor Dillmann, of Berlin, and, besides incomparable works on the grammar and lexicography, we are indebted to him for the publication of many texts. Thanks to the extension of philological, historical, and patristic studies, the study of this language has spread in our own times to a greater and greater degree. Works of the first importance have been published on the literature by Professors Bassett, Bezold, Guidi, Littmann, and Prætorius, as also by Charles, Esteves-Pereira, Perruchon, and Touraiso. The Amharic, too, has inspired a number of studies, whether of its grammar, of its lexicography, or of its texts; the works of Massaja, Isenberg, d'Abbadie, Prætorius, Guidi, Mondon-Kidailhet, and Afevork have served to definitively place it within the domain of Oriental studies.

Maspéro, *Histoire ancienne des peuples de l'Orient classique* (Paris, 1895–99); Budge, *A History of Egypt* (London, 1902); Amherst of Hackney, *A Sketch of Egyptian History* (London, 1906); Basset, *Etudes sur l'histoire d'Ethiopie* (Paris, 1882); Rossini, *Note per la storia litteraria abissina* in *Rend. della R. A. dei Lincei* (Rome, 1899), VIII; Littmann, *Geschichte der äthiopischen Litteratur* in *Geschichte der christlichen Litteraturen des Orients* (Leipzig, 1907); Beccari, *Notizia e saggi di opere inediti riguardanti la storia di Ethiopia* (Rome, 1903——); Bruce, *A Journey to the Sources of the Nile* (London, 1790); Glaser, *Die Abessinier in Arabien und Afrika* (Munich, 1895); Massaia, *I miei trenta cinque anni nell' alta Etiopia* (Rome, 1895); Ludolf, *Historia Æthiopica* (Frankfort, 1681); Id., *Ad historiam æthiopicam commentarius* (Frankfort, 1691).

M. Chaine.

Ethiopian Versions of the Bible. See Versions of the Bible.

Etschmiadzin, a famous Armenian monastery, since 1441 the ecclesiastical capital of the schismatic Armenians, and seat of their patriarch or catholicos (q. v.), whom the greater part of the Non-Uniat Armenian Church acknowledge as their head. It is situated in Russian territory, in the extreme south of the Caucasus, on the River Aras near the city of Erivan. As early as the fifth or sixth century, if not earlier, a monastery existed there attached to the royal residence of Valarshapat, itself the immemorial national centre of Armenia. According to national tradition, more or less reliable, the primatial see of Armenia was founded here by Saint Gregory Illuminator, the Apostle of Armenia, early in the fourth century. On the site of his famous vision of "the descent of the only Begotten One" (Descendit Unigenitus=in Armenian, Etschmiadzin), the anniversary of which is still kept as a national feast, he built a chapel, and in time a splendid church and a monastery arose there, around which centred the national and religious life of Armenia until the middle of the fifth century, when, owing first to the invasions of Caucasian hordes and then to Persian ambition and persecution, there began the long series of wanderings that recall the story of the monks of Durham with St. Cuthbert's body. During these centuries both clergy and people valued most highly the right arm of St. Gregory; its possessor was practically considered the legitimate patriarch. After many removals, first to Dowin (Duin, Tvin) and then to other places, the patriarchal see was eventually located in the city of Sis, in Cilicia (Lesser Armenia), where it remained from 1293 to 1441; at the former date the relic was said to have been miraculously brought to Sis from Egypt, whither it had been taken by the Mamelukes. When the small Christian principality of Lesser Armenia, long upheld by the Crusades (1097–1375), was at last destroyed, the national and religious life of its people naturally turned again towards the earlier venerable centre, in Northern or Greater Armenia. After the death, at Sis (1440), of Patriarch Joseph II, irregularities occurred in the election of the new patriarch, Gregory Musapekian, which northern bishops were willing to overlook if he would transfer his see to Greater Armenia. On his refusal a new election was held at Etschmiadzin where, it is said, about seven hundred bishops and archpriests (*vartapeds*) assembled and elected Kirakos Virabetzi, with whom begins the series of patriarchs of Etschmiadzin. By some stratagem the monastery is said to have secured from Sis the possession of the famous relic of St. Gregory. A patriarchal succession, however, was, and is still, maintained at Sis, where what purport to be the selfsame relics are shown and venerated. There are, moreover, Armenian (schismatic) patriarchs at Aghtamar, Jerusalem (1311) and Constantinople (1461), the latter for the Armenians of the Ottoman Empire, also an independent Archbishop of Lemberg. Several patriarchs of Etschmiadzin, Stephen V (1541), Michael of Sebaste (1564), David IV

(1587), Melchisedek (1593), Moses (1629), Pilibos (1633), Aghob IV (1655), and others, took steps towards reunion with Rome, and some made profession of the Catholic Faith before death. Catholic Armenians finally abandoned Etschmiadzin as their religious centre, and obtained a Uniat patriarchate, first at Aleppo (1742), later at Constantinople (1830–67). The Armenians subject to Etschmiadzin underwent bitter persecution when Greater Armenia passed into the power of Persia; even the right hand of St. Gregory and other prized relics and images of the national apostle, and of King Tiridates and St. Rhipsime, were carried away (1604) to the Persian capital; these were finally restored to Etschmiadzin in 1638. Since 1828 the monastery and its district have passed into Russian hands, whereby the independence of the patriarch has been naturally diminished. He is not, however, subject to the Holy Synod of Russia, but presides over his own holy synod of seven members. In 1836 the Russian Government issued an official constitution for the administration of the Gregorian (i. e. Armenian) Church in Russia. It comprises 141 articles regulating the election of patriarchs and the ruling of Gregorian dioceses. In 1882 non-Russian Armenians refused to recognize the Russian nomination of the Armenian Archbishop of Smyrna to Etschmiadzin, but in 1884 they yielded. Thus a Russian ecclesiastical functionary residing at Etschmiadzin is, in theory, the "Supreme Patriarch and Catholicos of all the Armenians". Even in fact, the great majority of the schismatic Armenians acknowledge his authority; only a small minority adhere to Sis, Aghtamar, Constantinople, and Lemberg. In the United States, the Armenian Bishop of Worcester is subject to Etschmiadzin, and has as quasi-suffragans the Vartapeds of Boston, New York, Providence, and Chicago. In England the Vartaped of Manchester is subject to the Armenian Bishop of Paris. Since Kirakos Virapetzi (1441) some thirty-eight successors have ruled at Etschmiadzin, not however without numerous schisms. The patriarchs are often assisted by a coadjutor, or rather co-titular bishop, whose name sometimes erroneously gets inserted in the list of patriarchs proper. The Patriarch of Etschmiadzin alone consecrates the *myron* (chrism) and also the bishops for the schismatic Armenians. His curia is formed by (a) a patriarchal synod (two archbishops, five archpriests); (b) a board of administration (one bishop, two archpriests); (c) an editorial committee (two archpriests and a deacon). The monastery consists of about twenty monks; since 1874 a seminary has been maintained for the training of the higher Armenian clergy. Though prominent in a hierarchical sense, as a centre of Armenian literary and theological activity Etschmiadzin ranks far behind Venice, Vienna, Moscow, and Constantinople (see MECHITARISTS), though of late some life and energy are evident. Etschmiadzin is richly endowed. Externally it resembles a great fortress; within its walls are the monastery proper, the magnificent church dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, and six chapels, one of them said to stand on the site of the apparition of Jesus Christ to St. Gregory. Outside the walls are several churches, among them three dedicated to the earliest Armenian martyrs, St. Rhipsime and her companions and St. Gaiane, hence the Turkish name Ütsch Kilisse (Three Churches). The numerous buildings, either restored or rebuilt, date mostly from the last three centuries, and make an imposing appearance. (See ARMENIA; GREGORY ILLUMINATOR; SIS.)

For the earliest history of the site of Etschmiadzin, see WEBER, *Die katholische Kirche in Armenien* (Freiburg, 1903); GELZER, *Die Anfänge der armenischen Kirche* (1895). The monastery is described at length by BROSSET, *Description d'Etschmiadzin* in *Rev. Archéol.* (1859), XV, 427–37; *Etschmiadzin, ou la Rome des Arméniens* in *Rev. Générale* (1892), LV, 701–24. See also MACDONALD, *The Land of Ararat* (London, 1893); ISSAVERDENTZ, *Hist. de l'Arménie* (Venice, 1888); IDEM, *Armenia and the Armenians* (Venice, 1875); TER GREGOR, *History of Armenia* (London, 1897); INDSHIDSHIAN, *Antiquités Arméniennes* (Venice, 1835); SKRINE, *The Expansion of Russia*, 1815–1900 (London, 1903). For the annals of the monastery see NÈVE, *Etude sur Thomas de Medzoph* (d. 1448) in *Journal Asiatique* (Paris, 1855), VI, 22–81; PATCANIAN, *Littérature Arménienne* (Paris, 1860), 130; LANGLOIS, *Collection des historiens anciens et modernes de l'Arménie* (Paris, 1869–79); PETIT, in *Dict. de théol. cath.* (Paris, 1903), I, 1905–07; VON HIMPEL in *Kirchenlex.*, IV, 942–43. For the manuscript treasures of the monastery library see KARENIAN, *Catal. des manuscrits de la bibliothèque patriarchale d'Etschmiadzin* (Tiflis, 1863); and for a specimen of Armenian medieval illumination, STRZYGOWSKI, *Das Etschmiadzin Evangeliarium* (Vienna, 1891).

J. P. ARENDZEN.

Euaria, a titular see of Phœnicia Secunda or Libanensis, in Palestine. The true name of this city seems to have been Hawârin; as such it appears in a Syriac inscription of the fourth to the sixth century of the Christian Era. According to Ptolemy (V, xiv) it was situated in the Palmyrene province. Georgius Cyprius calls it Euarios or Justinianopolis. The "Notitiæ episcopatuum" of the Patriarchate of Antioch (sixth century) gives it as a suffragan see of Damascus. [See Echos d'Orient, X (1907), 145.] One of its bishops, Thomas, is known in 451; there is some uncertainty about another, John, who lived a little later (Lequien, Oriens christ., II, 847). It is to-day El Hawârin, a large Mohammedan village, a three-hour journey north of Karyatein and on the road from Damascus to Palmyra; there are still visible the ruins of a Roman *castellum* and of a basilica. Euaria (Hawârin) is to be distinguished from Hauara or Havara, another titular see in Palæstina Tertia, south of Petra.

SACHAU, *Reise in Syrien und Mesopotamien*, 53; FURRER in *Zeitschr. d. deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, VIII, 28; JULLIEN, *Sinaï et Syrie* (Lille, 1893), 198.

S. VAILHÉ.

Eucarpia, a titular see of Phrygia Salutaris in Asia Minor. Eucarpia (Εὐκάρπεια), mentioned by Strabo (XII, 576) and several other geographers, was situated on a road from Dorylæum to Eumenia, between the Dorylæum-Acmonia and Dorylæum-Synnada roads, probably at the modern village of Emin Hissar, in the vilayet of Brusa. The imposing ruins, seen by Hamilton in 1837, have almost disappeared. Nothing is known about the history of the city. It struck its own coins from the time of Augustus till the reign of Volusianus. The bishopric, being a suffragan of Synnada, figures in the "Notitiæ episcopatuum" until the twelfth or thirteenth century. Six bishops are known: Eugenius, present at the Council of Nicæa (325), Auxomenus in 381, Cyriacus in 451, Dionysius in 536, Constantine or Constans in 787 (not mentioned by Lequien), and Constantine in 879.

LEQUIEN, *Oriens christ.* (Paris, 1740), I, 845; HAMILTON, *Researches in Asia Minor*, II, 169; RAMSAY, *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia* (Oxford, 1895–97), 690–693, 706.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Eucharist (Gr. εὐχαριστία, thanksgiving), the name given to the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar under its twofold aspect of sacrament and Sacrifice of the Mass, and in which, whether as sacrament or sacrifice, Jesus Christ is truly present under the appearances of bread and wine. Other titles are used, such as the "Lord's Supper" (*Cœna Domini*), "Table of the Lord" (*Mensa Domini*), the "Lord's Body" (*Corpus Domini*), and the "Holy of Holies" (*Sanctissimum*), to which may be added the following expressions, now obsolete and somewhat altered from their primitive meaning: "Agape" (Love-Feast), "Eulogia" (Blessing), "Breaking of Bread", "Synaxis" (Assembly), etc.; but the ancient title "Eucharistia", appearing in writers as early as Ignatius, Justin, and Irenæus, has taken precedence in the technical terminology of the Church and her theologians. The expression "Blessed Sacrament of the Altar", introduced by Augustine, is at the present day almost entirely restricted to catechetical

and popular treatises. This extensive nomenclature, describing the great mystery from such different points of view, is in itself sufficient proof of the central position the Eucharist has occupied from the earliest ages, both in the Divine worship and services of the Church and in the life of faith and devotion which animates her members.

The Church honours the Eucharist as one of her most exalted mysteries, since for sublimity and incomprehensibility it yields in nothing to the allied mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation. These three mysteries constitute a wonderful triad, which causes the essential characteristic of Christianity, as a religion of mysteries far transcending the capabilities of reason, to shine forth in all its brilliance and splendour, and elevates Catholicism, the most faithful guardian and keeper of our Christian heritage, far above all pagan and non-Christian religions. The organic connexion of this mysterious triad is clearly discerned, if we consider Divine grace under the aspect of a personal communication of God. Thus in the bosom of the Blessed Trinity, God the Father, by virtue of the eternal generation, communicates His Divine Nature to God the Son, "the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father" (John, i, 18), while the Son of God, by virtue of the hypostatic union, communicates in turn the Divine Nature received from His Father to His human nature formed in the womb of the Virgin Mary (John, i, 14), in order that thus as God-man, hidden under the Eucharistic Species, He might deliver Himself to His Church, who, as a tender mother, mystically cares for and nurtures in her own bosom this, her greatest treasure, and daily places it before her children as the spiritual food of their souls. Thus the Trinity, Incarnation, and Eucharist are really welded together like a precious chain, which in a wonderful manner links heaven with earth, God with man, uniting them most intimately and keeping them thus united. By the very fact that the Eucharistic mystery does transcend reason, no rationalistic explanation of it, based on a merely natural hypothesis and seeking to comprehend one of the sublimest truths of the Christian religion as the spontaneous conclusion of logical processes, may be attempted by a Catholic theologian.

The modern science of comparative religion is striving, wherever it can, to discover in pagan religions "religio-historical parallels", corresponding to the theoretical and practical elements of Christianity, and thus by means of the former to give a natural explanation of the latter. Even were an analogy discernible between the Eucharistic repast and the ambrosia and nectar of the ancient Greek gods, or the haoma of the Iranians, or the soma of the ancient Hindus, we should nevertheless be very cautious not to stretch a mere analogy to a parallelism strictly so called, since the Christian Eucharist has nothing at all in common with these pagan foods, whose origin is to be found in the crassest idol- and nature-worship. What we do particularly discover is a new proof of the reasonableness of the Catholic religion, from the circumstance that Jesus Christ in a wonderfully condescending manner responds to the natural craving of the human heart after a food which nourishes unto immortality, a craving expressed in many pagan religions, by dispensing to mankind His own Flesh and Blood. All that is beautiful, all that is true in the religions of nature, Christianity has appropriated to itself, and like a concave mirror has collected the dispersed and not unfrequently distorted rays of truth into their common focus and again sent them forth resplendently in perfect beams of light.

It is the Church alone, "the pillar and ground of truth", imbued with and directed by the Holy Spirit, that guarantees to her children through her infallible teaching the full and unadulterated revelation of God. Consequently, it is the first duty of Catholics to adhere to what the Church proposes as the "proximate norm of faith" (*regula fidei proxima*), which, in reference to the Eucharist, is set forth in a particularly clear and detailed manner in Sessions XIII, XXI, and XXII of the Council of Trent. The quintessence of these doctrinal decisions consists in this, that in the Eucharist the Body and Blood of the God-man are truly, really, and substantially present for the nourishment of our souls, by reason of the transubstantiation of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, and that in this change of substances the unbloody Sacrifice of the New Testament is also contained. Since the Eucharistic Sacrifice is to be treated in the article MASS, there remain here for a more detailed consideration two principal truths: (I) The Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist; and (II) The Eucharist as a Sacrament.

I. THE REAL PRESENCE OF CHRIST IN THE EUCHARIST.—In this section we shall consider, first, the fact of the Real Presence, which is, indeed, the central dogma; then the several allied dogmas grouped about it, namely, the Totality of Presence, Transubstantiation, Permanence of Presence and the Adorableness of the Eucharist; and, finally, the speculations of reason, so far as speculative investigation regarding the august mystery under its various aspects is permissible, and so far as it is desirable to illumine it by the light of philosophy.

(1) *The Real Presence as a Fact.*—According to the teaching of theology a revealed fact can be proved solely by recurrence to the sources of faith, viz. Scripture and Tradition, with which is also bound up the infallible magisterium of the Church.

(a) Proof from Scripture.—This may be adduced both from the words of promise (John, vi, 26 sqq.) and, especially, from the words of Institution as recorded in the Synoptics and St. Paul (I Cor., xi, 23 sqq.). By the miracles of the loaves and fishes and the walking upon the waters, on the previous day, Christ not only prepared His hearers for the sublime discourse containing the promise of the Eucharist, but also proved to them that He possessed, as Almighty God-man, a power superior to and independent of the laws of nature, and could, therefore, provide such a supernatural food, none other, in fact, than His own Flesh and Blood. This discourse was delivered at Capharnaum (John, vi, 26–72), and is divided into two distinct parts, about the relation of which Catholic exegetes vary in opinion. Nothing hinders our interpreting the first part [John, vi, 26–48 (51)] metaphorically and understanding by "bread of heaven" Christ Himself as the object of faith, to be received in a figurative sense as a spiritual food by the mouth of faith. Such a figurative explanation of the second part of the discourse (John, vi, 52–72), however, is not only unusual but absolutely impossible, as even Protestant exegetes (Delitzsch, Köstlin, Keil, Kahnis, and others) readily concede. First of all the whole structure of the discourse of promise demands a literal interpretation of the words: "eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood". For Christ mentions a threefold food in His address, the manna of the past (John, vi, 31, 32, 49, 59), the heavenly bread of the present (John, vi, 32 sq.), and the Bread of Life of the future (John, vi, 27, 52). Corresponding to the three kinds of food and the three periods, there are as many dispensers—Moses dispensing the manna, the Father nourishing man's faith in the Son of God made flesh, finally Christ giving His own Flesh and Blood. Although the manna, a type of the Eucharist, was indeed eaten with the mouth, it could not, being a transitory food, ward off death. The second food, that offered by the Heavenly Father, is the bread of heaven, which He dispenses *hic et nunc* to the Jews for their spiritual nourishment, inasmuch as by reason of the Incarnation He holds up His Son to them as the object of their faith. If, however, the third kind of food, which Christ Him-

self promises to give only at a future time, is a new refection, differing from the last-named food of faith, it can be none other than His true Flesh and Blood, to be really eaten and drunk in Holy Communion. This is why Christ was so ready to use the realistic expression "to chew" (John, vi, 54, 56, 58: τρώγειν) when speaking of this, His Bread of Life, in addition to the phrase, "to eat" (John, vi, 51, 53: φαγεῖν). Cardinal Bellarmine (De Euchar., I, 3), moreover, calls attention to the fact, and rightly so, that if in Christ's mind the manna was a figure of the Eucharist, the latter must have been something more than merely blessed bread, as otherwise the prototype would not substantially excel the type. The same holds true of the other figures of the Eucharist, as the bread and wine offered by Melchisedech, the loaves of proposition (*panes propositionis*), the paschal lamb. The impossibility of a figurative interpretation is brought home more forcibly by an analysis of the following text: "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life: and I will raise him up in the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed: and my blood is drink indeed" (John, vi, 54–56). It is true that even among the Semites, and in Scripture itself, the phrase, "to eat some one's flesh", has a figurative meaning, namely, "to persecute, to bitterly hate some one". If, then, the words of Jesus are to be taken figuratively, it would appear that Christ had promised to His enemies eternal life and a glorious resurrection in recompense for the injuries and persecutions directed against Him. The other phrase, "to drink some one's blood", in Scripture, especially, has no other figurative meaning than that of dire chastisement (cf. Is., xlix, 26; Apoc., xvi, 6); but, in the present text, this interpretation is just as impossible here as in the phrase, "to eat some one's flesh". Consequently, eating and drinking are to be understood of the actual partaking of Christ in person, hence literally.

This interpretation agrees perfectly with the conduct of the hearers and the attitude of Christ regarding their doubts and objections. Again, the murmuring of the Jews is the clearest evidence that they had understood the preceding words of Jesus literally (John, vi, 53). Yet far from repudiating this construction as a gross misunderstanding, Christ repeated them in a most solemn manner, in the text quoted above (John, vi, 54 sqq.). In consequence, many of His Disciples were scandalized and said: "This saying is hard, and who can hear it?" (John, vi, 61); but instead of retracting what He had said, Christ rather reproached them for their want of faith, by alluding to His sublimer origin and His future Ascension into heaven. And without further ado He allowed these Disciples to go their way (John, vi, 62 sqq.). Finally He turned to His twelve Apostles with the question: "Will you also go away?" Then Peter stepped forth and with humble faith replied: "Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life. And we have believed and have known, that thou art the Christ, the Son of God" (John, vi, 68 sqq.). The entire scene of the discourse and murmurings against it proves that the Zwinglian and Anglican interpretation of the passage, "It is the spirit that quickeneth", etc., in the sense of a glossing over or retractation, is wholly inadmissible. For in spite of these words the Disciples severed their connexion with Jesus, while the Twelve accepted with simple faith a mystery which as yet they did not understand. Nor did Christ say: "My flesh is spirit", i. e. to be understood in a figurative sense, but: "My words are spirit and life". There are two views regarding the sense in which this text is to be interpreted. Many of the Fathers declare that the true Flesh of Jesus (σάρξ) is not to be understood as separated from His Divinity (*spiritus*), and hence not in a cannibalistic sense, but as belonging entirely to the supernatural economy. The second and more scientific explanation asserts that in the Scriptural opposition of "flesh and blood" to "spirit", the former always signifies carnal-mindedness, the latter mental perception illumined by faith, so that it was the intention of Jesus in this passage to give prominence to the fact that the sublime mystery of the Eucharist can be grasped in the light of supernatural faith alone, whereas it cannot be understood by the carnal-minded, who are weighed down under the burden of sin. Under such circumstances it is not to be wondered at that the Fathers and several œcumenical councils (Ephesus, 431; Nicæa, 787) adopted the literal sense of the words, though it was not dogmatically defined (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. XXI, c. i). If it be true that a few Catholic theologians (as Cajetan, Ruardus Tapper, Johann Hessel, and the elder Jansenius) preferred the figurative interpretation, it was merely for controversial reasons, because in their perplexity they imagined that otherwise the claims of the Hussite and Protestant Utraquists for the partaking of the Chalice by the laity could not be answered by argument from Scripture. (Cf. Patrizi, "De Christo pane vitæ", Rome, 1851; Schmitt, "Die Verheissung der Eucharistie bei den Vätern", 2 vols., Würzburg, 1900–03.)

The Church's Magna Charta, however, are the words of Institution, "This is my body—this is my blood", whose literal meaning she has uninterruptedly adhered to from the earliest times. The Real Presence is evinced, positively, by showing the necessity of the literal sense of these words, and negatively, by refuting the figurative interpretations. As regards the first, the very existence of four distinct narratives of the Last Supper, divided usually into the Petrine (Matt., xxvi, 26 sqq.; Mark, xiv, 22 sqq.) and the double Pauline accounts (Luke, xxii, 19 sq.; I Cor., xi, 24 sq.), favours the literal interpretation. In spite of their striking unanimity as regards essentials, the Petrine account is simpler and clearer, whereas the Pauline is richer in additional details and more involved in its citation of the words that refer to the Chalice. It is but natural and justifiable to expect that, when four different narrators in different countries and at different times relate the words of Institution to different circles of readers, the occurrence of an unusual figure of speech, as, for instance, that bread is a sign of Christ's Body, would, somewhere or other, betray itself, either in the difference of word-setting, or in the unequivocal expression of the meaning really intended, or at least in the addition of some such remark as: "He spoke, however, of the sign of His Body." But nowhere do we discover the slightest ground for a figurative interpretation. If, then, the natural, literal interpretation were false, the Scriptural record alone would have to be considered as the cause of a pernicious error in faith and of the grievous crime of rendering Divine homage to bread (*artolatria*) —a supposition little in harmony with the character of the four Sacred Writers or with the inspiration of the Sacred Text. Moreover, we must not omit the very important circumstance, that one of the four narrators has interpreted his own account literally. This is St. Paul (I Cor., xi, 27 sq.), who, in the most vigorous language, brands the unworthy recipient as "guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord". There can be no question of a grievous offence against Christ Himself, unless we suppose that the true Body and the true Blood of Christ are really present in the Eucharist. Further, if we attend only to the words themselves, their natural sense is so forceful and clear that even Luther wrote to the Christians of Strasburg in 1524: "I am caught, I cannot escape, the text is too forcible" (De Wette, II, 577). The necessity of the natural sense is not based upon the absurd assumption that Christ could not in general have resorted to the use of figures, but upon the evident requirements of

the case, which demand that He did not, in a matter of such paramount importance, have recourse to meaningless and deceptive metaphors. For figures enhance the clearness of speech only when the figurative meaning is obvious, either from the nature of the case (e. g. from a reference to a statue of Lincoln, by saying: "This is Lincoln") or from the usages of common parlance (e. g. in the case of this synecdoche: "This glass is wine"). Now, neither from the nature of the case nor in common parlance is bread an apt or possible symbol of the human body. Were one to say of a piece of bread: "This is Napoleon", he would not be using a figure, but uttering nonsense. There is but one means of rendering a symbol improperly so called clear and intelligible, namely, by conventionally settling beforehand what it is to signify, as, for instance, if one were to say: "Let us imagine these two pieces of bread before us to be Socrates and Plato". Christ, however, instead of informing His Apostles that he intended to use such a figure, told them rather the contrary in the discourse containing the promise: "the bread that I will give, is my flesh, for the life of the world" (John, vi, 52). Such language, of course, could be used only by a God-man; so that belief in the Real Presence necessarily presupposes belief in the true Divinity of Christ. The foregoing rules would of themselves establish the natural meaning with certainty, even if the words of Institution, "This is my body—this is my blood", stood alone. But in the original text *corpus* (body) and *sanguis* (blood) are followed by *significant* appositional additions, the Body being designated as "given for you" and the Blood as "shed for you [many]"; hence the Body given to the Apostles was the selfsame Body that was crucified on Good Friday, and the Chalice drunk by them, the selfsame Blood that was shed on the Cross for our sins. Therefore the above-mentioned appositional phrases directly exclude every possibility of a figurative interpretation.

We reach the same conclusion from a consideration of the concomitant circumstances, taking into account both the hearers and the Institutor. Those who heard the words of Institution were not learned Rationalists, possessed of the critical equipment that would enable them, as philologists and logicians, to analyse an obscure and mysterious phraseology; they were simple, uneducated fishermen, from the ordinary ranks of the people, who with childlike *naïveté* hung upon the words of their Master and with deep faith accepted whatever He proposed to them. This childlike disposition had to be reckoned with by Christ, particularly on the eve of His Passion and Death, when He made His last will and testament and spoke as a dying father to His deeply afflicted children. In such a moment of awful solemnity, the only appropriate mode of speech would be one which, stripped of unintelligible figures, made use of words corresponding exactly to the meaning to be conveyed. It must be remembered, also, that Christ as omniscient God-man, must have foreseen the shameful error into which He would have led His Apostles and His Church by adopting an unheard-of metaphor; for the Church down to the present day appeals to the words of Christ in her teaching and practice. If then she practises idolatry by the adoration of mere bread and wine, this crime must be laid to the charge of the God-man Himself. Besides this, Christ intended to institute the Eucharist as a most holy sacrament, to be solemnly celebrated in the Church even to the end of time. But the content and the constituent parts of a sacrament had to be stated with such clearness of terminology as to exclude categorically every error in liturgy and worship. As may be gathered from the words of consecration of the Chalice, Christ established the New Testament in His Blood, just as the Old Testament had been established in the typical blood of animals (cf. Ex., xxiv, 8; Heb., ix, 11 sqq.). With the true instinct of justice, jurists prescribe that in all debatable points the words of a will must be taken in their natural, literal sense; for they are led by the correct conviction, that every testator of sound mind, in drawing up his last will and testament, is deeply concerned to have it done in language at once clear and unencumbered by meaningless metaphors. Now, Christ, according to the literal purport of His testament, has left us as a precious legacy, not mere bread and wine, but His Body and Blood. Are we justified, then, in contradicting Him to His face and exclaiming: "No, this is not your Body, but mere bread, the sign of your Body!"

The refutation of the so-called Sacramentarians, a name given by Luther to those who opposed the Real Presence, evinces as clearly the impossibility of a figurative meaning. Once the manifest literal sense is abandoned, occasion is given to interminable controversies about the meaning of an enigma which Christ supposedly offered His followers for solution. There were no limits to the dispute in the sixteenth century, for at that time Christopher Rasperger wrote a whole book on some 200 different interpretations: "Ducentæ verborum, 'Hoc est corpus meum' interpretationes" (Ingolstadt, 1577). In this connexion we must restrict ourselves to an examination of the most current and widely known distortions of the literal sense, which were the butt of Luther's bitter ridicule even as early as 1527. The first group of interpreters, with Zwingli, discovers a figure in the copula *est* and renders it: "This signifies (*est=significat*) my Body". In proof of this interpretation, examples are quoted from Scripture, as: "The seven kine are seven years" (Gen., xli, 26) or: "Sara and Agar are the two covenants" (Gal., iv, 24). Waiving the question whether the verb "to be" (*esse*, εἶναι) of itself can ever be used as the "copula in a figurative relation" (Weiss) or express the "relation of identity in a metaphorical connexion" (Heinrici), which most logicians deny, the fundamental principles of logic firmly establish this truth, that all propositions may be divided into two great categories, of which the first and most comprehensive denominates a thing as it is in itself (e. g. "Man is a rational being"), whereas the second designates a thing according as it is used as a sign of something else (e. g. "This picture is my father"). To determine whether a speaker intends the second manner of expression, there are four criteria, whose joint concurrence alone will allow the verb "to be" to have the meaning of "signify". Abstracting from the three criteria, mentioned above, which have reference either to the nature of the case, or to the usages of common parlance, or to some convention previously agreed upon, there remains a fourth and last of decisive significance, namely: when a complete substance is predicated of another complete substance, there can exist no logical relation of identity between them, but only the relation of similarity, inasmuch as the first is an image, sign, symbol, of the other. Now this last-named criterion is inapplicable to the Scriptural examples brought forward by the Zwinglians, and especially so in regard to their interpretation of the words of Institution; for the words are not: "This bread is my Body", but indefinitely: "This is my Body". In the history of the Zwinglian conception of the Lord's Supper, certain "sacramental expressions" (*locutiones sacramentales*) of the Sacred Text, regarded as parallelisms of the words of Institution, have attracted considerable attention. The first is to be found in I Cor., x, 4: "And the rock was [signified] Christ". Yet it is evident that, if the subject *rock* is taken in its material sense, the metaphor, according to the fourth criterion just mentioned, is as apparent as in the analogous phrase: "Christ is the vine". If, however, the word *rock* in this passage is stripped of all that is material, it may be understood in a spiritual sense, because the Apostle himself is speaking of that "spiritual rock"

(*petra spiritalis*), which in the Person of the Word in an invisible manner ever accompanied the Israelites in their journeyings and supplied them with a spiritual fountain of waters. According to this explanation the copula would here retain its meaning "to be". A nearer approach to a parallel with the words of Institution is found apparently in the so-called "sacramental expressions": "Hoc est pactum meum" (Gen., xvii, 10), and "est enim Phase Domini" (Ex., xii, 11). It is well known how Zwingli by a clever manipulation of the latter phrase succeeded in one day in winning over to his interpretation the entire Catholic population of Zurich. And yet it is clear that no parallelism can be discerned between the aforesaid expressions and the words of Institution; no real parallelism, because there is question of entirely different matters. Not even a verbal parallelism can be pointed out, since in both texts of the Old Testament the subject is a ceremony (circumcision in the first case, and the rite of the paschal lamb in the second), while the predicate involves a mere abstraction (covenant, Passover of the Lord). A more weighty consideration is this, that on closer investigation the copula *est* will be found to retain its proper meaning of "is" rather than "signifies". For just as the circumcision not only signified the nature or object of the Divine covenant, but really was such, so the rite of the paschal lamb was really the Passover (*Phase*) or Pasch, instead of its mere representation. It is true that in certain Anglican circles it was formerly the custom to appeal to the supposed poverty of the Aramaic tongue, which was spoken by Christ in the company of His Apostles; for it was maintained that no word could be found in this language corresponding to the concept "to signify". Yet, even prescinding from the fact that in the Aramaic tongue the copula *est* is usually omitted and that such an omission rather makes for its strict meaning of "to be", Cardinal Wiseman (Horæ Syriacæ, Rome, 1828, pp. 3–73) succeeded in producing no less than forty Syriac expressions conveying the meaning of "to signify" and thus effectually exploded the myth of the Semitic tongue's limited vocabulary.

A second group of Sacramentarians, with Œcolampadius, shifted the diligently sought-for metaphor to the concept contained in the predicate *corpus*, giving to the latter the sense of "signum corporis", so that the words of Institution were to be rendered: "This is a sign [symbol, image, type] of my Body". Essentially tallying with the Zwinglian interpretation, this new meaning is equally untenable. In all the languages of the world the expression "my body" designates a person's natural body, not the mere sign or symbol of that body. True it is that the Scriptural words "Body of Christ" not unfrequently have the meaning of "Church", which is called the mystical Body of Christ, a figure easily and always discernible as such from the text or context (cf. Col., i, 24). This mystical sense, however, is impossible in the words of Institution, for the simple reason that Christ did not give the Apostles His Church to eat, but His Body, and that "body and blood", by reason of their real and logical association, cannot be separated from one another, and hence are all the less susceptible of a figurative use. The case would be different if the reading were: "This is the bread of my Body, the wine of my Blood". In order to prove at least this much, that the contents of the Chalice are merely wine and, consequently, a mere sign of the Blood, Protestants have recourse to the text of St. Matthew, who relates that Christ, after the completion of the Last Supper, declared: "I will not drink from henceforth of this fruit of the vine [*genimen vitis*]" (Matt., xxvi, 29). It is to be noted that St. Luke (xxii, 18 sqq.), who is chronologically more exact, places these words of Christ before his account of the Institution, and that the true Blood of Christ may with right still be called (consecrated) wine, on the one hand, because the Blood was partaken of after the manner in which wine is drunk, and, on the other, because the Blood continues to exist under the outward appearances of the wine. In its multifarious wanderings from the old beaten path, being consistently forced with the denial of Christ's Divinity to abandon faith in the Real Presence also, modern criticism seeks to account for the text along other lines. With utter arbitrariness, doubting whether the words of Institution originated from the mouth of Christ, it traces them to St. Paul as their author, in whose ardent soul something original supposedly mingled with his subjective reflections on the value attached to "Body" and on the "repetition of the Eucharistic banquet". From this troubled fountain-head the words of Institution first found their way into the Gospel of St. Luke and then, by way of addition, were woven into the texts of St. Matthew and St. Mark. It stands to reason that the latter assertion is nothing more than a wholly unwarrantable conjecture, which may be passed over as gratuitously as it was advanced. It is, moreover, essentially untrue that the value attached to the Sacrifice and the repetition of the Lord's Supper are mere reflections of St. Paul, since Christ attached a sacrificial value to His Death (cf. Mark, x, 45) and celebrated His Eucharistic Supper in connexion with the Jewish Passover, which itself had to be repeated every year. As regards the interpretation of the words of Institution, there are at present three modern explanations contending for supremacy—the symbolical, the parabolical, and the eschatological. According to the symbolical interpretation, *corpus* is supposed to designate the Church as the mystical Body and *sanguis* the New Testament. We have already rejected this last meaning as impossible. For is it the Church that is eaten and the New Testament that is drunk? Did St. Paul brand the partaking of the Church and of the New Testament as a heinous offence committed against the Body and Blood of Christ? The case is not much better in regard to the parabolical interpretation, which would discern in the pouring out of the wine a mere parable of the shedding of the Blood on the Cross. This again is a purely arbitrary explanation, an invention, unsupported by any objective foundation. Then, too, it would follow from analogy, that the breaking of the bread was a parable of the slaying of Christ's Body, a meaning utterly inconceivable. Rising as it were out of a dense fog and labouring to take on a definite form, the incomplete eschatological explanation would make the Eucharist a mere anticipation of the future heavenly banquet. Supposing the truth of the Real Presence, this consideration might be open to discussion, inasmuch as the partaking of the Bread of Angels is really the foretaste of eternal beatitude and the anticipated transformation of earth into heaven. But as implying a mere symbolical anticipation of heaven and a meaningless manipulation of unconsecrated bread and wine, the eschatological interpretation is diametrically opposed to the text and finds not the slightest support in the life and character of Christ.

Concerning the entire matter, see HEHN, *Die Einsetzung des Abendmahls als Beweis für die Gottheit Christi* (Würzburg, 1900); BERNING, *Die Einsetzung der hl. Eucharistie in ihrer ursprünglichen Form* (Münster, 1901); KOCH, *Die neutestamentl. Abendmahlsberichte und die neueste Abendmahlsforschung* in *Tübinger Theol. Quartalschrift* (1905), pp. 230 sqq.; SEEBERG, *Das Abendmahl im Neuen Testament* (Berlin, 1905); also LOOFS, *Abendmahl* in *Realencyklopädie für prot. Theol.*; ZÖTZ, *Die Abendmahlsfeier in ihrer geschichtl. Entwickelung* (Leipzig, 1904).

(b) Proof from Tradition.—As for the cogency of the argument from tradition, this historical fact is of decided significance, namely, that the dogma of the Real Presence remained, properly speaking, unmolested down to the time of the heretic Berengarius of Tours (d. 1088), and so could claim even at that time the uninterrupted possession of ten centuries. In the course of the dogma's history there arose in general

three great Eucharistic controversies, the first of which, begun by Paschasius Radbertus, in the ninth century, scarcely extended beyond the limits of his audience and concerned itself solely with the philosophical question, whether the Eucharistic Body of Christ is identical with the natural Body He had in Palestine and now has in heaven. Such a numerical identity could well have been denied by Ratramnus, Rabanus Maurus, Ratherius, Lanfranc, and others, since even nowadays a true, though accidental, distinction between the sacramental and the natural condition of Christ's Body must be rigorously maintained. The first occasion for an official procedure on the part of the Church was offered when Berengarius of Tours, influenced by the writings of Scotus Eriugena (d. about 884), the first opponent of the Real Presence, rejected both the latter truth and that of Transubstantiation. He repaired, however, the public scandal he had given by a sincere retractation made in the presence of Pope Gregory VII at a synod held in Rome in 1079, and died reconciled to the Church. The third and the sharpest controversy was that opened by the Reformation in the sixteenth century, in regard to which it must be remarked that Luther was the only one among the Reformers who still clung to the old Catholic doctrine, and, though subjecting it to manifold misrepresentations, defended it most tenaciously. He was diametrically opposed by Zwingli of Zurich, who, as was seen above, reduced the Eucharist to an empty, meaningless symbol. Having gained over to his views such friendly contemporary partisans as Carlstadt, Bucer, and Œcolampadius, he later on secured influential allies in the Arminians, Mennonites, Socinians, and Anglicans, and even to-day the rationalistic conception of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper does not differ substantially from that of the Zwinglians. In the meantime, at Geneva, Calvin was cleverly seeking to bring about a compromise between the extremes of the Lutheran literal and the Zwinglian figurative interpretations, by suggesting instead of the substantial presence in one case or the merely symbolical in the other, a certain mean, i. e. "dynamic", presence, which consists essentially in this, that at the moment of reception, the efficacy of Christ's Body and Blood is communicated from heaven to the souls of the predestined and spiritually nourishes them. Thanks to Melanchthon's pernicious and dishonest double-dealing, this attractive intermediary position of Calvin made such an impression even in Lutheran circles that it was not until the Formula of Concord in 1577 that the "crypto-Calvinistic venom" was successfully rejected from the body of Lutheran doctrine. The Council of Trent met these widely divergent errors of the Reformation with the dogmatic definition, that the God-man is "truly, really, and substantially" present under the appearances of bread and wine, purposely intending thereby to oppose the expression *vere* to Zwingli's *signum*, *realiter* to Œcolampadius's *figura*, and *essentialiter* to Calvin's *virtus* (Sess. XIII, can. i). And this teaching of the Council of Trent has ever been and is now the unwavering position of the whole of Catholic Christendom.

As regards the doctrine of the Fathers, it is not possible in the present article to multiply patristic texts, which are usually characterized by wonderful beauty and clearness. Suffice it to say that, besides the Didache (ix, x, xiv), the most ancient Fathers, as Ignatius (Ad. Smyrn., vii; Ad. Ephes., xx; Ad. Philad., iv), Justin (Apol., I, lxvi), Irenæus (Adv. Hær., IV, xvii, 5; IV, xviii, 4; V, ii, 2), Tertullian (De resurrect. carn., viii; De pudic., ix; De orat., xix; De bapt., xvi), and Cyprian (De orat. dom., xviii; De lapsis, xvi), attest without the slightest shadow of a misunderstanding what is the faith of the Church, while later patristic theology bears witness to the dogma in terms that approach exaggeration, as Gregory of Nyssa (Orat. catech , xxxvii), Cyril of Jerusalem (Catech. myst., iv, 2 sqq.), and especially the Doctor of the Eucharist, Chrysostom [Hom. lxxxii (lxxxiii), in Matt., 1 sqq.; Hom. xlvi, in Joan., 2 sqq.; Hom. xxiv, in I Cor., 1 sqq.; Hom. ix, de pœnit., 1], to whom may be added the Latin Fathers, Hilary (De Trinit., VIII, iv, 13) and Ambrose (De myst., viii, 49; ix, 51 sq.). Concerning the Syriac Fathers, see Th. Lamy, "De Syrorum fide in re eucharisticâ" (Louvain, 1859). The position held by St. Augustine is at present the subject of a spirited controversy, since the adversaries of the Church rather confidently maintain that he favoured their side of the question in that he was an out-and-out "Symbolist". In the opinion of Loofs ("Dogmengeschichte", 4th ed., Halle, 1906, p. 409), St. Augustine never gives the "reception of the true Body and Blood of Christ" a thought; and this view Ad. Harnack (Dogmengeschichte, 3rd ed., Freiburg, 1897, III, 148) emphasizes when he declares that St. Augustine "undoubtedly was one in this respect with the so-called pre-Reformation and with Zwingli". Against this rather hasty conclusion Catholics first of all advance the undoubted fact that Augustine demanded that Divine worship should be rendered to the Eucharistic Flesh (In Ps. xxxiii, enarr., i, 10), and declared that at the Last Supper "Christ held and carried Himself in His own hands" (In Ps. xcviii, n. 9). They insist, and rightly so, that it is not fair to separate this great Doctor's teaching concerning the Eucharist from his doctrine of the Holy Sacrifice, since he clearly and unmistakably asserts that the true Body and Blood are offered in the Holy Mass. The variety of extreme views just mentioned requires that an attempt be made at a reasonable and unbiased explanation, whose verification is to be sought for and found in the acknowledged fact that a gradual process of development took place in the mind of St. Augustine. No one will deny that certain expressions occur in Augustine as forcibly realistic as those of Tertullian and Cyprian or of his intimate literary friends, Ambrose, Optatus of Mileve, Hilary, and Chrysostom. On the other hand, it is beyond question that, owing to the determining influence of Origen and the Platonic philosophy, which, as is well known, attached but slight value to visible matter and the sensible phenomena of the world, Augustine did not refer what was properly real (*res*) in the Blessed Sacrament to the Flesh of Christ (*caro*), but transferred it to the quickening principle (*spiritus*), i. e. to the effects produced by a worthy Communion. A logical consequence of this was that he allowed to *caro*, as the vehicle and antitype of *res*, not indeed a mere symbolical worth, but at best a transitory, intermediary, and subordinate worth (*signum*), and placed the Flesh and Blood of Christ, present under the appearances (*figuræ*) of bread and wine, in too decided an opposition to His natural, historical Body. Since Augustine was a strenuous defender of personal co-operation and effort in the work of salvation and an enemy to mere mechanical activity and superstitious routine, he omitted insisting upon a lively faith in the real personality of Jesus in the Eucharist, and called attention to the spiritual efficiency of the Flesh of Christ instead. His mental vision was fixed, not so much upon the saving *caro*, as upon the *spiritus*, which alone possessed worth. Nevertheless a turning-point occurred in his life. The conflict with Pelagianism and the diligent perusal of Chrysostom freed him from the bondage of Platonism, and he thenceforth attached to *caro* a separate, individual value independent of that of *spiritus*, going so far, in fact, as to maintain too strongly that the Communion of children was absolutely necessary to salvation. If, moreover, the reader finds in some of the other Fathers difficulties, obscurities, and a certain inaccuracy of expression, this may be explained on three general grounds: (1) because of the peace and security there is in their possession of the Church's truth, whence resulted a certain want of accuracy in

their terminology; (2) because of the strictness with which the Discipline of the Secret, expressly concerned with the Holy Eucharist, was maintained in the East until the end of the fifth, in the West down to the middle of the sixth, century; (3) because of the preference of many Fathers for the allegorical interpretation of Scripture, which was especially in vogue in the Alexandrian School (Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Cyril), but which found a salutary counterpoise in the emphasis laid on the literal interpretation by the School of Antioch (Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret). Since, however, the allegorical sense of the Alexandrians did not exclude the literal, but rather supposed it as a working basis, the realistic phraseology of Clement (Pæd., I, vi), of Origen (Contra Celsum, VIII, xiii, 32; Hom. ix, in Levit., x), and of Cyril (In Matt., xxvi, xxvii; Contra Nestor., IV, 5) concerning the Real Presence is readily accounted for. (For the solution of patristic difficulties, see Pohle, "Dogmatik", 3rd ed., Paderborn, 1908, III, 209 sqq.)

The argument from tradition is supplemented and completed by the argument from prescription, which traces the constant belief in the dogma of the Real Presence through the Middle Ages back to the early Apostolic Church, and thus proves the anti-Eucharistic heresies to have been capricious novelties and violent ruptures of the true faith as handed down from the beginning. Passing over the interval that has elapsed since the Reformation, as this period receives its entire character from the Council of Trent, we have for the time of the Reformation the important testimony of Luther (Wider etliche Rottengeister, 1532) for the fact that the whole of Christendom then believed in the Real Presence. And this firm, universal belief can be traced back uninterruptedly to Berengarius of Tours (d. 1088), in fact—omitting the sole exception of Scotus Eriugena—to Paschasius Radbertus (831). On these grounds, therefore, we may proudly maintain that the Church has been in legitimate possession of this dogma for fully eleven centuries. When Photius started the Greek Schism in 869, he took over to his Church the inalienable treasure of the Catholic Eucharist, a treasure which the Greeks, in the negotiations for reunion at Lyons in 1274 and at Florence in 1439, could show to be still intact, and which they vigorously defended in the schismatical Synod of Jerusalem (1672) against the sordid machinations of the Calvinistic-minded Cyril Lucar, Patriarch of Constantinople (1629). From this it follows conclusively that the Catholic dogma must be much older than the Eastern Schism under Photius. In fact, even the Nestorians and Monophysites, who broke away from Rome in the fifth century, have, as is evident from their literature and liturgical books, preserved their faith in the Eucharist as unwaveringly as the Greeks, and this in spite of the dogmatic difficulties which, on account of their denial of the hypostatic union, stood in the way of a clear and correct notion of the Real Presence. Therefore the Catholic dogma is at least as old as Nestorianism (431 A. D.). But is it not of even greater antiquity? To decide this question one has only to examine the oldest Liturgies of the Mass, whose essential elements date back to the time of the Apostles (see articles on the various liturgies), to visit the Roman Catacombs (see CATACOMBS, ROMAN), where Christ is shown as present in the Eucharistic food under the symbol of a fish (see EUCHARIST, EARLY SYMBOLS OF THE), to decipher the famous Inscription of Abercius (see ABERCIUS, INSCRIPTION OF) of the second century, which, though composed under the influence of the Discipline of the Secret, plainly attests the faith of that age. And thus the argument from prescription carries us back to the dim and distant past and thence to the time of the Apostles, who in turn could have received their faith in the Real Presence from no one but Christ Himself.

On the argument from tradition, cf. ERNST, *Die Lehre des Paschasius Radbertus von der Eucharistie* (Freiburg, 1896); NÄGLE, *Ratramnus und die hl. Eucharistie* (Vienna, 1903); SCHNITZER, *Berengar von Tours, sein Leben und seine Lehre* (Stuttgart, 1892); AD. HARNACK, *Dogmengeschichte* (Freiburg, 1894), III, pp. 278 sqq.; MÖHLER, *Symbolik* (Mainz, 1884), §§ 35, 56, 68; BÖHM, *Konfessionelle Lehrgegensätze* (Hildesheim, 1888), IV, pp. 73 sqq.; DÖLLINGER, *Die Lehre von der Eucharistie in den drei ersten Jahrhunderten* (Mainz, 1826); *La Perpétuité de la foi de l'Eglise touchant l'Eucharistie*, Vols. I and II by NICOLE AND ARNAULD (Paris, 1669–1674), Vols. IV and V by RENAUDOT (Paris, 1711–1713); CORBLET, *Histoire du sacrement de l'Eucharistie* (2 vols., Paris, 1885); STRUCKMANN, *Die Gegenwart Christi in der hl. Eucharistie nach den schriftlichen Quellen der vornicänischen Zeit* (Vienna, 1905); BÉGUINOT, *La très-sainte Eucharistie des 12 premiers siècles* (2 vols., Paris, 1903); NÄGLE, *Die Eucharistielehre des hl. Chrysostomus* (Freiburg, 1885); BATIFFOL, *Etudes d'Histoire et de Théologie positive*, Vol. II: *L'Eucharistie, la Présence réelle et la Transsubstantiation* (Paris, 1905); BLANK, *Die Lehre Augustins vom Sakrament der Eucharistie* (Paderborn, 1907); ADAM, *Die Eucharistielehre des hl. Augustin* (Paderborn, 1908); WEBER, *Die römischen Katakomben* (2nd ed., Ratisbon, 1900); KRAUS, *Roma sotterranea* (3rd ed., Freiburg, 1901); WILPERT, *Die Malereien der Katakomben Roms* (2 vols., Freiburg, 1903); KAUFMANN, *Handbuch der christlichen Archäologie* (Paderborn, 1905).

(2) *The Totality of the Real Presence.*—In order to forestall at the very outset the unworthy notion, that in the Eucharist we receive merely the Body and merely the Blood of Christ but not Christ in His entirety, the Council of Trent defined the Real Presence to be such as to include with Christ's Body and Blood His Soul and Divinity as well. A strictly logical conclusion from the words of promise: "he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me", this Totality of Presence was also the constant property of tradition, which characterized the partaking of separated parts of the Saviour as a sarcophagy (flesh-eating) altogether derogatory to God. Although the separation of the Body, Blood, Soul, and Logos, is, absolutely speaking, within the almighty power of God, yet their actual inseparability is firmly established by the dogma of the indissolubility of the hypostatic union of Christ's Divinity and Humanity. In case the Apostles had celebrated the Lord's Supper during the *triduum mortis* (the time during which Christ's Body was in the tomb), when a real separation took place between the constitutive elements of Christ, there would have been really present in the Sacred Host only the bloodless, inanimate Body of Christ as it lay in the tomb, and in the Chalice only the Blood separated from His Body and absorbed by the earth as it was shed, both the Body and the Blood, however, remaining hypostatically united to His Divinity, while His Soul, which sojourned in Limbo, would have remained entirely excluded from the Eucharistic presence. This unreal, though not impossible, hypothesis, is well calculated to throw light upon the essential difference designated by the Council of Trent (Sess. XIII, c. iii), between the meanings of the words *ex vi verborum* and *per concomitantiam*. By virtue of the words of Consecration, or *ex vi verborum*, that only is made present which is expressed by the words of Institution, namely the Body and the Blood of Christ. But by reason of a natural concomitance (*per concomitantiam*), there becomes simultaneously present all that which is physically inseparable from the parts just named, and which must, from a natural connexion with them, always be their accompaniment. Now, the glorified Christ, Who "dieth now no more" (Rom., vi, 9), has an animate Body through whose veins courses His life's Blood under the vivifying influence of the soul. Consequently, together with His Body and Blood and Soul, His whole Humanity also, and, by virtue of the hypostatic union, His Divinity, i. e. Christ whole and entire, must be present. Hence Christ is present in the sacrament with His Flesh and Blood, Body and Soul, Humanity and Divinity.

This general and fundamental principle, which entirely abstracts from the duality of the species, must, nevertheless, be extended to each of the species of bread and wine. For we do not receive in the Sacred Host one part of Christ and in the Chalice the other, as though our reception of the totality depended upon our partaking of both forms; on the contrary, under

the appearance of bread alone, as well as under the appearance of wine alone, we receive Christ whole and entire (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. XIII, can. iii). This, the only reasonable conception, finds its Scriptural verification in the fact, that St. Paul (I Cor., xi, 27, 29) attaches the same guilt "of the body and the blood of the Lord" to the unworthy "eating *or* drinking", understood in a disjunctive sense, as he does to "eating *and* drinking", understood in a copulative sense. The traditional foundation for this is to be found in the testimony of the Fathers and of the Church's liturgy, according to which the glorified Saviour can be present on our altars only in His totality and integrity, and not divided into parts or distorted to the form of a monstrosity. It follows, therefore, that supreme adoration is separately due to the Sacred Host and to the consecrated contents of the Chalice. On this last truth are based especially the permissibility and intrinsic propriety of Communion only under one kind for the laity and for priests not celebrating Mass (see COMMUNION UNDER BOTH KINDS). But in particularizing upon the dogma, we are naturally led to the further truth, that, at least after the actual division of either Species into parts, Christ is present in each part in His full and entire essence. If the Sacred Host be broken into pieces or if the consecrated Chalice be drunk in small quantities, Christ in His entirety is present in each particle and in each drop. By the restrictive clause, *separatione factâ*, the Council of Trent (Sess. XIII, can. iii) rightly raised this truth to the dignity of a dogma. While from Scripture we may only judge it improbable that Christ consecrated separately each particle of the bread He had broken, we know with certainty, on the other hand, that He blessed the entire contents of the Chalice and then gave it to His disciples to be partaken of distributively (cf. Matt., xxvi, 27 sq.; Mark, xiv, 23). It is only on the basis of the Tridentine dogma that we can understand how Cyril of Jerusalem (Catech. myst. v, n. 21) obliged communicants to observe the most scrupulous care in conveying the Sacred Host to their mouths, so that not even "a crumb, more precious than gold or jewels", might fall from their hands to the ground; how Cæsarius of Arles taught that there is "just as much in the small fragment as in the whole"; how the different liturgies assert the abiding integrity of the "indivisible Lamb", in spite of the "division of the Host"; and, finally, how in actual practice the faithful partook of the broken particles of the Sacred Host and drank in common from the same cup.

While the three foregoing theses contain dogmas of faith, there is a fourth proposition which is merely a theological conclusion, namely, that even *before* the actual division of the Species, Christ is present wholly and entirely in each particle of the still unbroken Host and in each drop of the collective contents of the Chalice. For were not Christ present in His entire Personality in every single particle of the Eucharistic Species even before their division took place, we should be forced to conclude that it is the process of dividing which brings about the Totality of Presence, whereas according to the teaching of the Church the operative cause of the Real and Total Presence is to be found in Transubstantiation alone. No doubt this last conclusion directs the attention of philosophical and scientific inquiry to a mode of existence peculiar to the Eucharistic Body, which is contrary to the ordinary laws of experience. It is, indeed, one of those sublime mysteries, concerning which speculative theology attempts to offer various solutions [see below under (5)].

(3) *Transubstantiation.*—Before proving dogmatically the fact of the substantial change here under consideration, we must first outline its history and nature. (a) The scientific development of the concept of Transubstantiation can hardly be said to be a product of the Greeks, who did not get beyond its more general notes; rather, it is the remarkable contribution of the Latin theologians, who were stimulated to work it out in complete logical form by the three Eucharistic controversies mentioned above. The term *transubstantiation* seems to have been first used by Hildebert of Tours (about 1079). His encouraging example was soon followed by other theologians, as Stephen of Autun (d. 1139), Gaufred (1188), and Peter of Blois (d. about 1200), whereupon several œcumenical councils also adopted this significant expression, as the Fourth Council of the Lateran (1215), and the Council of Lyons (1274), in the profession of faith of the Greek Emperor Michael Palæologus. The Council of Trent (Sess. XIII, cap. iv; can. ii) not only accepted as an inheritance of faith the truth contained in the idea, but authoritatively confirmed the "aptitude of the term" to express most strikingly the legitimately developed doctrinal concept. In a closer logical analysis of Transubstantiation, we find the first and fundamental notion to be that of conversion, which may be defined as "the transition of one thing into another in some aspect of being". As is immediately evident, conversion (*conversio*) is something more than mere change (*mutatio*). Whereas in mere changes one of the two extremes may be expressed negatively, as, e. g., in the change of day and night, conversion requires two positive extremes, which are related to each other as thing to thing, and must have, besides, such an intimate connexion with each other, that the last extreme (*terminus ad quem*) begins to be only as the first (*terminus a quo*) ceases to be, as, e. g., in the conversion of water into wine at Cana. A third element is usually required, known as the *commune tertium*, which, even after conversion has taken place, either physically or at least logically unites one extreme to the other; for in every true conversion the following condition must be fulfilled: "What was formerly A, is now B." A very important question suggests itself as to whether the definition should further postulate the previous non-existence of the last extreme, for it seems strange that an existing terminus a quo, A, should be converted into an already existing terminus ad quem, B. If the act of conversion is not to become a mere process of substitution, as in sleight-of-hand performances, the terminus ad quem must unquestionably in some manner newly exist, just as the terminus a quo must in some manner really cease to exist. Yet as the disappearance of the latter is not attributable to annihilation properly so called, so there is no need of postulating creation, strictly so called, to explain the former's coming into existence. The idea of conversion is amply realized if the following condition is fulfilled, viz., that a thing which already existed in substance, acquires an altogether new and previously non-existing *mode of being*. Thus in the resurrection of the dead, the dust of the human bodies will be truly converted into the bodies of the risen by their previously existing souls, just as at death they had been truly converted into corpses by the departure of the souls. This much as regards the general notion of conversion. Transubstantiation, however, is not a conversion simply so called, but a substantial conversion (*conversio substantialis*), inasmuch as one thing is *substantially* or *essentially* converted into another. Thus from the concept of Transubstantiation is excluded every sort of merely accidental conversion, whether it be purely natural (e. g. the metamorphosis of insects) or supernatural (e. g. the Transfiguration of Christ on Mount Tabor). Finally, Transubstantiation differs from every other substantial conversion in this, that *only* the substance is converted into another—the accidents remaining the same—just as would be the case if wood were miraculously converted into iron, the substance of the iron remaining hidden under the external appearance of the wood.

The application of the foregoing to the Eucharist is an easy matter. First of all the notion of conversion is verified in the Eucharist, not only in general, but in

all its essential details. For we have the two extremes of conversion, namely, bread and wine as the terminus a quo, and the Body and Blood of Christ as the terminus ad quem. Furthermore, the intimate connexion between the cessation of one extreme and the appearance of the other seems to be preserved by the fact, that both events are the results, not of two independent processes, as, e. g. annihilation and creation, but of one single act, since, according to the purpose of the Almighty, the substance of the bread and wine departs in order to make room for the Body and Blood of Christ. Lastly, we have the commune tertium in the unchanged appearances of bread and wine, under which appearances the pre-existent Christ assumes a new, sacramental mode of being, and without which His Body and Blood could not be partaken of by men. That the consequence of Transubstantiation, as a conversion of the total substance, is the transition of the entire substance of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, is the express doctrine of the Church (Council of Trent, Sess. XIII, can. ii). Thus were condemned as contrary to faith the antiquated view of Durandus, that only the substantial form (*forma substantialis*) of the bread underwent conversion, while the primary matter (*materia prima*) remained, and, especially, Luther's doctrine of Consubstantiation, i. e. the coexistence of the substance of the bread with the true Body of Christ. Thus, too, the theory of Impanation advocated by Osiander and certain Berengarians, and according to which a hypostatic union is supposed to take place between the substance of the bread and the God-man (*impanatio= Deus panis factus*), is authoritatively rejected. So the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation sets up a mighty bulwark around the dogma of the Real Presence and constitutes in itself a distinct doctrinal article, which is not involved in that of the Real Presence, though the doctrine of the Real Presence is necessarily contained in that of Transubstantiation. It was for this very reason that Pius VI, in his dogmatic Bull "Auctorem fidei" (1794) against the Jansenistic pseudo-Synod of Pistoia (1786), protested most vigorously against suppressing this "scholastic question", as the synod had advised pastors to do.

(b) In the mind of the Church, Transubstantiation has been so intimately bound up with the Real Presence, that both dogmas have been handed down together from generation to generation, though we cannot entirely ignore a dogmatico-historical development. The total conversion of the substance of bread is expressed clearly in the words of Institution: "This is my body". These words form, not a theoretical, but a practical proposition, whose essence consists in this, that the objective identity between subject and predicate is effected and verified only after the words have all been uttered, not unlike the pronouncement of a king to a subaltern: "You are a major", or, "You are a captain", which would immediately cause the promotion of the officer to a higher command. When, therefore, He Who is All Truth and All Power said of the bread: "This is my body", the bread became, through the utterance of these words, the Body of Christ; consequently, on the completion of the sentence the substance of bread was no longer present, but the Body of Christ under the outward appearance of bread. Hence the bread must have become the Body of Christ, i. e. the former must have been converted into the latter. The words of Institution were at the same time the words of Transubstantiation. Indeed the actual manner in which the absence of the bread and the presence of the Body of Christ is effected, is not read into the words of Institution but strictly and exegetically deduced from them. The Calvinists, therefore, are perfectly right when they reject the Lutheran doctrine of Consubstantiation as a fiction, with no foundation in Scripture. For had Christ intended to assert the coexistence of His Body with the substance of the bread, He would not have expressed a simple identity between *hoc* and *corpus* by means of the copula *est*, but would have resorted to some such expression as: "This bread contains my body", or, "In this bread is my body." Had He desired to constitute bread the sacramental receptacle of His Body, He would have had to state this expressly, for neither from the nature of the case nor according to common parlance can a piece of bread be made to signify the receptacle of a human body. On the other hand, the synecdoche is plain in the case of the Chalice: "This is my blood", i. e. the contents of the Chalice are my blood, and hence no longer wine.

Regarding tradition, the earliest witnesses, as Tertullian and Cyprian, could hardly have given any particular consideration to the genetic relation of the natural elements of bread and wine to the Body and Blood of Christ, or to the manner in which the former were converted into the latter; for even Augustine was deprived of a clear conception of Transubstantiation, so long as he was held in the bonds of Platonism. On the other hand, complete clearness on the subject had been attained by writers as early as Cyril of Jerusalem, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, and Cyril of Alexandria in the East, and by Ambrose and the later Latin writers in the West. Eventually the West became the classic home of scientific perfection in the difficult doctrine of Transubstantiation. The claims of the learned work of the Anglican Dr. Pusey (The Doctrine of the Real Presence as contained in the Fathers, Oxford, 1855), who denied the cogency of the patristic argument for Transubstantiation, have been met and thoroughly answered by Cardinal Franzelin (De Euchar., Rome, 1887, thes. xiv). The argument from tradition is strikingly confirmed by the ancient liturgies, whose touching and beautiful prayers express the idea of conversion in the clearest manner. Many examples may be found in Renaudot, "Liturgiæ orient." (2nd ed., Frankfort, 1847); Assemani, "Codex liturg." (13 vols., Rome, 1749–66); Denzinger, "Ritus Orientalium" (2 vols., Würzburg, 1864). Concerning the Adduction Theory of the Scotists and the Production Theory of the Thomists, see Pohle, "Dogmatik" (3rd ed., Paderborn, 1908), III, 237 sqq.

(4) *The Permanence and Adorableness of the Blessed Eucharist.*—Since Luther arbitrarily restricted the Real Presence to the moment of reception (*in usu, non extra*), the Council of Trent (Sess. XIII, can. iv) by a special canon emphasized the fact, that immediately after the Consecration Christ is truly present and, consequently, does not make His Presence dependent upon the act of eating or drinking. On the contrary, He continues His Eucharistic Presence even in the consecrated Hosts and Sacred particles that remain on the altar or in the ciborium after the distribution of Holy Communion. In the deposit of faith the Real Presence and the Permanence of Presence are so closely allied, that in the mind of the Church both continue on as an undivided whole. And rightly so; for just as Christ promised His Flesh and Blood as meat and drink, i. e. as something permanent (cf. John, vi, 50 sqq.), so, when He said: "Take ye, and eat. This is my body", the Apostles received from the hand of the Lord His Sacred Body, which was already objectively present and did not first become so in the act of partaking. This non-dependence of the Real Presence upon the actual reception is manifested very clearly in the case of the Chalice, when Christ said: "Drink ye all of this. For [*enim*] this is my Blood." Here the act of drinking is evidently neither the cause nor the *conditio sine quâ non* for the presence of Christ's Blood.

Much as he disliked it, even Calvin had to acknowledge the evident force of the argument from tradition (Instit. IV, xvii, §39). Not only have the Fathers, and among them Chrysostom with special vigour, de-

fended in theory the permanence of the Real Presence, but the constant practice of the Church has also established its truth. In the early days of the Church the faithful frequently carried the Blessed Eucharist with them to their homes (cf. Tertullian, "Ad uxor.", II, v; Cyprian, "De lapsis", xxvi) or upon long journeys (Ambrose, De excessu fratris, I, 43, 46), while the deacons were accustomed to take the Blessed Sacrament to those who did not attend Divine service (cf. Justin, Apol., I, n. 67), as well as to the martyrs, the incarcerated, and the infirm (cf. Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., VI, xliv). The deacons were also obliged to transfer the particles that remained to specially prepared repositories called *Pastophoria* (cf. Apostolic Constitutions, VIII, xiii). Furthermore, it was customary as early as the fourth century to celebrate the Mass of the Presanctified (cf. Synod of Laodicea, can. xlix), in which were received the Sacred Hosts that had been consecrated one or more days previously. In the Latin Church the celebration of the Mass of the Presanctified is nowadays restricted to Good Friday, whereas, ever since the Trullan Synod (692), the Greeks celebrate it during the whole of Lent, except on Saturdays, Sundays, and the feast of the Annunciation (25 March). A deeper reason for the permanence of Presence is found in the fact, that some time elapses between the confection and the reception of the sacrament, i. e. between the Consecration and the Communion, whereas in the case of the other sacraments both the confection and the reception take place at the same instant. Baptism, for instance, lasts only as long as the baptismal action or ablution with water, and is, therefore, a transitory sacrament; on the contrary, the Eucharist, and the Eucharist alone, constitutes a permanent sacrament (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. XIII, cap. iii). The permanence of Presence, however, is limited to an interval of time of which the beginning is determined by the instant of Consecration and the end by the corruption of the Eucharistic Species. If the Host has become mouldy or the contents of the Chalice sour, Christ has discontinued His Presence therein. Since in the process of corruption those elementary substances return which correspond to the peculiar nature of the changed accidents, the law of the indestructibility of matter, notwithstanding the miracle of the Eucharistic conversion, remains in force without any interruption.

The Adorableness of the Eucharist is the practical consequence of its permanence. According to a well-known principle of Christology, the same worship of latria (*cultus latriæ*) as is due to the Triune God is due also to the Divine Word, the God-man Christ, and in fact, by reason of the hypostatic union, to the Humanity of Christ and its individual component parts, as, e. g., His Sacred Heart. Now, identically the same Lord Christ is truly present in the Eucharist as is present in heaven; consequently He is to be adored in the Blessed Sacrament, and just so long as He remains present under the appearances of bread and wine, namely, from the moment of Transubstantiation to the moment in which the species are decomposed (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. XIII, can. vi).

In the absence of Scriptural proof, the Church finds a warrant for, and a propriety in, rendering Divine worship to the Blessed Sacrament in the most ancient and constant tradition, though of course a distinction must be made between the dogmatic principle and the varying discipline regarding the outward form of worship. While even the East recognized the unchangeable principle from the earliest ages, and, in fact, as late as the schismatical Synod of Jerusalem in 1672, the West has furthermore shown an untiring activity in establishing and investing with more and more solemnity, homage and devotion to the Blessed Eucharist. In the early Church, the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament was restricted chiefly to Mass and Communion, just as it is to-day among the Orientals and the Greeks. Even in his time Cyril of Jerusalem insisted just as strongly as did Ambrose and Augustine on an attitude of adoration and homage during Holy Communion (cf. Ambrose, De Sp. Sancto, III, ii, 79; Augustine, In Ps. xcviii, n. 9). In the West the way was opened to a more and more exalted veneration of the Blessed Eucharist when the faithful were allowed to Communicate even outside of the liturgical service. After the Berengarian controversy, the Blessed Sacrament was in the eleventh and twelfth centuries elevated for the express purpose of repairing by its adoration the blasphemies of heretics and strengthening the imperilled faith of Catholics. In the thirteenth century were introduced, for the greater glorification of the Most Holy, the "theophoric processions" (*circumgestatio*), and also the feast of Corpus Christi, instituted under Urban IV at the solicitation of St. Juliana of Liège. In honour of the feast, sublime hymns, such as the "Pange Lingua" of St. Thomas Aquinas, were composed. In the fourteenth century the practice of the Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament arose. The custom of the annual Corpus Christi procession was warmly defended and recommended by the Council of Trent (Sess. XIII, cap. v). A new impetus was given to the adoration of the Eucharist through the visits to the Blessed Sacrament (*Visitatio SS. Sacramenti*), introduced by St. Alphonsus Liguori; in later times the numerous orders and congregations devoted to Perpetual Adoration, the institution in many dioceses of the devotion of "Perpetual Prayer", the holding of International Eucharistic Congresses, e. g. that of London in September, 1908, have all contributed to keep alive faith in Him Who has said: "behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world" (Matt., xxviii, 20).

On this whole matter see BELLARMINE *De Euchar.*, disp. x, sect. 3; BONGARDT, *Die Eucharistie der Mittelpunkt des Glaubens, des Gottesdienstes und des Lebens der Kirche* (2nd ed., Paderborn, 1882); HOFFMANN, *Die Verehrung und Anbetung des Sakraments des Altars geschichtlich dargestellt* (Kempten, 1897).

(5) *Speculative Discussion of the Real Presence.*—The principal aim of speculative theology with regard to the Eucharist, should be to discuss philosophically, and seek a logical solution of, three apparent contradictions, namely: (a) the continued existence of the Eucharistic Species, or the outward appearances of bread and wine, without their natural underlying subject (*accidentia sine subjecto*); (b) the spatially uncircumscribed, spiritual mode of existence of Christ's Eucharistic Body (*existentia corporis ad modum spiritus*); (c) the simultaneous existence of Christ in heaven and in many places on earth (*multilocatio*).

(a) The study of the first problem, viz. whether or not the accidents of bread and wine continue their existence without their proper substance, must be based upon the clearly established truth of Transubstantiation, in consequence of which the entire substance of the bread and the entire substance of the wine are converted respectively into the Body and Blood of Christ in such a way that "only the appearances of bread and wine remain" (Council of Trent, Sess. XIII, can. ii: *manentibus dumtaxat speciebus panis et vini*). Accordingly, the continuance of the appearances without the substance of bread and wine as their connatural substratum is just the reverse of Transubstantiation. If it be further asked, whether these appearances have any subject at all in which they inhere, we must answer with St. Thomas Aquinas (III, Q. lxxvii, a. 1), that the idea is to be rejected as unbecoming, as though the Body of Christ, in addition to its own accidents, should also assume those of bread and wine. The most that may be said is, that from the Eucharistic Body proceeds a miraculous sustaining power, which supports the appearances bereft of their natural substances and preserves them from collapse. The position of the Church in this regard may

be readily determined from the Council of Constance (1414–1418). In its eighth session, approved in 1418 by Martin V, this synod condemned the following articles of Wyclif: (1) "Substantia panis materialis et similiter substantia vini materialis remanent in Sacramento altaris", i. e. the material substance of bread and likewise the material substance of wine remain in the Sacrament of the Altar; (2) "Accidentia panis non manent sine subjecto", i. e. the accidents of the bread do not remain without a subject. The first of these articles contains an open denial of Transubstantiation. The second, so far as the text is concerned, might be considered as merely a different wording of the first, were it not that the history of the council shows that Wyclif had directly opposed the Scholastic doctrine of "accidents without a subject" as absurd and even heretical (cf. De Augustinis, De re sacramentariâ, Rome, 1889, II, 573 sqq.). Hence it was the intention of the council to condemn the second article, not merely as a conclusion of the first, but as a distinct and independent proposition; wherefore we may gather the Church's teaching on the subject from the contradictory proposition: "Accidentia panis manent sine subjecto", i. e. the accidents of bread do remain without a subject. Such, at least, was the opinion of contemporary theologians regarding the matter; and the Roman Catechism, referring to the above-mentioned canon of the Council of Trent, tersely explains: "The accidents of bread and wine inhere in no substance, but continue existing by themselves." This being the case, some theologians in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, who inclined to Cartesianism, as E. Maignan, Drouin, and Vitasse, displayed but little theological penetration when they asserted that the Eucharistic appearances were optical illusions, phantasmagoria, and make-believe accidents, ascribing to Divine omnipotence an immediate influence upon the five senses, whereby a mere subjective impression of what seemed to be the accidents of bread and wine was created. Since Descartes (d. 1650) places the essence of corporeal substance in its actual extension and recognizes only modal accidents metaphysically united to their substance, it is clear, according to his theory, that together with the conversion of the substance of bread and wine, the accidents must also be converted and thereby made to disappear. If the eye nevertheless seems to behold bread and wine, this is to be attributed to an optical illusion alone. But it is clear at first blush, that no doubt can be entertained as to the physical reality, or in fact, as to the identity of the accidents before and after Transubstantiation. This physical, and not merely optical, continuance of the Eucharistic accidents was repeatedly insisted upon by the Fathers, and with such excessive vigour that the notion of Transubstantiation seemed to be in danger. Especially against the Monophysites, who based on the Eucharistic conversion an *a pari* argument in behalf of the supposed conversion of the Humanity of Christ into His Divinity, did the Fathers retort by concluding from the continuance of the unconverted Eucharistic accidents to the unconverted Human Nature of Christ. Both philosophical and theological arguments were also advanced against the Cartesians, as, for instance, the infallible testimony of the senses, the necessity of the commune tertium to complete the idea of Transubstantiation [see above, (3)], the idea of the Sacrament of the Altar as the visible sign of Christ's invisible Body, the physical signification of Communion as a real partaking of food and drink, the striking expression "breaking of bread" (*fractio panis*), which supposes the divisible reality of the accidents, etc. For all these reasons, theologians consider the physical reality of the accidents as an incontrovertible truth, which cannot without temerity be called in question.

As regards the philosophical possibility of the accidents existing without their substance, the older school drew a fine distinction between modal and absolute accidents. By the modal accidents were understood such as could not, being mere modes, be separated from their substance without involving a metaphysical contradiction, e. g. the form and motion of a body. Those accidents were designated absolute, whose objective reality was adequately distinct from the reality of their substance, in such a way that no intrinsic repugnance was involved in their separability, as, e. g., the quantity of a body. Aristotle himself taught (Metaphys., VI, 3rd ed. of Bekker, p. 1029, a. 13), that quantity was not a corporeal substance, but only a phenomenon of substance. Modern philosophy, on the other hand, has endeavoured since the time of John Locke, to reject altogether from the realm of ideas the concept of substance as something imaginary, and to rest satisfied with qualities alone as the excitants of sensation, a view of the material world which the so-called psychology of association and actuality is trying to carry out in its various details. The Catholic Church does not feel called upon to follow up the ephemeral vagaries of these new philosophical systems, but bases her doctrine on the everlasting philosophy of sound reason, which rightly distinguishes between the thing in itself and its characteristic qualities (colour, form, size, etc.). Though the "thing in itself" may ever remain imperceptible to the senses and therefore be designated in the language of Kant as a noumenon, or in the language of Spencer, the Unknowable, yet we cannot escape the necessity of seeking beneath the appearances the thing which appears, beneath the colour that which is coloured, beneath the form that which has form, i. e. the substratum or subject which sustains the phenomena. The older philosophy designated the appearances by the name of accidents, the subject of the appearances, by that of substance. It matters little what the terms are, provided the things signified by them are rightly understood. What is particularly important regarding material substances and their accidental qualities, is the necessity of proceeding cautiously in this discussion, since in the domain of natural philosophy the greatest uncertainty reigns even at the present day concerning the nature of matter, one system pulling down what another has reared, as is proved in the latest theories of atomism and energy, of ions and electrons.

The old theology tried with St. Thomas Aquinas (III, Q. lxxvii) to prove the possibility of absolute accidents on the principles of the Aristotelean-Scholastic hylomorphism, i. e. the system which teaches that the essential constitution of bodies consists in the substantial union of *materia prima* and *forma substantialis*. Some theologians of to-day would seek to come to an understanding with modern science, which bases all natural processes upon the very fruitful theory of energy, by trying with Leibniz to explain the Eucharistic *accidentia sine subjecto* according to the dynamism of natural philosophy. Assuming, according to this system, a real distinction between force and its manifestations, between energy and its effects, it may be seen that under the influence of the First Cause the energy (substance) necessary for the essence of bread is withdrawn by virtue of conversion, while the effects of energy (accidents) in a miraculous manner continue. For the rest it may be said, that it is far from the Church's intention to restrict the Catholic's investigation regarding the doctrine of the Blessed Sacrament to any particular view of natural philosophy or even to require him to establish its truth on the principles of medieval physics; all that the Church demands is, that those theories of material substances be rejected which not only contradict the teaching of the Church, but also are repugnant to experience and sound reason, as Pantheism, Hylozoism, Monism, Absolute Idealism, Cartesianism, etc.

(b) The second problem arises from the Totality of

Presence, which means that Christ in His entirety is present in the whole of the Host and in each smallest part thereof, as the spiritual soul is present in the human body [see above, (2)]. The difficulty reaches its climax when we consider that there is no question here of the Soul or the Divinity of Christ, but of His Body, which, with its head, trunk, and members, has assumed a mode of existence spiritual and independent of space, a mode of existence, indeed, concerning which neither experience nor any system of philosophy can have the least inkling. That the idea of conversion of corporeal matter into a spirit can in no way be entertained, is clear from the material substance of the Eucharistic Body itself. Even the above-mentioned separability of quantity from substance gives us no clue to the solution, since according to the best-founded opinions not only the substance of Christ's Body, but by His own wise arrangement, its corporeal quantity, i. e. its full size, with its complete organization of integral members and limbs, is present within the diminutive limits of the Host and in each portion thereof. Later theologians (as Rossignol, Legrand) resorted to the unseemly explanation, according to which Christ is present in diminished form and stature, a sort of miniature body; while others (as Oswald, Fernandez, Casajoana) assumed with no better sense of fitness the mutual compenetration of the members of Christ's Body to within the narrow compass of the point of a pin. The vagaries of the Cartesians, however, went beyond all bounds. Descartes had already, in a letter to P. Mesland (ed. Emery, Paris, 1811), expressed the opinion, that the identity of Christ's Eucharistic with His Heavenly Body was preserved by the identity of His Soul, which animated all the Eucharistic Bodies. On this basis, the geometrician Varignon suggested a true multiplication of the Eucharistic Bodies upon earth, which were supposed to be most faithful, though greatly reduced, miniature copies of the prototype, the Heavenly Body of Christ. Nor does the modern theory of n-dimensions throw any light upon the subject; for the Body of Christ is not invisible or impalpable to us because it occupies the fourth dimension, but because it transcends and is wholly independent of space. Such a mode of existence, it is clear, does not come within the scope of physics and mechanics, but belongs to a higher, supernatural order, even as does the Resurrection from the sealed tomb, the passing in and out through closed doors, the Transfiguration of the future glorified risen Body. What explanation may, then, be given of the fact?

The simplest treatment of the subject was that offered by the Schoolmen, especially St. Thomas (III, Q. lxxvi, a. 4). They reduced the mode of being to the mode of becoming, i. e. they traced back the mode of existence peculiar to the Eucharistic Body to the Transubstantiation; for a thing has to so "be" as it was in "becoming". Since *ex vi verborum* the immediate result is the presence of the Body of Christ, its quantity, present merely *per concomitantiam*, must follow the mode of existence peculiar to its substance, and, like the latter, must exist without division and extension, i. e. entirely in the whole Host and entirely in each part thereof. In other words, the Body of Christ is present in the sacrament, not after the manner of "quantity" (*per modum quantitatis*), but of "substance" (*per modum substantiæ*). Later Scholasticism (Bellarmine, Suarez, Billuart, and others) tried to improve upon this explanation along other lines by distinguishing between internal and external quantity. By internal quantity (*quantitas interna seu in actu primo*) is understood that entity, by virtue of which a corporeal substance merely possesses "aptitudinal extension", i. e. the "capability" of being extended in tri-dimensional space. External quantity, on the other hand (*quantitas externa seu in actu secundo*), is the same entity, but in so far as it follows its natural tendency to occupy space and *actually* extends itself in the three dimensions. While aptitudinal extension or internal quantity is so bound up with the essences of bodies that its separability from them involves a metaphysical contradiction, external quantity is, on the other hand, only a natural consequence and effect, which can be so suspended and withheld by the First Cause, that the corporeal substance, retaining its internal quantity, does not extend itself into space. At all events, however plausibly reason may seem to explain the matter, it is nevertheless face to face with a great mystery.

(c) The third and last question has to do with the multilocation of Christ in heaven and upon thousands of altars throughout the world. Since in the natural order of events each body is restricted to one position in space (*unilocatio*), so that before the law proof of an alibi immediately frees a person from the suspicion of crime, multilocation without further question belongs to the supernatural order. First of all, no intrinsic repugnance can be shown in the concept of multilocation. For if the objection be raised, that no being can exist separated from itself or show forth local distances between its various selves, the sophism is readily detected; for multilocation does not multiply the individual object, but only its external relation to and presence in space. Philosophy distinguishes two modes of presence in creatures: (1) the circumscriptive and (2) the definitive. The first, the only mode of presence proper to bodies, is that by virtue of which an object is confined to a determinate portion of space in such wise that its various parts (atoms, molecules, electrons) also occupy their corresponding positions in that space. The second mode of presence, that properly belonging to a spiritual being, requires the substance of a thing to exist in its entirety in the whole of the space, as well as whole and entire in each part of that space. The latter is the soul's mode of presence in the human body. The distinction made between these two modes of presence is important, inasmuch as in the Eucharist both kinds are found in combination. For, in the first place, there is verified a *continuous* definitive multilocation, called also replication, which consists in this, that the Body of Christ is totally present in each part of the continuous and as yet unbroken Host and also totally present throughout the whole Host, just as the human soul is present in the body. And precisely this latter analogy from nature gives us an insight into the possibility of the Eucharistic miracle. For if, as has been seen above, Divine omnipotence can in a supernatural manner impart to a body such a spiritual, unextended, spatially uncircumscribed mode of presence, which is natural to the soul as regards the human body, one may well surmise the possibility of Christ's Eucharistic Body being present in its entirety in the whole Host, and whole and entire in each part thereof.

There is, moreover, the *discontinuous* multilocation, whereby Christ is present not only in one Host, but in numberless separate Hosts, whether in the ciborium or upon all the altars throughout the world. The intrinsic possibility of discontinuous multilocation seems to be based upon the non-repugnance of continuous multilocation. For the chief difficulty of the latter appears to be that the same Christ is present in two different parts, A and B, of the continuous Host, it being immaterial whether we consider the distant parts A and B joined by the continuous line AB or not. The marvel does not substantially increase, if by reason of the breaking of the Host, the two parts A and B are now completely separated from each other. Nor does it matter how great the distance between the parts may be. Whether or not the fragments of a Host are distant one inch or a thousand miles from one another is altogether immaterial in this consideration; we need not wonder, then, if Catholics adore their Eucharistic Lord at one and the same time in New

York, London, and Paris. Finally, mention must be made of *mixed* multilocation, since Christ with His natural dimensions reigns in heaven, whence he does not depart, and at the same time dwells with His Sacramental Presence in numberless places throughout the world. This third case would be in perfect accordance with the two foregoing, were we *per impossibile* permitted to imagine that Christ were present under the appearances of bread exactly as He is in heaven and that He had relinquished His natural mode of existence. This, however, would be but one more marvel of God's omnipotence. Hence no contradiction is noticeable in the fact, that Christ retains His natural dimensional relations in heaven and at the same time takes up His abode upon the altars of earth.

There is, furthermore, a fourth kind of multilocation, which, however, has not been realized in the Eucharist, but would be, if Christ's Body were present in its natural mode of existence both in heaven and on earth. Such a miracle might be assumed to have occurred in the conversion of St. Paul before the gates of Damascus, when Christ in person said to him: "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" So, too, the bilocation of saints, sometimes read of in the pages of hagiography, as, e. g., in the case of St. Alphonsus Liguori, cannot be arbitrarily cast aside as untrustworthy. The Thomists and some later theologians, it is true, reject this kind of multilocation as intrinsically impossible and declare bilocation to be nothing more than an "apparition" without corporeal presence. But Cardinal De Lugo is of opinion, and justly so, that to deny its possibility might reflect unfavourably upon the Eucharistic multilocation itself. If there were question of the vagaries of many Nominalists, as, e. g., that a bilocated person could be living in Paris and at the same time dying in London, hating in Paris and at the same time loving in London, the impossibility would be as plain as day, since an individual, remaining such as he is, cannot be the subject of contrary propositions, since they exclude one another. The case assumes a different aspect, when wholly external contrary propositions, relating to position in space, are used in reference to the bilocated individual. In such a bilocation, which leaves the principle of contradiction intact, it would be hard to discover an intrinsic impossibility.

On the foregoing matter see WILDT, *Explanatio mirabilium, quæ divina potentia in Eucharistiæ Sacramento operatur* (Bonn, 1868); RAYNAUD, *Exuviæ panis et vini* in *Opera* (Lyons, 1665), VI, 419 sqq.; BILLUART, *De mente Ecclesiæ circa accidentia Eucharistiæ* (Liège, 1714); SALIER, *Historia scholastica de speciebus eucharisticis* (Lyons, 1687); LEIBNIZ, *Systema theol.* (Paris, 1819), xlviii sqq.; JOHN RICKABY, *General Metaphysics* (New York, 1890), 267 sqq.; UBAGHS, *Du Dynamisme dans ses rapports avec la Sainte Eucharistie* (Louvain, 1861); CIENFUÉGOS, *Vita abscondita sub speciebus velata* (Rome, 1728); *Zeitschrift für kathol. Theologie* (Innsbruck, 1894), pp. 108 sqq.; (1903), pp. 429 sqq.; (1904), pp. 486 sqq.; REINHOLD, *Die Lehre von der örtlichen Gegenwart Christi* (Vienna, 1893); SCHEEBEN, *Die Mysterien des Christentums* (Freiburg, 1898), §§ 69 sqq.; POHLE, *Dogmatik* (3rd ed., Paderborn, 1908), III, 247–73.

II. THE BLESSED EUCHARIST AS A SACRAMENT.—Since Christ is present under the appearances of bread and wine in a sacramental way, the Blessed Eucharist is unquestionably a sacrament of the Church. Indeed, in the Eucharist the definition of a Christian sacrament as "an outward sign of an inward grace instituted by Christ" is verified. The investigation into the precise nature of the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar, whose existence Protestants do not deny, is beset with a number of difficulties. Its essence certainly does not consist in the Consecration or the Communion, the former being merely the sacrificial action, the latter the reception of the sacrament, and not the sacrament itself. The question may eventually be reduced to this, whether or not the sacramentality is to be sought for in the Eucharistic species or in the Body and Blood of Christ hidden beneath them. The majority of theologians rightly respond to the query by saying, that neither the species themselves nor the Body and Blood of Christ by themselves, but the union of both factors constitute the moral whole of the Sacrament of the Altar. The species undoubtedly belong to the essence of the sacrament, since it is by means of them, and not by means of the invisible Body of Christ, that the Eucharist possesses the outward sign of the sacrament. Equally certain is it, that the Body and the Blood of Christ belong to the concept of the essence, because it is not the mere unsubstantial appearances which are given for the food of our souls, but Christ concealed beneath the appearances. The twofold number of the Eucharistic elements of bread and wine does not interfere with the unity of the sacrament; for the idea of refection embraces both eating and drinking, nor do our meals in consequence double their number. In the doctrine of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass (see MASS), there is a question of even a higher relation, in that the separated species of bread and wine also represent the mystical separation of Christ's Body and Blood or the unbloody Sacrifice of the Eucharistic Lamb. The Sacrament of the Altar may be regarded under the same aspects as the other sacraments, provided only it be ever kept in view that the Eucharist is a permanent sacrament [see above I, (4)]. Every sacrament may be considered either in itself or with reference to the persons whom it concerns. Passing over the Institution, which was discussed above in connexion with the words of Institution, the only essentially important points remaining are the outward sign (matter and form) and inward grace (effects of Communion), to which may be added the necessity of Communion for salvation. In regard to the persons concerned, we distinguish between the minister of the Eucharist and its recipient or subject.

(1) *The Matter or Eucharistic Elements.*—There are two Eucharistic elements, bread and wine, which constitute the remote matter of the Sacrament of the Altar, while the proximate matter can be none other than the Eucharistic appearances under which the Body and Blood of Christ are truly present.

(a) The first element is wheaten bread (*panis triticeus*), without which the "confection of the Sacrament does not take place" (Missale Romanum: De defectibus, §3). Being true bread, the Host must be baked, since mere flour is not bread. Since, moreover, the bread required is that formed of wheaten flour, not every kind of flour is allowed for validity, such, e. g., as is ground from rye, oats, barley, Indian corn or maize, though these are all botanically classified as grain (*frumentum*). On the other hand, the different varieties of wheat (as spelt, amel-corn, etc.) are valid, inasmuch as they can be proved botanically to be genuine wheat. The necessity of wheaten bread is deduced immediately from the words of Institution: "The Lord took bread" (*τὸν ἄρτον*), in connexion with which it may be remarked, that in Scripture *bread* (*ἄρτος*), without any qualifying addition, always signifies wheaten bread. No doubt, too, Christ adhered unconditionally to the Jewish custom of using only wheaten bread in the Passover Supper, and by the words, "Do this for a commemoration of me", commanded its use for all succeeding times. In addition to this, uninterrupted tradition, whether it be the testimony of the Fathers or the practice of the Church, shows wheaten bread to have played such an essential part, that even Protestants would be loath to regard rye bread or barley bread as a proper element for the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

The Church maintains an easier position in the controversy respecting the use of fermented or unfermented bread. By leavened bread (*fermentum, ζῦμος*) is meant such wheaten bread as requires leaven or yeast in its preparation and baking, while unleavened bread (*azyma, ἄζυμον*) is formed from a mixture of wheaten flour and water, which has been kneaded to dough and then baked. After the Greek

Patriarch Michael Cærularius of Constantinople had sought in 1053 to palliate the renewed rupture with Rome by means of the controversy concerning unleavened bread, the two Churches, in the Decree of Union at Florence, in 1439, came to the unanimous dogmatic decision, that the distinction between leavened and unleavened bread did not interfere with the confection of the sacrament, though for just reasons based upon the Church's discipline and practice, the Latins were obliged to retain unleavened bread, while the Greeks still held on to the use of leavened (cf. Denzinger, Enchirid., Freiburg, 1908, no. 692). Since the Schismatics had before the Council of Florence entertained doubts as to the validity of the Latin custom, a brief defence of the use of unleavened bread will not be out of place here. Pope Leo IX had as early as 1054 issued a protest against Michael Çærularius (cf. Migne, P. L., CXLIII, 775), in which he referred to the Scriptural fact, that according to the three Synoptics the Last Supper was celebrated "on the first day of the azymes" and so the custom of the Western Church received its solemn sanction from the example of Christ Himself. The Jews, moreover, were accustomed even the day before the fourteenth of Nisan to get rid of all the leaven which chanced to be in their dwellings, that so they might from that time on partake exclusively of the so-called *mazzoth* as bread. As regards tradition, it is not for us to settle the dispute of learned authorities, as to whether or not in the first six or eight centuries the Latins also celebrated Mass with leavened bread (Sirmond, Döllinger, Kraus) or have observed the present custom ever since the time of the Apostles (Mabillon, Probst). Against the Greeks it suffices to call attention to the historical fact that in the Orient the Maronites and Armenians have used unleavened bread from time immemorial, and that according to Origen (In Matt., XII, n. 6) the people of the East "sometimes", therefore not as a rule, made use of leavened bread in their Liturgy. Besides, there is considerable force in the theological argument that the fermenting process with yeast and other leaven, does not affect the substance of the bread, but merely its quality. The reasons of congruity advanced by the Greeks in behalf of leavened bread, which would have us consider it as a beautiful symbol of the hypostatic union, as well as an attractive representation of the savour of this heavenly Food, will be most willingly accepted, provided only that due consideration be given to the grounds of propriety set forth by the Latins with St. Thomas Aquinas (III, Q. lxxiv, a. 4) namely, the example of Christ, the aptitude of unleavened bread to be regarded as a symbol of the purity of His Sacred Body, free from all corruption of sin, and finally the instruction of St. Paul (I Cor., v, 8) to keep the Pasch "not with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth".

(b) The second Eucharistic element required is wine of the grape (*vinum de vite*). Hence are excluded as invalid, not only the juices extracted and prepared from other fruits (as cider and perry), but also the so-called artificial wines, even if their chemical constitution is identical with the genuine juice of the grape. The necessity of wine of the grape is not so much the result of the authoritative decision of the Church, as it is presupposed by her (Council of Trent, Sess. XIII, cap. iv), and is based upon the example and command of Christ, Who at the Last Supper certainly converted the natural wine of grapes into His Blood. This is deduced partly from the rite of the Passover, which required the head of the family to pass around the "cup of benediction" (*calix benedictionis*) containing the wine of grapes, partly, and especially, from the express declaration of Christ, that henceforth He would not drink of the "fruit of the vine" (*genimen vitis*). The Catholic Church is aware of no other tradition and in this respect she has ever been one with the Greeks. The ancient Hydroparastatæ, or Aquarians, who used water instead of wine, were heretics in her eyes. The counter-argument of Ad. Harnack ["Texte und Untersuchungen", new series, VII, 2 (1891), 115 sqq.], that the most ancient of Churches was indifferent as to the use of wine, and more concerned with the action of eating and drinking than with the elements of bread and wine, loses all its force in view not only of the earliest literature on the subject (the Didache, Ignatius, Justin, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Hippolytus, Tertullian, and Cyprian), but also of non-Catholic and apocryphal writings, which bear testimony to the use of bread and wine as the only and necessary elements of the Blessed Sacrament. On the other hand, a very ancient law of the Church which, however, has nothing to do with the validity of the sacrament, prescribes that a little water be added to the wine before the Consecration (Decr. pro Armenis: *aqua modicissima*), a practice, whose legitimacy the Council of Trent (Sess. XXII, can. ix) established under pain of anathema. The rigour of this law of the Church may be traced to the ancient custom of the Romans and Jews, who mixed water with the strong southern wines (see Prov., ix, 2), to the expression of *calix mixtus* found in Justin (Apol., I, lxv), Irenæus (Adv. hær., V, ii, 3), and Cyprian (Ep. lxiii, ad Cæcil., n. 13 sq.), and especially to the deep symbolical meaning contained in the mingling, inasmuch as thereby are represented the flowing of blood and water from the side of the Crucified Saviour and the intimate union of the faithful with Christ (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. XXII, cap. vii).

In this connexion, see GIESE, *Streitfrage über den Gebrauch der Azymen* (Münster, 1852); FUNK, *Die Abendmahlselemente bei Justin* in *Kirchengesch. Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen* (Paderborn, 1897), I, 278 sqq.; SCHEIWILER, *Die Elemente der Eucharistie in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (Mainz, 1903).

(2) *The Sacramental Form or the Words of Consecration.*—In proceeding to verify the form, which is always made up of words, we may start from the indubitable fact, that Christ did not consecrate by the mere fiat of His omnipotence, which found no expression in articulate utterance, but by pronouncing the words of Institution: "This is my body . . . this is my blood", and that by the addition: "Do this for a commemoration of me", He commanded the Apostles to follow His example. Were the words of Institution a mere declarative utterance of the conversion, which might have taken place in the "benediction" unannounced and articulately unexpressed, the Apostles and their successors would, according to Christ's example and mandate, have been obliged to consecrate in this mute manner also, a consequence which is altogether at variance with the deposit of faith. It is true, that Pope Innocent III (De Sacro altaris myst., IV, vi) before his elevation to the pontificate did hold the opinion, which later theologians branded as "temerarious", that Christ consecrated without words by means of the mere "benediction". Not many theologians, however, followed him in this regard, among the few being Ambrose Catharinus, Cheffontaines, and Hoppe, by far the greater number preferring to stand by the unanimous testimony of the Fathers. Meanwhile, Innocent III also insisted most urgently that at least in the case of the celebrating priest, the words of Institution were prescribed as the sacramental form. It was, moreover, not until its comparatively recent adherence in the seventeenth century to the famous "Confessio fidei orthodoxa" of Peter Mogilas (cf. Kimmel, "Monum. fidei eccl. orient.", Jena, 1850, I, p. 180), that the Schismatical Greek Church adopted the view, according to which the priest does not at all consecrate by virtue of the words of Institution, but only by means of the Epiklesis occurring shortly after them and expressing in the Oriental Liturgies a petition to the Holy Spirit, "that the bread and wine may be converted into the Body and Blood of Christ"

Were the Greeks justified in maintaining this position, the immediate result would be, that the Latins who have no such thing as the Epiklesis in their present Liturgy, would possess neither the true Sacrifice of the Mass nor the Holy Eucharist. Fortunately, however, the Greeks can be shown the error of their ways from their own writings, since it can be proved, that they themselves formerly placed the form of Transubstantiation in the words of Institution. Not only did such renowned Fathers as Justin (Apol., I, lxvi), Irenæus (Adv. hær., V, ii, 3), Gregory of Nyssa (Or. catech., xxxvii), Chrysostom (Hom. i, de prod. Judæ, n. 6), and John Damascene (De fid. orth., IV, xiii) hold this view, but the ancient Greek Liturgies bear testimony to it, so that Cardinal Bessarion in 1439 at Florence called the attention of his fellow-countrymen to the fact, that as soon as the words of Institution have been pronounced, supreme homage and adoration are due to the Holy Eucharist, even though the famous Epiklesis follows some time after.

The objection that the mere historical recitation of the words of Institution taken from the narrative of the Last Supper possesses no intrinsic consecratory force, would be well founded, did the priest of the Latin Church merely intend by means of them to narrate some historical event rather than pronounce them with the practical purpose of effecting the conversion, or if he pronounced them in his own name and person instead of the Person of Christ, whose minister and instrumental cause he is. Neither of the two suppositions holds in the case of a priest who really intends to celebrate Mass. Hence, though the Greeks may in the best of faith go on erroneously maintaining that they consecrate exclusively in their Epiklesis, they do, nevertheless, as in the case of the Latins, actually consecrate by means of the words of Institution contained in their Liturgies, if Christ has instituted these words as the words of Consecration and the form of the sacrament. We may in fact go a step farther and assert, that the words of Institution constitute the only and wholly adequate form of the Eucharist and that, consequently, the words of the Epiklesis possess no inherent consecratory value. The contention that the words of the Epiklesis have a joint essential value and constitute the partial form of the sacrament, was indeed supported by individual Latin theologians, as Toutée, Renaudot, and Lebrun. Though this opinion cannot be condemned as erroneous in faith, since it allows to the words of Institution their essential, though partial, consecratory value, it appears nevertheless to be intrinsically repugnant. For, since the act of Consecration cannot remain, as it were, in a state of suspense, but is completed in an instant of time, there arises the dilemma: Either the words of Institution alone and, therefore, not the Epiklesis, are productive of the conversion, or the words of the Epiklesis alone have such power and not the words of Institution. Of more considerable importance is the circumstance that the whole question came up for discussion in the council for union held at Florence in 1439. Pope Eugene IV urged the Greeks to come to a unanimous agreement with the Roman faith and subscribe to the words of Institution as alone constituting the sacramental form, and to drop the contention that the words of the Epiklesis also possessed a partial consecratory force. But when the Greeks, not without foundation, pleaded that a dogmatic decision would reflect with shame upon their whole ecclesiastical past, the œcumenical synod was satisfied with the oral declaration of Cardinal Bessarion recorded in the minutes of the council for 5 July, 1439 (P. G., CLXI, 491), namely, that the Greeks follow the universal teaching of the Fathers, especially of "blessed John Chrysostom, familiarly known to us", according to whom the "Divine words of Our Redeemer contain the full and entire force of Transubstantiation".

The venerable antiquity of the Oriental Epiklesis, its peculiar position in the Canon of the Mass, and its interior spiritual unction, oblige the theologian to determine its dogmatic value and to account for its use. Take, for instance, the Epiklesis of the Ethiopian Liturgy: "We implore and beseech Thee, O Lord, to send forth the Holy Spirit and His Power upon this Bread and Chalice and convert them into the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ." Since this prayer always follows after the words of Institution have been pronounced, the theological question arises, as to how it may be made to harmonize with the words of Christ, which alone possess the consecratory power. Two explanations have been suggested, which, however, can be merged in one. The first view considers the Epiklesis to be a mere declaration of the fact, that the conversion has already taken place, and that in the conversion just as essential a part is to be attributed to the Holy Spirit as Co-Consecrator as in the allied mystery of the Incarnation. Since, however, because of the brevity of the actual instant of conversion, the part taken by the Holy Spirit could not be expressed, the Epiklesis takes us back in imagination to the precious moment and regards the Consecration as just about to occur. A similar purely psychological retrospective transfer is met with in other portions of the Liturgy, as in the Mass for the Dead, wherein the Church prays for the departed as if they were still upon their bed of agony and could still be rescued from the gates of hell. Thus considered, the Epiklesis refers us back to the Consecration as the centre about which all the significance contained in its words revolves. A second explanation is based, not upon the enacted Consecration, but upon the approaching Communion, inasmuch as the latter, being the effective means of uniting us more closely in the organized body of the Church, brings forth in our hearts the mystical Christ, as is read in the Roman Canon of the Mass: "Ut *nobis* corpus et sanguis fiat", i. e. that it may be made *for us* the body and blood. It was in this purely mystical manner that the Greeks themselves explained the meaning of the Epiklesis at the Council of Florence (Mansi, Collect. Concil., XXXI 106). Yet since much more is contained in the plain words than this true and deep mysticism, it is desirable to combine both explanations into one, and so we may regard the Epiklesis, both in point of liturgy and of time, as the significant connecting link, placed midway between the Consecration and the Communion in order to emphasize the part taken by the Holy Spirit in the Consecration of bread and wine, and, on the other hand, with the help of the same Holy Spirit to obtain the realization of the true Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ by their fruitful effects on both priest and people.

On the subject-matter of the foregoing section, see Orsi, *De invocatione S. Spiritus in Liturgiis Græcis et orientalibus* (Milan, 1731); Hoppe, *Die Epiklesis der griechischen und orientalischen Liturgie* (Schaffhausen, 1864); Franz, *Die eucharistische Wandlung und die Epiklese* (Würzburg, 1880); Scheeben, *Mysterien des Christentums* (Freiburg, 1898), pp. 449 sqq.; *Innsbrucker Zeitschrift für kathol. Theologie* (1896), pp. 743 sqq.; (1897), pp. 51 sqq.; Semeria, *La Messa nella sua storia e nei suoi simboli* (Rome, 1904), 153 sqq.

(3) *The Effects of the Holy Eucharist.*—The doctrine of the Church regarding the effects or the fruits of Holy Communion centres around two ideas: (a) the union with Christ by love and (b) the spiritual repast of the soul. Both ideas are often verified in one and the same effect of Holy Communion.

(a) The first and principal effect of the Holy Eucharist is union with Christ by love (Decr. pro Armenis: *adunatio ad Christum*), which union as such does not consist in the sacramental reception of the Host, but in the spiritual and mystical union with Jesus by the theological virtue of love. Christ Himself designated the idea of Communion as a union by love: "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my

blood, abideth in me, and I in him" (John, vi, 57). St. Cyril of Alexandria (Hom. in Joan., IV, xvii) beautifully represents this mystical union as the fusion of our being into that of the God-man, as "when melted wax is fused with other wax". Since the Sacrament of Love is not satisfied with an increase of habitual love only, but tends especially to fan the flame of actual love to an intense ardour, the Holy Eucharist is specifically distinguished from the other sacraments, and hence it is precisely in this lattef effect that Suarez recognizes the so-called "grace of the sacrament", which otherwise is so hard to discern. It stands to reason that the essence of this union by love consists neither in a natural union with Jesus analogous to that between soul and body, nor in a hypostatic union of the soul with the Person of the Word, nor finally in a pantheistical deification of the communicant, but simply in a moral but wonderful union with Christ by the bond of the most ardent charity. Hence the chief effect of a worthy Communion is to a certain extent a foretaste of heaven, in fact the anticipation and pledge of our future union with God by love in the Beatific Vision. He alone can properly estimate the precious boon which Catholics possess in the Holy Eucharist, who knows how to ponder these ideas of Holy Communion to their utmost depth. The immediate result of this union with Christ by love is the bond of charity existing between the faithful themselves, as St. Paul says: "For we, being many, are one bread, one body, all that partake of one bread" (I Cor., x, 17). And so the Communion of Saints is not merely an ideal union by faith and grace, but an eminently real union, mysteriously constituted, maintained, and guaranteed by partaking in common of one and the same Christ.

(b) A second fruit of this union with Christ by love is an increase of sanctifying grace in the soul of the worthy communicant. Here let it be remarked at the outset, that the Holy Eucharist does not *per se* constitute a person in the state of grace as do the sacraments of the dead (baptism and penance), but presupposes such a state. It is, therefore, one of the sacraments of the living. It is as impossible for the soul in the state of mortal sin to receive this Heavenly Bread with profit, as it is for a corpse to assimilate food and drink. Hence the Council of Trent (Sess. XIII, can. v), in opposition to Luther and Calvin, purposely defined, that the "chief fruit of the Eucharist does not consist in the forgiveness of sins". For though Christ said of the Chalice: "This is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins" (Matt., xxvi, 28), He had in view an effect of the sacrifice, not of the sacrament; for He did not say that His Blood would be drunk unto remission of sins, but shed for that purpose. It is for this very reason that St. Paul (I Cor., xi, 28) demands that rigorous "self-examination", in order to avoid the heinous offence of being guilty of the Body and the Blood of the Lord by "eating and drinking unworthily", and that the Fathers insist upon nothing so energetically as upon a pure and innocent conscience. In spite of the principles just laid down, the question might be asked, if the Blessed Sacrament could not at times *per accidens* free the communicant from mortal sin, if he approached the Table of the Lord unconscious of the sinful state of his soul. Presupposing what is self-evident, that there is question neither of a conscious sacrilegious Communion nor a lack of imperfect contrition (*attritio*), which would altogether hinder the justifying effect of the sacrament, theologians incline to the opinion, that in such exceptional cases the Eucharist can restore the soul to the state of grace, but all without exception deny the possibility of the reviviscence of a sacrilegious or unfruitful Communion after the restoration of the soul's proper moral condition has been effected, the Eucharist being different in this respect from the sacraments which imprint a character upon the soul (baptism, confirmation, and Holy orders). Together with the increase of sanctifying grace there is associated another effect, namely, a certain spiritual relish or delight of soul (*delectatio spiritualis*). Just as food and drink delight and refresh the heart of man, so does this "Heavenly Bread containing within itself all sweetness" produce in the soul of the devout communicant ineffable bliss, which, however, is not to be confounded with an emotional joy of the soul or with sensible sweetness. Although both may occur as the result of a special grace, its true nature is manifested in a certain cheerful and willing fervour in all that regards Christ and His Church, and in the conscious fulfilment of the duties of one's state of life, a disposition of soul which is perfectly compatible with interior desolation and spiritual dryness. A good Communion is recognized less in the transitory sweetness of the emotions than in its lasting practical effects on the conduct of our daily lives.

(c) Though Holy Communion does not *per se* remit mortal sin, it has nevertheless the third effect of "blotting out venial sin and preserving the soul from mortal sin" (Council of Trent, Sess. XIII, cap. ii). The Holy Eucharist is not merely a food, but a medicine as well. The destruction of venial sin and of all affection to it, is readily understood on the basis of the two central ideas mentioned above. Just as material food banishes minor bodily weaknesses and preserves man's physical strength from being impaired, so does this food of our souls remove our lesser spiritual ailments and preserve us from spiritual death. As a union based upon love, the Holy Eucharist cleanses with its purifying flame the smallest stains which adhere to the soul, and at the same time serves as an effective prophylactic against grievous sin. It only remains for us to ascertain with clearness the manner in which this preservative influence against relapse into mortal sin is exerted. According to the teaching of the Roman Catechism, it is effected by the allaying of concupiscence, which is the chief source of deadly sin, particularly of impurity. Therefore it is that spiritual writers recommend frequent Communion as the most effective remedy against impurity, since its powerful influence is felt even after other means have proved unavailing (cf. St. Thomas, III, Q. lxxix, a. 6). Whether or not the Holy Eucharist is directly conducive to the remission of the temporal punishment due to sin, is disputed by St. Thomas (ibid., a. 5), since the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar was not instituted as a means of satisfaction; it does, however, produce an indirect effect in this regard, which is proportioned to the communicant's love and devotion. The case is different as regards the effects of grace in behalf of a third party. The pious custom of the faithful of "offering their Communion" for relations, friends, and the souls departed, is to be considered as possessing unquestionable value, in the first place, because an earnest prayer of petition in the presence of the Spouse of our souls will readily find a hearing, and then, because the fruits of Communion as a means of satisfaction for sin may be applied to a third person, and especially *per modum suffragii* to the souls in purgatory.

(d) As a last effect we may mention that the Eucharist is the "pledge of our glorious resurrection and eternal happiness" (Council of Trent, Sess. XIII, cap. ii), according to the promise of Christ: "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life: and I will raise him up on the last day." Hence the chief reason why the ancient Fathers, as Ignatius (Ephes., 20), Irenæus (Adv. haer., IV, xviii, 4), and Tertullian (De resurr. carn., viii), as well as later patristic writers, insisted so strongly upon our future resurrection, was the circumstance that it is the door by which we enter upon unending happiness. There can be nothing incongruous or improper in the fact that the body also shares in this effect of Communion, since by its physical contact with the Eucharistic species,

and hence (indirectly) with the living Flesh of Christ, it acquires a moral right to its future resurrection, even as the Blessed Mother of God, inasmuch as she was the former abode of the Word made flesh, acquired a moral claim to her own bodily assumption into heaven. The further discussion as to whether some "physical quality" (Contenson) or a "sort of germ of immortality" (Heimbucher) is implanted in the body of the communicant, has no sufficient foundation in the teaching of the Fathers and may, therefore, be dismissed without any injury to dogma.

See DALGAIRNS, *The Holy Communion, its Philosophy, Theology and Practice* (Dublin, 1861, and many later editions); HEIMBUCHER, *Wirkungen der hl. Kommunion* (Ratisbon, 1884); LOHRUM, *Die sakramentalen Wirkungen der Eucharistie* (Mainz, 1886); BELLAMY, *Les effets de la Communion* (Paris, 1900); RADEMACHER, *Die übernatürl. Lebensordnung nach der paulinischen und johanneischen Theologie* (Freiburg, 1903), 230 sqq.

(4) *The Necessity of the Holy Eucharist for Salvation.*—We distinguish two kinds of necessity, (1) the necessity of means (*necessitas medii*) and (2) the necessity of precept (*necessitas præcepti*). In the first sense a thing or action is necessary because without it a given end cannot be attained; the eye, e. g. is necessary for vision. The second sort of necessity is that which is imposed by the free will of a superior, e. g. the necessity of fasting. As regards Communion a further distinction must be made between infants and adults. It is easy to prove that in the case of infants Holy Communion is not necessary to salvation, either as a means or as of precept. Since they have not as yet attained to the use of reason, they are free from the obligation of positive laws; consequently, the only question is whether Communion is, like Baptism, necessary for them as a means of salvation. Now the Council of Trent under pain of anathema, solemnly rejects such a necessity (Sess. XXI, can. iv) and declares that the custom of the primitive Church of giving Holy Communion to children was not based upon the erroneous belief of its necessity to salvation, but upon the circumstances of the times (Sess. XXI, cap. iv). Since according to St. Paul's teaching (Rom., viii, 1) there is "no condemnation" for those who have been baptized, every child that dies in its baptismal innocence, even without Communion, must go straight to heaven. This latter position was that usually taken by the Fathers, with the exception of St. Augustine, who from the universal custom of the Communion of children drew the conclusion of its necessity for salvation (see COMMUNION OF CHILDREN). On the other hand, Communion is prescribed for adults, not only by the law of the Church, but also by a Divine command (John, vi, 50 sqq.), though for its absolute necessity as a means to salvation there is no more evidence than in the case of infants. For such a necessity could be established only on the supposition that Communion *per se* constituted a person in the state of grace or that this state could not be preserved without Communion. Neither supposition is correct. Not the first, for the simple reason that the Blessed Eucharist, being a sacrament of the living, presupposes the state of sanctifying grace; not the second, because in case of necessity, such as might arise, e. g., in a long sea-voyage, the Eucharistic graces may be supplied by actual graces. It is only when viewed in this light that we can understand how the primitive Church, without going counter to the Divine command, withheld the Eucharist from certain sinners even on their deathbeds. There is, however, a moral necessity on the part of adults to receive Holy Communion, as a means, for instance, of overcoming violent temptation, or as a viaticum for persons in danger of death. Eminent divines, like Suarez, claim that the Eucharist, if not absolutely necessary, is at least a relatively and morally necessary means to salvation, in the sense that no adult can long sustain his spiritual, supernatural life who neglects on principle to approach Holy Communion. This view is supported, not only by the solemn and earnest words of Christ, when He promised the Eucharist, and by the very nature of the sacrament as the spiritual food and medicine of our souls, but also by the fact of the helplessness and perversity of human nature and by the daily experience of confessors and directors of souls.

Since Christ has left us no definite precept as to the frequency with which He desired us to receive Him in Holy Communion, it belongs to the Church to determine the Divine command more accurately and prescribe what the limits of time shall be for the reception of the sacrament. In the course of centuries the Church's discipline in this respect has undergone considerable change. Whereas the early Christians were accustomed to receive at every celebration of the Liturgy, which probably was not celebrated daily in all places, or were in the habit of Communicating privately in their own homes every day of the week, a falling-off in the frequency of Communion is noticeable since the fourth century. Even in his time Pope Fabian (236–250) made it obligatory to approach the Holy Table three times a year, viz. at Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost, and this custom was still prevalent in the sixth century [cf. Synod of Agde (506), c. xviii]. Although St. Augustine left daily Communion to the free choice of the individual, his admonition, in force even at the present day, was: *Sic vive, ut quotidie possis sumere* (De dono persev., c. xiv), i. e. "So live, that you may receive every day." From the tenth to the thirteenth century, the practice of going to Communion more frequently during the year was rather rare among the laity and obtained only in cloistered communities. St. Bonaventure reluctantly allowed the lay brothers of his monastery to approach the Holy Table weekly, whereas the rule of the Canons of Chrodegang prescribed this practice. When the Fourth Council of Lateran (1215), held under Innocent III, mitigated the former severity of the Church's law to the extent that all Catholics of both sexes were to communicate at least once a year, and this during the paschal season, St. Thomas (III, Q. lxxx, a. 10) ascribed this ordinance chiefly to the "reign of impiety and the growing cold of charity". The precept of the yearly paschal Communion was solemnly reiterated by the Council of Trent (Sess. XIII, can. ix). The mystical theologians of the later Middle Ages, as Eckhart, Tauler, St. Vincent Ferrer, Savonarola, and later on St. Philip Neri, the Jesuit Order, St. Francis de Sales, and St. Alphonsus Liguori were zealous champions of frequent Communion; whereas the Jansenists, under the leadership of Antoine Arnauld (De la fréquente communion, Paris, 1643), strenuously opposed them and demanded as a condition for every Communion the "most perfect penitential dispositions and the purest love of God". This rigorism was condemned by Pope Alexander VIII (7 Dec., 1690); the Council of Trent (Sess. XIII, cap. viii; Sess. XXII, cap. vi) and Innocent XI (12 Feb., 1679) had already emphasized the permissibility of even daily Communion. To root out the last vestiges of Jansenistic rigorism, Pius X issued a decree (24 Dec., 1905) wherein he allows and recommends daily Communion to the entire laity and requires but two conditions for its permissibility, namely, the state of grace and a right and pious intention. Concerning the non-requirement of the twofold species as a means necessary to salvation see COMMUNION UNDER BOTH KINDS.

See HOFFMANN, *Geschichte der Laienkommunion bis zum Tridentinum* (Speyer, 1891); BEHRINGER, *Die hl. Kommunion in ihren Wirkungen und ihrer Heilsnotwendigkeit* (Ratisbon, 1898); BASTIEN, *De frequenti quotidianâque Communione* (Rome, 1907).

(5) *The Minister of the Eucharist.*—The Eucharist being a permanent sacrament, and the confection (*confectio*) and reception (*susceptio*) thereof being separated from each other by an interval of time, the minister may be and in fact is twofold: (a) the minister of consecration and (b) the minister of administration.

(a) In the early Christian Era the Peputians, Collyridians, and Montanists attributed priestly powers even to women (cf. Epiphanius, De hær., xlix, 79); and in the Middle Ages the Albigenses and Waldenses ascribed the power to consecrate to every layman of upright disposition. Against these errors the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) confirmed the ancient Catholic teaching, that "no one but the priest [*sacerdos*], regularly ordained according to the keys of the Church, has the power of consecrating this sacrament". Rejecting the hierarchical distinction between the priesthood and the laity, Luther later on declared, in accord with his idea of a "universal priesthood" (cf. I Peter, ii, 5), that every layman was qualified, as the appointed representative of the faithful, to consecrate the Sacrament of the Eucharist. The Council of Trent opposed this teaching of Luther, and not only confirmed anew the existence of a "special priesthood" (Sess. XXIII, can. i), but authoritatively declared that "Christ ordained the Apostles true priests and commanded them as well as other priests to offer His Body and Blood in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass" (Sess. XXII, can. ii). By this decision it was also declared that the power of consecrating and that of offering the Holy Sacrifice are identical. Both ideas are mutually reciprocal. To the category of "priests" (*sacerdos*, *ἱερεύς*) belong, according to the teaching of the Church, only bishops and priests; deacons, subdeacons, and those in minor orders are excluded from this dignity.

Scripturally considered, the necessity of a special priesthood with the power of validly consecrating is derived from the fact that Christ did not address the words, "Do this", to the whole mass of the laity, but exclusively to the Apostles and their successors in the priesthood; hence the latter alone can validly consecrate. It is evident that tradition has understood the mandate of Christ in this sense and in no other. We learn from the writings of Justin, Origen, Cyprian, Augustine, and others, as well as from the most ancient Liturgies, that it was always the bishops and priests, and they alone, who appeared as the properly constituted celebrants of the Eucharistic Mysteries, and that the deacons merely acted as assistants in these functions, while the faithful participated passively therein. When in the fourth century the abuse crept in of priests receiving Holy Communion at the hands of deacons, the First Council of Nicæa (325) issued a strict prohibition to the effect, that "they who offer the Holy Sacrifice shall not receive the Body of the Lord from the hands of those who have no such power of offering", because such a practice is contrary to "rule and custom". The sect of the Luciferians was founded by an apostate deacon named Hilary, and possessed neither bishops nor priests; wherefore St. Jerome concluded (Dial. adv. Lucifer., n. 21), that for want of celebrants they no longer retained the Eucharist. It is clear that the Church has always denied the laity the power to consecrate. When the Arians accused St. Athanasius (d. 373) of sacrilege, because supposedly at his bidding the consecrated Chalice had been destroyed during the Mass which was being celebrated by a certain Ischares, they had to withdraw their charges as wholly untenable when it was proved that Ischares had been invalidly ordained by a pseudo-bishop named Colluthos and, therefore, could neither validly consecrate nor offer the Holy Sacrifice.

(b) The dogmatic interest which attaches to the minister of administration or distribution is not so great, for the reason that the Eucharist being a permanent sacrament, any communicant having the proper dispositions could receive it validly, whether he did so from the hand of a priest, or layman, or woman. Hence the question is concerned, not with the validity, but with the liceity of administration. In this matter the Church alone has the right to decide, and her regulations regarding the Communion rite may vary according to the circumstances of the times. In general it is of Divine right, that the laity should as a rule receive only from the consecrated hand of the priest (cf. Trent, Sess. XIII, cap. viii). The practice of the laity giving themselves Holy Communion was formerly, and is to-day, allowed only in case of necessity. In ancient Christian times it was customary for the faithful to take the Blessed Sacrament to their homes and Communicate privately, a practice (Tertullian, Ad uxor., II, v), to which, even as late as the fourth century, St. Basil makes reference (Ep. xciii, ad Cæsariam). Up to the ninth century, it was usual for the priest to place the Sacred Host in the right hand of the recipient, who kissed it and then transferred it to his own mouth; women, from the fourth century onward, were required in this ceremony to have a cloth wrapped about their right hand. The Precious Blood was in early times received directly from the Chalice, but in Rome the practice, after the eighth century, was to receive it through a small tube (*fistula*); at present this is observed only in the pope's Mass. The latter method of drinking the Chalice spread to other localities, in particular to the Cistercian monasteries, where the practice was partially continued into the eighteenth century.

Whereas the priest is both by Divine and ecclesiastical right the ordinary dispenser (*minister ordinarius*) of the sacrament, the deacon is by virtue of his order the extraordinary minister (*minister extraordinarius*), yet he may not administer the sacrament except *ex delegatione*, i. e. with the permission of the bishop or priest. As has already been mentioned above, the deacons were accustomed in the Early Church to take the Blessed Sacrament to those who were absent from Divine service, as well as to present the Chalice to the laity during the celebration of the Sacred Mysteries (cf. Cyprian, De lapsis, nn. 17, 25), and this practice was observed until Communion under both kinds was discontinued. In St. Thomas's time (III, Q. lxxxii, a. 3), the deacons were allowed to administer only the Chalice to the laity, and in case of necessity the Sacred Host also, at the bidding of the bishop or priest. After the Communion of the laity under the species of wine had been abolished, the deacon's powers were more and more restricted. According to a decision of the Sacred Congregation of Rites (25 Feb., 1777), still in force, the deacon is to administer Holy Communion only in case of necessity and with the approval of his bishop or his pastor. (Cf. Funk, "Der Kommunionritus" in his "Kirchengeschichtl. Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen", Paderborn, 1897, I, pp. 293 sqq.; see also "Theol. praktische Quartalschrift", Linz, 1906, LIX, 95 sqq.)

(6) *The Recipient of the Eucharist.*—The two conditions of objective capacity (*capacitas*, *aptitudo*) and subjective worthiness (*dignitas*) must be carefully distinguished. Only the former is of dogmatic interest, while the latter is treated in moral theology (see Communion and Communion of the Sick). The first requisite of aptitude or capacity is that the recipient be a "human being", since it was for mankind only that Christ instituted this Eucharistic food of souls and commanded its reception. This condition excludes not only irrational animals, but angels also; for neither possess human souls, which alone can be nourished by this food unto eternal life. The expression "Bread of Angels" (Ps. lxxvii, 25) is a mere metaphor, which indicates that in the Beatific Vision where He is not concealed under the sacramental veils, the angels spiritually feast upon the God-man, this same prospect being held out to those who shall gloriously rise on the Last Day. The second requisite, the immediate deduction from the first, is that the recipient be still in the "state of pilgrimage" to the next life (*status viatoris*), since it is only in the present life that man can validly Communicate. Exaggerating the Eucharist's necessity as a means to salvation, Rosmini advanced the untenable opinion that at the moment of death

this heavenly food is supplied in the next world to children who had just departed this life, and that Christ could have given Himself in Holy Communion to the holy souls in Limbo, in order to "render them apt for the vision of God". This evidently impossible view, together with other propositions of Rosmini, was condemned by Leo XIII (14 Dec., 1887). In the fourth century the Synod of Hippo (393) forbade the practice of giving Holy Communion to the dead as a gross abuse, and assigned as a reason, that "corpses were no longer capable of eating". Later synods, as those of Auxerre (578) and the Trullan (692), took very energetic measures to put a stop to a custom so difficult to eradicate. The third requisite, finally, is baptism, without which no other sacrament can be validly received; for in its very concept baptism is the "spiritual door" to the means of grace contained in the Church. A Jew or Mohammedan might, indeed, materially receive the Sacred Host, but there could be no question in this case of a sacramental reception, even though by a perfect act of contrition or of the pure love of God he had put himself in the state of sanctifying grace. Hence in the Early Church the catechumens were strictly excluded from the Eucharist. (Cf. Schanz, Die Lehre von den hl. Sakramenten der Kirche, Freiburg, 1893, sect. 35.)

The literature on the subject of the Eucharist is very extensive; hence only the most important works are cited here. The special literature on the subject has been indicated in connexion with the various subdivisions of this article. Concerning the Eucharistic Sacrifice, see MASS. Conspicuous among the Schoolmen are: ALBERT THE GREAT, *De SS. Corpore Domini sermones*, ed. JACOB (Ratisbon, 1893); ST. THOMAS AQUINAS, *Summa theol.*, III, QQ. lxxiii sqq., and *Opuscul.* xxxvii, ed. DE MARIA, vol. III, pp. 460 sqq. (Città di Castello, 1886). See also the commentators on St. Thomas, e. g. BILLUART, *Summa S. Thomæ* (ed. LEQUETTE), VI, 382 sqq. The following are valuable even at the present day: BELLARMINE, *Controversiæ de sacramento Eucharistiæ*, ed. FÈVRE (Paris, 1873), VI; DE LUGO, *De venerabili Eucharistiæ sacramento*, ed. FOURNIALS (Paris, 1892), III and IV; DUPERRON, *Traité du sacrement de l' Eucharistie* (Paris, 1620). Among later writers, see ROCK, *The Church of Our Fathers;* WISEMAN, *Lectures on the Real Presence* (London, 1842); BRIDGETT, *The Holy Eucharist in Great Britain* (London, 1881; new illustrated edition with valuable notes by THURSTON, London, 1908); HEDLEY, *The Holy Eucharist*, in *The Westminster Library* (London, 1907); HIRST, *On the Origin of the Exposition of the Bl. Sacrament* in *The Month* (1890), pp. 68, 86–96; DUCHESNE, *Origines du Culte chrétien*, tr. MCCLURE, *Christian Worship* (see fourth ed. of French original, Paris, 1908); SALMON, *The Ancient Irish Church* (Dublin, 1897), contains good bibliography; MORAN, *Essays on the Origin, Doctrines and Discipline of the Early Irish Church* (Dublin, 1864); WARREN, *The Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church* (Oxford, 1881); JOURDAIN, *La s. Eucharistie, Somme de Théologie et Prédication eucharistiques* (4 vols., Paris, 1897); CAPPELLAZZI, *L'Eucaristia come sacramento e come sacrificio* (Turin, 1898). Latin monographs: ROSSET, *De Eucharistiæ mysterio* (Ratisbon, 1886); FRANZELIN, *De ss. Eucharistiæ sacramento et sacrificio* (Rome, 1887); EINIG, *De ss. Eucharistiæ mysterio* (Trier, 1888); GASPARRI, *Tract. canonicus de ss. Eucharistiâ* (2 vols., Paris, 1897); LAHOUSSE, *Tract. Dogmatico-moralis de ss. Eucharistiæ mysterio* (Bruges, 1899). To these may be added the numerous textbooks of dogma, as: BILLOT, *De Ecclesiæ sacramentis* (Rome, 1893), I; HEINRICH-GUTBERLET, *Dogmatische Theologie* (Mainz, 1901), IX; GIHR, *Die hl. Sakramente der kathol. Kirche* (Freiburg, 1902), I; SCHEEBEN-ATZBERGER, *Handbuch der kathol. Dogmatik* (Freiburg, 1901), IV; POHLE, *Lehrbuch der Dogmatik* (Paderborn, 1908), III. Much material may be had from the following: CABROL AND LECLERCQ, *Monumenta Ecclesiæ liturgica;* SMITH, *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities;* VACANT AND MANGENOT, *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* (Paris, 1903—); SCHMID in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Altarssacrament.*

J. POHLE.

Eucharist, EARLY SYMBOLS OF THE.—Among the symbols employed by the Christians of the first ages in decorating their tombs, those which relate to the Eucharist hold a place of the first importance. The monuments of greatest consequence on which these symbols are depicted exist, principally, in the subterranean cemeteries of early Christian Rome, better known as the Roman catacombs (see CATACOMBS, ROMAN; CEMETERY, *Early Roman Christian Cemeteries*). Their discovery and reopening in the latter half of the nineteenth century have thrown great light on more or less obscure allusions in early Christian literature. In this way Catholic theology now possesses supplementary information of appreciable value bearing on the belief in, and the manner of celebrating, the Eucharist in the sub-Apostolic age. According to Wilpert, an expert scholar in this field of Christian archæology, the symbolic representations of the catacombs which refer to the Eucharist form three groups, inspired by three of Christ's miracles, namely the miraculous multiplication of the loaves and fishes, the banquet of the seven Disciples by the Sea of Galilee after the Resurrection, and the miracle of Cana. It is to the first two of these miracles, probably, that we owe the famous fish symbol, which briefly summed up the chief articles of the Christian belief (see FISH, SYMBOLISM OF THE). The earliest and always the favourite symbol of the Eucharist in the monuments was that inspired by the miracle of the multiplication of the loaves and fishes; the banquet of the seven Disciples appears only in one (second-century) catacomb scene; the miracle of Cana in two, one of which is of the early third, the other of the fourth, century.

I. THE MIRACLE OF THE MULTIPLICATION.—On two occasions Christ fed with loaves and fishes, miraculously multiplied, a large concourse of people who had followed Him into the desert. On the first of these occasions, recorded by all four Evangelists, five loaves and two fishes supplied the needs of five thousand people, while on the second occasion, mentioned only by St. Matthew (xv, 32 sq.), seven loaves and a "few" fishes more than sufficed for four thousand persons. In accordance with the practice of depicting only those features which were necessary to convey the meaning of a symbol, the Christian artists of the catacombs represented the miraculous multiplication as a banquet, in which the guests are seen partaking of a repast of loaves and fishes. In frescoes of this category, the source of the artist's inspiration is clearly indicated by the baskets of fragments on the right and left of the banquet scene. The number of baskets represented is not always historical, this being regarded as a matter of indifference so far as the symbol was concerned; six Eucharistic frescoes show each seven baskets, but in three others the number is two, eight, and twelve, respectively. The number of guests in all symbolical repasts of the Eucharist is invariably seven, a peculiarity which Wilpert regards as due to the early Christian fondness for the symbolism of numbers. According to St. Augustine (Tract. cxxiii, in Joan.), the number seven represented the totality of the Christian world. The most ancient representations of the Eucharist in the catacombs is the fresco known as the "Fractio Panis", an ornament of the Capella Greca, in the cemetery of St. Priscilla. Wilpert attributes this, with other paintings of that chapel, to the early part of the second century, and his opinion is generally accepted. The scene represents seven persons at table, reclining on a semicircular divan, and is depicted on the wall above the apse of this little underground chapel, consequently in close proximity to the place where once stood the altar. One of the banqueters is a woman. The place of honour, to the right (*in cornu dextro*), is occupied by the "president of the Brethren" (described about 150–155 by Justin Martyr in his account of the Christian worship), i. e. the bishop, or a priest deputed in his place for the occasion (Apol., I, lxvi). The "president" (προεστώς), a venerable, bearded personage is depicted performing the function described in the Acts of the Apostles (ii, 42, 46; xx, 7) as "breaking bread"; hence the name "Fractio Panis" (ἡ κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου), appropriately given to the fresco by its discoverer. It is to be noted that these words are frequently used in the earliest non-inspired Christian literature as a synonym for the Eucharist (for the texts see Wilpert, Fractio Panis, Freiburg, 1895). The moment represented, therefore, is that immediately before the Communion, when the celebrant, then

as now, divided the Sacred Host. And, as though to exclude all doubt as to the character of his subject, the artist added a detail found in no other representation of the Eucharist; in front of the celebrant he placed a two-handled cup, evidently the chalice (*calix ministerialis*) of the second century. Such is the earliest representation in Christian art of the offering of the Mass. A recent writer regards the scene as representing the celebration of the Eucharist in connexion with the funeral agape on the anniversary of some person interred in the chapel. The guests partaking of the banquet, in this view, represent the relations of the deceased assisting at an anniversary Mass (*sacrificium pro dormitione*) for the repose of his soul (Wieland, Mensa und Confessio, p. 139). In addition to these unique details showing a real celebration of the Mass in the early second century, the author of this fresco depicted, side by side with the reality, a symbol of the Eucharist. In the centre of the table are two plates, one containing five loaves, the other two fishes, while on the right and left of the divan seven baskets of bread are distributed symmetrically.

After the "Fractio Panis" the most remarkable frescoes in which the miraculous multiplication is employed as a symbol of the Eucharist are two in the crypt of Lucina, the most ancient part of the catacomb of St. Callistus. Each consists of a fish and a basket of bread on a green field. At first view it would seem as though the fishes were represented each carrying a basket of bread, in the act of swimming. A closer examination of the frescoes made by Wilpert, however, has shown that the baskets are placed very close to, but not on, the fishes, and that the supposed blue surface is really green. The subject, therefore, is the miraculous multiplication, the green surface representing a field. As a symbol these pictures are particularly striking from the introduction of two glasses, containing a red substance, into the baskets. Evidently the artist in this detail had in mind the Eucharistic matter of wine. Consequently, the frescoes as a whole conveyed to an onlooker in the second century a meaning somewhat as follows: the miraculously multiplied bread, together with wine, formed the matter of the Eucharist, which, in turn, by a still greater miracle, became the substance of the Body and Blood of the Divine Ichthys, Jesus Christ.

The various Eucharistic banquet scenes of the catacombs appropriately symbolized the reception of Holy Communion. In one early instance the artist portrayed, besides a representation of this character, a new symbol having special reference to the Consecration. This consists of a scene showing two persons beside a tripod, on which are placed a loaf and fish. One of the figures is clad in the tunic and pallium reserved in early Christian art to persons of sacred character, while the other, at the opposite side of the tripod, stands in the attitude of an orans. The sacred personage holds his hands extended over the loaf and the fish, somewhat after the manner of a priest holding his hands over the chalice before the Consecration. Wilpert's interpretation of the scene is that the figure with extended hands represents Christ performing the miracle of the multiplication, which act, in the intention of the artist, is symbolic of the Consecration. The orans, on the other hand, is a symbol of the deceased, who, through the reception of Holy Communion, has obtained eternal happiness: "He that eateth this bread shall live forever" (St. John, vi, 59). The representation described forms one of a series comprising three subjects, all relating to the Eucharist. The second of the series is the usual banquet of seven persons, symbolizing Communion, while the third depicts Abraham and Isaac in the orans attitude. In the symbolism of the time Isaac was regarded as a figure of Christ, whence the inference that this representation of Abraham's sacrifice was figurative of the Sacrifice of the Cross.

II.—The Banquet of the Seven Disciples.—The repast of the seven Disciples by the Sea of Galilee is recorded by the Evangelist St. John (xxi, 9 sqq.). St. Peter and his fellow-fishermen, seven altogether, after taking the miraculous draught of fishes, drew their boats on shore, where they found "hot coals lying, and a fish laid thereon, and bread". The risen Saviour then invited them to eat, "and none of them... durst ask him: Who art thou? knowing that it was the Lord". The incident thus recorded was just as appropriate a symbol of the Eucharist as the miracle of the multiplication, and as such it is once depicted in a painting of the second century. In this, as in all Eucharistic frescoes, the symbol of Communion appears in close proximity with a baptismal symbol. The banquet scene itself at first view seems in no wise different from the category of Eucharistic representations already described: seven persons are partaking of food, which consists of loaves and fishes. Two details, however, differentiate this particular picture (Sacrament Chapel A 2, cemetery of Callistus), from the symbolic banquets based on the miraculous multiplication. The first of these details is the absence of the basket of fragments always present in frescoes inspired by the latter subject, and the second consists in the fact that the seven banqueters are depicted nude, the manner in which fishermen were invariably represented in classic art. The author of this fresco, we may safely conclude, drew his inspiration from the repast by the Sea of Galilee, which he depicted as a symbol of the Eucharist. St. Augustine alludes to this symbol when he speaks of the "roasted fish" on the hot coals as representing Christ crucified (*Piscis assus Christus est passus*, Tract. cxxiii, in Joan.).

During the first and second centuries, with the one exception noted, the only symbol of the Eucharist adopted in Christian art was that inspired by the miraculous multiplication. The mode of representing the symbol, also, during this period scarcely varied; seven guests partake of the symbolic loaves and

Eucharistic Symbol
End of second century, Sacrament Chapel, Catacomb of St. Callistus

fishes, while baskets of bread are distributed at the sides. In one instance, however, the guests are omitted, and only a tripod with loaves and fishes and the baskets of bread are depicted. This fresco, which occupies a lunette of the Sacrament Chapel containing the symbol of the seven Disciples, Wilpert regards as a sort of compendium of the two symbols of the Consecration and the Communion described above. In the third century a new mode of representing the favourite Eucharistic symbol was adopted in a number of frescoes. This consisted in a scene showing Christ performing the miracle of multiplication by touching with a rod one of several baskets of bread placed before Him. In the loaves, also, incisions, sometimes made in the form of a cross, are seen. Paintings of this class were symbols of the Consecration. One of them (chamber III in the catacomb of St. Domitilla) is of more than ordinary interest. Unfortunately it has suffered serious injury at the hands of collectors. By the aid of a design made for Bosio, Wilpert has been able to reproduce the picture. It consists of three scenes. In the centre Christ is performing the miracle of multiplication with a rod. To the right of this He is again represented, His right hand raised in the oratorical gesture, while within the folds of His pallium five loaves marked with a cross are visible. Balancing this figure on the left is the Samaritan woman drawing water from the well of Jacob. According to the general principles underlying early Christian art, some relationship was here intended between the three groups. Ordinarily the Samaritan woman was a symbol of the *refrigerium* (refreshment) petitioned for in the Memento for the Dead at Mass. In the present instance Wilpert regards it as more probable that she is intended as a symbol of the soul in the enjoyment of eternal happiness; the Eucharist, like the fountain of water (John, iv, 14) "springing up into life everlasting", being a pledge of immortality. In the catacomb of St. Callistus there is a fourth painting of the miracle of the multiplication which conforms more closely to historical narrative than the representations of an earlier date; Christ is here depicted with both hands held over the loaves and fishes presented to Him by two Apostles. It may be added that more than thirty frescoes of the miraculous multiplication still exist in the Roman catacombs. For an exact and reliable reproduction of them see Wilpert, "Le Pitture delle catacombe Romane", Rome, 1903.

III.—The Wedding at Cana.—The custom introduced in the third century of representing the multiplication of the loaves to the exclusion of the fishes is thought to have been indirectly instrumental in bringing about a new and beautiful symbol of the Eucharist in early Christian painting. Previous to this time only two frescoes contained any allusions to the Eucharistic wine: the chalice of the "Fractio Panis" and the red substance in the baskets of the crypt of Lucina. But the epitomizing of the multiplication symbol by the omission of the fishes (leaving only bread, one of the two species required for the Eucharist) probably suggested the idea of a special symbol for the Eucharistic wine. No more appropriate symbol for this purpose was to be desired than the miracle of Cana (John, ii, 1–11), which was actually adopted. As Christ at the marriage feast changed water into wine, so on another occasion He changed wine into His blood. Quite apropos in this relation is a statement of St. Cyril of Jerusalem to the effect that, since the Lord "in Cana of Galilee changed water into wine, which is akin to blood", why should it be regarded as "incredible that He should have changed wine into blood?" (Cat., XXII, 2.) Two frescoes representing the miracle of Cana exist in the Roman catacomb of Sts. Peter and Marcellinus. The more ancient of these, which dates from the middle of the third century, represents four men and three women partaking of a repast. Before the couch on which they are reclining is a table, while on the left a servant is carrying a dish to the person occupying the post of honour at the right extremity. The servant's hands are covered by a cloth. On the right Christ is seen touching with a rod one of six water pots that stand in front of Him. Taken as a whole, there can scarcely be any doubt that here we have a Eucharistic scene, with the symbol of wine substituted for the symbol of bread. The number of guests is the invariable number in Eucharistic representations. The servant with veiled hands is the bearer of some sacred object (elsewhere St. Peter receiving the Law from Christ has his hands similarly veiled). Finally, as in all other Eucharistic frescoes, the Sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion are brought into close relationship; on the right of the scene described is the fountain of Moses and on the left a representation of the administration of baptism. In the centre of the vault also a veiled orans is an allusion to the effects of Communion (a pledge of eternal life).

The second fresco of this subject belongs to the middle of the fourth century. Here Christ is twice represented, once multiplying the loaves, and a second time changing water into wine. A banquet scene, which has suffered serious injury, occupies the lunette; five of the seven participants can still be recognized as men. The discovery in 1864 at Alexandria of an ancient Christian subterranean cemetery similar in some respects to the catacombs of Rome, brought to light a fresco in which two Eucharistic symbols of the first Christian age are reproduced in a new and striking manner. The picture occupies the frieze of the apse in a small cemeterial basilica and is, consequently, above the place formerly occupied by the altar. The stone bench for the clergy in the sanctuary is still in place. Three scenes, separated by trees, are represented. The central subject is the miraculous multiplication; Christ, identified by the nimbus, is seated on a throne and is in the act of blessing loaves and fishes presented by St. Peter and St. Andrew (identified by inscriptions). At his feet twelve baskets of bread are distributed symmetrically. To the right and left of this picture were two banquet scenes. The former is almost wholly destroyed, but a Greek inscription gives a clue to the subject. This reads: "Those partaking of the *eulogia* of Christ". *Eulogia* is the term used by St. Paul (I Cor., x, 16) in reference to the Eucharist: "the chalice of eulogia [benediction] which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" The application of this term, therefore, to the food set before the banqueters, points to the inference that here was depicted a Eucharistic scene in which the guests partook of the symbolic loaves and fishes. The scene on the right, we learn from inscriptions ("Jesus", "Mary", "Servants"), represented the miracle of Cana. The author of this fresco, who was well acquainted with the symbolism of the first centuries, evidently reproduced (1) the favourite symbol of the Eucharist, i. e. the miraculous multiplication of the loaves and fishes, and (2) the later symbol of the Eucharistic wine, inspired by the miracle at the wedding feast.

Wilpert, *Fractio Panis* (Freiburg, 1895); Idem, *Le pitture delle catacombe Romane* (Freiburg im Br. and Rome, 1903), large folio, replaces for completeness and trustworthiness all previous similar works, e. g. De Rossi, Garrucci, etc.; Wieland, *Mensa und Confessio* (Munich, 1906); Kraus in *Real-Encyklopädie*, etc. (Freiburg, 1882), 433–51; Marucchi, *Eléments d'archéol. chrét.* (Paris, 1905), I, 291–307, also new edition (1908); Northcote and Brownlow, *Roma Sotterranea* (London, 1878), passim; Lowrie, *Monuments of the Early Ch.* (New York, 1901), non-Catholic.

Maurice M. Hassett.

Eucharistic Congresses are gatherings of ecclesiastics and laymen for the purpose of celebrating and glorifying the Holy Eucharist and of seeking the best means to spread its knowledge and love throughout

EXETER CATHEDRAL

the world. The Real Presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist is one of the principal dogmas of the Catholic Faith and is therefore of paramount importance as the most precious treasure that Christ has left to His Church as the centre of Catholic worship and as the source of Christian piety. The main advantages of these congresses have been in the concentration of the thoughts of the faithful upon the mystery of the altar, and in making known to them the means by which devotion towards the Holy Eucharist may be promoted and implanted in the hearts of the people. The promoters of Eucharistic congresses believe that, if during recent years devotion to the Holy Eucharist has become more widespread, if works of adoration, Confraternities of the Blessed Sacrament, and the practice of frequent Communion have spread rapidly and extensively, it must be ascribed in great part to these gatherings.

The first congress owed its inspiration to Bishop Gaston de Ségur, and was held at Lille, France, 21 June, 1881. The idea at first was merely local and met with few adherents, but it grew from year to year with an ever-increasing importance. The second gathering was at Avignon, in 1882, and the third at Liège, in the following year. When from the 9th to the 13th of September, 1885, the fourth congress met at Fribourg in Switzerland, under the presidency of the famous Mgr. Mermillod, Bishop of Lausanne and Geneva, his influence and example drew to the platform members of the Cantonal Government, officials of the municipality of Fribourg, officers of the army, judges of the courts, while thousands of Catholics from all over Europe joined in the formal procession. Toulouse, in the South of France, was the place of meeting of the fifth congress, from the 20th to the 25th of June, 1886, and about 1500 ecclesiastics and 30,000 laymen were present at the closing exercises.

The sixth congress met in Paris, 2–6 July, 1888, and the great memorial church of the Sacred Heart on Monmartre was the centre of the proceedings. Antwerp, in Belgium, entertained the next congress, 15–21 August, 1890; an immense altar of repose was erected in the Place de Meir, and it was estimated that 150,000 persons were gathered about it when Cardinal Goossens, Archbishop of Mechlin, gave the solemn Benediction. Bishop Doutreloux of Liège was then president of the Permanent Committee for the Organization of Eucharistic Congresses, the body which has charge of the details of these meetings.

Special importance was attached to the eighth congress, which went to Jerusalem to hold its sessions from the 14th to the 21st of May, 1893. Pope Leo XIII sent as legate Cardinal Langénieux, Archbishop of Reims. Here the reunion of the Orient was advocated, and an adoration of the Blessed Sacrament was preached on the very spot where tradition says the Agony in the Garden took place. Next year the congress was held at Reims, 25–29 July, and the different churches of the East were largely represented. A place was given in the deliberations for the first time to the study of social questions affecting the working classes. Paray-le-Monial, the city of the Sacred Heart, 20–24 September, 1897, was the scene of the tenth congress; and the eleventh, the best organized and most numerously attended of the series, met at Brussels, 13–17 July, 1898. Cardinal Langénieux was again the pope's legate at the twelfth congress which had Lourdes, the city of Eucharistic miracles, as its meeting place, 7–11 August, 1899. This gathering was notable for the number of priests who took part in the procession. When the thirteenth congress met at Angers, 4–8 September, 1901, a special section was formed for young men to read and discuss papers having reference to such works as young men ought to undertake for the promotion of devotion to the Holy Eucharist and the solution of social questions. Namur, Belgium, 3–7 September, 1902, was chosen as the location for the fourteenth congress, and the fifteenth, 20–24 July, 1904, went to Angoulême, where the operations of French law forbade the usual procession of the Blessed Sacrament.

Pope Pius X having expressed a wish that the Eucharistic Congress should be held in Rome, the delegates met there, 1–6 June, 1905. He added to the solemnity of the occasion by celebrating Mass, at the opening of the sessions, by giving a special audience to the delegates, and by being present at the procession that closed the proceedings. It was the dawn of the movement that led to his decree, "Tridentina Synodus", 20 December, 1905, advising daily communions.

Tournai, in Belgium, saw the seventeenth congress, 15–19 August, 1906; and the next one went to Metz, in Lorraine, 7–11 August, 1907. Cardinal Vincenzo Vannutelli was the pope's legate, and the German Government suspended the law of 1870, forbidding processions, in order that the usual solemn procession of the Blessed Sacrament might be held. Each year the congress had become more and more definitely international, and at the invitation of Archbishop Bourne of Westminster it was decided to hold the nineteenth congress in London, the first under the auspices of, and among, English-speaking members of the Church.

In addition to these general congresses there had also grown up, in all countries where Catholics were numerous, local gatherings of the Eucharistic leagues which were potent factors in the spread of the devotion. These were held in France, Germany, Belgium, Spain, Italy, England, Canada, Australia, and the United States. The first of these in the United States was at St. Louis, in September, 1901; the second at New York, in 1905; and the third at Pittsburg, in 1907. The presidents of the Permanent Committee of the International Eucharistic Congresses, under whose direction all this progress was made were: Bishop Gaston de Ségur, of Lille; Archbishop de La Bouillerie, titular of Perga and coadjutor of Bordeaux; Archbishop Duquesnay of Cambrai; Cardinal Mermillod, Bishop of Lausanne and Geneva; Bishop Doutreloux of Liège, and Bishop Thomas Heylen of Namur, Belgium. After each congress this committee prepared and published a volume giving a report of all the papers read and the discussions on them in the various sections of the meeting, the sermons preached, the addresses made at the public meetings, and the details of all that transpired.

As the most representative and important of all the congresses, the whole Catholic world was at once interested in the nineteenth, which was held in London, 9–13 September, 1908, and regarded as the greatest religious triumph of its generation. In an affectionate letter voicing anew his interest in these congresses, the pope once more designated Cardinal Vincenzo Vannutelli as his legate to attend the sessions. More than three hundred and fifty years had elapsed since a legate from the pope had been seen in England. With him were six other cardinals, fourteen archbishops, seventy bishops and a host of priests. No such gathering of ecclesiastics had ever been seen outside of Rome in modern times, and English Catholics prepared to make it locally even more memorable. The seeds of "the Second Spring", one of them aptly said, awakened by the tears and blood of persecution, and strengthened by the prayers of the remnant of the faithful in the dreary years of the penal laws, bore flower and fruit.

A distinguished escort met Cardinal Vannutelli when he landed at Dover, and an enormous crowd assembled to witness the arrival of a papal legate in London for the first time in more than three centuries. On the next day, 9 September, the congress was solemnly opened in the cathedral at Westminster, by the legate, supported by Cardinals Gibbons of Baltimore, Logue of Ireland, Sancha y Hervàs of Toledo, Ferrari

of Milan, Mathieu of France, and Mercier of Belgium. Bishops, priests, and laymen from all quarters of the globe were about them. The regular sessions began on 10 September, Archbishop Amette of Paris celebrating the Mass. Two sectional meetings in English and one in French then listened to the papers and discussions. In the evening there was a great meeting of 15,000 people at the Albert Hall, to greet the papal legate, at which meeting resolutions pledging all to promote devotion to the Eucharist and unalterable fidelity to the Holy See were passed. The speakers included Archbishops Carr of Melbourne and Bruchesi of Montreal. On 11 September Archbishop Van der Wetering, of Utrecht, was the celebrant of the Mass, and the next day Mass was celebrated according to the Byzantine Rite by the Very Reverend Arsenius Atiych, archimandrite of the church of Saint-Julien-le-Pauvre of Paris, assisted by several Greek Assumptionist priests from Constantinople. The Mass on Sunday, 13 September, celebrated by the papal legate, and at which Cardinal Gibbons preached, closed the series of splendid ceremonies that marked the congress. Vespers followed, and then the solemn procession took place.

It had been intended to carry the Blessed Sacrament through the streets, but, owing to a protest and public clamour against this, made by the societies composing the Protestant Alliance, the Prime Minister, Mr. Asquith, sent a formal request to Archbishop Bourne on the part of "His Majesty's Government", for the abandonment of this programme, and this was complied with. The legate, attended by a guard of honour headed by the Duke of Norfolk, Earl Marshal of England, and made up of eleven English noblemen and the Duke of Orleans and the Comte d'Eu and some members of the French Chamber of Deputies, after passing over the route, gave solemn benediction from the balcony of the cathedral to the multitude below. Telegraphing after the ceremony to Rome, Cardinal Vannutelli said to the Cardinal Secretary of State: "The Congress concluded with a great triumph to-day when the procession passed through the streets of London packed with crowds raising continuous cheers for the cardinal legate and the other cardinals and prelates. The Sacred Host was not carried in the procession, but I gave a final benediction with the Sacrament to the crowd from three open balconies on the façade of the cathedral. Members of the House of Lords formed an escort of honour for me. Perfect order was kept."

The pope sent a special letter to the Archbishop of Westminster after the congress concluded, stating that, though it was the first of its kind in England, it must be looked on as the greatest of all, for its concourse of illustrious men, for the weight of its deliberations, for its display of faith, and for the magnificence of its religious functions. He thanked the archbishop and all who had taken any part in the proceedings. Before it closed the congress decided to have the session of 1909 meet at Cologne, and that of 1910 at Montreal.

François Désiré, Cardinal Mathieu, Archbishop of Toulouse, France, who had attended the Congress, was stricken with an illness that necessitated an operation shortly after his arrival in London. He died in London from the effects of this on the 25th of October following. Another great dignitary of the Church who was called to his reward shortly after assisting at this memorable congress was Ciriaco Maria, Cardinal Sancha y Hervás, Archbishop of Toledo and Patriarch of the West Indies, who died at Toledo, 25 February, 1909, in the seventy-first year of his age.

Official reports of the several Eucharistic Congresses; SÉGUR, *Biog. nouvelle de Mgr. de Ségur* (Paris, 1885); *The Tablet*, *Catholic Times*, *Catholic Herald* (London), files, Oct., Sept., 1908; *The Catholic World* (New York, November, 1908); *The Rosary Magazine* (Somerset, Ohio, Oct., Nov., 1908); *The Messenger* (New York, Oct., Nov., 1908). THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Eucharistic Test. See ORDEAL.

Eucharius, SAINT, first Bishop of Trier (Treves) in the second half of the third century. According to an ancient legend, he was one of the seventy-two disciples of Christ, and was sent to Gaul by St. Peter as bishop, together with the deacon Valerius and the subdeacon Maternus, to preach the Gospel. They came to the Rhine and to Elegia (Ehl) in Alsace, where Maternus died. His two companions hastened back to St. Peter and begged him to restore the dead man to life. St. Peter gave his pastoral staff to Eucharius, and, upon being touched with it, Maternus, who had been in his grave for forty days, returned to life. The Gentiles were then converted in large numbers. After founding many churches the three companions went to Trier where the work of evangelization progressed so rapidly that Eucharius chose that city for his episcopal residence. Among other miracles related in the legend he raised a dead person to life. An angel announced to him his approaching death and pointed out Valerius as his successor. Eucharius died 8 Dec., having been bishop for twenty-five years, and was interred in the church of St. John outside the city. Valerius was bishop for fifteen years and was succeeded by Maternus, who had in the meantime founded the dioceses of Cologne and Tongres, being bishop altogether for forty years. The staff of St. Peter, with which he had been raised to life, was preserved at Cologne till the end of the tenth century when the upper half was presented to Trier, and was afterwards taken to Prague by Emperor Charles IV.

In the Middle Ages it was believed that the pope used no crozier, because St. Peter had sent his episcopal staff to St. Eucharius; Innocent III concurs in this opinion (De Sacrif. Missæ, I, 62). The same instance, however, is related of several other alleged disciples of St. Peter, and more recent criticism interprets the staff as the distinctive mark of an envoy, especially of a missionary. Missionaries in subsequent centuries, e. g. St. Boniface, were occasionally called ambassadors of St. Peter, the pope who sent them being the successor of Peter. Moreover, in medieval times the foundation of a diocese was often referred to as early a date as possible, in order thereby to increase its reputation, perhaps also its rights. Thus Paris gloried in Dionysius Areopagita as its first bishop; similarly ancient origins were claimed by other Frankish dioceses. In time, especially through the ravages of the Normans, the more reliable earlier accounts were lost. When at a later period the lives of primitive holy founders, e. g. the saints of ancient Trier, came to be written anew, the gaps in tradition were filled out with various combinations and fanciful legends. In this way there originated in the monastery of St. Matthias near Trier the famous chronicle of Trier (Gesta Trevererorum, ed. Waitz in Mon. Germ. Hist.; script., VIII, 111–174) in which there is a curious mixture of truth and error. It contains the account of the life of St. Eucharius given above. An amplification thereof, containing the lives of the three saints in question, is said to have been written by the monk Goldscher or Golscher, who lived in that monastery about the year 1130. From the "Gesta" the narrative passed unchallenged into numerous medieval works. More recent criticism has detected many contradictions and inaccuracies in these ancient records, and it is almost universally believed at present that, with few exceptions, the first Christian missionaries came to Gaul, to which Trier then belonged, not earlier than about 250. Following Hontheim, Calmet and others, the Bollandists, with Marx, Lütolf, and other historians refer these holy bishops of Trier to a period following 250, though not all of them consider this as fully established. The feast of St. Eucharius is celebrated on 8 Dec.

The lives of the three saints may be found in the *Acta SS.*, Jan., II, 917–22 (feast of St. Valerius), and in the *Mon. Ger. Hist., Scriptores*, VIII, 111–174. See also RETTBERG, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, I, 74–82; HAUCK, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, 2d ed., I, 4 sqq.; MARX, *Geschichte des Erzstifts Trier* (Trier, 1858), I, 32–60; BEISSEL, *Geschichte der Trierer Kirchen* (Trier, 1888), I, 10 sqq.

GABRIEL MEIER.

Eucherius, Saint, Bishop of Lyons, theologian, b. in the latter half of the fourth century; d. about 449. On the death of his wife he withdrew to the monastery of Lérins, where his sons, Veranius and Salonius, lived, and soon afterward to the neighbouring island of Lerona (now Sainte-Marguerite), where he devoted his time to study and mortification. Desirous of joining the anchorites in the deserts of the East, he consulted John Cassian, who, in reply, sent him some of his "Collationes", describing the daily lives of the hermits of the Thebaid. It was at this time that Eucherius wrote his beautiful letter "De laude Eremi" to St. Hilary of Arles (c. 428). Though imitating the virtues of the Egyptian solitaries, he kept in touch with men renowned for learning and piety, e. g. Cassian, St. Hilary of Arles, St. Honoratus, later Bishop of Marseilles, and Valerian, to whom he wrote his "Epistola parænetica de contemptu mundi". The fame of Eucherius was soon so widespread in south-eastern Gaul, that he was chosen Bishop of Lyons. This was probably in 434; it is certain, at least that he attended the First Council of Orange (441) as Metropolitan of Lyons, and that he retained this dignity until his death. In addition to the above-mentioned letters, Eucherius wrote "Formularium spiritualis intelligentiæ ad Veranium", and "Institutiones ad Salonium", besides many homilies. His works have been published both separately and among the writings of the Fathers. There is no critical edition but the text is most accessible in Migne, "P. L.", L, 685–894. In the same volume (appendix, 893–1214) is to be found a long series of works attributed to Eucherius, some of doubtful authenticity, others certainly apocryphal.

ALLÈGRE in *Rev. de Marseille* (Marseilles, 1862), VIII, 277–85, 345–58, 409–18; GOUILLOUD, *S. Eucher, Lérins, et l'église de Lyon au V^me^ siècle* (Lyons, 1881); MELLIER, *De vitâ et scriptis S. Eucherii Lugdunensis episcopi* (Lyons, 1877); *Rev. du Lyonnais* (Lyons, 1868), CVI, 422–46; BARDENHEWER, *Patrology*, tr. SHAHAN (Freiburg-im-Br., St. Louis, 1908), 518–19.

LÉON CLUGNET.

Euchites. See MESSALIANS.

Euchologion (*εὐχολόγιον*), the name of one of the chief service-books of the Byzantine Church. It corresponds more or less to our Missal and Ritual. The Euchologion contains first, directions for the deacon at the *Hesperinon* (Vespers), *Orthros* (Lauds), and Liturgy. The priest's prayers and the deacon's litanies for those two hours follow. Then come the Liturgies; first, rubrics for the holy Liturgy in general, and a long note about the arrangement of the breads at the Proskomide. The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom is the frame into which the others are fitted. The Euchologion contains only the parts of priest and deacon at full length, first for the Chrysostom-liturgy, then for those parts of St. Basil's Liturgy that differ from it, then for the Presanctified-Liturgy, beginning with the Hesperinon that always precedes it. After the Liturgies follow a collection of sacraments and sacramentals with various rules, canons, and blessings. First the rite of churching the mother after child-birth (*εὐχαὶ εἰς γυναῖκα λεχώ*), adapted for various conditions, then certain "canons of the Apostles and Fathers" about baptism, prayers to be said over catechumens, the rite of baptism, followed by the washing (*ἀπόλουσις*) of the child, seven days later, certain exorcisms of St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom, and the rite of consecrating chrism (*μύρον*) on Maundy Thursday. Then follow the ordination services for deacon, priest, and bishop (there is a second rite of ordaining bishops "according to the exposition of the most holy Lord Metrophanes, Metropolitan of Nyssa"), the blessing of a hegumenos (abbot) and of other superiors of monasteries, a prayer for those who begin to serve in the Church, and the rites for minor orders (reader, singer, and subdeacon).

The ceremonies for receiving novices, clothing monks in the mandyas (the "little habit") and in the "great and angelic habit" come next, the appointing of a priest to be confessor (*πνευματικός*) and the manner of hearing confessions, prayers to be said over persons who take a solemn oath, for those who incur canonical punishments, and for those who are absolved from them. Then comes a collection of prayers for various necessities. A long hymn to Our Lady for "forgiveness of sins", written by a monk, Euthymius, follows, and we come to the rites of espousal, marriage (called the "crowning", *Στεφάνωμα*, from the most striking feature of the ceremony), the prayers for taking off the crowns eight days later, the rite of second marriages (called, as by us, "bigamy", *διγαμία*, in which the persons are not crowned), and the very long unction of the sick (*τὸ ἅγιον ἔλαιον*), performed normally by seven priests. Next, blessings for new churches and antiminsia (the corporal containing relics they use for the Liturgy; it is really a kind of portable altar), the ceremony of washing the altar on Maundy Thursday, erection of a Stauropegion (exempt monastery), the short blessing of waters (*ἁγιασμός*), and the great one (used on the Epiphany) followed by a sacramental which consists of bathing (*νιπτήρ*) afterwards. After one or two more ceremonies, such as a curious rite of kneeling (*γονύκλισις*, otherwise a rare gesture in the Eastern Churches) on the evening of Whitsunday, exorcisms, prayers for the sick and dying, come the burial services for laymen, monks, priests. Then follows a very miscellaneous collection of prayers and hymns (marked *εὐχαὶ διάφοροι*), canons of penance, against earthquakes, for time of pestilence, and war, and two addressed to Our Lady. More prayers for various occasions end the book. In modern Euchologia, however, it is usual to add the "Apostles" (the Epistles) and Gospels for the chief feasts (these are taken from the two books that contain the whole collection of liturgical lessons), and lastly the arrangement of the court of the œcumenical patriarch in choir, with rubrical directions for their various duties during the Liturgy. This last chapter is found, of course, only in the Orthodox book.

It will be seen, then, that the Euchologion is the handbook for bishops, priests, and deacons. It contains only the short responses of the choir, who have to use their own choir-books (Triodion, Pentekostarion, Oktoechos, Parakletike, Menologion). The Euchologion, in common with all Byzantine service-books, suffers from an amazing want of order. One discerns a certain fundamental system in the order of its chief parts; but the shorter services, blessings, prayers, hymns, etc. are thrown together pell-mell.

The first printed edition was published at Venice in 1526. The Orthodox official edition in Greek is printed (as are all their books) at the Phoenix press (*τυπογράφειον ὁ Φοίνιξ*) at Venice (7th ed., edited by Spiridion Zerbos, 1898). There is also an Athenian edition and one of Constantinople. The Churches that use other liturgical languages have presses (generally at the capital of the country, St. Petersburg, Bukarest, Jerusalem) for their translations. Provost Alexios Maltzew of the Russian Embassy Church at Berlin has edited the Euchologion in Old Slavonic and German with notes (Vienna, 1861, reprinted at Berlin, 1892). Uniats use the Propaganda edition and have a compendium (*μικρὸν εὐχολόγιον*) containing only the Liturgies, Apostles and Gospels, baptism, marriage, unction, and confession (Rome, 1872). J. Goar, O.P., edited the Euchologion with very complete notes, explanations, and illustrations (Eucholo-

gion, sive Rituale Græcorum, 2nd ed., Venice, fol., 1720); this is still the standard work of reference for Byzantine rites.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Eucrates. See MOSCHUS, JOHN.

Eudæmonism. See HEDONISM.

Eudes, JEAN, BLESSED, French missionary and founder of the Eudists and of the Congregation of Our Lady of Charity; author of the liturgical worship of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary; b. at Ri, France, 14 Nov., 1601; d. at Caen, 19 Aug., 1680. He was a brother of the French historian, François Eudes de Mézeray. At the age of fourteen he took a vow of chastity. After brilliant studies with the Jesuits at Caen, he entered the Oratory, 25 March, 1623. His masters and models in the spiritual life were Fathers de Bérulle and de Condren. He was ordained priest 20 Dec., 1625, and began his sacerdotal life with heroic labours for the victims of the plague, then ravaging the country. As a missionary, Father Eudes became famous. Since the time of St. Vincent Ferrer, France had probably not seen a greater. He was called by Olier "the prodigy of his age". In 1641 he founded the Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Refuge, to provide a refuge for women of ill-fame who wished to do penance. The society was approved by Alexander VII, 2 Jan., 1666. With the approbation of Cardinal de Richelieu and a great number of others, Father Eudes severed his connexion with the Oratory to establish the Society of Jesus and Mary for the education of priests and for missionary work. This congregation was founded at Caen, 25 March, 1643, and was considered a most important and urgent work (see EUDISTS).

Father Eudes, during his long life, preached not less than one hundred and ten missions, three at Paris, one at Versailles, one at St-Germain-en-Laye, and the others in different parts of France. Normandy was the principal theatre of his apostolic labours. In 1674 he obtained from Clement X six Bulls of indulgences for the Confraternities of the Sacred Heart already erected or to be erected in the seminaries. He also established the Society of the Heart of the Mother Most Admirable—which resembles the Third Orders of St. Francis and St. Dominic. This society now numbers from 20,000 to 25,000 members. Father Eudes dedicated the seminary chapels of Caen and Coutances to the Sacred Hearts. The feast of the Holy Heart of Mary was celebrated for the first time in 1648, and that of the Sacred Heart of Jesus in 1672, each as a double of the first class with an octave. The Mass and Office proper to these were composed by Father Eudes, who thus had the honour of preceding the Blessed Margaret Mary in establishing the devotion to the Sacred Hearts. For this reason, Pope Leo XIII, in proclaiming his virtues heroic in 1903, gave him the title of "Author of the Liturgical Worship of the Sacred Heart of Jesus and Holy Heart of Mary". Father Eudes wrote a number of books remarkable for elevation of doctrine and simplicity of style. His principal works are:—"Le Royaume de Jésus"; "Le contrat de l'homme avec Dieu par le Saint Baptême"; "Le Mémorial de la vie Ecclésiastique"; "Le Bon Confesseur"; "Le Prédicateur Apostolique"; "Le Cœur Admirable de la Très Sainte Mère de Dieu". This last is the first book ever written on the devotion to the Sacred Hearts. His virtues were declared heroic by Leo XIII, 6 Jan., 1903. The miracles proposed for his beatification were approved by Pius X, 3 May, 1908, and he was beatified 25 April, 1909.

Œuvres Complètes du Vén. J. Eudes (1905—); MONTIGNY, *Vie du R. P. Jean Eudes* (Paris, 1827); HÉRAMBOURG, *Le Père Eudes, ses vertus* (Paris, 1869); MARTINE, *Vie du P. Eudes* (Caen, 1880); BOULAY, *Vie du V. Jean Eudes* (Paris); JOLY, *Le Vén. Père Eudes* (Paris, 1907); LE DORÉ, *Le Père Eudes, Premier Apôtre des Sacrés Cœurs de Jésus et de Marie* (Paris, 1870); *Les Sacrés Cœurs et le V. P. Eudes* (Paris, 1891); ORY, *Les Origines de Nôtre Dame de Charité* (Abbeville, 1891); NILLES, *De Rationibus festorum SS. Cordium Jesu et Mariæ* (Innsbruck, 1889).

CHARLES LEBRUN.

Eudists, or SOCIETY OF JESUS AND MARY, an ecclesiastical society instituted at Caen, France, 25 March, 1643, by the Venerable Jean Eudes. The principal works of the society are the education of priests in seminaries and the giving of missions. The end which Father Eudes assigned to his society made him decide not to introduce religious vows. He was persuaded that, better than religious, priests, finding in the very dignity with which they were invested the reason and means of rising to eminent perfection, were in a position to inspire young clerics with a high idea of the priesthood and of the sanctity which it required. He also felt that bishops would not so willingly give their seminaries over to priests who were not entirely subject to them. Father Eudes shared the opinions of Cardinal de Bérulle and Father Olier, who did not think it proper to admit religious vows in the orders which they founded. Even St. Vincent de Paul did so only after great hesitation and on the condition, ratified by the sovereign pontiff, that the Priests of the Mission should not form a religious order, properly so called, but an ecclesiastical society.

The Society of Jesus and Mary is not, therefore, a religious order, but an ecclesiastical body under the immediate jurisdiction of the bishops, to aid in the formation of the clergy. It is composed of priests, and of postulants who are admitted after a probation of three years and three months. There are also lay brothers employed in temporal affairs, but who do not wear the ecclesiastical habit. To develop the spirit of Jesus Christ in the members of the society, Father Eudes caused to be celebrated every year in his seminaries the feast of the Holy Priesthood of Jesus Christ and of all Holy Priests and Levites. After the feast of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary it is one of the principal in the community. The solemnity begins on 13 November and is celebrated with an octave. It thus serves as a preparation for the renewal of the clerical promises on 21 November, the feast of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin. As early as 1649 Father Eudes had prepared an Office proper to the feast. Some years later the feast and office were adopted by the Sulpician Fathers. Although not a religious order, the Society of Jesus and Mary is subject to discipline which does not differ from that of orders with simple vows. The administration is modelled on that of the Oratory to which Father Eudes had belonged for twenty years. The supreme authority resides in a general assembly which names the superior general and which is called, at intervals, to control his administration. It alone can make permanent laws. In the intervals between the general assemblies, the superior general, named for life, exercises full authority in matters spiritual and temporal. He has the right to name and depose local superiors, to fix the personnel of each house, to make the annual visit, to admit, and, in case of necessity, to dismiss, subjects, to accept or to give up foundations, and, in general, to perform, or at least to authorize, all important acts. He is aided by assistants, named by the general assembly, who have a deciding vote in temporal affairs, and a consulting vote only in other questions.

During the lifetime of Father Eudes, the society founded seminaries at Caen (1643), Coutances (1650), Lisieux (1653), Rouen (1658), Evreux (1667), and Rennes (1670). These were all "grand" seminaries; Father Eudes never thought of founding any other. He admitted, however, besides clerical students, priests with newly granted benefices who came for further study, those who wished to make retreats, and even lay students who followed the courses of the Faculty of Theology. After his death directors were

appointed for the Seminaries of Valognes, Avranches, Dol, Senlis, Blois, Domfront, and Séez. At Rennes, Rouen, and some other cities seminaries were conducted for students of a poorer class who were called to exercise the ministry in country places. These were sometimes called "little" seminaries. The postulants were admitted early and made both their profane and ecclesiastical studies. During the French Revolution, three Eudists, Fathers Hébert, Potier, and Lefranc, perished at Paris in the massacres of September, 1792. The cause of their beatification with that of some other victims of September has been introduced in Rome. Father Hébert was the confessor of King Louis XVI, and shortly before his death he made the king promise to consecrate his kingdom to the Sacred Heart if he escaped from his enemies. After the Revolution the society had great difficulty in establishing itself again, and it was only in the second half of the nineteenth century that it began to prosper. Too late to take over again the direction of seminaries formerly theirs, the Eudists entered upon missionary work and secondary education in colleges. The "Law of Associations" (1906) brought about the ruin of the establishments which they had in France. Besides the scholasticates which they have opened in Belgium and in Spain, they direct seminaries at Carthagena, at Antioquia, at Pamplona, at Panamá (South America), and at San Domingo, West Indies. In Canada they have the Vicariate Apostolic of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, a seminary at Halifax, N. S., a college at Church Point, N. S., and at Caraquet, N. B., and a number of other establishments less important. They number about fifteen establishments and about one hundred and twenty priests in Canada. In France, where the majority still remains, the Eudists continue to preach missions and to take part in various other works.

De Montzey, *Le Père Eudes et ses Institutes* (Paris, 1869); Heimbucher, *Ord. u. Kong. d. Kath. Kirche* (Paderborn, 1908), III, 449–52; Braunmüller in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.

Charles Lebrun.

Eudocia (Eudokia).—Ælia Eudocia, sometimes wrongly called Eudoxia, was the wife of Theodosius II; died c. 460. Her original name was Athenais, and she was the daughter of Leontius, one of the last pagans who taught rhetoric at Athens. Malalas and the other Byzantine chroniclers make the most of the romantic story of her marriage. Leontius when dying left nearly all his property to his two sons. To Athenais he bequeathed only 100 pieces of gold with the explanation that she would not need more, since "her luck was greater than that of all women". She came to Constantinople to dispute this will, and was there seen by Pulcheria, the elder sister of Theodosius II, who ruled for him till he should be of age. The emperor had already expressed his wish to marry (he was just twenty years old); both he and Pulcheria were greatly delighted with Athenais. Malalas (op. cit., p. 353) enlarges on her beauty. She was instructed in the Christian Faith and baptized by the Patriarch Atticus. On 7 June, 421, she married Theodosius. At her baptism she had taken the name Eudocia. Pulcheria took charge of her education in the deportment that was expected of an empress. Theodosius and Eudocia had one daughter, Eudoxia, who married the Western Cæsar, Valentinian III (425–455). It seems that after the wedding a certain rivalry began between Pulcheria and Eudocia and that this was the beginning of the empress's troubles. In 438 Eudocia made her first pilgrimage to Jerusalem; on the way she stopped at Antioch and made a speech with a quotation from Homer that greatly delighted the citizens—so much so that they set up a golden statue in her honour. From Jerusalem she brought back St. Peter's chains, of which she sent half to her daughter in the West, who gave it to the pope. The basilica of St. Peter ad Vincula was built to receive this chain (Brev. Rom., 1 Aug., Lect. 4–6).

In 441 Eudocia fell into disgrace through an unjust suspicion of infidelity with Paulinos, the "Master of the Offices". Paulinos was murdered and Eudocia banished. In 442 she went back to Jerusalem and lived there till her death. She became for a time an ardent Monophysite. In 453 St. Leo I of Rome wrote to convert her. She then returned to the Catholic Faith and used her influence in Palestine in favour of the Council of Chalcedon (451). Theodosius II died in 450, Pulcheria in 453; another dynasty under Marcian took the place of the line of Theodosius the Great. Eudocia, forgotten by the world, spent her last years in good works and quiet meditation at the holy places of Jerusalem. She was buried in the church of St. Stephen, built by her outside the northern gate. Byzantine history offers few so strange or picturesque stories as that of the little pagan Athenian who, after having been mistress of the civilized world, ended her days as an ardent mystic, almost a nun, by the tomb of Christ. Eudocia wrote much poetry. As empress she composed a poem in honour of her husband's victory over the Persians; later at Jerusalem she wrote religious verse, namely, a paraphrase of a great part of the Bible (warmly praised by Photius, Bibliotheca, 183), a life of Christ in Homeric hexameters, and three books telling the story of Sts. Cyprian and Justina (a legend about a converted magician that seems to be one version of the Faust story; see Th. Zahn, "Cyprian von Antiochien und die deutsche Faustsage", 1887). The extant fragments of these poems were edited by A. Ludwich, "Eudociæ Augustæ . . . carminum græcorum reliquiæ" (Leipzig, 1897). See also fragments in P. G., LXXXV, 832 sqq.

Another Byzantine empress of the same name (d. 404), like the above often wrongly called Eudoxia, daughter of the Frank general Bauto, and wife of Emperor Arcadius, was the cause of the first and second exile of St. John Chrysostom. After the fall of the eunuch Eutropius this beautiful but proud and avaricious woman dominated Arcadius. She was the mother of Pulcheria and Theodosius II. The homily against her attributed to St. John Chrysostom (P. G., LIX, 485) is not genuine. Cf. Tillemont, "Hist. des Empereurs" (Paris, 1701), V, 785.

Malalas, *Chronographia*, ed. Dindorf (Bonn, 1831); repr. in *P. G.*, XCVII, 9–790, pp. 353–358; Socrates, *H. E.*, VII, xxi, 47; Evagrius, *H. E.*, I, xx–xxii; Wiegand, *Eudoxia, Gemahlin des oströmischen Kaisers Theodosius II.* (Worms, 1871); Gregorovius, *Athenaïs, Geschichte einer byzantinischen Kaiserin* (Leipzig, 1892); Diehl, *Athenaïs* in *Figures Byzantines* (Paris, 1906, pp. 25–49), I, ii.

Adrian Fortescue.

Eudoxias, a titular see of Galatia Secunda in Asia Minor, suffragan of Pessinus. Eudoxias is mentioned only by Hierocles (Synecdemus, 698, 2) and Parthey (Notit. episc., I, VIII, IX). Two bishops are known, Aquilas in 451 and Menas in 536 (Lequien, Or. christ., I, 495). Another is spoken of in the life of St. Theodore of Sycæ, about the end of the sixth century. The original name of the town is unknown, Eudoxias being the name given to it in honour either of the mother or of the daughter of Theodosius II. It was perhaps Gordion, where Alexander the Great cut the famous knot, and stood perhaps at the modern Yürme, in the vilayet of Angora. Others, however, identify Eudoxias with Akkilaion, whose site is unknown, and place Germe at Yürme.

Ramsay, *Asia Minor*, 224–226; Anderson in *Journal of Hellen. Studies*, XIX, 88; Idem in *Annual of the British School at Athens*, IV, 66.

S. Pétridès.

Eugendus, Saint (Augendus; Fr. Oyand, Oyan), fourth Abbot of Condat (Jura), b. about 449, at Izernore, Ain, Franche-Comté; d. 1 Jan., 510, at Condat. He was instructed in reading and writing by his

father, who had become a priest, and at the age of seven was given to Sts. Romanus and Lupicinus to be educated at Condat, in the French Jura. Thenceforth he never left the monastery. He imitated the example of the above-named saints with such zeal that it was difficult to tell which of the two he resembled more. Eugendus acquired much learning, read the Greek and Latin authors, and was well versed in the Scriptures. He led a life of great austerity, but out of humility did not want to be ordained priest. Abbot Minausius made him his coadjutor, and after the former's death (about 496) Eugendus became his successor. He always remained the humble religious that he had been before, a model for his monks by his penitence and piety, which God deigned to acknowledge by miracles. After the monastery, which St. Romanus had built of wood, was destroyed by fire, Eugendus erected another of stone, and improved the community life; thus far the brethren had lived in separate cells after the fashion of the Eastern ascetics. He built a beautiful church in honour of the holy Apostles Peter, Paul, and Andrew, and enriched it with precious relics. The order, which had been founded on the rules of the Oriental monasteries, now took on more of the active character of the Western brethren; the rule of Tarnate is thought to have served as a model. Condat began to flourish as a place of refuge for all those who suffered from the misfortunes and afflictions of those eventful times, a school of virtue and knowledge amid the surrounding darkness, an oasis in the desert. When Eugendus felt his end approaching he had his breast anointed by a priest, took leave of his brethren, and died quietly after five days.

A few years after his death, his successor, St. Viventiolus, erected a church over his tomb, to which numerous pilgrims travelled. A town was founded, which was called, after the saint, Saint-Oyand de Joux, and which retained that name as late as the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, while its former name of Condat passed into oblivion. But when St. Claudius had, in 687, resigned his Diocese of Besançon and had died, in 696, as twelfth abbot, the number of pilgrims who visited his grave was so great that, since the thirteenth century, the name Saint-Claude came more and more into use and has to-day superseded the other. The feast of St. Eugendus was at first transferred to 2 Jan.; in the Dioceses of Besançon and Saint Claude it is now celebrated on 4 Jan.

Acta SS., January, I, 49–54; *Mon. Germ. Hist. SS. Rer. Merov.* III, 154–56, ed. KRUSCH, who wrongly holds this text of his life ■ non-authentic; *Analecta Bollandiana*, XVII, 367; MABILLON, *Acta SS., ord. s. Bened.*, I, 570–76.

GABRIEL MEIER.

Eugene I–IV, POPES.—Eugene I, SAINT, was elected 10 Aug., 654, and d. at Rome, 2 June, 657. Because he would not submit to Byzantine dictation in the matter of Monothelism, St. Martin I was forcibly carried off from Rome (18 June, 653) and kept in exile till his death (September, 655). What happened in Rome after his departure is not well known. For a time the Church was governed in the manner usual in those days during a vacancy of the Holy See, or during the absence of its occupant, viz., by the archpriest, the archdeacon, and the primicerius of the notaries. But after about a year and two months a successor was given to Martin in the person of Eugene (10 Aug., 654). He was a Roman of the first ecclesiastical region of the city, and was the son of Rufinianus. He had been a cleric from his earliest years, and is set down by his biographer as distinguished for his gentleness, sanctity, and generosity. With regard to the circumstances of his election, it can only be said that if he was forcibly placed on the Chair of Peter by the power of the emperor, in the hope that he would follow the imperial will, these calculations miscarried; and that, if he was elected against the will of the reigning pope in the first instance, Pope Martin subsequently acquiesced in his election (Ep. Martini xvii in P. L., LXXXVII).

One of the first acts of the new pope was to send legates to Constantinople with letters for the Emperor Constans II, informing him of his election, and presenting a profession of his faith. But the legates allowed themselves to be deceived, or gained over, and brought back a synodical letter from Peter, the new Patriarch of Constantinople (656–666), while the emperor's envoy, who accompanied them, brought offerings for St. Peter, and a request from the emperor that the pope would enter into communion with the Patriarch of Constantinople. Peter's letter proved to be written in the most obscure style, and avoided making any specific declaration as to the number of "wills or operations" in Christ. When its contents were communicated to the clergy and people in the church of St. Mary Major, they not only rejected the letter with indignation, but would not allow the pope to leave the basilica until he had promised that he would not on any account accept it (656). So furious were the Byzantine officials at this contemptuous rejection of the wishes of their emperor and patriarch that they threatened, in their coarse phraseology, that when the state of politics allowed it, they would roast Eugene, and all the talkers at Rome along with him, as they had roasted Pope Martin I (Disp. inter S. Maxim. et Theod. in P. L., CXXIX, 654). Eugene was saved from the fate of his predecessor by the advance of the Moslems who took Rhodes in 654, and defeated Constans himself in the naval battle of Phoenix (655). It was almost certainly this pope who received the youthful St. Wilfrid on the occasion of his first visit to Rome (c. 654). He went thither because he was anxious to know "the ecclesiastical and monastic rites which were in use there". At Rome he gained the affection of Archdeacon Boniface, a counsellor of the apostolic pope, who presented him to his master. Eugene "placed his blessed hand on the head of the youthful servant of God, prayed for him, and blessed him" (Bede, Hist. Eccles., V, 19; Eddius, In vit. Wilf., c. v). Nothing more is known of Eugene, except that he consecrated twenty-one bishops for different parts of the world, and that he was buried in St. Peter's. In the Roman Martyrology he is reckoned among the saints of that day.

Liber Pontificalis, ed. DUCHESNE, I, 341–2; various documents in *P. L.*, CXXIX, LXXXVII; PAPEBROCH in *Acta SS.* (1695), 1 June, 220–2 (2a. 214–6); MANN, *Lives of the Early Popes*, I, pt. I, 406 sqq.

EUGENE II, elected 6 June, 824; died 27 Aug., 827. On the death of Paschal I (Feb.–May, 824) there took place a divided election. The late pope had wisely endeavoured to curb the rapidly increasing power of the Roman nobility, who, to strengthen their position against him, had turned for support to the Frankish power. When he died these nobles made strenuous efforts to replace him by a candidate of their own; and despite the fact that the clergy put forward a candidate likely to continue the policy of Paschal the nobles were successful in their attempt. They secured the consecration of Eugene, archpriest of S. Sabina on the Aventine, although by a decree of the Roman Council of 769, under Stephen IV, they had no right to a real share in a papal election. Their candidate is stated, in earlier editions of the "Liber Pontificalis", to have been the son of Boemund; but in the recent and better editions his father's name is not given. Whilst archpriest of the Roman Church he is credited with having fulfilled most conscientiously the duties of his position and after he became pope he beautified his ancient church of S. Sabina with mosaics and with metal work bearing his name, which were intact in the sixteenth century. Eugene is described by his biographer as simple and humble, learned and eloquent, handsome and generous, a lover of peace, and wholly occupied with the thought of doing what was pleasing to God.

The election of Eugene II was a triumph for the Franks, and they resolved to improve the occasion. Emperor Louis the Pious accordingly sent his son Lothair to Rome to strengthen the Frankish influence. Those of the Roman nobles who had been banished during the preceding reign, and who had fled to Frankland (Francia), were recalled, and their property was restored to them. A concordat or constitution was then agreed upon between the pope and the emperor (824). This "Constitutio Romana", in nine articles, was drawn up seemingly with a view of advancing the imperial pretensions in the city of Rome, but at the same time of checking the power of the nobles. It decreed that those who were under the special protection of the pope or emperor were to be inviolable, and that proper obedience be rendered to the pope and his officials; that church property be not plundered after the death of a pope; that only those to whom the right had been given by the decree of Stephen IV, in 769, should take part in papal elections; that two commissioners (*missi*) were to be appointed, the one by the pope and the other by the emperor, who should report to them how justice was administered, so that any failure in its administration might be corrected by the pope, or, in the event of his not doing so, by the emperor; that the people should be judged according to the law (Roman, Salic, or Lombard) they had elected to live under; that its property be restored to the Church; that robbery with violence be put down; that when the emperor was in Rome the chief officials should appear before him to be admonished to do their duty; and, finally, that all must obey the Roman pontiff. By command of the pope and Lothair the people had to swear that, saving the fidelity they had promised the pope, they would obey the Emperors Louis and Lothair; would not allow a papal election to be made contrary to the canons; and would not suffer the pope-elect to be consecrated save in the presence of the emperor's envoys.

Seemingly before Lothair left Rome, there arrived ambassadors from Emperor Louis, and from the Greeks concerning the image-question. At first the Greek emperor, Michael II, showed himself tolerant towards the image-worshippers, and their great champion, Theodore the Studite, wrote to him to exhort him "to unite us [the Church of Constantinople] to the head of the Churches of God, viz. Rome, and through it with the three Patriarchs" (Epp., II, lxxiv); and in accordance with ancient custom to refer any doubtful points to the decision of Old Rome (II, lxxxvi; cf. II, cxxix). But Michael soon forgot his tolerance, bitterly persecuted the image-worshippers, and endeavoured to secure the co-operation of Louis the Pious. He also sent envoys to the pope to consult him on certain points connected with the worship of images (Einhard, Annales, 824). Before taking any steps to meet the wishes of Michael, Louis sent to ask the pope's permission for a number of his bishops to assemble, and make a selection of passages from the Fathers to elucidate the question the Greeks had put before them. The leave was granted, but the bishops who met at Paris (825) were incompetent for their work. Their collection of extracts from the Fathers was a mass of confused and ill-digested lore, and both their conclusions and the letters they wished the pope to forward to the Greeks were based on a complete misunderstanding of the decrees of the Second Council of Nicæa (cf. P. L., XCVIII, p. 1293 sqq.). Their labours do not appear to have accomplished much; nothing at any rate is known of their consequences.

In 826 Eugene held an important council at Rome of sixty-two bishops, in which thirty-eight disciplinary decrees were issued. One or two of its decrees are noteworthy as showing that Eugene had at heart the advance of learning. Not only were ignorant bishops and priests to be suspended till they had acquired sufficient learning to perform their sacred duties, but it was decreed that, as in some localities there were neither masters nor zeal for learning, masters were to be attached to the episcopal palaces, cathedral churches and other places, to give instruction in sacred and polite literature (can. xxxiv). To help on the work of the conversion of the North, Eugene wrote commending St. Ansgar, the Apostle of the Scandinavians, and his companions "to all the sons of the Catholic Church" (Jaffé, 2564). Coins of this pope are extant bearing his name and that of Emperor Louis. It is supposed, for no document records the fact, that, in accordance with the custom of the time, he was buried in St. Peter's.

Liber Pontificalis, ed. DUCHESNE, II, 69–70; EINHARD and other chroniclers in *Mon. Germ. Hist., Script.*, I–II; *Letters* of THEODORE THE STUDITE in *P. G.*, XCIX; DUCHESNE, *The Beginnings of the Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes* (tr. London, 1908), 128 sqq.; MANN, *Lives of the Early Popes*, II, 156 sqq.

HORACE K. MANN.

EUGENE III, BLESSED (BERNARDO PIGNATELLI), born in the neighbourhood of Pisa, elected 15 Feb., 1145; d. at Tivoli, 8 July, 1153. On the very day that Pope Lucius II succumbed, either to illness or wounds, the Sacred College, foreseeing that the Roman populace would make a determined effort to force the new pontiff to abdicate his temporal power and swear allegiance to the *Senatus Populusque Romanus*, hastily buried the deceased pope in the Lateran and withdrew to the remote cloister of St. Cæsarius on the Appian Way. Here, for reasons unascertained, they sought a candidate outside their body, and unanimously chose the Cistercian monk, Bernard of Pisa, abbot of the monastery of Tre Fontane, on the site of St. Paul's martyrdom. He was enthroned as Eugene III without delay in St. John Lateran, and since residence in the rebellious city was impossible, the pope and his cardinals fled to the country. Their rendezvous was the monastery of Farfa, where Eugene received the episcopal consecration. The city of Viterbo, the hospitable refuge of so many of the afflicted medieval popes, opened its gates to welcome him; and thither he proceeded to await developments. Though powerless in face of the Roman mob, he was assured by embassies from all the European powers that he possessed the sympathy and affectionate homage of the entire Christian world.

Concerning the parentage, birth-place, and even the original name of Eugene, each of his biographers has advanced a different opinion. All that can be affirmed as certain is that he was born in the territory of Pisa. Whether he was of the noble family of Pignatelli, and whether he received the name of Bernardo in baptism or only upon entering religion, must remain uncertain. He was educated in Pisa, and after his ordination was made a canon of the cathedral. Later he held the office of *vice-dominus* or steward of the temporalities of the diocese. In 1130 he came under the magnetic influence of St. Bernard of Clairvaux; five years later when the saint returned home from the Synod of Pisa, the *vice-dominus* accompanied him as a novice. In course of time he was employed by his order on several important affairs; and lastly was sent with a colony of monks to repeople the ancient Abbey of Farfa; but Innocent II placed them instead at the Tre Fontane.

St. Bernard received the intelligence of the elevation of his disciple with astonishment and pleasure, and gave expression to his feelings in a paternal letter addressed to the new pope, in which occurs the famous passage so often quoted by reformers, true and false: "Who will grant me to see, before I die, the Church of God as in the days of old when the Apostles let down their nets for a draught, not of silver and gold, but of souls?" The saint, moreover, proceeded to compose in his few moments of leisure that admirable handbook for popes called "De Consideratione". Whilst Eugene sojourned at Viterbo, Arnold of Brescia

(q. v.), who had been condemned by the Council of 1139 to exile from Italy, ventured to return at the beginning of the new pontificate and threw himself on the clemency of the pope. Believing in the sincerity of his repentance, Eugene absolved him and enjoined on him as penance fasting and a visit to the tombs of the Apostles. If the veteran demagogue entered Rome in a penitential mood, the sight of democracy based on his own principles soon caused him to revert to his former self. He placed himself at the head of the movement, and his incendiary philippics against the bishops, cardinals, and even the ascetic pontiff who treated him with extreme lenity, worked his hearers into such fury that Rome resembled a city captured by barbarians. The palaces of the cardinals and of such of the nobility as held with the pope were razed to the ground; churches and monasteries were pillaged; St. Peter's church was turned into an arsenal; and pious pilgrims were plundered and maltreated.

But the storm was too violent to last. Only an idiot could fail to understand that medieval Rome without the pope had no means of subsistence. A strong party was formed in Rome and the vicinity consisting of the principal families and their adherents, in the interests of order and the papacy, and the democrats were induced to listen to words of moderation. A treaty was entered into with Eugene by which the Senate was preserved but subject to the papal sovereignty and swearing allegiance to the supreme pontiff. The senators were to be chosen annually by popular election and in a committee of their body the executive power was lodged. The pope and the senate should have separate courts, and an appeal could be made from the decisions of either court to the other. By virtue of this treaty Eugene made a solemn entry into Rome a few days before Christmas, and was greeted by the fickle populace with boundless enthusiasm. But the dual system of government proved unworkable. The Romans demanded the destruction of Tivoli. This town had been faithful to Eugene during the rebellion of the Romans and merited his protection. He therefore refused to permit it to be destroyed. The Romans growing more and more turbulent, he retired to Castle S. Angelo, thence to Viterbo, and finally crossed the Alps, early in 1146.

Problems lay before the pope of vastly greater importance than the maintenance of order in Rome. The Christian principalities in Palestine and Syria were threatened with extinction. The fall of Edessa (1144) had aroused consternation throughout the West, and already from Viterbo Eugene had addressed a stirring appeal to the chivalry of Europe to hasten to the defence of the Holy Places. St. Bernard was commissioned to preach the Second Crusade, and he acquitted himself of the task with such success that within a couple of years two magnificent armies, commanded by the King of the Romans and the King of France, were on their way to Palestine. That the Second Crusade was a wretched failure cannot be ascribed to the saint or the pope; but it is one of those phenomena so frequently met with in the history of the papacy, that a pope who was unable to subdue a handful of rebellious subjects could hurl all Europe against the Saracens. Eugene spent three busy and fruitful years in France, intent on the propagation of the Faith, the correction of errors and abuses, and the maintenance of discipline. He sent Cardinal Breakspear (afterwards Adrian IV) as legate to Scandinavia; he entered into relations with the Orientals with the view to reunion; he proceeded with vigour against the nascent Manichean heresies. In several synods (Paris, 1147, Trier, 1148), notably in the great Synod of Reims (1148), canons were enacted regarding the dress and conduct of the clergy. To ensure the strict execution of these canons, the bishops who should neglect to enforce them were threatened with suspension. Eugene was inexorable in punishing the unworthy. He deposed the metropolitans of York and Mainz, and, for a cause which St. Bernard thought not sufficiently grave, he withdrew the pallium from the Archbishop of Reims. But if the saintly pontiff could at times be severe, this was not his natural disposition.

"Never", wrote Ven. Peter of Cluny to St. Bernard, "have I found a truer friend, a sincerer brother, a purer father. His ear is ever ready to hear, his tongue is swift and mighty to advise. Nor does he comport himself as one's superior, but rather as an equal or an inferior. . . I have never made him a request which he has not either granted, or so refused that I could not reasonably complain." On the occasion of a visit which he paid to Clairvaux, his former companions discovered to their joy that "he who externally shone in the pontifical robes remained in his heart an observant monk".

The prolonged sojourn of the pope in France was of great advantage to the French Church in many ways and enhanced the prestige of the papacy. Eugene also encouraged the new intellectual movement to which Peter Lombard had given a strong impulse. With the aid of Cardinal Pullus, his chancellor, who had established the University of Oxford on a lasting basis, he reduced the schools of theology and philosophy to better form. He encouraged Gratian in his herculean task of arranging the Decretals, and we owe to him various useful regulations bearing on academic degrees. In the spring of 1148, the pope returned by easy stages to Italy. On 7 July, he met the Italian bishops at Cremona, promulgated the canons of Reims for Italy, and solemnly excommunicated Arnold of Brescia, who still reigned over the Roman mob. Eugene, having brought with him considerable financial aid, began to gather his vassals and advanced to Viterbo and thence to Tusculum. Here he was visited by King Louis of France, whom he reconciled to his queen, Eleanor. With the assistance of Roger of Sicily, he forced his way into Rome (1149), and celebrated Christmas in the Lateran. His stay was not of long duration. During the next three years the Roman court wandered in exile through the Campagna while both sides looked for the intervention of Conrad of Germany, offering him the imperial crown. Aroused by the earnest exhortations of St. Bernard, Conrad finally decided to descend into Italy and put an end to the anarchy in Rome. Death overtook him in the midst of his preparations on 15 Feb., 1152, leaving the task to his more energetic nephew, Frederick Barbarossa. The envoys of Eugene having concluded with Frederick at Constance, in the spring of 1153, a treaty favourable to the interests of the Church and the empire, the more moderate of the Romans, seeing that the days of democracy were numbered, joined with the nobles in putting down the Arnoldists, and the pontiff was enabled to spend his concluding days in peace.

Eugene is said to have gained the affection of the people by his affability and generosity. He died at Tivoli, whither he had gone to avoid the summer heats, and was buried in front of the high altar in St. Peter's, Rome. St. Bernard followed him to the grave (20 Aug.). "The unassuming but astute pupil of St. Bernard", says Gregorovius, "had always continued to wear the coarse habit of Clairvaux beneath the purple; the stoic virtues of monasticism accompanied him through his stormy career, and invested him with that power of passive resistance which has always remained the most effectual weapon of the popes." St. Antoninus pronounces Eugene III "one of the greatest and most afflicted of the popes". Pius IX by a decree of 28 Dec., 1872, approved the cult which from time immemorial the Pisans have rendered to their countryman, and ordered him to be honoured

with Mass and Office *ritu duplici* on the anniversary of his death.

For the earlier lives by Boso, John of Salisbury, Bernhard Guidonis, and Amalricus Augerii see Muratori, *SS. Rer. Ital.*, III, 439 sqq. Cf. *Lib. Pont.*, ed. Duchesne, II, 386; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.*, V, 494; his letters are in *P. L.*, CLXXX, 1009 sqq. (Jaffé, II, 20 sqq.). See also Sainati, *Vita del beato Eugenio III* (Monza, 1874); *Annal. Bolland.* (1891), X, 455; and histories of the city of Rome by Von Reumont and Gregorovius.

James F. Loughlin.

Eugene IV (Gabriello Condulmaro, or Condulmerio), b. at Venice, 1383; elected 4 March, 1431; d. at Rome, 23 Feb., 1447. He sprang from a wealthy Venetian family and was a nephew, on the mother's side, of Gregory XII. His personal presence was princely and imposing. He was tall, thin, with a remarkably winning countenance. Coming at an early age into the possession of great wealth, he distributed 20,000 ducats to the poor and, turning his back upon the world, entered the Augustinian monastery of St. George in his native city. At the age of twenty-four he was appointed by his uncle Bishop of Siena; but since the people of that city objected to the rule of a foreigner, he resigned the bishopric and, in 1408, was created Cardinal-Priest of St. Clement. He rendered signal service to Pope Martin V by his labours as legate in Picenum (March of Ancona) and later by quelling a sedition of the Bolognesi. In recognition of his abilities, the conclave, assembled at Rome in the church of the Minerva after the death of Martin V, elected Cardinal Condulmaro to the papacy on the first scrutiny. He assumed the name of Eugene IV, possibly anticipating a stormy pontificate similar to that of Eugene III. Stormy, in fact, his reign was destined to be; and it cannot be denied that many of his troubles were owing to his own want of tact, which alienated all parties from him. By the terms of the capitulation which he signed before election and afterwards confirmed by a Bull, Eugene secured to the cardinals one-half of all the revenues of the Church, and promised to consult with them on all questions of importance relating to the spiritual and temporal concerns of the Church and the Papal States. He was crowned at St. Peter's, 11 March, 1431.

Arms of Eugene IV

Eugene continued on the throne his simple routine of monastic life and gave great edification by his regularity and unfeigned piety. But his hatred of nepotism, the solitary defect of his great predecessor, led him into a fierce and sanguinary conflict with the house of Colonna, which would have resulted disastrously for the pope, had not Florence, Venice, and Naples come to his aid. A peace was patched up by virtue of which the Colonnesi surrendered their castles and paid an indemnity of 75,000 ducats. Scarcely was this danger averted when Eugene became involved in a far more serious struggle, destined to trouble his entire pontificate. Martin V had convoked the Council of Basle (q. v.) which opened with scant attendance 23 July, 1431. Distrusting the spirit which was reigning at the council, Eugene, by a Bull dated 18 Dec., 1431, dissolved it, to meet eighteen months later in Bologna. There is no doubt that this exercise of the papal prerogative would sooner or later have become imperative; but it seems unwise to have resorted to it before the council had taken any overt steps in the wrong direction. It alienated public opinion, and gave colour to the charge that the Curia was opposed to any measures of reform. The prelates at Basle refused to separate, and issued an encyclical to all the faithful in which they proclaimed their determination to continue their labours. In this course they had the assurance of support from all the secular powers, and on 15 Feb., 1432, they reasserted the Gallican doctrine of the superiority of the council to the pope (see Constance, Council of). All efforts to induce Eugene to recall his Bull of dissolution having failed, the council, on 29 April, formally summoned the pope and his cardinals to appear at Basle within three months, or to be punished for contumacy. The schism which now seemed inevitable was for the time averted by the exertions of Sigismund, who had come to Rome to receive the imperial crown, 31 May, 1433. The pope recalled the Bull and acknowledged the council as œcumenical, 15 Dec., 1433. In the following May, 1434, a revolution, fomented by the pope's enemies, broke out in Rome. Eugene, in the garb of a monk, and pelted with stones, escaped down the Tiber to Ostia, whence the friendly Florentines conducted him to their city and received him with an ovation. He took up his residence in the Dominican convent of Santa Maria Novella, and sent Vitelleschi, the militant Bishop of Recanati, to restore order in the States of the Church.

The prolonged sojourn of the Roman Court in Florence, then the centre of the literary activity of the age,

Tomb of Eugene IV
San Salvatore in Lauro, Rome

gave a strong impetus to the Humanistic movement. During his stay in the Tuscan capital, Eugene consecrated the beautiful cathedral, just then finished by Brunelleschi. Meanwhile, the rupture between the Holy See and the revolutionists at Basle, now completely controlled by the radical party under the leadership of Cardinal d'Allemand, of Arles, became complete. This time our sympathies are entirely on the side of the pontiff, for the proceedings of the little coterie which assumed the name and authority of a general council were utterly subversive of the Divine constitution of the Church. By abolishing all sources of papal revenue and restricting in every way the papal prerogative, they sought to reduce the head of the Church to a mere shadow. Eugene answered with a dignified appeal to the European powers. The struggle came to a crisis in the matter of the negotiations for union with the Greeks. The majority at Basle were in favour of holding a council in France or Savoy. But geography was against them. Italy was much more convenient for the Greeks; and they declared for the pope. This so provoked the radical party at Basle that on 3 July, 1437, they issued a *monitum* against Eugene, heaping all sorts of accusations upon him. In reply the pope published (18 Sept.) a Bull in which he transferred the council to Ferrara. Though the council declared the Bull invalid, and threatened the pope with deposition, yet the Bull dealt a deadly blow to the adversaries of papal supremacy. The better disposed leaders, notably Cardinals Cesarini and Cusa, left them and repaired to Ferrara, where the council convened by Eugene opened, 8 Jan., 1438, under the presidency of Cardinal Albergati.

The deliberations with the Greeks lasted for over a year, and were concluded at Florence, 5 July, 1439, by the Decree of Union. Though the union was not permanent, it vastly enhanced the prestige of the papacy. The union with the Greeks was followed by that of the Armenians, 22 Nov., 1439, the Jacobites, 1443, and the Nestorians, 1445. Eugene exerted himself to the utmost in rousing the nations of Europe to resist the advance of the Turks. A powerful army was formed in Hungary, and a fleet was despatched to the Hellespont. The first successes of the Christians were followed, in 1444, by the crushing defeat at Varna. In the mean time, the dwindling conventicle at Basle proceeded on the path of schism. On 24 Jan., 1438, Eugene was pronounced suspended, and this step was followed by his deposition on 25 June, 1439, on the charge of heretical conduct towards a general council. To crown their infamy, the sectaries, now reduced to one cardinal and eleven bishops, elected an anti-pope, Duke Amadeus of Savoy, as Felix V. But Christendom, having recently experienced the horrors of a schism, repudiated the revolutionary step, and, before his death, Eugene had the happiness of seeing the entire Christian world, at least in theory, obedient to the Holy See. The decrees of Florence have since been the solid basis of the spiritual authority of the papacy.

Eugene secured his position in Italy by a treaty, 6 July, 1443, with Alfonso of Aragon, whom he confirmed as monarch of Naples, and after an exile of nearly ten years he made a triumphant entry into Rome, on 28 Sept., 1443. He devoted his remaining years to the amelioration of the sad condition of Rome, and to the consolidation of his spiritual authority among the nations of Europe. He was unsuccessful in his efforts to induce the French court to cancel the anti-papal Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (7 July, 1438), but, by prudent compromises and the skill of Æneas Silvius, he gained a marked success in Germany. On the eve of his death he signed (5, 7 Feb., 1447) with the German nation the so-called Frankfort, or Princes', Concordat, a series of four Bulls, in which, after long hesitancy and against the advice of many cardinals, he recognized, not without diplomatic reserve, the persistent German contentions for a new council in a German city, the mandatory decree of Constance (Frequens) on the frequency of such councils, also its authority (and that of other general councils), but after the manner of his predecessors, from whom he declared that he did not intend to differ. On the same day he issued another document, the so-called "Bulla Salvatoria", in which he asserted that notwithstanding these concessions, made in his last illness when unable to examine them with more care, he did not intend to do aught contrary to the teachings of the Fathers, or the rights and authority of the Apostolic See (Hergenröther-Kirsch, II, 941–2). See Pius II; Gregory of Heimburg.

Raynaldus, *Annales*, ad ann. 1431–47; Vespasiano da Bisticci, *Commentario della vita di Eugenio IV e Nicola V* etc. in Muratori, *Script. rer. Ital.*, XXV, 251; Piccolomini, *ibid.*, III (ii), 868–904; *Tiara et purpura Veneta* (Venice, 1761), 5–15, 50–53, 344–48; Christophe, *Hist. de la papauté au XV siècle* (Paris, 1863), II, 94–359; Albert, *Papst Eugen IV* (Mainz, 1885); Arnold, *Rep. Germ.* etc. (Berlin, 1897), I; Gebhardt, *Die Gravamina d. deutsch. Nat. gegen den röm. Hof* (Breslau, 1895); Pastor, *Gesch. der Päpste*, etc. (4th ed.), I, 280 sqq., *ibid.* tr. Antrobus (St. Louis, 1902); Hefele, *Conciliengesch.*, VII (ii); Düx, *Der deutsche Kardinal Nich. Von Cusa und die Kirche seiner Zeit* (Ratisbon, 1847); Montor, *Hist. of the Popes* (New York, 1867), II; see also literature on the Councils of Basle and Florence, and on Humanism and Renaissance in Chevalier, *Bio-bibl.*, 1399–40, and Hergenröther-Kirsch, *Kirchengesch.* (1904), II, 907–9.

James F. Loughlin.

Eugenius I, Archbishop of Toledo, successor in 636 of Justus in that see; d. 647. Like his predecessor he had been a disciple of Helladius in the monastery of Agli. He is famous as an astronomer and astronomical mathematician. As a bishop he was virtuous and intelligent. At this period, under the Gothic kings, the councils of Toledo were national diets convoked by the monarch, attended by lay lords; they regulated, to some extent, not only spiritual but temporal affairs. Of these councils Eugenius presided at the fifth, convoked in 636 by King Chintil to confirm his elevation to the throne; he assisted at the sixth, convoked by the same king to take precautions against the disorders of royal elections. This council, contrary to the principles later put in practice by St. Ildephonsus, banished all Jews who did not embrace the Catholic Faith. Eugenius attended the seventh council of Toledo, which was summoned by King Chindaswith and decreed that the bishops of Toledo should reside one month every year in that city.

Goschler, *Dict. encycl. de la théol. cath.* (Paris, 1860); Labbe, *Sacrosancta Concilia* (Paris, 1671), V, 1738, 1749, 1841.

Eugenius II (the Younger), Archbishop of Toledo from 647 to 13 Nov., 657, the date of his death. He was the son of a Goth named Evantius, became a cleric in the cathedral of Toledo, and at the death of Eugenius I was elected his successor. The office was so little to his taste that he fled to Saragossa to lead a monastic life, but was forced to return to Toledo by King Chindaswith and take up the government of that see. Though of small stature and feeble health he was a zealous prelate. He undertook the reform of the ecclesiastical chant of the Divine Office and achieved distinction as a writer of prose and poetry. His style is natural and clear, and his exposition easy and agreeable. His poems, though lacking polish and elegance, are full of fire, spirit, and poetic movement. Piety breathes throughout, and the orthodoxy of his faith is notable. His thought is solid, fertile, and gives evidence of a well-trained mind. His feast is kept on 13 November.

Eugenius left two books in prose and verse, published (Paris, 1619) by Father Sirmond, S.J., containing his poems on religious and secular subjects, his recension of the poem of Dracontius on "The Six Days of Creation" (Hexaemeron), to which he added a "Seventh Day", and a letter to King Chindaswith explaining the plan of the entire work; he also edited the metrical "Satisfactio" of Dracontius, an account of the writer's misfortunes. Of this work Bardenhewer says (Patrology, tr. St. Louis, 1908, p. 619) that it "underwent a substantial revision at the hands of Eugenius II, Bishop of Toledo, in keeping with the wish of the Visigothic King Chindaswith (642–49); not only were the poetical form and the theology of the poem affected by this treatment, but probably also its political sentiments. It is this revision that was usually printed as Dracontii Elegia (Migne, P.L., LXXVIII, 383–88), until the edition of Arevalo (Rome, 1791, 362–402, and 901–32) made known the original text". He also wrote a treatise on the Trinity probably against the Arian Visigoths. Ferrera mentions a letter of Eugenius to the king and one to Protasius, the Metropolitan of Tarragona, promising if possible to write a mass of St. Hippolytus and some festal sermons, but disclaiming the ability to equal his former productions.

Sirmond, *Opera* (Venice, 1728), II, 610; *P. L.*, LXXXVII, 347–418; Ferrera, *History of Spain*, ad ann. 647–658; Gams, *Kirchengesch. Spaniens* (1874), II, 2, 132–35; Michaud, *Biog. Univ.* (Paris, 1826).

Mark J. McNeal.

Eugenius of Carthage, Saint, unanimously elected Bishop of Carthage in 480 to succeed Deogratias (d. 456); d. 13 July, 505. The election was deferred owing to the opposition of the Arian Vandal kings and was only permitted by Huneric at the instance of Zeno and Placidia, into whose family the Vandals had married. The bishop's wise government, charity to the poor, austerity of life, and courage under persecution, won the admiration of the Arians. In his uncompromising defence of the Divinity of the

Word he was imitated by the members of his flock, many of whom were exiled with him, after he had admitted Vandals into the Catholic Church, contrary to royal edict, and had worsted in argument Arian theologians, whom the king pitted against the Catholics. Both sides claimed the name "Catholic", the Arians calling their opponents "Homoousians". The conference was held some time between 481 and February, 484, and ended by the withdrawal of the chief Arian bishop on the plea that he could not speak Latin. The Arians being enraged, Huneric persecuted the Catholics, exiling forty-six bishops to Corsica, and three hundred and two to the African deserts. Among the latter was Eugenius, who under the custody of a ruffian named Antonius dwelt in the desert of Tripoli. On setting out he wrote a letter of consolation and exhortation to the faithful of Carthage which is still extant in the works of Gregory of Tours (P. L., LVII, 769–71). Gunthamund, who succeeded Huneric allowed Eugenius to return to Carthage and permitted him to reopen the churches. After eight years of peace Thrasamund succeeded to the throne, revived the persecution, arrested Eugenius, and condemned him to death, but commuted the sentence into exile at Vienne, near Albi (Languedoc), where the Arian Alaric was king. Eugenius built here a monastery over the tomb of St. Amaranthus, the martyr, and led a penitential life till his death. He is said to have miraculously cured a man who was blind.

He wrote: "Expositio Fidei Catholicæ", demanded of him by Huneric, probably the one submitted by the Catholic bishops at the conference. It proves the consubstantiality of the Word and Divinity of the Holy Ghost. He wrote also an "Apologeticus pro Fide"; "Altercatio cum Arianis", fragments of which are quoted by Victor de Vita; also pleas for the Catholics, addressed to Huneric or his successors. His letter to the faithful of Carthage has been mentioned above.

VICTOR DE VITA, *Historia persecutionis Vandalicæ* in *P. L.*, LVIII; *Acta SS.*, 13 July; GENNADIUS, *De viris illustr.*, c. XCVII; ROHRBACHER, *Hist. Univ. de l'Eglise Catholique* (Paris, 1857), VIII, 384–400; BARDENHEWER, *Patrology*, tr. SHAHAN (Freiburg, 1908), 615.

MARK J. MCNEAL.

Eugippius. See SEVERINUS, SAINT.

Eulalia of Barcelona, SAINT, a Spanish martyr in the persecution of Diocletian (12 Feb., 304), patron of the cathedral and city of Barcelona, also of sailors. The Acts of her life and martyrdom were copied early in the twelfth century, and with elegant conciseness, by the learned ecclesiastic Renallus Grammaticus (Bol. acad. hist., Madrid, 1902, XLI, 253–55). Their chief historical source is a Latin hymn of the middle of the seventh century by Quiricus, Bishop of Barcelona, friend and correspondent of St. Ildephonsus of Toledo and of Tajo, Bishop of Saragossa. This hymn, identical with that of Prudentius (Peristephanon, III) for the feast of St. Eulalia of Merida (10 Dec., 304), was preserved in the Visigothic Church and has reached us through the Mozarabic Liturgy.

There is no reason to doubt the existence of two distinct saints of this name, despite the over-hasty and hypercritical doubts of some. The aforesaid Quiricus of Barcelona and Oroncius of Merida were present at the tenth council of Toledo (656). The latter had already founded (651) a convent of nuns close by the basilica of the celebrated martyr of his episcopal city, had written a rule for its guidance, and given it for abbess the noble lady Eugenia. Quiricus now did as much for the basilica and sepulchre of the martyr of Barcelona, close to whom he wished to be buried, as we read in the last lines of the hymn. The inscriptions on many Visigothic altars show that they contained relics of St. Eulalia; except in the context, however, they do not distinguish between the martyr of Barcelona and the one of Merida. On an altar in the village of Morera, Province of Badajoz, we find enumerated consecutively Sts. Fructuosus and Augurius (Tarragona), St. Eulalia (Barcelona), St. Baudilius (Nimes), and St. Paulus (Narbonne). The Visigothic archæology of Eastern Spain has been hitherto poor in hagiological remains; nevertheless, a trans-Pyrenean inscription found at Montady near Béziers mentions a basilica dedicated to the martyrs Sts. Vincentius, Iñes, and Eulalia (of Barcelona). Until 23 Nov., 874, the body of the Barcelona martyr reposed outside the walls of the city in the church of Santa Maria del Mar. On that date both the body and the tomb were transferred to his cathedral by Bishop Frodoinus. In memory of this act he set up an inscription yet preserved in the Muséo Provincial of Barcelona (no. 864); see also volume XX of Florez, "España Sagrada", for a reproduction of the same. Not long before this the martyr, St. Eulogius, having occasion to defend the martyrs of Cordova for their spontaneous confession of the Christian Faith before the Mussulman magistrates, quoted the example of St. Eulalia of Barcelona, and referred to the ancient Acts of her martyrdom. Her distinct personality is also confirmed by the existence of an ancient church and monastery in Cordova that bear the name of the Barcelona martyr; this important evidence is borne out by the Mozarabic calendars examined by the learned Dom Ferotin (below).

Acta SS. Feb. 12, II, 576–80; FLOREZ, *España Sagrada*, XIII, XXIX; HÜBNER, *Inscriptiones Hispaniæ Christianæ* (Berlin, 1900), nos. 57, 80, 89, 178, 334, 374, 519; FEROTIN, *Liber Ordinum* in *Mon. Eccl. Liturgica* (Paris, 1904), V, 449–505, 767; FITA, *Boletin de la Real Academia de la Historia* (Madrid), 1900–03, XXV, 53–55; XXXVII, 347; XLI, 253; XLIII, 50, 250, 449; *P. L.*, LX, 643; LXXXIX, 1033, 1100; *Anonymi Libellus de vitis et miraculis patrum Emeritensium Paulo diacono Emeritensi vulgo inscriptus* etc., ed. DE SMEDT in *Hagiogr. Bolland.* (Brussels, 1884); GAMS, *Kircheng. Spaniens* (1862), I, 306.

F. FITA.

Eulalius, ANTI-POPE. See BONIFACE I.

Eulogia (Greek *εὐλογία*, "a blessing").—The term has been applied in ecclesiastical usage to the object blessed. It was occasionally used in early times to signify the Holy Eucharist, and in this sense is especially frequent in the writings of St. Cyril of Alexandria. The origin of this use is doubtless to be found in the words of St. Paul (I Cor., X, 16): *τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν*. But the more general use is for such objects as bread, wine, etc., which it was customary to distribute after the celebration of the Divine Mysteries. Bread so blessed, we learn from St. Augustine (De peccat. merit., ii, 26), was customarily distributed in his time to catechumens, and he even gives it the name of *sacramentum*, as having received the formal blessing of the Church: "Quod acceperunt catechumeni, quamvis non sit corpus Christi, sanctum tamen est, et sanctius quam cibi quibus alimur, quoniam sacramentum est" (What the catechumens receive, though it is not the Body of Christ, is holy—holier, indeed, than our ordinary food, since it is a *sacramentum*). For the extension of this custom in later ages, see ANTIDORON; BREAD, LITURGICAL USE OF.

The word *eulogia* has a special use in connexion with monastic life. In the Benedictine Rule monks are forbidden to receive "litteras, eulogias, vel quælibet munuscula" without the abbot's leave. Here the word may be used in the sense of blessed bread only, but it seems to have a wider signification, and to designate any kind of present. There was a custom in monasteries of distributing in the refectories, after Mass, the eulogiæ of bread blessed at the Mass.

AUBESPINE, *De vet. ecc. ritibus* (Paris, 1623); DUCANGE, *Glossarium med. et inf. latinitatis*, ed. FAVRE (Niort, 1883–88); DE VERT, *Cérémonies de l'Eglise.*

ARTHUR S. BARNES.

Eulogius of Alexandria, SAINT, patriarch of that see from 580 to 607. He was a successful combatant of the heretical errors then current in Egypt, notably the various phases of Monophysitism. He was a

warm friend of St. Gregory the Great, corresponded with him, and received from that pope many flattering expressions of esteem and admiration. Among other merits the pope makes special mention of his defence of the primacy of the Roman See (Baronius, Ann. Eccl., ad an. 597, no. 9) Eulogius refuted the Novatians, some communities of which ancient sect still existed in his diocese, and vindicated the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ, against both Nestorius and Eutyches. Baronius (ad ann. 600, no. 5) says that Gregory wished Eulogius to survive him, recognizing in him the voice of truth. It has been rightly said that he restored for a brief period to the church of Alexandria that life and youthful vigour characteristic of those churches only which remain closely united to Rome. Besides the above works and a commentary against the various sects of the Monophysites (Severians, Theodosians, Cainites, Acephali) he left eleven discourses in defence of Leo I and the council of Chalcedon, also a work against the Agnoetæ, submitted by him before publication to Gregory I, who after some observations authorized it unchanged. With exception of one sermon and a few fragments all the writings of Eulogius have perished.

NEALE, *The Holy Eastern Church: Patriarchate of Alexandria* (London, 1850), II, 46–52; BARDENHEWER, *Patrology*, tr. SHAHAN (Freiburg and St. Louis, 1908), 575. The extant fragments of the writings of Eulogius are in *P. G.*, LXXXVI (2) 2913–64.

M. J. MCNEAL.

Eulogius of Cordova, SAINT, Spanish martyr and writer who flourished during the reigns of the Cordovan Caliphs, Abd-er-Rahman II and Mohammed I (822–886). It is not certain on what date or in what year of the ninth century he was born; it must have been previous to 819, because in 848 he was a priest highly esteemed among the Christians of Catalonia and Navarre, and priesthood was then conferred only on men thirty years of age. The family of the saint was of the nobility and held land in Cordova from Roman times. The Mussulman rulers of Spain, at the beginning of the eighth century, tolerated the creed of the Christians and left them, with some restrictions, their civil rule, ecclesiastical hierarchy, monasteries, and property, but made them feel the burden of subjection in the shape of pecuniary exactions and military service. In the large cities like Toledo and Cordova, the civil rule of the Christians did not differ from that of the Visigothic epoch. The government was exercised by the *comes* (count), president of the council of senators, among whom we meet a similarly named ancestor of Eulogius. The saint, like his five brothers, received an excellent education in accord with his good birth and under the guardianship of his mother Isabel. The youngest of the brothers, Joseph, held a high office in the palace of Abd-er-Rahman II; two other brothers, Alvarus and Isidore, were merchants and traded on a large scale as far as Central Europe. Of his sisters, Niola and Anulona, the first remained with her mother; the second was educated from infancy in a monastery where she later became a nun.

After completing his studies in the monastery of St. Zoilus, Eulogius continued to live with his family the better to care for his mother; also, perhaps, to study with famous masters, one of whom was Abbot Speraindeo, an illustrious writer of that time. In the meantime he found a friend in the celebrated Alvarus Paulus, a fellow-student, and they cultivated together all branches of science, sacred and profane, within their reach. Their correspondence in prose and verse filled volumes; later they agreed to destroy it as too exuberant and lacking in polish. Alvarus married, but Eulogius preferred the ecclesiastical career, and was finally ordained a priest by Bishop Recared of Cordova. Alvarus has left us a portrait of his friend: "Devoted", he says, "from his infancy to the Scriptures, and growing daily in the practice of virtue, he quickly reached perfection, surpassed in knowledge all his contemporaries, and became the teacher even of his masters. Mature in intelligence, though in body a child, he excelled them all in science even more than they surpassed him in years. Fair in feature [*clarus vultu*], honest and honourable, he shone by his eloquence, and yet more by his works. What books escaped his avidity for reading? What works of Catholic writers, of heretics and Gentiles, chiefly philosophers? Poets, historians, rare writings, all kinds of books, especially sacred hymns, in the composition of which he was a master, were read and digested by him; his humility was none the less remarkable and he readily yielded to the judgment of others less learned than himself." This humility shone particularly on two occasions. In his youth he had decided to make a foot pilgrimage to Rome; notwithstanding his great fervour and his devotion to the sepulchre of the Prince of the Apostles (a notable proof of the union of the Mozarabic Church with the Holy See), he gave up his project, yielding to the advice of prudent friends. Again, during the Saracenic persecution in 850, after reading a passage of the works of St. Epiphanius he decided to refrain for a time from saying Mass that he might better defend the cause of the martyrs; however, at the request of his bishop, Saul of Cordova, he put aside his scruples. His extant writings are proof that Alvarus did not exaggerate. They give an account of what is most important from 848 to 859 in Spanish Christianity, both without and within the Mussulman dominions, especially of the lives of the martyrs who suffered during the Saracenic persecution, *quorum pars ipse magna fuit.* He was elected Archbishop of Toledo shortly before he was beheaded (11 March, 859). He left a perfect account of the orthodox doctrine which he defended, the intellectual culture which he propagated, the imprisonment and sufferings which he endured; in a word, his writings show that he followed to the letter the exhortation of St. Paul: *Imitatores mei estote sicut et ego Christi.* He is buried in the cathedral of Oviedo.

FUENTE, *Hist. Ec.ca de España* (1855), II, 124–26; FLOREZ, *España Sagrada*, X, 336–471; GAMS, *Kirchengesch. Spaniens* (1874), II, 229–38; MIGNE, *P.L.*, CXV, 704–966; SIMONET, *Historia de los Mozárabes de España* in *Memorias de la Real Academia de la Historia*, XIII, 357, 486 (Madrid, 1903); BAUDISSIN, *Eulogius und Alvar* (Leipzig, 1872); EBERT, *Gesch. der lat. Litt. des Mittelalters* (Leipzig, 1880), II, 300–05; BOURRET, *Schola Cordubæ Christiana* (Paris, 1858), 35–58.

F. FITA.

Eumenia, a titular see of Phrygia Pacatiana in Asia Minor, and suffragan to Hierapolis. It was founded by Attalus II Philadelphus (159–138 B. C.) at the sources of the Cludrus and near the Glaucus, on the site of the modern Ishekli, the centre of a nahié in the vilayet of Brusa (1000 inhabitants). The new city was named by its founder after his brother Eumenes. Numerous inscriptions and many coins remain to show that Eumenia was an important and prosperous city under Roman rule. On its coins it boasts of its Achæan origin. The spread of Christianity is, however, the most interesting fact in its history. As early as the third century its population was in great part Christian, and it seems to have suffered much during the persecution of Diocletian. Its bishop and martyr, St. Thraseas (Euseb., H. E., V, xxiv), must belong to this period. Another bishop, Metrodorus, known by an inscription, lived probably soon after Emperor Constantine. Four other bishops are known by their subscriptions to proceedings of councils—Theodore in 361, Leo in 787, Paul and Epiphanius in 879 (Lequien, Oriens christ., I, 807). The see is mentioned in the "Notitiæ episcopatuum" as late as the twelfth or thirteenth centuries.

RAMSAY, *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia* (Oxford, 1898), 353–373, 484–533.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Eunomianism, a phase of extreme Arianism prevalent amongst a section of Eastern churchmen from about 350 until 381; as a sect it is not heard of after the middle of the fifth century. The teaching of Arius was condemned by the Council of Nicæa, and the word *homoousion* adopted as the touchstone of orthodoxy. The subsequent history of the Arian heresy is the history of the endeavours of arianizing sympathizers to get rid of the obnoxious word. The diplomacy of court intriguers forms the dark background against which stand out Eusebians and Semi-Arians. Imperial influence had been all-powerful too long in the official religion to allow imperial ingerence in church affairs to cease with the imperial change of attitude towards Christianity. That influence was exercised through the court prelates tinged with the fundamental rationalism underlying Arianism. They skilfully avoided the real issue, represented the whole affair as merely a question of the propriety of using particular terms, and for a time deluded those who were unfamiliar with the metaphysics of the question. St. Athanasius was represented as a political fire-brand whose watchword was *homoousion*. The Emperor Constantius (337–361), to his great personal annoyance, was obliged to allow Athanasius to return from his second exile (339–346) to Alexandria (31 Oct., 346). The lull which seemed to follow the return of Athanasius was due to the political circumstances arising out of the disastrous Persian War and the civil war against Maxentius; and it was not until the victory of Mount Seleucus (13 Aug., 353) that the emperor's hands were freed.

In the meantime a new and more defiant Arian school was arising, impatient of diplomacy, and less pliant to imperial dictation. It frankly returned to the fullest expression of the errors of Arius, and sought to defend it on the rationalizing basis of Aristotelean dialectics. The history of the new school coincides with the life-history of Aetius and Eunomius. Aetius, its founder, successively a goldsmith, physician, and grammarian, turned his attention to theology under Arian influences at Antioch and Alexandria. Aristotle's categories henceforth formed the limits of his knowledge, and the abuse of the syllogism his principal weapon. Ordained deacon at Antioch in 350, he was deposed by Leontius and sought refuge at Alexandria, where he found a disciple in Eunomius. Radical and uncompromising in their heretical teaching, they asserted that in substance and in all else the Son is unlike the Father: ἀνόμοιος, "unlike", became their watchword as against the ὁμοούσιος (*homoousios*) of the Orthodox, the ὁμοιούσιος (*homoiousios*) of the Semi-Arians, and the later ὅμοιος (*homoios*) of the Acacians. Hence the Arian extremists became known as Aetians, and later as Eunomians and Anomœans. Their doctrines were received favourably by Eudoxius of Antioch and the Synod of Antioch in 358; but the formulation of their tenets produced a reaction, and in the same year they were condemned by the Semi-Arians at Ancyra and at the Third Synod of Sirmium, and the leaders were exiled for a short time to Pepuza. They reappeared, however, at the Semi-Arian Synod of Seleucia (Sept., 359), where Acacius of Cæsarea rejected the ἀνόμοιος and the triumph of the Homœans led to the exile of Aetius to Mopsuestia in Cilicia and later to Amblada in Pisidia. After 360 the Anomœan Arians ceased to be formidable. Julian the Apostate (361–363) allowed Aetius to return; he was rehabilitated in an Arian synod, and died c. 370. Meanwhile Eunomius, supported by his friend Eudoxius, transferred from Antioch to Constantinople (Jan., 360), became Bishop of the Orthodox See of Cyzicus in Mysia. His flock appealed to Constantius, who obliged Eudoxius to take action against him. Deposed in his absence and banished, Eunomius founded a sect of his own, ordained and consecrated some of his followers. Julian recalled both Aetius and Eunomius, who acquired considerable importance in Constantinople. The Synod of Antioch, 362, explicitly set forth the Anomœan doctrine that "the Son is in all things unlike [κατὰ πάντα ἀνόμοιος] the Father, as well in will as in substance". The death of Eudoxius in 370 marks the beginning of the end of Eunomianism. The sectaries were excluded from the benefit of Gratian's edict of toleration (end of 378), were directly condemned by the Council of Constantinople (381), and were the objects of special repressive measures in addition to those directed against Arians and heretics in general. Moreover, disruptive forces were at work within the sect. Eunomius died about 395, and for all practical purposes the sect may be said to have died with him.

The dogmatic system of Eunomius is characterized at once by its presumptuous dialectics and its shallowness. His errors concerning Christ are founded upon his erroneous theodicy, which involves the assertion that a God of simplicity cannot be a God of mystery at all, for even man is as competent as God to comprehend simplicity. Eunomius proclaims the absolute intelligibility of the Divine Essence: "God knows no more of His own substance, than we do; nor is this more known to Him, and less to us: but whatever we know about the Divine Substance, that precisely is known to God; on the other hand, whatever He knows, the same also you will find without any difference in us" (Socrates, Hist. Eccl., IV, vii). Ἀγεννησία, he maintains, perfectly expresses the Divine Essence: as the Unbegotten, God is an absolutely simple being: an act of generation would involve a contradiction of His essence, by introducing duality into the Godhead. The Father is ἀγέννητος, the Son γέννητος; hence, he held, there must be diversity of substance. The general line of his sophistical reasoning against the Orthodox was as follows: You allow ἀγεννησία to be a Divine attribute. Now the simplicity of God excludes all multiplicity of attributes. Consequently ἀγεννησία is the only attribute which befits the Divine nature, the only one therefore essential to Him. In other words, God is essentially incapable of being begotten. Hence it is folly to speak of a God begotten, of a Son of God. The one God, ἀγέννητος and ἄναρχος, unbegotten and without beginning, could not communicate His own substance, nor beget even a consubstantial Son; consequently there could be no question of identity of substance (*homoousios*) or of likeness of substance (*homoiousios*) between the Father and the Son. There could be no essential resemblance (κατ' οὐσίαν), but at most a moral resemblance. For the Son is a being drawn forth from nothing by the will of the Father, yet superior to all Creation inasmuch as He alone was created by the One God to be the Creator of the world. He does not share in the incommunicable Divine Essence (ὀυσία), but he does partake in the communicable Divine creative power (ἐνέργεια), and it is that partaking which constitutes the Son's Divinity and establishes Him, as regards creation, in the position of Creator: and as the principle of paternity in God is not the οὐσία but the ἐνέργεια, the sense in which the term *Son of God* may be used is clear.

The works of Eunomius are of less importance in themselves than in the fact that they called forth the best efforts of St. Basil and St. Gregory of Nyssa. His Commentary on the Romans and his letters have perished. His "Apologeticus" (P. G., XXX, 835), written before 365, seeks to refute the Nicene teaching concerning the coeternal and consubstantial Divinity of the Son. It is extremely obscure, and has been frequently misunderstood. For example, Tillemont, VI, 501–516, needs careful checking. It was against this work of Eunomius that St. Basil wrote his "Adversus Eunomium" (Ἀντιρρητικόν) in five books. (It is clear, however, that books IV and V are from another pen.) Eunomius retorted with his Ἀπολογία

ὑπὲρ ἀπολογίας (Defence of the Defence), written after the death of St. Basil (1 Jan., 379), wherein he does his best to defend more fully and by new arguments his teaching concerning the nature of God. This work was elaborately refuted by St. Gregory of Nyssa in his lengthy "Adversus Eunomium", of which some twelve books have come down to us preserving the fragmentary remains of the 'Απολογία, which are gathered in Rettberg's "Marcelliana" (Göttingen, 1794, pp. 124–147). A very full analysis of it is found in Diekamp, "Gotteslehre des hl. Gregor von Nyssa" (1896), I, 123 sqq. The third extant work is his ἔκθεσις πίστεως, or "Confession of Faith", presented by order to the Emperor Theodosius in 383. (See ARIANISM.)

MASON, *Introduction* to his *Five Theological Orations of Saint Gregory Nazianzenus* (Cambridge University Press, 1899); KLOSE, *Geschichte und Lehre des Eunomius* (Kiel, 1833); NEWMAN, *Arians of the Fourth Century* (3rd ed., London, 1871), 337–352; DIEKAMP, *Die Gotteslehre des hl. Gregor von Nyssa* (Münster, 1896), I, 123; GWATKIN, *Studies of Arianism* (London, 1882); HEFELE, *History of the Church Councils* (tr. Edinburgh, 1876), II; DORNER, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ* (Edinburgh, 1862), Div. i, vol. II, 264 sq.

EDWARD MYERS.

Euphemia, MOTHER SUPERIOR SISTERS OF CHARITY. See BLENKINSOP, PETER.

Euphemites. See MESSALIANS.

Euphemius of Constantinople (490–496) succeeded as patriarch Flavitas (or Fravitas, 489–490), who succeeded Acacius (471–489). The great Acacian schism (484–519), therefore, lasted during his reign. The Emperor Zeno (474–491) had published a decree called the "Henotikon" (482) that forbade in the current theological discussions any other criterion but that of Nicæa-Constantinople (ignoring the decrees of Chalcedon), carefully avoided speaking of Christ's two natures, and used ambiguous formulæ that were meant to conciliate the Monophysites. The "Henotikon" really satisfied no one. Consistent Monophysites disliked it as much as Catholics. But Acacius at the capital, Peter Mongus of Alexandria, and Peter Fullo (Gnapheus) of Antioch, signed it. Pope Felix III (or II, 483–492) in a Roman synod of sixty-seven bishops (484) condemned the emperor's decree, deposed and excommunicated Acacius, Peter Mongus, and Peter Fullo. Acacius retorted by striking the pope's name from his diptychs and persecuted Catholics at Constantinople. When he died, Flavitas, his successor, applied for recognition at Rome, but in vain, since he would not give up communion with Peter Mongus. Euphemius recognized the Council of Chalcedon, restored the pope's name to his diptychs, and broke with Peter Mongus, who died in the year of Euphemius's accession (490). He was therefore a well-meaning person who wanted to restore the union with the Holy See. Unfortunately he still refused to erase the names of his two predecessors (Acacius and Flavitas) from the diptychs, where they occurred among the faithful departed. The pope insisted that heretics and favourers of heresy should not be prayed for publicly in the Liturgy; so during the reign of Euphemius the union he desired was not brought about. But Euphemius was always a Catholic at heart. Before the accession of the Emperor Anastasius I (491–518) he had made him sign a Catholic profession of faith (Evagrius, H. E., III, xxxii). After the death of Pope Felix, Euphemius wrote to his successor, Gelasius I (492–496), again asking for intercommunion on any terms but the condemnation of Acacius. This time, too, the pope refused to modify his condition (Gelasii Epist. et Decret.; P. L., LIX, 13). The patriarch had already summoned a synod at Constantinople in which he confirmed the decrees of Chalcedon (Mansi, VII, 1180). Eventually he fell foul of the emperor. A war against the Bulgars and Slavs was then going on, and Euphemius was accused of treason by revealing the emperor's plans to his enemies. A soldier tried, unsuccessfully, to murder the patriarch, apparently by order of Anastasius. The emperor further wanted to have back his written profession of faith, which Euphemius refused to give up. So he was deposed (496) in spite of the resistance of the people, and Macedonius II (496–511) was appointed successor. Macedonius seems to have been unwilling to take his place and refused to wear patriarchal vestments in his presence. Euphemius was exiled to Asia Minor and died in 515 at Ancyra. He was recognized to the end as lawful patriarch by Catholics in the East (Elias of Jerusalem, Flavian of Antioch, etc.).

THEOPHANES, *Chronographia*, ad ann. 481–489, in *P. G.*, CVIII, 324–337; NICEPHORUS, *Chronographicon Syntomon*, 45, in *P. G.*, C, 1046; BARONIUS, *Annales Eccl.*, ad ann. 489–495.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Euphrasia, or EUPRAXIA, SAINT, VIRGIN, b. in 380; d. after 410. She was the daughter of Antigonus, a senator of Constantinople, and a relation of Emperor Theodosius. Her father died shortly after her birth, and her mother, also Euphrasia, devoted her life thenceforth exclusively to the service of God. To carry out this ideal she abandoned the capital, and, with her seven-year-old daughter, repaired to Egypt, where she dwelt on one of her estates, near a convent, and adopted the nuns' austere mode of life. This example aroused in her daughter the desire to enter the convent, and her mother gave her into the care of the superior, that she might be trained in the ascetic life. After her mother's death she declined an offer of marriage made, by the Emperor Theodosius, on behalf of a senator's son, transferred to the emperor her entire fortune, to be used for charitable purposes, and took up, with a holy ardour, the rigorous practices of Christian perfection. She was about thirty when she died. Her feast is celebrated in the Greek Church on 25 July, and in the Latin Church on 13 March. She is mentioned by St. John Damascene, in his third "Oratio de imaginibus".

Vitæ Patrum (ed. ROSWEYD) in *P. L.*, LXXIII, 623–642; *Acta SS.*, March, II, 265–274; 727–735.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Euphrates. See PERATÆ.

Euphrosyne, SAINT, d. about 470. Her story belongs to that group of legends which relate how Christian virgins, in order the more successfully to lead the life of celibacy and asceticism to which they had dedicated themselves, put on male attire and passed for men. According to the narrative of her life in the "Vitæ Patrum", Euphrosyne was the only daughter of Paphnutius, a rich man of Alexandria, who desired to marry her to a wealthy youth. But having consecrated her life to God and apparently seeing no other means of keeping this vow, she clothed herself as a man and under the name of Smaragdus gained admittance into a monastery of men near Alexandria, where she lived for thirty-eight years after. She soon attracted the attention of the abbot by the rapid strides which she made toward a perfect ascetic life, and when Paphnutius appealed to him for comfort in his sorrow, the abbot committed the latter to the care of the alleged young man Smaragdus. The father received from his own daughter, whom he failed to recognize, helpful advice and comforting exhortation. Not until she was dying did she reveal herself to him as his lost daughter Euphrosyne. After her death Paphnutius also entered the monastery. Her feast is celebrated in the Greek Church on 25 September, in the Roman Church on 16 January (by the Carmelites on 11 February).

MOMBRITIUS, *Sanctuarium*, I, 253–255; *Acta SS.*, Feb., II, 535–541; BOUCHERIE in *Revue des langues romanes* (1870), II, 26–40); *Analecta Bollandiana*, II, 195–205. For earlier monographs see POTTHAST, *Bibliotheca historica medii ævi*, II, 1298–1299; BARING-GOULD, *Lives of the Saints* (London, 1898), II, 264; BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, 11 Feb.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Eurœa, a titular see of Epirus Vetus in Greece, suffragan of Nicopolis. Eurœa is mentioned by Hierocles (Synecdemus, 651, 6). Justinian transferred its inhabitants to an islet in a neighbouring lake and built there a strong city (Procop., De ædif., IV, 1). We know five bishops of Eurœa; the first, St. Donatus, lived under Theodosius I, the last is mentioned in a letter of Pope St. Gregory the Great about 603 (Lequien, Or. christ., II, 143). The site of the city is unknown; Lequien identifies it with Paramythia, which is called Aï Donat (St. Donatus) by the Turks, in the vilayet of Janina. Others have placed it at Limboni, now proved to be Photice, others at Janina itself.

PANAGIOTIDES in Νεολόγου ἑβδομαῖα ἐπιθεώρησις (Constantinople, 1892), II, 308; PHILIPPSON in PAULY-WISSOWA, *Real-Encycl.*, s. v.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Europe.—NAME.—The conception of Europe as a distinct division of the earth, separate from Asia and Africa, had its origin in ancient times. The sailors of the Ægean Sea applied the Semitic designations *Ereb* (sunset, west) and *Açu* (sunrise, east) to the countries lying respectively west and east of the sea; in this way it became customary to call Greece and the territory back of it Europe, while Asia Minor and the parts beyond were named Asia. At a later date the mass of land lying to the south of the Mediterranean was set off as a distinct division of the earth with the name of Libya or Africa.

POSITION, BOUNDARIES, AND AREA.—Europe is a large peninsula forming the western part of the northern continent of the Eastern Hemisphere. On the north and west it is separated from North America by the Arctic and North Atlantic Oceans; on the south by the Mediterranean Sea from Africa and Western Asia. In the east there is no clear natural division from the continental mass of Asia. Such a dividing line may be drawn along the crest of the Ural and Mugadzhar Mountains, the Emba River, Caspian Sea, and the lowlands of the Manitch River, or through the depression that, starting from the Gulf of Obi, extends through the valleys of the Obi, Irtysh, Tobol, and Emba Rivers. The political boundary extends beyond the Ural Mountains towards the east, and beyond the Ural River to the south and west, runs along the range called Obtschei Syrt and the Usen River, and encloses within the eastern boundary of Europe the whole of the Caucasus. The most northern point of Europe is North Cape (71° 12′ N. lat.) on the Island of Magerö belonging to Norway; the most western point is Cape da Roca (9° 31′ west of Greenwich) in Portugal; the most southern is Cape Tarifa (35° 59′ 53″ N. lat.) in Spain; the Continent extends as far to the east as 65° longitude east of Greenwich. Its greatest length from north to south is 2398 miles, from west to east 3455 miles. The statement as to the extent of its area varies, according to the position assigned to its eastern boundary, from 3,672,969 sq. miles to 4,092,660 sq. miles. This measurement includes the polar islands Iceland, Nova Zembla, and Spitzbergen, but not the Canary, Madeira, and Azores Islands.

GEOLOGICAL FORMATION.—Three leading tectonic divisions are to be distinguished in the geological formation of Europe. These appeared in the middle Tertiary period. Western Europe, as far south as the Alps, the Pyrenees, and, reaching beyond the Pyrenees, into the Spanish Peninsula, to the east as far as the Baltic and the Vistula River, is formed of debris and sedimentary deposits. This has been produced by the breaking up and overflowing with water of mountain chains that now exist as secondary ranges, as the Scotch Highlands, the central plateau of France, and the mountain chain of Central Germany. Towards the east is low-lying land that has remained the same from early times. Sweden and Finland form together a great level called the Plain of the Baltic, south-east from which spreads the great Russian plain, which is limited by the Ural and Carpathian Mountains, the Crimea, and the Caucasus Mountains. The whole of Southern Europe and a part of Middle Europe is a region of late folded mountain ranges. These begin with the Pyrenees, which have remarkable spurs in the ranges of Provence, in Corsica, and Sardinia. The ranges of Andalusia in Southern Spain find their continuation in the Atlas range, which bends to the east and reappears in Europe in the mountains of the northern coast of Sicily and the Apennines. The north-western Apennines pass into the Alpine system. In the east the Alps are divided into three chains; of these the middle one passes into the Hungarian plain; the Carpathian and Balkan ranges unite in a great bend with the northern chain, and the southern one is continued by the Dinaric Alps and the western chains of the Balkan Peninsula as far as Crete and the south-western part of Asia Minor. Numerous islands belong to the Continent of Europe. The separation of the islands from the mainland arose in two ways. In the north and west, the encroachment of the sea produced bays and peninsulas and formed islands. In the south, the western and eastern basins of the Mediterranean, those of the Adriatic and Ægean Seas, the Sea of Marmora, and the southern part of the Black and Caspian Seas, were formed by folding; and in this way also were formed the Iberian, Italian, and Balkan Peninsulas and the archipelago lying between Greece and Asia Minor. The rivers of Europe belong to three different basins, namely, to the Caspian Sea, the Atlantic Ocean, including the Mediterranean and Black Seas, and the Arctic Ocean. The courses of the rivers of Europe are much shorter than the courses of those of Asia, Africa, or America. The largest of the European rivers, the Volga (1978 miles), the Danube (1771 miles), Dnieper (1329 miles), Don (1120 miles), Petchora (1023 miles), and the Dniester (835 miles), flow into seas that are almost entirely cut off from the ocean, consequently from the world's traffic. They offer, however, little obstruction to navigation, and numerous canals are cut through the main watershed that extends from Gibraltar to the northern Urals. The largest number of lakes is found in the region, formerly covered with glaciers, lying north of 50° N. lat.—Finland, Scandinavia, Scotland, and Ireland, and the region of the Alps. Besides this lake region, lakes have also been formed in the Alps by folding, in the Balkans by the breaking in of the surface, and in the Apennine Peninsula by volcanic outbreaks.

CLIMATE, FLORA, FAUNA.—The climatic conditions of Europe are very favourable. Almost the entire continent, excepting the northern point, belongs to the temperate zone. At the same time it is much warmer than other countries in the same latitude, as, for instance, than eastern North America, because along its western coast flows the Gulf Stream, which leaves the coast of Florida with a temperature of 68° Fahr. and raises the normal temperature on the Portuguese and Spanish coast about 7·2° Fahr., of the British coast about 9°–14·4° Fahr., and of the Norwegian coast about 14·4°–18° Fahr. Since there is no chain of mountains traversing Europe from north to south, as is the case with North America, the influence of the Gulf Stream extends far into the interior of the mainland. On the borders of the Arctic Ocean a rigorous climate prevails, summer is short, and during the greater part of the year the temperature is below freezing. This northern region has polar vegetation; the rolling plains called tundras are found on the peninsulas of Kanin and Kola and at the mouth of the Petchora. The sub-arctic zone is found south of this in the Scandinavian Peninsula down to 60° N. lat.; here the climate of the coast, influenced by the sea, is milder in winter and cool in summer. The part of Europe properly included in the temperate zone is divided

into the following regions: the countries lying on the Atlantic, Great Britain, Brittany, the Channel, and northwestern Spain; this section has moderate temperature and large rainfall; west and middle Europe, with an inland climate, less heavy rainfall (about 19·7 inches), and moderate changes of temperature (27°–45° Fahr.); in this section the southern part of France forms an exception, as also the depression of the Upper Rhine, and the mountains. Beyond this is the section of Eastern Europe or Russia, with a completely inland climate, the variations of temperature amounting to 45° Fahr., and the rainfall to less than 23·6 inches. Finally comes the section of the Euxine comprising the great Hungarian plain, the plain of the Balkan provinces, and Southern Russia; in this division the spring is moist and warm and midsummer hot and dry. The depression of the Caspian belongs to the dry zone of Asia.

The forests of Europe flourish in the temperate zone. In Norway they are composed chiefly of pine; the only deciduous tree found in the highest latitudes is the birch (*betula odorata*); the mixed forests of pines and deciduous trees are found south of 61° N. lat.; this region is further characterized by grass-lands, heaths, and moors. The cultivated land, which in Central and Western Europe is about sixty to seventy per cent, is divided into farm land, cultivated forest land, grass and pasture land. From north to south the succession of grains is as follows: barley, rye and oats, wheat, especially in France and Hungary, and maize. Potatoes are cultivated on less fruitful soil. In this region native fruits are the apple, pear, and cherry; finer kinds of fruit trees, as the peach, apricot, plum, and of nut trees, the walnut and almond, have been introduced from the south. In this region the grape is also cultivated; its northern limit, extending from the mouth of the Loire, passes to Paris and the Rhine near Bonn, then towards the Unstrut and Saale Rivers, and reaches its most northerly point on the Oder below 52° N. lat.; the limit of its cultivation here turns to the south-east until it reaches the Sea of Azov. The region of the Mediterranean, that is the Iberian Peninsula, Provence, Italy to the foot of the Alps, and the Balkan Peninsula south of 42° N. lat., has a subtropical climate. Here flourish trees and bushes which are always green; among those that are cultivated for their products are the citron, orange, fig, almond, mulberry, and pomegranate trees. The fauna of Europe is in accord with the climate and vegetation. In Northern Europe are found the polar bear, polar fox, and reindeer; in the region of forests live the bear, wolf, and lynx, which have, however, almost disappeared; the region of the Mediterranean contains numerous reptiles.

Population, Political Divisions, and Religions.—The greater part of the population of Europe belongs to the European or Mediterranean race. The main race-groups are the Teutonic, Romanic, and Slavonic. To the Teutonic division belong: the Germans, Dutch, Flemish, English, and Scandinavians; it contains in all 127,800,000 souls or 32·1 per cent of the whole population; included in the Romanic group are: the French, Walloons, Italians, Friulians, natives of the Rhætian Alps, Maltese, Spaniards, Portuguese, and Rumanians, in all 108,100,000 or 27·1 per cent; included in the Slavonic are: the Russians, Ruthenians, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Wends, Slovenes, Croats, Serbs, Bulgarians, Letts, and Lithuanians, in all 124,600,000, or 31·3 per cent. A smaller number, about 9,500,000 souls or 2·4 per cent is composed of other Aryan races: Celts, Greeks, Albanians, Gypsies, Armenians, etc. There are also about 27,900,000, or some 7 per cent, of non-Aryan races: Basques, Magyars, Finns, the tribes of the Ural region, Turks, Kalmucks, and Jews. The total population of Europe amounts to about 420,000,000.

The organization of the present States of Europe may be traced back to the Middle Ages. Most of the States are limited by natural boundaries within which each has developed its own individual character. The States vary greatly in size and population; most of them are constitutional monarchies, the only republics being France and Switzerland. The British Isles, united as Great Britain and Ireland, have a total area of 121,622 sq. miles and 43,722,000 inhabitants; as a natural consequence of the geographical position of the islands, the nation is largely interested in colonial enterprises. The Scandinavian Peninsula is halved by an uninhabited mountain range, thus permitting the existence of two countries, Norway and Sweden. Norway, lying on the Atlantic, has an area of 123,938 sq. miles and 2,300,000 inhabitants; Sweden, on the Baltic, has an area of 172,973 sq. miles and 5,261,000 inhabitants. The peninsula and islands lying south of Norway and Sweden form the third Scandinavian state, Denmark, that controls the entrance to the Baltic. Denmark has an area of 14,672 sq. miles and 2,450,000 inhabitants. France, the western part of the continental mass, has an area of 206,950 sq. miles and a population of 39,060,000; it has the advantage, excepting towards the north-east, of having for its boundaries either seas or mountain ranges. Between Western and Central Europe lie the so-called "buffer" States: Belgium with an area of 11,197 sq. miles and 7,075,000 inhabitants; the Netherlands, area 12,741 sq. miles, inhabitants 5,510,000; Switzerland, area 15,830 sq. miles, inhabitants 3,425,000. The German Empire, area 208,880 sq. miles, inhabitants 60,605,000, covers the greater part of Central Europe. Germany borders upon nearly all the great powers of Europe and has, therefore, developed a large army. The State having the least organic union geographically and ethnographically, and consequently in constant danger of internal disorganization, is the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. Its area is 261,004 sq. miles, population 49,092,000 souls. Russia, area 2,081,079 sq. miles, inhabitants 119,115,000, occupies the lowland of Europe and, in its largest extent, stretches beyond Europe into the Asiatic plain. Southern Europe embraces numerous states with sharply defined boundaries. The Iberian Peninsula is divided between Portugal and Spain; Portugal, a country lying on the ocean and having a great maritime past, has an area of 43,363 sq. miles, inhabitants 5,016,000; Spain, area 191,892 sq. miles, inhabitants 18,249,000. Italy belongs completely to the lands of the Mediterranean; its area is 110,811 sq. miles, population 33,604,000. The physical contour of the Balkan Peninsula is so broken up by mountain ranges that it fails to show any one organically large State. Its divisions at the present time are: Bulgaria, 37,066 sq. miles, population 3,744,400; Montenegro, 3475 sq. miles, population 228,000; Rumania, 50,579 sq. miles, population 6,392,000; Servia, 18,533 sq. miles, population 2,677,000; European Turkey, 65,251 sq. miles, population 6,130,000; Greece, 25,000 sq. miles, population 2,440,000.

By far the greater proportion of the inhabitants of Europe belong to the Christian Faith. One-fourth of the population are Protestants, somewhat over one-fourth belong to the Oriental Christian Churches, nearly 45 per cent are Catholics, 4½ per cent are non-Christian. In the Romanic States 99 per cent of the population are Catholic; in the Teutonic States 74 per cent are Protestant and less than one per cent non-Christian. In the States of Eastern Europe, Austria-Hungary, Russia, and the Balkan provinces, 57 per cent belong to the Oriental Churches, 9·2 per cent are non-Christian, 6 per cent are Protestant, and 27 per cent are Catholic. The only heathen are the Kalmucks living between the Ural and Caucasus mountains, the Finns of the Volga, and the Samoyedes. About 8,250,000 persons or 2·1 per cent of the whole population of Europe are Mohammedans in belief; these are limited to several tribes of the Uralo-Altaic

family in Russia, and to the former territories of the Ottoman Empire; among the Mohammedans are a large portion of the Albanians, some of the Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and a part of the Bulgarians. The Jews of Europe number 9,000,000 or 2·2 per cent; they are to be found chiefly in Russia, in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, Rumania, and Turkey. (The above figures are based on Hettner, op. cit. infra.)

Christianity.—European civilization is founded on that of the East; from Western Asia and Egypt Europe received its food-plants, domestic animals, method of writing, numerals, the beginnings of art and science; and the higher forms of state organization and religion. The various States of Greece, the European neighbour of Asia, transmitted these by trade and the foundation of colonies to the countries lying on the shores of the eastern Mediterranean and to Southern Italy. Rome from its central position imparted them to Western and Northern Europe and united the civilized parts of the continent into a great empire. At the time of its greatest extent imperial Rome included, on European soil, the present countries of Italy, Spain, France, England, Germany west of the Rhine and south of the Danube, the countries bordering on the Danube as far as the Black Sea, and the whole Balkan Peninsula, besides all the islands of the Mediterranean. Christianity, too, came from the East by way of Greece and Rome. The connexion existing between the various Roman provinces and the wide prevalence of the Latin and Greek tongues were most favourable to its spread. When the structure erected by the Cæsars fell to pieces, the Christian Faith not only entered into its inheritance, but also subdued all those barbarian peoples that had up to then defied the imperial power. The Gospel was brought to Rome by colonies of Jewish Christians who kept up close relations with Palestine, their mother country. St. Paul brought Christianity to Greece on his second journey (49–52 A.D.) when he founded, with the aid of Silas, Timothy, and Luke, Christian communities in Philippi, Thessalonica, Berœa, Athens, and Corinth. St. Paul's great letters and his journeys to Italy, perhaps also to Spain, prepared the way for the close connexion between the Roman and Greek Christians and strengthened them for the work of spreading the Gospel. In fact the first persecution under Nero in 64 was not able to crush the new movement, and the same is true of the many other later persecutions.

Towards the end of the first century, under Clement, the head of the Church at that time, there was a close bond between Rome and Corinth. It is also to be assumed that in the meantime all the commercial cities on the coasts of the Mediterranean had Christians in their midst, and that before long the regions adjoining these cities accepted the Gospel. According to tradition the Church in Gaul was founded by Trophimus, who was sent there by St. Paul; to Crescentius, a disciple of the Apostles, is ascribed the preaching of the Gospel in Vienne and Mainz; and to Dionysius the Areopagite, the founding of the Church of Paris. To Eucharius and Maternus, two disciples of St. Paul, are attributed the founding of the Churches of Trier and Cologne. It is certain that flourishing dioceses arose in Lyons and Vienne during the reign of Marcus Aurelius (161–80). At the beginning of the third century, according to the testimony of Tertullian (Adv. Judæos, i), various tribes of Gaul had accepted Christianity. At about the same date Irenæus (Adv. hæreses) speaks of Churches in Germany, and the new faith had at that time spread into all the provinces of the Spanish Peninsula. According to the Venerable Bede (Histor. gentis Angl., I, iii), the first missionaries came to England during the reign of Pope Eleutherius (177–90). By the opening of the third century the British Church had spread beyond the Roman possessions in Britain and may even have embraced Ireland. In the meantime the barbarians living along the northern boundaries of the Roman Empire had begun their migrations and predatory incursions. Along this border lived the tribes of the Teutonic family, divided by the Oder into the East Germans and West Germans. The East Germans included the Ostrogoths and Visigoths, Burgundians, Vandals, Heruli, Rugii, and Scyrri. The West Germans were divided into the Ingvæones or Germans on the sea-coast, including the later Frisians and Anglo-Saxons; the Istvæones or the Germans of the Rhine, including the Franks between the Weser and Rhine; the Hermiones, among whom were the later Thuringians and the upper German tribes of the Alamanni and Bavarians (Bajuvarii). As early as the years 161–80 the Marcomanni, a West German tribe, advanced as far as Aquileia; they were defeated, but introduced northern elements into the population. After this failure the current of the migration divided into two streams: one to the south-east, the migration of the East Germans; one to the south-west, the migration of the West Germans. Of the East Germans, the Goths reached the lower Danube and the Black Sea and divided, according to these respective positions, into the Ostrogoths and Visigoths. In 375, on account of the pouring in of Asiatic hordes through the gateway of the nations between the Urals and the Caspian, the Ostrogoths came under the power of the Huns. The Visigoths, who were also hard pressed, retreated towards Transylvania and received land somewhat south of this from the Emperors Valens and Theodosius. When, after the death of Theodosius, the Roman Empire was divided in 395 into the Western and Eastern Empires, ruled respectively by his sons Honorius and Arcadius, the Visigoths under Alaric plundered Thrace and Greece and, with the permission of Arcadius, settled in Illyria. From here they presseds toward Italy and in 410 even entered Rome. They then turned towards South-Eastern Gaul and in 419 founded the first German kingdom on Roman soil, its capital being Toulouse; they also conquered a large part of Spain. In 507 the Visigoths were forced to give up their possessions in Gaul to the Franks, and in 531 the capital of the Visigothic Kingdom was transferred to Toledo.

The recall from the Rhine of the Roman legions needed for the struggle against Alaric left the way to the south-west open to two other East German peoples, the Burgundians and the Vandals. The Burgundians, who had formerly lived between the Oder and the Vistula, crossed the Rhine in 406 and founded a kingdom having its capital at Worms; in 437 this kingdom was broken up by the Roman governor Aetius, but another arose in 443 around Geneva and Lyons; this, however, in 532, was absorbed into the Kingdom of the Franks. In 406 the Vandals left their home on the northern slope of the mountains called Riesengebirge, and in union with the Alani and Suevi passed through Gaul into Spain; the Visigoths drove them out of Spain into the Roman provinces in Africa, whence for a long time they controlled the Mediterranean and in 455 ravaged Rome. In 476 Odoacer, the leader of the mercenaries made up of Heruli, Rugii, and Scyrri, seized the government and called himself King of Italy. At almost the same time the Ostrogoths in Pannonia were again free, as the power of the Huns was broken in the great battle on the Catalaunian Fields near Châlons-sur-Marne in 451. Theodoric, the King of the Ostrogoths, conquered Odoacer in 489 and created a kingdom (493–526) that embraced Italy, Sicily, a part of Pannonia, Rhætia, and the Province; this kingdom went to pieces in 553. The Ostrogoths were followed by the Lombards, a tribe of the lower Elbe, who, passing through Pannonia, reached Italy in 568 under their King Alboin; it was not until 774 that the Lombards were brought under subjection by the Franks. All these peoples were to disappear in order, by their absorption into the civilization of Rome, to bring about the union of Christianity,

the state religion of Rome since the time of Constantine the Great, with a more stable power, the united West Germans.

The West Germans, although their migrations were not very extended, had changed their habitations as follows: in the fourth century the Alamanni advanced into Alsace and in the fifth century took entire possession of it, spreading towards the north as far as Coblenz. The Franks were divided into the Ripuarian and Salian Franks; the former settled on both sides of the middle and lower Rhine, the latter advanced from the Scheldt to the Somme. Towards the end of the third century the Saxons advanced from the Elbe to the Rhine; in the fifth century, with the aid of the Angles, they conquered Britain; the former inhabitants of Britain took refuge in Wales and France and gave their name to Brittany. The Frisians settled on the coast and islands of Schleswig-Holstein; the Thuringians spread from the lower Elbe to the southern bank of the Main. The Bajuvarii went farthest south. At the time of the birth of Christ they lived in modern Bohemia; about 500 their territory extended from the Lech to the Enns and from the Danube to the junction of the Eisack and the Adige. The region occupied by the tribes just named enlarged the scene of European history; all that was now needed was the political and spiritual union of these peoples to make them the leading people of Europe. The political union was brought about by the Franks, the spiritual union by Christianity. In the end these were combined into a form of theocracy which, by a rapid series of victories, conquered not only Southern Europe, but also Middle and Eastern Europe as well.

Just as the fifth century passed into the sixth (481–511) Clovis, King of the Salian Franks, forcibly subdued the most important of the surrounding tribes; he led them to embrace Christianity after his own conversion. Clovis first united what was left of the Roman Empire on the Seine and Loire with his own domain and made Paris his capital. After this he subdued the Alamanni on the Rhine, Mosel, Lower Main, and Neckar; as the champion of the doctrines of Roman Christianity, he conquered the King of the Arian Visigoths near Poitiers (507) and seized the Visigothic territory between the Loire and the Garonne. By overthrowing the petty Salian chiefs and the royal family of the Ripuarian Franks, he made himself the ruler of all the Frankish tribes. The work was completed by his four sons, who seized the territories of the Thuringians and Burgundians, forced the Ostrogoths to give up Provence and Rhætia, and obtained by treaties sovereignty over the Bajuvarii.

Thus was laid the foundation of the Franco-Christian Empire which opened to Christianity a new missionary field to be won over to the Faith only by properly trained apostles. The training was given in the monastic institutions which, in imitation of the East, had now spread over all of Western Europe. One of the chief factors in the conversion of the heathen was the Order of St. Benedict of Nursia, encouraged by Gregory the Great. The precursors of the Benedictines were St. Patrick (432) and St. Columba (about 550), who converted Ireland and Scotland, while the Anglo-Saxons received Christianity from the Benedictine Augustine (596), who had been specially sent by Rome. At the death of St. Patrick there were in Ireland several bishops, numerous priests and many monasteries; his own see was Armagh. Columba founded the celebrated monastery on the Island of Iona, between Ireland and Scotland, which was the centre of the Scotch missions and dioceses. The Abbot Augustine and his companions erected the metropolitan Sees of Canterbury (Durovernum), York (Eboracum), and the see of London; in the course of the seventh century the successors of Augustine, Mellitus and Theodore of Tarsus, completed his work.

A glorious band of self-sacrificing apostles of the Faith, from Columbanus and Gallus to Bonitace, carried Christianity from the British Isles to the Continent. They founded their work on what scanty remains of Christianity still existed in the former Roman provinces. In the fifth century Severinus and Valentinus laboured in south-eastern Germany. They found the remains of nearly obliterated sees in Lorch, Pettau, Windisch in Switzerland, Chur, Basle, Strasburg, Avenches in Switzerland, Martigny, and Geneva, but the Teutonic migrations and the disorders consequent on them had almost destroyed the life of the Church. About 610 Columbanus crossed the Vosges mountains, where he had founded the monasteries of Annegray and Luxeuil, and came to Lake Constance; here from Bregenz as a centre he preached Christianity, while his companion St. Gall became the founder of the celebrated monastery of St. Gall. In the early part of the seventh century the monks Agilus and Eustasius, of the monastery of Luxeuil, preached the Gospel in Bavaria; they were followed by Rupert of Worms and Emmeram of Aquitaine. St. Corbinian laboured as the first Bishop of Freising, and Kilian in Würzburg. Ecclesiastical life on the Rhine was largely developed by Bishops Nicetius of Trier, Cunibert of Cologne, Dragobodo of Speyer, Amandus, Lambert, and Hugo of Maastricht. The Gospel was brought to the Frisians by Wilfrid of York and Willibrord of Northumbria; the latter erected a see at Utrecht. Willibrord's companion, Suidbert, went into the countship of Mark in the region of the Weser, Lippe, and Ruhr Rivers; the brothers Ewald laboured with little success among the Saxons. An organization including all these countries was not established until the appearance of the greatest of the apostles of the Germans, St. Boniface. He entered on his career in the time of the Carlovingian Mayors of the Palace, who were destined to realize the union of Church and State in Western Europe.

Repeated divisions of the kingdom, disputes as to succession, civil wars, and the power of the nobles almost brought the great Frankish kingdom to dissolution. It was saved from utter ruin by Pepin of Heristal, Mayor of the Palace (*Major domus*), who gradually took control of the government. In 687 Pepin won for himself the position of Mayor of the Palace of Neustria and Burgundy, in addition to that for Austrasia which he already held; in this way he reunited the kingdom. He then undertook the conquest of the tribes which had broken loose from the Frankish rule and encouraged the missions to the West Frisians. His son Charles Martel, who was not less active, held a position of such power that he was able, in the great battle of Poitiers, 732, to protect Christian German civilization against the attempt of Islam to conquer the world. Pepin the Short, the son of Charles, brought about the union of Church and State which had so great an influence on the history of the world. Having obtained the title of king in 752, his first task was to defend Pope Stephen II, who had appealed to him for aid, from the attacks of the Lombards; this was followed by the so-called "Donation of Pepin", a grant of territory to the pope which was the foundation of the later States of the Church Their mutual engagements fixed not only their own policy but also that of their successors. Like Pepin, his famous son Charlemagne lent his support to the Holy See, and all his conquests were undertaken for the good of the Church and Christianity. By successful campaigns against Aquitaine, the Lombards, Avars, Saxons, and Danes, and by treaties with the Slavic peoples, Charlemagne increased his domain until it extended from the Ebro and the Apennines to the Eider River in Schleswig-Holstein, and from the Atlantic to the Elbe and the Raab. His kingdom became a world-empire and he himself one of the great rulers of history, worthy of reviving the Western Roman Empire. He was crowned, Christmas Day, 800,

by the pope, and the new empire rested essentially on the basis of an alliance with the Church. Its ideal was the Kingdom of God on earth, in which the emperor by Divine appointment is God's viceroy in order to lead and rule all races as divided into nations, classes, and distinctions of rank according to Divine will.

Pepin the Short had been filled with this lofty conception; consequently extraordinary success attended the missionary labours of the Church under both rulers. As early as 716, under the rule of Charles Martel, the Anglo-Saxon monk Winfrid, better known as Boniface, landed on the Continent; he was to be the reformer and organizer of German ecclesiastical life. He always laboured in union with Rome, and was himself a missionary in Frisia with Willibrord, then, in 722, in Hesse and Thuringia, and in 736 in Bavaria. Having been made an archbishop and having received authority from Rome, he founded a number of monasteries, e. g. that of Fulda, and the Bishoprics of Eichstätt, Würzburg, Buraburg, and Erfurt. By means of synods held every five years he brought about the closer union between the old and new dioceses, and placed the newly founded sees in Thuringia and Hesse, as well as those of Speyer, Worms, Cologne, Utrecht, Tongern, Augsburg, Chur, Constance, and Strasburg, under Mainz as metropolitan see, of which he became archbishop in 746. In the reign of Charlemagne the large territories of the Saxons and Avars were added to the lands thus organized, and these new regions also received missionaries and bishops. The result was the founding of the Dioceses of Bremen (787), Paderborn (806), Werden, and Minden in the country of the Engern, Osnabrück and Münster (785) in Westphalia, Halberstadt and Hildesheim (817) in Eastphalia; the metropolitan of all the Saxon sees was Bremen (834). The conversion of the Avars had been attempted by the Bavarian Duke Tassilo II; when the East Mark was founded the Avars came under the influence of the sees and monasteries established in this country; after their subjugation they were placed partly under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Salzburg and partly under that of the Patriarch of Aquileia.

From these points, Christianity, as formerly in the Roman Empire, extended beyond the boundaries of Charlemagne's dominions, and new tribes and peoples were evangelized, while, at the same time, Christian civilization was peacefully established within the Frankish Empire. The monastery of Corvey on the Weser, and the Sees of Bremen and Hamburg (831) were the mission centres for the northern provinces. The monk Anschar of Corvey, first Archbishop of Hamburg, laboured with great zeal as Apostolic legate in Denmark, Sweden, and Norway; his successors were equally active as missionaries and bishops. However it was not until the reign of Canute the Great (1014–35) that the victory of Christianity in Denmark was assured; in 1104 Lund was made the metropolitan See of Scandinavia; in 1163 Upsala became the metropolitan See of Sweden, and about the middle of the twelfth century Trondhjem was made the same for Norway. Iceland was won for Christianity about the year 1000 and was divided into the two sees of Skalhold and Holum. The inhabitants of the Orkneys, Hebrides, Faroe, and Shetland Islands were converted about the same time as Iceland; they were at first placed under the metropolitan See of Hamburg-Bremen, which had been united in 849, and later under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan See of Norway.

During the period of the Teutonic migrations the Slavs had come into contact with Christianity and were converted partly by Christian rulers, as in Thrace, Macedonia, Greece and Dalmatia, partly through the influence of neighbouring Christian countries, as in Carinthia. In 806 the Bishop of Passau undertook the conversion of Moravia; that of Pannonia was attempted by Archbishop Adalram of Salzburg (821–36). In both these countries a great missionary work was done by Cyril and Methodius; the latter, Methodius, became Archbishop of Moravia and Pannonia. The work of converting Bohemia began in the year 845; the country was at first under the care of Ratisbon; in 973 a diocese was founded in Bohemia itself at Prague, which was suffragan to Mainz. Poland was brought to Christianity by its ruler Duke Mieczyslaw (963), and in 968 he erected the Bishopric of Posen. In the year 1000 Gnesen was made a metropolitan see, its suffragan sees were Kolberg (1065), Breslau (1000), and Cracow (1000). Finally, in the reigns of Heinrich I and Otto I the northern Slavs, living in regions subsequently German, namely the Wends, including those living in Pomerania, as well as the Obotrites and Sorbs on the Oder, Vistula, and Elbe, in Lausitz, and Saxony were forcibly Christianized. The new Sees of Havelberg, Brandenburg, Meissen, Zeitz, Merseburg, and Oldenburg (Stargard) served as points from which the work of conversion could be carried on; Magdeburg was the centre of the entire Slavonic mission.

It was during this same period that the Greek Church spread through the eastern part of Europe. In 955 the first Christian princess of Russia, Olga, was baptized at Constantinople; during the reign of her grandson Vladimir, baptized 989, Christianity became the religion of the country. In 864 the Bulgars, at the command of their prince Bogoris, accepted Christianity as a people, and from 870 were under the ecclesiastical control of Constantinople. A bishop sent from Constantinople introduced Christianity among the Magyars, or Hungarians; the work was completed by German missionaries sent in pursuance of the masterful policy of the Saxon emperors. The first Christian ruler of Hungary was Stephen (997–1038).

Many sacrifices, however, were still necessary in order to keep what had been gained for Christianity and to protect these gains against the threatened dangers of Mohammedanism and heathenism. These sacrifices were freely made by medieval Christian Europe. Under the careful training of their appointed guardians, the Catholic orders, the various nations and their rulers were filled with Christian thoughts and feelings. Although the conception of their respective positions held by the human representatives of the secular and spiritual power inevitably led to friction, especially in the age of the Hohenstaufen emperors, nevertheless all were conscious of their common duty to protect faith and civilization against foes both in Europe and outside of it. A convincing proof of this was the courageous struggle of Europe against the attempted inroads of Islam, and especially the expeditions of conquest to the Holy Land repeatedly undertaken by the various nations of Europe acting together. Spain, which since 711 had been almost entirely under the control of the Arabs, was able in 1212 to drive them as far back as Granada; in 1492 Granada also fell. From 878 Sicily had been in the hands of the Saracens, but it was freed by the courageous Normans (1061–91). The so-called Crusades (1061–1244) continued with interruptions for nearly two hundred years; among those who shared in them were monks, as Peter of Amiens and St. Bernard; bishops, as Otto of Freising; rulers of the greatest nations of Western Europe, as the German emperors, Frederick Barbarossa and Frederick II; the French kings, St. Louis and Philip II, and the English Richard the Lion-Hearted. Orders of knights, as the Order of St. John, were formed to take part in these expeditions. The original aim of the Crusades, the freeing of Palestine from the control of non-Christians, it is true, was not attained. But the power of Mohammedanism was weakened for a long time to come; the civilization of Western Europe, moreover,

gained from the Orient the best the East had to give and thus was greatly aided in its development.

A more lasting success, however, followed the attempts, patterned on the Crusades, to carry on wars of conversion and conquest in those territories of north-eastern Europe peopled by tribes that had lapsed from the Faith or that were still heathen; among such pagans were the Obotrites, Pomeranians, Wiltzi, Sorbs, Letts, Livonians, Finns, and Prussians. The preparatory work was done in the twelfth century by missionaries of the Premonstratensian and Cistercian Orders. They were aided with armed forces by Duke Henry the Lion of Saxony, Albert the Bear of Brandenburg, Boleslaw of Poland, and St. Erik IX of Sweden. From the beginning of the thirteenth century Crusades were undertaken against Livonia, Semgall, a division of the present Courland, and Esthonia; the Teutonic Knights conquered Prussia after a struggle that lasted more than fifty years. In Lithuania scribed elsewhere, and was facilitated by the violent procedure of the petty princes who had absolute sovereign power over their subjects. The first of the ruling princes to make the change was Albert of Brandenburg, Grand Master of the Teutonic Knights (1525); he was followed by the Elector John of Saxony, Philip, Landgrave of Hesse (1527), and at almost the same date by nearly all the German imperial cities. The movement soon gained the northern countries, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and the Baltic provinces; these all gave their adherence (1530) to the so-called Augsburg Confession, while the upper German imperial cities, Strasburg, Constance, Lindau, Memmingen, held to the Tetrapolitan Confession of the so-called Reformed Church founded by Zwingli and especially strong in Switzerland. The Reformed Church also found adherents in the Palatinate, and at the beginning of the seventeenth century in Hesse-Cassel and Brandenburg. The Anglican Church was

RELIGIOUS STATISTICS FOR THE COUNTRIES OF EUROPE

THE FIGURES BELOW ARE BASED ON CENSUS REPORTS, DATES OF WHICH ARE GIVEN IN PARENTHESES

Country	Catholics (including Uniat Eastern Churches)	Evangelicals: including Anglicans, Methodists, Unitarians, etc.	Oriental Christians: Orthodox Greek, Gregorian Armenian, etc.	Jews	Mohammedans	Others: Rationalists, Without a Confession, Non-Christian
Russia, Finland, and Poland, (1897)	11,326,794	6,283,679	78,713,017	5,082,342	3,560,361	320,292
Austria-Hungary, with Bosnia and Herzegovina (1900)	35,804,263	4,227,691	4,095,723	2,158,380	548,632	
Germany (1900)	20,327,913	35,231,104		586,833		17,535
France (1900)	38,100,000	662,000		100,000		100,000
Spain (1900)	about 18,500,000	(1887) 6,654		(1887) 402		(1887) 23,330
Sweden (1890)	1,436	4,779,867		3,402		276
Norway (1900)	2,065	2,204,989		642		13,770
Great Britain and Ireland (1901)	5,310,000	35,925,000		210,000		
Italy (1901)	about 30,500,000	(1880) 62,000		(1880) 38,000		
Turkish Empire (1900)	480,000	20,000	2,480,000	90,000	3,060,000	
Denmark (1900)	5,479	2,436,012		3,476		4,573
Rumania (1899)	149,667	22,749	5,408,743	269,015	43,740	16,148
Bulgaria (1900)	40,790	4,524	3,020,840	33,717	643,253	1,149
Portugal (1900)	5,425,500	500		2,000		
Greece and Crete (1900)	34,710		2,172,048	6,518	57,446	740
Servia (1895)	10,948	1,002	2,281,018	5,102	14,414	
Switzerland (1900)	1,283,135	1,918,197		12,551		
The Netherlands (1899)	1,790,161	3,085,899	45	103,988		115,179
Belgium (1900)	6,669,000	20,000		4,000		
Montenegro (1897)	12,934		201,067		13,840	
The inhabitants of the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, Republic of Andorra, Principality of Lichtenstein, Republic of San Marino, and the Principality of Monaco, are almost entirely Catholics	about 280,000					
	176,055,796	96,872,067	98,372,501	8,530,368	7,941,686	612,992

Christianity did not win the victory until 1368. After this only the Turks, in the south-eastern corner of the Continent, were a cause of alarm to Christian Europe for centuries. The decline of the power of the Eastern Empire drew the Turks over the Bosporus; in 1365 they had control of Adrianople; in the course of the fourteenth century the Serbs, Bulgars, Macedonians, and the inhabitants of Thessaly became their subjects. In 1453 the Turks took Constantinople, in 1461 Trebizond, in 1480 even Otranto in Apulia; after 1547 they owned half of Hungary. It was not until the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries that their possessions were reduced to their present boundaries, thus limiting Mohammedanism to a small part of the population of Europe.

At the beginning of modern times a great change took place in the boundaries of the European States. The cause was that ecclesiastical movement known as the Reformation, which placed in opposition to the unity of Catholicism in Western Europe the numerous religious associations that together form Protestantism. The apostasy of the various countries and cities, which began soon after Luther first appeared, was brought about by the most varied causes, de- established in 1549 in Great Britain; in 1559 the French Reformed Church adopted the "Confessio Gallicana"; in 1560 the Scotch Reformed the "Confessio Scottica"; from 1592 the Reformation in Scotland adopted a Presbyterian form of government. Since 1562 the Reformation in the Netherlands has held to the "Confessio Belgica", and the Reformed Church in Hungary since 1567, to the "Confessio Hungarica". Soon the Counter-Reformation, called into life by the Council of Trent (1545–63) to prevent the loss of the whole of middle Europe, appeared; its success was assured by the aid of the Society of Jesus. In this way various princes and bishops who were desirous of doing their duty were enabled to hold their countries to the Catholic Church, as the Duke of Cleves, the Electors of Mainz and Trier, the Bishops of Augsburg, Würzburg, Bamberg, Münster, Constance, Basle, the Abbey of Fulda, but especially the Dukes of Bavaria and the Hapsburg dynasty within their Austrian provinces. Soon the hostility between the two ecclesiastical parties grew so bitter that a trifling incident sufficed to bring on a terrible religious conflict, the Thirty Years War (1616–48). Two religious confessional leagues confronted each other in Germany:

Longitude West 10 from Greenwich 0 10 Longitude 20
50
45
40
35
30
25
20
0 10 20
MARE ATLANTICUM
MARE MEDITERRANEUM
PATRIARCHATUS ROMANUS
REGNA BRITANNIARUM
I. Orcades
I. Iona
Ultonia
Bangor
Ardmacha
Dublinium
Emelia
Menevia
Bangor Colonia
BRITANNIA (Mercia)
Wigornia
(Eastangles) (Essex)
Londinum
Landava
Cornubia
Sarum (Vessex)
Rofia (Sussex) (Cantia)
Is. Sillinae
Durovernum Cantiacorum
REGNA GERMANIARUM
Colonia Agrippina
Moguntia
Treveri
Remi
Parisii
Lutetia
Turones
Senones
Aug. Rauracorum
Vesontio
Constantia
Augusta Vindelicorum
Juvavia
Pannonia
Dalmatia
Mare Adriaticum
Pomerania
Lutici
Thuringia
Albis
Danubius
Visturla
Ligeris
Garumna
Burdigala
Bituriges
Lugdunum
Vienna
Mediolanum
Aquileja
Verona
Ravenna
Roma
Italia
Sardinia
Majorica
Minor
Major
Ebusus
Balearis
Corsica
Aleria
Tamita
Sulci
Calaris
Eryeum
Sanafer
Tarraconensis
Carthaginiensis
Lusitania
Baetica
Gades
Malaca
Asidonia
Urci
Abdera
Carthago Nova
Valentia
Barcinona
Tarraco
Gerunda
Empuriae
Narbona
Massilia
Arelate
Arausio
Vasio
Vienna
Augusta Taurinorum
Mediolanum
Placentia
Bobium
Genua
Mutina
Luna
Albinganum
Pisae
Florentia
Tusci
Umbria
Picenum
Samnium
Campania
Apulia
Calabria
Lucania
Brutii
Neapolis
Nola
Capua
Beneventum
Tarentum
Thurium
Sybaris
Crotona
Locri
Rhegium
Messana
Panormus
Tricala
Scyllacium
Scylla
Tauromenium
Catana
Syracusae
Sicilia
I. Liparae
I. Cephalenia
I. Zacynthus
I. Corcyra
Dyrrhachium
Apollonia
Egnatia
Lissus
Scodra
Dioclea
Praevalitana
Salona
Sirmium
Stridon
Cibalis
Mursa
Sabiona
Aquileja
Forum Julii
Tridentum
Augusta Vindelicorum
Juvavia
Curia
St. Galli
Constantia
Treveri
Moguntia
Colonia Agrippina
Frisia
Pannonia
Valeria Ripa
Savus
Drauus
Dacia
Mauretania Tingitana
Mauretania Caesariensis
Mauretania Sitifensis
Numidia
Proconsularis
Africa
Byzacena
Tingitana
Oppidum
Herpis
Gypsaria
Malachat
Malvana
Tingis
Sitifi
Milevis
Hippo Regius
Zerta
Aptunga
Tagaste
Calama
Casae nigrae
Tubuna
Sufetula
Vite
Junca
Thenae
Tacape
Thysdrus
Hermione
Ruspe
Adrumetum
Macriana
Carthago
Sicilibu
Tela
Gaulos
Melita
Sabrata
Oea
Lepfis Magna
Tripolis
Pentapolis
Berenice
Proie
Ptole
Cyrenaica
Marmarica
Aegyptus
Alexandria
Memphis
Pelusium
Heliopolis
Babylon
Arabia
Palaestina
Jerusalem
Damascus
Phoenicia
Tyrus
Ptolemais
Caesarea
Scythopolis
Hierapolis
Antiochia
Seleucia
Cilicia
Tarsus
Mopsuestia
Anazarbus
Cyprus
Salamis
Paphos
Cappadocia
Caesarea
Galatia
Ancyra
Pontus
Amasia
Neocaesarea
Trapezus
Armenia
Colchis
Iberia
Mesopotamia
Edessa
Nisibis
Amida
Carrhae
Euphrates
Tigris
Assyria
Arbela
Ninive
Babylonia
Seleucia
Ctesiphon
Susiana
Susa
Persia
Persepolis
Media
Ecbatana
Parthia
Hyrcania
Dioscurias
Caspium Mare
Rubrum Mare
Persicus Sinus
Arabicus Sinus
Nilus
Oxus
Jaxartes
Sogdiana
Bactriana
Margiana
Aria
Arachosia
Gedrosia
Carmania
Indus
Taprobane
Serica
Scythia
Sarmatia
Asiatica
Europea
Germania
Magna
Suevia
Vandalia
Gothia
Dacia
Thracia
Macedonia
Illyricum
Epirus
Achaia
Peloponnesus
Creta
Rhodus
Cyprus
Asia
Bithynia
Lydia
Caria
Lycia
Pamphylia
Isauria
Lycaonia
Galatia
Cappadocia
Pontus
Armenia
Colchis
Iberia
Albania
Sarmatia
Asiatica
Europea
Scythia
Serica
Indus
Taprobane
Rubrum Mare
Persicus Sinus
Arabicus Sinus
Caspium Mare
Nilus
Oxus
Jaxartes
Sogdiana
Bactriana
Margiana
Aria
Arachosia
Gedrosia
Carmania
Susiana
Susa
Persia
Persepolis
Media
Ecbatana
Parthia
Hyrcania
Dioscurias
Assyria
Arbela
Ninive
Babylonia
Seleucia
Ctesiphon
Mesopotamia
Edessa
Nisibis
Amida
Carrhae
Euphrates
Tigris
Arabia
Palaestina
Jerusalem
Damascus
Phoenicia
Tyrus
Ptolemais
Caesarea
Scythopolis
Hierapolis
Antiochia
Seleucia
Cilicia
Tarsus
Mopsuestia
Anazarbus
Cyprus
Salamis
Paphos
Cappadocia
Caesarea
Galatia
Ancyra
Pontus
Amasia
Neocaesarea
Trapez


CHRISTENDOM
A. D. 622
showing the
ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCES
AND SEES
of the
PATRIARCHATES OF ROME,
CONSTANTINOPLE, ANTIOCH,
JERUSALEM, ALEXANDRIA
also the
NESTORIAN AND JACOBITE
SEES OF WESTERN ASIA
0 50 100 200 300 400 500
English Statute Miles.
from Greenwich
30
40
50
60
45
40
35
30
25
20
PATRIARCHATUS CONSTANTINOPOLITANUS
PATRIARCHATUS ANTIOCHENUS
PATRIARCHATUS HIEROSOLYMITANUS
PATRIARCHATUS ALEXANDRINUS
Pontus Euxinus
Mare Caspium
Mare Mediterraneum
Sinus Persicus
Arabia Felix
Constantinopolis
Antiochia
Hierosolyma
Alexandria
Seleucia
Ctesiphon
Mathota
Jemana
Medina
THE MATTHEWS-NORTHRUP WORKS, BUFFALO, N. Y.

the Catholic League, which was formed in 1609 among the Catholic States of the German Empire and had for its leader the vigorous Duke Maximilian of Bavaria, and the Union in which, from 1609, most of the Protestant princes and cities combined under the leadership of Frederick IV of the Palatinate. Foreign powers—Denmark, Sweden, and France—also took part in the war. The result of the Thirty Years' War, confirmed in the Peace of Westphalia, laid the foundation of confessional relations as they now exist. Neither internal commotions nor seemingly mighty political revolutions, such as the illuminism of the French Encyclopedists and the German neo-classicists, the temporary supremacy of rationalism, and the French Revolution, with its consequent wars, greatly changed these relations. The present condition as developed during the course of the nineteenth century and up to the present time is as follows.

PRESENT CONDITION OF RELIGION IN EUROPE.—(1) *Relations of the Different States to the Religious Communions.*—In the German Empire the formation of religious denominations and their religious worship are subject to the legislation of the several States. Some States allow complete freedom, as Prussia, Würtemberg, Hesse, and Saxe-Coburg-Gotha; others supervise religious worship, as Baden, Waldeck, and Mecklenburg; others again make the establishment of religious denominations depend on the Government, as in Bavaria, Saxony, Brunswick, Saxe-Meiningen, and Alsace-Lorraine. The Catholic and the Evangelical Churches are regarded as privileged and public corporations. In England and Wales the Anglican is the State Church, its head being the king; the fundamental principles are defined by Parliament. There is a similar arrangement for the Presbyterian State Church in Scotland where, however, the organization is somewhat freer. On the other hand the Anglican Church of Ireland is, since 1869, no longer a State Church. The Dissenters, who in 1689 were only conditionally tolerated, have now equal rights. In France the Separation Law of 9 December, 1905, brought about the separation of Church and State and provided for the formation of *Associations cultuelles* for the exercise of religion. In Italy the Constitution originally declared the Roman Catholic religion the religion of the State, but gradually all privileges have been withdrawn from it; besides the Roman Catholic Church, the Evangelical Waldensian Church, the National Greek Church, and the Jewish communities are organized as Churches with separate constitutions. In Spain and Portugal the State religion is the Roman Catholic. In Belgium the Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, and Anglican forms of worship are recognized by the granting of salaries from the State to those having ecclesiastical charges. Outside of these any religious community is a private association The Netherlands grants equal protection to all confessions. So does Switzerland, excepting that in this country a more exacting control is exercised over the Roman Catholic Church. In Denmark the Evangelical Lutheran Church is the State Church, at least inasmuch as its ministers are paid by the State and subject to removal by the State; other religious communities have no claim to state support. The case is the same in Sweden, where, in addition, the condition is laid down that the king, the members of the Council of State, and foreigners who are appointed teachers at the university must all subscribe to some evangelical confession. In Norway this ordinance is enforced for the head of the State. In Austria the Churches and religious associations recognized by law are as follows: the Roman Catholic, the Uniat Greek, and Uniat Armenian Churches, the Evangelical Churches of the Augsburg and Helvetic Confessions, the Orthodox Greek Church, the Jewish religious community, the religious association of the Russian sect of the Lipovani, and the Oriental Armenian in Bukowina, the Old Catholic religious community, and the Moravian Brethren (*Herrnhuter*) The expenses of the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Greek Churches are met from a fund controlled by the State and obtained from the secularization of Church property in the reign of Joseph II. In Hungary the Roman Catholic Church was originally the state religion; the State grants in addition free exercise to other Christian confessions and to the Jewish faith. Croatia-Slavonia recognizes only the Roman Catholic and Uniat Greek Churches, the Orthodox Greek and Protestant Churches, and the Jewish belief. In Bosnia and Herzegovina the ruling confessions are the Orthodox Greek and Roman Catholic Churches, and Mohammedanism. The State Church of the Balkan provinces is the Orthodox Greek. The State Church of Russia is the Orthodox Greek Russian Church; the other Christian and non-Christian confessions are tolerated, the Jews have only limited rights.

(2) *Organization of the Religious Communions.*—The Evangelical Church distinguishes three forms of organization: (a) The episcopal, in which the ruler of the country with the aid of a subordinate hierarchy exercises ecclesiastical authority. This is the form in force in Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Finland. (b) The consistorial organization, in which the ruler is aided by a consistory made up of ecclesiastical and secular members. This form is found in Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Mecklenburg-Strelitz, Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, Saxony-Altenburg, Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt, Schwarzburg-Sonderhausen, the two principalities of Reuss, Schaumburg-Lippe, Lübeck, Bremen, Alsace-Lorraine, and Russia. (c) The synodal form of organization and similar Presbyterian associations which are based on assemblies of elected representatives and the ordinances passed by these. This form of organization is in existence in Austria-Hungary, Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony, Würtemberg, Baden, Hesse, and other German States, where the consistorial system is not in force. The synodal organization also exists among the non-Anglican Churches in Great Britain, in France, among the Italian Waldenses, in the Netherlands, Belgium, Switzerland, and Spain; also in connexion with the episcopal form of church government in Sweden and Finland. The Anglican Church, called in England and Wales the Established Church of England, and in Ireland the Church of Ireland, is episcopal in government; in Ireland the episcopal and synodal systems are united. The head of the Church is the king. England and Wales are divided into the two church provinces of Canterbury and York. The Archbishop of Canterbury is the Primate of All England; under Canterbury are 28 suffragan dioceses; York consists of an archdiocese and 9 suffragan bishoprics. Ireland has 2 archdioceses: Armagh, which has the primacy of all Ireland, and Dublin with 10 suffragans; Scotland has 7 dioceses. The organization of the Oriental Greek Church varies in different countries. In Russia the head of the Church is the Tsar, who appoints the members of the Holy Synod, the highest ecclesiastical body. In Turkey the Œcumenical Patriarch is the head; under him are 10 or 12 metropolitans. In Rumania a national synod is the highest ecclesiastical authority; in Servia a metropolitan with the bishops; in Bulgaria the church government is vested in an exarch, aided by archbishops, bishops, and archpriests. The Holy Synod of Greece consists of five prelates or bishops named by the king. In the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy there are 3 provinces of the Oriental Greek Church: the Austrian, or Province of Czernowitz, with the suffragan Dioceses of Zara and Cattaro, the Archdiocese of Karlowitz (Patriarch-Archbishop), with 6 suffragans, and the Archdiocese of Herrmannstadt, with 2 suffragans. Bosnia and Herzegovina have each a metropolitan.

For the ecclesiastical organization of European countries, see the respective articles on the various political divisions, also EASTERN CHURCHES. The

religious statistics for the countries of Europe found in the adjoining table are based on Brachelli and von Juraschek, "Die Staaten Europas" (5th ed., Leipzig, Brünn, and Vienna, 1907).

THATCHER AND SCHWILL, *A General History of Europe, 350–1900* (London, 1902); HASSAL, *A Handbook of European History, 476–1871* (London, 1902); KIRSCH AND VON LUKSCH, *Illustrierte Geschichte der katholischen Kirche* (Munich, 1905); PHILIPPSON, *Europa* (2nd ed., Leipzig and Vienna, 1906); HETTNER, *Grundzüge der Länderkunde*, I, *Europa* (Leipzig, 1907). See also the bibliography under the names of the respective countries.

OTTO HARTIG.

Europus, a titular see in Provincia Euphratensis, suffragan of Hierapolis. The former name of this city was Thapsacus (*Thaphsakh*), an Aramean word which means "ford"; it was an important trade-centre at the northern limit of Solomon's kingdom (III K., iv, 24). The younger Cyrus and Alexander the Great forded the Euphrates at this point. The Macedonians called it Amphipolis. It took finally a third name, Europos, under which it is mentioned by the geographers Ptolemy, Pliny, Hierocles, Georgius Cyprius, etc. and figures in the "Notitia episcopatuum" of the Antiochene patriarchate. (See Échos d'Orient, 1907, 145.) We know but one of its Greek bishops, in 451 (Lequien, Oriens christ., II, 949), and a Jacobite one, between 793 and 817 (Revue de l'Orient Chrétien, 1899, 451). Justinian built a fortress at Europus (Procop., De ædif., II, 9). When the city was destroyed is unknown. Its ruins stand at Djerabis, a corrupted form of Europos, on the right bank of the Euphrates, about twenty-five kilometres south of Biredjik, in the vilayet of Aleppo.

HOFFMANN, *Auszüge aus Akten Pers. Märtyrer*, 161; SACHAU, *Reise in Syrien und Mesopotamien*, 168.

S. VAILHÉ.

Eusebianites. See EUSEBIUS OF NICOMEDIA.

Eusebius, SAINT, Bishop of Vercelli, b. in Sardinia c. 283; d. at Vercelli, Piedmont, 1 August, 371. He was made lector in Rome, where he lived some time, probably as a member, or head, of a religious community (Spreitzenhofer, Die Entwickelung des alten Mönchtums in Italien, Vienna, 1894, 14 sq.). Later he came to Vercellæ, the present Vercelli, and in 340 was unanimously elected bishop of that city by the clergy and the people. He received episcopal consecration at the hands of Pope Julius I on 15 December of the same year. According to the testimony of St. Ambrose (Ep. lxiii, Ad Vercellenses) he was the first bishop of the West who united monastic with clerical life. He led with the clergy of his city a common life modelled upon that of the Eastern cenobites (St. Ambrose, Ep. lxxxi and Serm. lxxxix). For this reason the Canons Regular of St. Augustine honour him along with St. Augustine as their founder (Proprium Canon. Reg., 16 December).

In 354 Pope Liberius sent Eusebius and Bishop Lucifer of Cagliari to the Emperor Constantius, who was then at Arles in Gaul, for the purpose of inducing the emperor to convoke a council which should put an end to the dissensions between the Arians and the orthodox. The synod was held at Milan in 355. At first Eusebius refused to attend it because he foresaw that the Arian bishops, who were supported by the emperor, would not accept the decrees of the Nicene Council and would insist on the condemnation of St. Athanasius. Being pressed by the emperor and the bishops to appear at the synod, he came to Milan, but was not admitted to the synod until the document condemning St. Athanasius had been drawn up and was awaiting the signature of the bishops. Eusebius vehemently protested against the unjust condemnation of St. Athanasius and, despite the threats of the emperor, refused to attach his signature to the document. As a result he was sent into exile, first to Scythopolis in Syria, where the Arian Bishop Patrophilus, whom Eusebius calls his jailer (Baronius, Annal., ad ann. 356, n. 97), treated him very cruelly, then to Cappadocia, and lastly to the Thebaid. On the accession of the Emperor Julian, the exiled bishops were allowed to return to their sees, in 362. Eusebius, however, and his brother-exile Lucifer did not at once return to Italy. Acting either by force of their former legatine faculties or, as is more probable, having received new legatine faculties from Pope Liberius, they remained in the Orient for some time, helping to restore peace in the Church. Eusebius went to Alexandria to consult with St. Athanasius about convoking the synod which, in 362, was held there under their joint presidency. Besides declaring the Divinity of the Holy Ghost and the orthodox doctrine concerning the Incarnation, the synod agreed to deal mildly with the repentant apostate bishops, but to impose severe penalties upon the leaders of the several Arianizing factions. At its close Eusebius went to Antioch to reconcile the Eustathians and the Meletians. The Eustathians were adherents of the bishop, St. Eustathius, who was deposed and exiled by the Arians in 331. Since Meletius's election in 361 was brought about chiefly by the Arians, the Eustathians would not recognize him, although he solemnly proclaimed his orthodox faith from the ambo after his episcopal consecration. The Alexandrian synod had desired that Eusebius should reconcile the Eustathians with Bishop Meletius, by purging his election of whatever might have been irregular in it, but Eusebius, upon arriving at Antioch, found that his brother-legate Lucifer had consecrated Paulinus, the leader of the Eustathians, as Bishop of Antioch, and thus unwittingly frustrated the pacific design. Unable to reconcile the factions at Antioch, he visited other Churches of the Orient in the interest of the orthodox faith, and finally passed through Illyricum into Italy. Having arrived at Vercelli in 363, he assisted the zealous St. Hilary of Poitiers in the suppression of Arianism in the Western Church, and was one of the chief opponents of the Arian Bishop Auxentius of Milan. The Church honours him as a martyr and celebrates his feast as a semi-double on 16 December. In the "Journal of Theological Studies" (1900), I, 302–99, E. A. Burn attributes to Eusebius the "Quicumque". (See ATHANASIAN CREED.)

Three short letters of Eusebius are printed in Migne, P. L., XII, 947–54, and X, 713–14. St. Jerome (De vir. ill., c. xcvi, and Ep. li, n. 2) ascribes to him a Latin translation of a commentary on the Psalms, written originally in Greek by Eusebius of Cæsarea; but this work has been lost. There is preserved in the cathedral of Vercelli the "Codex Vercellensis", the earliest manuscript of the Old Latin Gospels (codex *a*), which is generally believed to have been written by Eusebius. It was published by Irico (Milan, 1748) and Bianchini (Rome, 1749), and is reprinted in Migne, P. L., XII, 9–948; a new edition was brought out by Belsheim (Christiania, 1894). Krüger (Lucifer, "Bischof von Calaris", Leipzig, 1886, 118–30) ascribes to Eusebius a baptismal oration published by Caspari (Quellen zur Gesch. des Taufsymbols, Christiania, 1869, II, 132–40). The confession of faith "De s. trinitate confessio", P. L., XII, 959–968, sometimes ascribed to Eusebius, is spurious.

BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, 15 Dec.; BARING-GOULD, *Lives of the Saints*, 15 Dec.; DAVIES, in *Dict. Christ. Biogr.*; ST. JEROME, *De viris illustribus*, XCVI; FERRERIUS, *Vita s. Eusebii episcopi Vercellensis* (Vercelli, 1609); UGHELLI, *Italia Sacra* (Venice. 1719), IV, 749–61; BARONIUS, *Annales*, ad ann. 355–371; MORIN in *Revue Bénédictine* (Maredsous, 1890), VII, 567–73; SAVIO, *Gli antichi vescovi d'Italia* (*Piemonte*) (Turin, 1899), 412–20, 514–54; BARDENHEWER, *Patrologie*, SHAHAN tr. (Freiburg im Br.; St. Louis, 1908), 417–18.

MICHAEL OTT.

Eusebius, SAINT, Bishop of Samosata (now Samsat), in Syria; date of birth unknown; d. in 379 or 380. History makes no mention of him before the year 361.

when, as Bishop of Samosata, he took part in the consecration of St. Meletius, the newly elected Patriarch of Antioch. Just then the Eastern Church was rent by Arianism and its affiliated heresies. Most of the episcopal sees were occupied by Arian bishops, and Meletius himself was elected Patriarch of Antioch only because the Arians believed him to be a supporter of their heresy. Tillemont and a few other historians even maintain that Eusebius was at that time leaning towards Arianism. Whatever may have been the faith of Eusebius previously, it is certain that at a synod held in Antioch in 363 the Nicene formula, with express mention of the term *homoousios*, was accepted, and the document was signed by Eusebius and twenty-four other bishops.

When the Arians discovered that Meletius upheld the doctrine of the Nicene Council, they declared his election invalid and attempted to obtain from Eusebius, to whom they had been entrusted, the synodal acts proving the lawfulness of the election. The Emperor Constantius, who supported the Arians, ordered Eusebius to surrender the document, but without success. Thereupon Constantius threatened Eusebius with the loss of his right hand, but the bishop calmly presented both his hands to the bearer of the imperial message, saying: "Strike them both off. I will not surrender the document by which the injustice of the Arians can be proved." The emperor was struck by the constancy of Eusebius and left the document in his possession.

It was chiefly due to the concerted efforts of St. Eusebius and St. Gregory Nazianzen that, in 370, St. Basil was elected Archbishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia. From this time also dates the tender friendship between St. Eusebius and the last-named Father, which is attested by some still extant letters written by St. Basil to the Bishop of Samosata. Eusebius displayed his greatest activity during the persecution of the Catholics by the Arian Emperor Valens. Disguised as a military officer, he visited the persecuted Churches of Syria, Phœnicia, and Palestine, exhorting the afflicted Catholics to remain loyal to their faith, ordaining orthodox priests where they were needed, and in many other ways assisting the Catholic bishops in the difficult exercise of their duties during those troublous times. It is on account of this untiring zeal of Eusebius that St. Gregory Nazianzen calls him "a pillar of the Church", "a gift of God", "a rule of faith", etc. (Migne, P. G., XXI, 57). Incensed at the great success of Eusebius, the Arians prevailed upon the Emperor Valens to banish him into Thrace. After the death of Valens, in 378, he was allowed to return to his see. On his journey from Thrace to Samosata he was instrumental in the appointment of numerous orthodox bishops, among whom were Acacius at Bercœa, Theodotus at Hierapolis, Isidore at Cyrrhus, and Eulogius at Edessa. Having returned to his see, he resumed his former activity against the Arians, both in his own diocese and in the neighbouring churches. While he was taking part in the consecration of Bishop Maris, at the little town of Dolicha, near Samosata, an Arian woman struck him on the head with a tile thrown from the roof of her house. He died of this wound a few days later. The Greeks honour him as a martyr on the 21st of June, the Latins on the 22d.

BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, 21 June; BARING-GOULD, *Lives of the Saints*, 21 June; REYNOLDS in *Dict. Christ. Biogr.*, II, 369–372; *Acta SS.*, June, V, 204–208; TILLEMONT, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles* (Paris, 1693–1712), VIII, 319–336; LE QUIEN, *Oriens Christianus* (Paris, 1740), II, 933 sqq.; BEDJAN, *Acta martyrum et sanctorum* in Syriac (Paris, 1890–7), VI, 335 sqq.

MICHAEL OTT.

Eusebius, SAINT, a presbyter at Rome; date of birth unknown; d. 357(?). He was a Roman patrician and priest, and is mentioned with distinction in the Latin martyrologies. The ancient genuine martyrology of Usuard styles him confessor at Rome under the Arian emperor Constantius and adds that he was buried in the cemetery of Callistus. Some later martyrologies call him a martyr.

The "Acta Eusebii", discovered in 1479 by Mombritius and reproduced by Baluze in his "Miscellanea" (1678–1715), tell the following story: When Pope Liberius was permitted by Constantius to return to Rome, supposedly at the price of his orthodoxy, by subscribing the Arian formula of Sirmium, Eusebius, a priest, an ardent defender of the Nicene Creed, publicly preached against both pope and emperor, branding them as heretics. When the orthodox party who supported the antipope Felix were excluded from all the churches, Eusebius continued to hold Divine services in his own house. He was arrested and brought before Liberius and Constantius. Here he boldly reproved Liberius for deserting the Catholic Faith. In consequence he was placed in a dungeon, four feet wide (or was imprisoned in his own house), where he spent his time in prayer and died after seven months. His body was buried in the cemetery of Callistus with the simple inscription: "Eusebio homini Dei". This act of kindness was performed by two priests, Gregory and Orosius, friends of Eusebius. Gregory was put into the same prison and also died there. He was buried by Orosius, who professes to be the writer of the Acts.

It is generally admitted that these Acts are a forgery either entirely or at least in part, and written in the same spirit, if not by the same hand, as the notice on Liberius in the "Liber Pontificalis". The Bollandists and Tillemont point out some grave historical difficulties in the narrative, especially the fact that Liberius, Constantius, and Eusebius were never in Rome at the same time. Constantius visited Rome but once, and remained there for about a month, and Liberius was then still in exile. Some, taking for granted the alleged fall of Liberius, would overcome this difficulty by stating that, at the request of Liberius, who resented the zeal of the priest, the secular power interfered and imprisoned Eusebius. It is not at all certain whether Eusebius died after the return of Liberius, during his exile, or even much before that period.

The feast of St. Eusebius is kept on 14 August. The church on the Esquiline in Rome dedicated to him, said to have been built on the site of his house, is mentioned in the acts of a council held in Rome under Pope Symmachus in 498 (Mansi, VIII, 236, 237), and was rebuilt by Pope Zacharias. Formerly it had a *Statio* on the Friday after the fourth Sunday of Lent. It once belonged to the Celestines (an order now extinct); Leo XII gave it to the Jesuits. A good picture, representing the triumph of Eusebius, by Raphael Mengs, 1759, is on the ceiling. San Eusebio is the title of a cardinal-priest. The title was transferred by Gregory XVI, but restored by Pius IX.

Am. Cath. Q. Rev., VIII, 529; STOKES in *Dict. of Chr. Biogr.*, s. v.; *Acta SS.*, Aug., II, 166, and Sept., VI, 297; ARMELLINI, *Le Chiese di Roma* (Rome, 1887); cf. DUCHESNE, *Liber Pontificalis* (Paris, 1886–92), I, s.v. *Liberius*, also the *Introduction*; DUFOURCQ, *Les Gesta Martyrum Romains* (Paris, 1904).

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Eusebius, SAINT, POPE, successor of Marcellus, 309 or 310. His reign was short. The Liberian Catalogue gives its duration as only four months, from 18 April to 17 August, 309 or 310. We learn some details of his career from an epitaph for his tomb which Pope Damasus ordered. This epitaph has come down to us through ancient transcripts. A few fragments of the original, together with a sixth-century marble copy made to replace the original, after its destruction, were found by De Rossi in the Crypt of Eusebius, in the catacomb of Callistus. It appears from it that the grave internal dissensions caused in the Roman Church by the readmittance of apostates (*lapsi*) during the persecution of Diocletian, and which had

already arisen under Marcellus, continued under Eusebius. The latter maintained the attitude of the Roman Church, adopted after the Decian persecution (250–51), that apostates should not be forever debarred from ecclesiastical communion, but on the other hand should be readmitted only after doing proper penance (Eusebius miseros docuit sua crimina flere).

This view was opposed by a faction of Christians in Rome under the leadership of one Heraclius. Whether the latter and his partisans advocated a more rigorous (Novatianist) or a more lenient interpretation of the law has not been ascertained. The latter, however, is by far more probable, in the hypothesis that Heraclius was the chief of a party made up of apostates and their followers, who demanded immediate restoration to the body of the Church. Damasus characterizes in very strong terms the conflict which ensued (*seditio, cædes, bellum, discordia, lites*). It is likely that Heraclius and his supporters sought to compel by force their admittance to divine worship, which was resented by the faithful gathered in Rome about Eusebius. In consequence, both Eusebius and Heraclius were exiled by the Emperor Maxentius. Eusebius, in particular, was deported to Sicily, where he died soon after. Miltiades ascended the papal throne, 2 July, 311. The body of his predecessor was brought back to Rome, probably in 311, and 26 September (according to the "Depositio Episcoporum" in the Chronographer of 354) was placed in a separate cubiculum of the Catacomb of Callistus. His firm defense of ecclesiastical discipline and the banishment which he suffered therefor caused him to be venerated as a martyr, and in his epitaph Pope Damasus honours Eusebius with this title. His feast is yet celebrated on 26 September.

Liber Pontificalis, ed. Duchesne, I, 167; De Rossi, *Roma sotterranea*, II (Rome, 1867), 191–210; Northcote and Brownlow, *Roma sotterranea*, 2d ed. (London, 1879); Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2d. ed., I, I, 297–299; Ihm, *Damasi Epigrammata* (Leipzig, 1895), 25, num. 18; *Acta SS.*, Sept., VII, 265–271; Carini, *I lopsi e la deportazione in Sicilia del Papa S. Eusebio* (Rome, 1886); Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, I (Bonn, 1881), 380–382.

J. P. Kirsch.

Eusebius, Chronicle of, consists of two parts: the first was probably called by Eusebius the "Chronograph" or "Chronographies"; the second he terms the "Canon", or "Canons", and also the "Chronological Canons". It is brought down to the year 225, and as Eusebius alludes to it at an earlier date in the "Eclogæ Propheticæ" and "Præparatio Evangelica" there must have been two editions. The original is lost, but both parts are preserved in an Armenian version of which two rival translations by Zohrab and Aucher, respectively, were published in 1818. Both these editions are superseded by Schoene's. The "Canons", moreover, are preserved in St. Jerome's translation. Two Syriac epitomes have also been published, one from a MS. in the British Museum, which was translated by Roediger for Schoene's edition, another edited by Siegfried and Gelzer (Eusebii Canonum Epitome ex Dionysii Telmaharensis Chronico petita, Leipzig, 1884). Considerable extracts from the original were also preserved by later writers, especially by Syncellus. These it has been possible to identify since the discovery of the Armenian version. They will be found in Schoene.

The "Chronography" is an epitome of universal history. It is divided into five parts: (1) the history of the Chaldeans, and the Assyrians, followed by lists of the Assyrian, Median, Lydian, and Persian kings; (2) Old Testament history; (3) Egyptian history; (4) Grecian history; (5) Roman history. It is, like the "Præparatio Evangelica", full of quotations from lost authors. As an illustration of its value in one particular province we may turn to the third chapter of Smith's "Chaldean Account of Genesis", entitled "Chaldean Legends transmitted through Berosus and other Authors". The longest and most important extracts here given, containing, e. g. the Babylonian story of the Creation and the Flood, owe their preservation to Eusebius. The "Canons" are a series of chronological tables with short historical notices. The years of Abraham, beginning from the supposed date of his birth, form the backbone. Alongside of these are placed the regnal years of the monarchs of different kingdoms as they rose and fell. A single extract will, however, serve better than any description to give the reader an idea of the character and contents of the "Canons". We have shown above the value of the "Chronicle" to an Assyriologist; our second example will illustrate its importance for classical scholars. On almost the first page of Jebb's edition of the newly discovered poems of Bacchylides, the notices in the "Chronicle" concerning the poet are discussed. There are two such notices. We give the first with its context, as it is found in the facsimile of the Bodleian MS. of St. Jerome's version:—

LXXVIII Olymp.	Herodotus historiarum scriptor agnoscitur.	
XVIII	Bacchylides et Diagorus atheus sermone plurimo celebrantur	XXXVI
MDL. XVIIII	Zeuxis pictor agnoscitur, etc.	XXXVII

From the above we learn that Bacchylides became renowned in the 18th year of Xerxes, King of Persia, the 36th of an Alexander, King of Macedonia, the beginning of the seventy-eighth Olympiad, and the 1549th year of Abraham. In this MS. the years of Abraham are given at the commencement of every decade. Thus, in the last line, the first year (MDL) marks the opening of a new decade; while the second year (XVIIII) shows the continuation of the reign of Xerxes.

Which of the two versions of the "Chronicle" is the more trustworthy as regards dates and figures is a question that was conclusively answered in favour of the Latin version by Lightfoot in his excursus, "The Early Roman Succession". The striking differences between the episcopal lists (notably the Roman) as they are found in the Armenian version, on the one hand, and in the Latin version and "The Church History", on the other hand, give rise to a number of ingenious theories concerning changes made by Eusebius in a later edition of his "Chronicle". Lightfoot annihilated these theories by demonstrating the corrupt state of the Armenian version in all that relates to figures and the years to which different events are assigned. It is important to remember this in reading books or articles in which reference is made to the "Chronicle", if they were written before 1890.

Best Editions.—(1) "Eusebii Chronicorum Libri duo", ed. Schoene, 2 vols., Berlin, 1866–1875; (2) the Bodleian manuscript of Jerome's version of the "Chronicle of Eusebius", reproduced in collotype with an introduction by John Knight Fotheringham, M. A., Oxford, 1905; (3) the Syriac epitomes referred to above.

Salmon in Smith and Wace, *Dict. of Christ. Biog.*, s. v. *Eusebius, Chronicle of;* Lightfoot, *Excursus on the Early Roman Succession* in *St. Clement of Rome* (1890), I; Turner, *The Early Episcopal Lists:* I. *The Chronicle of Eusebius* in *Journal of Theological Studies*, I, 181 sq.; Chapman, *La Chronologie des premières listes épiscopales de Rome* in *Revue Bénédictine* (1901), 399 sq.; Schoene, *Die Weltchronik des Eusebius in ihrer Bearbeitung durch Hieronymus* (Berlin, 1900).

F. J. Bacchus.

Eusebius Bruno, Bishop of Angers, b. in the early part of the eleventh century; d. at Angers, 29 August, 1081. He received his ecclesiastical training under the famous Berengarius of Tours, and in December, 1047 was made Bishop of Angers. In 1049 he took part in the synod of Reims under Leo IX (1049–54), and was among the bishops who protested their innocence in regard to the prevalent evil of simony. He is best known for his relations to his master Beren-

garius who erroneously maintained that in the Holy Eucharist the bread and the wine are merely a figure or a symbol of the Body and Blood of Christ. That he was a partisan of Berengarius, at least for a time, cannot be denied. In a letter written shortly after the councils of Rome and Vercelli (1050), in which Berengarius was condemned, he protested against the injustice done to his teacher and the archdeacon of his church. When King Henry I of France (1031–60) summoned the bishops of his realm to a synod held in Paris in 1051, both Eusebius and Berengarius absented themselves, through fear of condemnation. Two contemporary writers, Deoduinus, Bishop of Liège (P. L., CXLVI, 1439), and Durandus, Abbot of Troarn (P. L., CXLIX, 1422), class Eusebius Bruno among the followers of Berengarius; the latter always claimed him as a partisan. It is not certain that he really appropriated in its entirety the teaching of his master, though Deoduinus and Durandus affirm it. On the other hand, at the Council of Tours (1054), presided over by the papal legate Hildebrand, Eusebius Bruno induced his friend Berengarius to declare, in writing and on oath, that after the Consecration the bread and the wine are the Body and Blood of Christ. Moreover, at a synod of Angers (1062) at which the Count of Anjou, Geoffrey the Bearded, asked for an account of the teaching of Berengarius, Eusebius' defence of his master was somewhat weak. When, shortly afterwards, Berengarius complained to him of the opposition of a certain Geoffrey Martini to his teaching, Eusebius declared frankly in a letter to Berengarius (P. L., CXLVII, 1201), that the reality of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Sacrament must be admitted, like other mysteries of faith, e. g. the Incarnation and the passing of Christ glorified through closed doors. These expressions indicate either a change of mind on the part of Eusebius, or, what is not unlikely, a misunderstanding, in the beginning, of the real import of the teachings of Berengarius.

Streber in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; *Hist. litt. de la France*, VIII, 79–104; Deutsch in *Realencyk. f. prot. Theol.*, s. v.; Chevalier, *Rép. des sources hist., Bio-bibl.*, s. v.

Francis J. Schaefer.

Eusebius of Alexandria, ecclesiastical writer and author of a number of homilies well known in the sixth and seventh centuries and of much ascetical and dogmatic value. There has been much dispute regarding the details of his life and the age in which he lived. Galland (Vet. Patr. Biblioth., VIII, 23) says, "De Eusebio qui vulgo dicitur episcopus Alexandriæ incerta omnia" (Concerning Eusebius, commonly called Bishop of Alexandria, there is nothing sure). His writings have been attributed to Eusebius of Emesa, Eusebius of Cæsarea, and others. According to an old biography said to have been written by his notary, the monk John, and discovered by Cardinal Mai, he lived in the fifth century and led a monastic life near Alexandria. The fame of his virtues attracted the attention of Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, who visited him with his clergy, and in 444, when dying, had him elected his successor and consecrated him bishop, though much against his will. Eusebius displayed great zeal in the exercise of his office and did much good by his preaching. Among those whom he converted was a certain Alexander, a man of senatorial rank. After having ruled his see for seven or, according to another account, for twenty years, he made Alexander his successor and retired to the desert, whence Cyril had summoned him, and there died in the odour of sanctity.

While Mai seems to have established the existence of a Eusebius of Alexandria who lived in the fifth century, it has been objected that neither the name of Eusebius, nor that of his successor Alexander, appears in the list of the occupants of that ancient see. Dioscurus is mentioned as the immediate successor of Cyril. Nor does the style of the homilies seem on the whole in keeping with the age of Cyril. It may be noted, however, that the biographer of Eusebius expressly states that the Cyril in question is the great opponent of Nestorius. Various solutions of the difficulty have been proposed. Thilo (Ueber die Schriften des Eusebius v. Alexandrien u. des Eusebius von Emesa, Halle, 1832) thinks that the authorship of the homilies is to be assigned either to a certain monk—one of four brothers—of the fifth century, or to a presbyter and court chaplain of Justinian I, who took an active part in the theological strifes of the sixth century. Mai suggests that after the death of Cyril there were two bishops at Alexandria, Dioscurus, the Monophysite leader, and Eusebius, the head of the Catholic party. The homilies cover a variety of subjects, and the author is one of the earliest patristic witnesses to the doctrine regarding the descent of Christ into Hell. A list of homilies with the complete text is given by Mai (Spicilegium Romanum, IX). They may also be found in Migne, P. G., LXXXVI. The "Sermo de Confusione Diaboli" was published with an introduction by Rand in "Modern Philology", II, 261.

Mai, *Spicilegium Romanum*, IX, 2 sq. (Rome, 1843); Migne, P. G., LXXXVI, part I (Paris, 1860); Streber in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.

H. M. Brock.

Eusebius of Cæsarea (Eusebius Pamphili), Bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, the "Father of Church History"; b. about 260; d. before 341.

Life.—It will save lengthy digression if we at once speak of a document which will often have to be referred to on account of its biographical importance, viz., the letter written by Eusebius to his diocese in order to explain his subscription to the Creed propounded by the Council of Nicæa. After some preliminary remarks, the writer proceeds: "We first transmit to you the writing concerning the faith which was put forward by us, and then the second, which they have published after putting in additions to our expressions. Now the writing presented by us, which when read in the presence of our most religious emperor was declared to have a right and approved character was as follows: [The Faith put forward by us]. As we have received from the bishops before us both in our first catechetical instruction and when we were baptized, and as we have learned from the Divine Scriptures, and as we have believed and taught in the presbyterate and in the office of bishop itself so now likewise believing we offer to you our faith and it is thus." Then follows a formal creed [Theodoret, Hist., I, 11; Socrates, Hist., I, 8; St. Athanasius, de Dec. Syn. Nic. (appendix) and elsewhere. Translated by Newman with notes in the Oxford Library of the Fathers (Select Treatises of St. Athanasius, p. 59) and St. Athanasius, vol. I. The translation given here is Dr. Hort's. The words in brackets are probably genuine though not given by Socrates and St. Athanasius].

Dr. Hort in 1876 ("Two Dissertations", etc., pp. 56 sqq.) pointed out that this creed was presumably that of the Church of Cæsarea of which Eusebius was bishop. This view is widely accepted (cf. Lightfoot, art. "Euseb." in "Dict. of Christ. Biog."—All references to Lightfoot, unless otherwise stated, are to this article.—Sanday, "Journal of Theolog. Studies", vol. I, p. 15; Gwatkin, "Studies of Arianism", p. 42, 2nd edition; McGiffert, "Prolog. to C. H. of Euseb." in "Select Library of Nic. and post-Nic. Fathers"; Duchesne, "Hist. de l'Eglise", vol. II, p. 149). According to this view it is natural to regard the introduction, "As we have received" etc., as autobiographical, and to infer that Eusebius had exercised the office of the priesthood in the city of Cæsarea before he became its bishop, and had received his earliest religious instruction and the sacrament of Baptism there also. But other interpretations of this document are given, one of which destroys, while the other diminishes, its biographical value: (a) According to some

the creed proffered by Eusebius was drawn up as a formula to be subscribed by all the bishops. It was they who were to say that it embodied what they had been taught as catechumens and had taught as priests and bishops. This seems to have been the view generally held before Hort, and was Kattenbusch's view in 1894 (Das apostolische Symbol, vol. I, p. 231). One objection to this view may be noted. It makes *all* the bishops equivalently say that before they received the episcopate they had for some time exercised the duties of the priesthood. (b) Others maintain that this creed was not the local creed of Cæsarea, but one drawn up by Eusebius in his own justification as embodying what he had always believed and taught. According to this interpretation the preliminary statement still remains autobiographical; but it merely informs us that the writer exercised the office of priest before he became a bishop. This interpretation has been adopted by Kattenbusch in his second volume (p. 239) published in 1900. One of the reasons which he gives for his change of view is that when he was preparing his first volume he used Socrates, who does not give the superscription which we have printed in brackets. It is a vital matter with writers of the school of Kattenbusch not to accept what seems the natural interpretation of Eusebius's words, viz., that the creed he read before the council was actually the one he had always used. If this is admitted, "then", to quote Dr. Sanday, "I cannot but think that the theory of Kattenbusch and Harnack [viz. that the Eastern creeds were daughters of the early Roman creed, and this latter did not reach the East till about A. D. 272] breaks down altogether. Bishop Lightfoot . . . puts the birth of Eusebius about 260 A. D., so that he would be something like twelve years old when Aurelian intervened in the affairs of Antioch. In other words he was in all probability already baptized, and had already been catechised in the Cæsarean creed at a time when, in the Kattenbusch-Harnack hypothesis, the parent of that creed had not yet reached Antioch—much less Cæsarea or Jerusalem" (Journ. Th. Studies, I, 15).

The passage just quoted shows that the date of Eusebius's birth is more than a merely curious question. According to Lightfoot, it cannot have been "much later than A. D. 260" (p. 309); according to Harnack, "it can hardly be placed later than 260–265" (Chronologie, I, p. 106). The data from which they argue are the persons and events which Eusebius describes as belonging to "our own times". Thus, at the end of his account of the epistles of Dionysius of Alexandria, he says he is now going to relate the events of "our own times" (*καθ' ἡμᾶς*.—H. E., VII, 26). He then recounts how, at Rome, Pope Dionysius (259–268) succeeded Xystus, and about the same time Paul of Samosata became Bishop of Antioch. Elsewhere (H. E., V, 28) he speaks of the same Paul as reviving "in our own time" (*καθ' ἡμᾶς*) the heresy of Artemon. He also speaks of the Alexandrian Dionysius (d. 265) in the same way (H. E., III, 28). He calls Manes, whom he places (H. E., VII, 31) during the episcopate of Felix (270–274), "the maniac of yesterday and our own times" (Theophania, IV, 30). An historian might of course refer to events recent, but before his own birth, as belonging to "our own times"; e. g. a man of thirty might speak thus of the Franco-German war in 1870. But the reference to Manes as "the maniac of yesterday" certainly suggests a writer who is alluding to what happened within his own personal recollection.

Concerning Eusebius's parentage we know absolutely nothing, but the fact that he escaped with a short term of imprisonment during the terrible Diocletian persecution, when his master Pamphilus and others of his companions suffered martyrdom, suggests that he belonged to a family of some influence and importance. His relations, later on, with the Emperor Constantine point to the same conclusion. At some time during the last twenty years of the third century he visited Antioch, where he made the acquaintance of the priest Dorotheus, and heard him expound the Scriptures (H. E., VII, 32). By a slip of the pen or the memory, Lightfoot (p. 309) makes Dorotheus a priest of the Church of Cæsarea. In 296 he saw for the first time the future Emperor Constantine, as he passed through Palestine in the company of Diocletian (Vit. Const., I, 19).

At a date which cannot be fixed Eusebius made the acquaintance of Pamphilus, the founder of the magnificent library which remained for several centuries the great glory of the Church of Cæsarea. Pamphilus came from Phœnicia, but at the time we are considering resided at Cæsarea, where he presided over a college or school for students. A man of noble birth, and wealthy, he sold his patrimony and gave the proceeds to the poor. He was a great friend to indigent students, supplying them to the best of his ability with the necessaries of life, and bestowing on them copies of the Holy Scriptures. Too humble to write anything himself, he spent his time in preparing accurate copies of the Scriptures and other books, especially those of Origen. Eloquent testimonies to the care bestowed by Pamphilus and Eusebius on the sacred text are found in Biblical MSS. which have reproduced their colophons. We give three specimens. (1) The following is prefixed to Ezechiel in the codex Marchalianus. A facsimile of the original will be found in Mai's "Bib. nov. Pat.", IV, p. 218, and in Migne. It is printed in ordinary type in Swete's O. T. in Greek (vol. III, p. viii). It must be remembered that Origen's own copy of the Hexapla was in the library of Pamphilus. It had probably been deposited there by Origen himself.

> "The following was transcribed from a copy of the Father Apollinarius the Coenobiarch, to which these words are subjoined: 'It was transcribed from the editions of the Hexapla and was corrected from the Tetrapla of Origen himself which also had been corrected and furnished with scholia in his own handwriting, whence I, Eusebius, added the scholia, Pamphilus and Eusebius corrected.'"

(2) At the end of the Book of Esdras, in the codex Sinaiticus, there is the following note:—

> "It was compared with a very ancient copy that had been corrected by the hand of the blessed martyr Pamphilus to which is appended in his own hand this subscription: 'It was transcribed and corrected according to the Hexapla of Origen. Antoninus compared, I, Pamphilus, corrected.'" (Swete, vol. II, p. 212.)

(3) The same codex and also the Vatican and Alexandrine quote a colophon like the above, with the difference that Antoninus has become a confessor, and Pamphilus is in prison—"Antoninus the confessor compared, Pamphilus corrected". The volume to which this colophon was subjoined began with I Kings and ended with Esther. Pamphilus was certainly not idle in prison. To most of the books in the Syro-Hexaplar is subjoined a note to the effect that they were translated from the Hexapla in the library of Cæsarea and compared with a copy subscribed: "I, Eusebius, corrected [the above] as carefully as I could" (Harnack, "Altchrist. Lit.", pp. 544, 545).

May not the confessor Antoninus be the same person as the priest of that name who, later on, with two companions interrupted the governor when he was on the point of sacrificing, and was beheaded? (Mart. Pal., 9.) One member of Pamphilus's household, Apphianus, had done the same a few years before; and another, Ædesius, after being tortured and sent to the mines, on obtaining his release provoked martyrdom at Alexandria by going before the governor and rebuking him. Towards the end of 307 Pamphilus was arrested, horribly tortured, and consigned to prison.

Besides continuing his work of editing the Septuagint, he wrote, in collaboration with Eusebius, a Defence of Origen which was sent to the confessors in the mines—a wonderful gift from a man whose sides had been curried with iron combs, to men with their right eyes burned out and the sinews of their left legs cauterized. Early in 309 Pamphilus and several of his disciples were beheaded. Out of devotion to his memory Eusebius called himself Eusebius Pamphili, meaning, probably, that he wished to be regarded as the bondsman of him whose name "it is not meet that I should mention . . . without styling him my lord" (Mart. Pal., ed. Cureton, p. 37). Mr. Gifford, in the introduction to his translation of the "Præp. Evang.", has suggested another explanation on the authority of an ancient scholion emanating from Cæsarea which calls Eusebius the "son of Pamphilus". He argues further that Pamphilus, in order to make Eusebius his heir, took the necessary step of adopting him.

During the persecution Eusebius visited Tyre and Egypt and witnessed numbers of martyrdoms (H. E., VIII, vii and ix). He certainly did not shun danger, and was at one time a prisoner. When, where, or how he escaped death or any kind of mutilation, we do not know. An indignant bishop, who had been one of his fellow-prisoners and "lost an eye for the Truth", demanded at the Council of Tyre how "he came off scathless". To this taunt—it was hardly a question—made under circumstances of great provocation, Eusebius deigned no reply (Epiphan., Hær., lxviii, 8; cf. St. Athanas., "Apol. c. Arian.", viii, 1). He had many enemies, yet the charge of cowardice was never seriously made—the best proof that it could not have been sustained. We may assume that, as soon as the persecution began to relax, Eusebius succeeded Pamphilus in the charge of the college and library. Perhaps he was ordained priest about this time. By 315 he was already a bishop, for he was present in that capacity at the dedication of a new basilica at Tyre, on which occasion he delivered a discourse given in full in the last book of the Church history.

Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, excommunicated Arius about the year 320. The Arians soon found that for all practical purposes Eusebius was on their side. He wrote to Alexander charging him with misrepresenting the teaching of the Arians and so giving them cause "to attack and misrepresent whatever they please" (see below). A portion of this letter has been preserved in the Acts of the second Council of Nicæa, where it was cited to prove that Eusebius was a heretic. He also took part in a synod of Syrian bishops who decided that Arius should be restored to his former position, but on his side he was to obey his bishop and continually entreat peace and communion with him (Soz., H. E., I, 15). According to Duchesne (Hist. de l'Eglise, II, 132), Arius, like Origen before him, found an asylum at Cæsarea. At the opening of the Council of Nicæa Eusebius occupied the first seat on the right of the emperor, and delivered the inaugural address which was "couched in a strain of thanksgiving to Almighty God on his, the emperor's, behalf" (Vit. Const., III, 11; Soz., H. E., I, 19). He evidently enjoyed great prestige and may not unreasonably have expected to be able to steer the council through the *via media* between the Scylla and Charybdis of "Yes" and "No". But if he entertained such hopes they were soon disappointed. We have already spoken of the profession of faith which he brought forward to vindicate his own orthodoxy, or perhaps in the hope that the council might adopt it. It was, in view of the actual state of the controversy, a colourless, or what at the present day would be called a comprehensive, formula. After some delay Eusebius subscribed to the uncompromising creed drawn up by the council, making no secret, in the letter which he wrote to his own Church, of the non-natural sense in which he accepted it. Between 325 and 330 a heated controversy took place between Eusebius and Eustathius, Bishop of Antioch. Eustathius accused Eusebius of tampering with the faith of Nicæa; the latter retorted with the charge of Sabellianism. In 331 Eusebius was among the bishops who, at a synod held in Antioch, deposed Eustathius. He was offered and refused the vacant see. In 334 and 335 he took part in the campaign against St. Athanasius at the synods held in Cæsarea and Tyre respectively. From Tyre the assembly of bishops were summoned to Jerusalem by Constantine, to assist at the dedication of the basilica he had erected on the site of Calvary. After the dedication they restored Arius and his followers to communion. From Jerusalem they were summoned to Constantinople (336), where Marcellus was condemned. The following year Constantine died. Eusebius survived him long enough to write his Life and two treatises against Marcellus, but by the summer of 341 he was already dead, since it was his successor, Acacius, who assisted as Bishop of Cæsarea at a synod held at Antioch in the summer of that year.

WRITINGS.—We shall take Eusebius's writings in the order given in Harnack's "Altchrist. Lit.", pp. 554 sqq.

A. *Historical.*—(1) The lost Life of Pamphilus, often referred to by Eusebius, of which only a single fragment, describing Pamphilus' liberality to poor students, quoted by St. Jerome (c. Ruffin., I, ix), survives.—(2) A collection of Ancient Martyrdoms, used by the compiler of Wright's Syriac Martyrology, also lost.—(3) On the Martyrs of Palestine. There are two distinct forms of this work, both drawn up by Eusebius. The longer is only extant in a Syriac version which was first edited and translated by Cureton in 1861. The shorter form is found in most MSS. (not, however, in the best) of the Church History, sometimes at the end of the last book, generally between books VIII and IX, also in the middle of book VIII. The existence of the same work in two different forms raises a number of curious literary problems. There is, of course, the question of priority. Here, with two notable exceptions, scholars seem to be agreed in favour of the longer form. Then comes the question, why Eusebius abridged it and, finally, how the abridgment found its way into the Church History. The shorter form lacks some introductory remarks, referred to in c. xiii, which defined the scope of the book. It also breaks off when the writer is about to "record the palinode" of the persecutors. It seems probable that part of the missing conclusion is extant in the form of an appendix to the eighth book of the Church History found in several MSS. This appendix contrasts the miserable fate of the persecutors with the good fortune of Constantine and his father. From these data Lightfoot concludes that what we now possess formed "part of a larger work in which the sufferings of the Martyrs were set off against the deaths of the persecutors". It must, however, be remembered that the missing parts would not add much to the book. So far as the martyrs are concerned, it is evidently complete, and the fate of the persecutors would not take long in the telling. Still, the missing conclusion may explain why Eusebius curtailed his account of the Martyrs. The book, in both forms, was intended for popular reading. It was therefore desirable to keep down the price of copies. If this was to be done, and new matter (i. e. the fate of the persecutors) added, the old matter had to be somewhat curtailed. In 1894, in the Theologische Literaturzeitung (p. 464) Preuschen threw out the idea that the shorter form was merely a rough draft not intended for publication. Bruno Violet, in his "Die Palästinischen Märtyrer" (Texte u. Untersuch., XIV, 4, 1896) followed up this idea and pointed out that, whereas the longer form was constantly used by the compilers of Martyrologies, Menologies, and the like, the shorter form was never used. In a review of Violet (Theolog. Litz, 1897, p. 300), Preuschen returns to his original

idea, and further suggests that the shorter form must have been joined to the Church History by some copyist who had access to Eusebius's MSS. Harnack (Chronologie, 11, 115) holds to the priority of the longer form, but he thinks that the shorter form was composed almost at the same time for readers of the Church History.—(4) The Chronicle (see separate article, EUSEBIUS, CHRONICLE OF).—(5) The Church History. It would be difficult to overestimate the obligation which posterity is under to Eusebius for this monumental work. Living during the period of transition, when the old order was changing and all connected with it was passing into oblivion, he came forward at the critical moment with his immense stores of learning and preserved priceless treasures of Christian antiquity. This is the great merit of the Church History. It is not a literary work which can be read with any pleasure for the sake of its style. Eusebius's "diction", as Photius said, "is never pleasant nor clear". Neither is it the work of a great thinker. But it is a storehouse of information collected by an indefatigable student. Still, great as was Eusebius's learning, it had its limitations. He is provokingly ill-informed about the West. That he knows very little about Tertullian or St. Cyprian is due, no doubt, to his scant knowledge of Latin; but in the case of a Greek writer, like Hippolytus, we can only suppose that his works somehow failed to make their way to the libraries of the East. Eusebius's good faith and sincerity has been amply vindicated by Lightfoot. Gibbon's celebrated sneer, about a writer "who indirectly confesses that he has related whatever might redound to the glory, and that he has suppressed all that could tend to the disgrace, of religion", can be sufficiently met by referring to the passages (H. E., VIII, ii; Mart. Pal. c. 12) on which it is based. Eusebius does not "indirectly confess", but openly avows, that he passes over certain scandals, and he enumerates them and denounces them. "Nor again", to quote Lightfoot, "can the special charges against his honour as a narrator be sustained. There is no ground whatever for the charge that Eusebius forged or interpolated the passage from Josephus relating to our Lord quoted in H. E., I, 11, though Heinichen is disposed to entertain the charge. Inasmuch as this passage is contained in all our MSS., and there is sufficient evidence that other interpolations (though not this) were introduced into the text of Josephus long before his time (see Orig., c. Cels., I, 47, Delarue's note) no suspicion can justly attach to Eusebius himself. Another interpolation in the Jewish historian, which he quotes elsewhere (11, 23), was certainly known to Origen (l. c.). Doubtless also the omission of the owl in the account of Herod Agrippa's death (H. E., 11, 10) was already in some texts of Josephus (Ant., XIX, 8, 2). The manner in which Eusebius deals with his numerous quotations elsewhere, where we can test his honesty, is a sufficient vindication against this unjust charge" (L., p. 325).

The notices in the Church History bearing on the New Testament Canon are so important that a word must be said about the rule followed by Eusebius in what he recorded and what he left unrecorded. Speaking generally, his principle seems to have been to quote testimonies for and against those books only whose claims to a place in the Canon had been disputed. In the case of undisputed books he gave any interesting information concerning their composition which he had come across in his reading. The subject was most carefully investigated by Lightfoot in an article in "The Contemporary" (January, 1875, reprinted in "Essays on Supernatural Religion"), entitled "The Silence of Eusebius". In regard to the Gospel of St. John, Lightfoot concludes: "The silence of Eusebius respecting early witnesses to the Fourth Gospel is an evidence in its favour." For the episcopal lists in the Church History, see article on the Chronicle. The tenth book of the Church History records the defeat of Licinius in 323, and must have been completed before the death and disgrace of Crispus in 326, for it refers to him as Constantine's "most pious son". The ninth book was compiled between the defeat of Maxentius in 312, and Constantine's first rupture with Licinius in 314.

(6) The Life of Constantine, in four books. This work has been most unjustly blamed, from the time of Socrates downwards, because it is a panegyric rather than a history. If ever there was a man under an obligation to respect the maxim, *De mortuis nil nisi bonum*, this man was Eusebius, writing the Life of Constantine within three years after his death (337). This Life is especially valuable because of the account it gives of the Council of Nicæa and the earlier phases of the Arian controversy. It is well to remember that one of our chief sources of information for the history of that council is a book written to magnify Constantine.

B. *Apologetic.*—(7) Against Hierocles. Hierocles, who, as governor in Bithynia and in Egypt, was a cruel enemy of the Christians during the persecution, before the persecution had attacked them with the pen. There was nothing original about his work except the use he made of Philostratus's Life of Apollonius of Tyana to institute a comparison between our Lord and Apollonius in favour of the latter. In his reply Eusebius confined himself to this one point.—(8) "Against Porphyry", a work in twenty-five books of which not a fragment survives.—(9) The "Præparatio Evangelica", in fifteen books.—(10) The "Demonstratio Evangelica", in twenty books, of which the last ten, with the exception of a fragment of the fifteenth, are lost. The object of these two treatises, which should be regarded as two parts of one comprehensive work, was to justify the Christian in rejecting the religion and philosophy of the Greeks in favour of that of the Hebrews, and then to justify him in not observing the Jewish manner of life. The "Præparatio" is devoted to the first of these objects. The following summary of its contents is taken from Mr. Gifford's introduction to his translation of the "Præparatio": "The first three books discuss the threefold system of Pagan Theology, Mythical, Allegorical, and Political. The next three, IV-VI, give an account of the chief oracles, of the worship of dæmons, and of the various opinions of Greek Philosophers on the doctrines of Fate and Free Will. Books VII-IX give reasons for preferring the religion of the Hebrews founded chiefly on the testimony of various authors to the excellency of their Scriptures and the truth of their history. In Books X-XII Eusebius argues that the Greeks had borrowed from the older theology and philosophy of the Hebrews, dwelling especially on the supposed dependence of Plato upon Moses. In the last three books the comparison of Moses with Plato is continued, and the mutual contradictions of other Greek Philosophers, especially the Peripatetics and Stoics, are exposed and criticized."

The "Præparatio" is a gigantic feat of erudition, and, according to Harnack (Chronologie, II, p. 120), was, like many of Eusebius's other works, actually composed during the stress of the persecution. It ranks, with the Chronicle, second only to the Church History in importance, because of its copious extracts from ancient authors whose works have perished. The first book of the Demonstratio chiefly deals with the temporary character of the Mosaic Law. In the second the prophecies concerning the vocation of the Gentiles and the rejection of the Jews are discussed. In the remaining eight the testimonies of the prophets concerning Christ are treated of.

We now pass to three books, of which nothing is known save that they were read by Photius, viz. (11), The "Præparatio Ecclesiastica", (12) the "Demonstratio Ecclesiastica", and (13) Two Books of Objection and Defence, of which, from Photius's account, there seem to have been two separate editions. (14)

The "Theophania" or "Divine Manifestation". Except for a few fragments of the original, this work is only extant in a Syriac version discovered by Tattam, edited by Lee in 1842, and translated by the same in 1843. It treats of the cosmic function of the Word, the nature of man, the need of revelation, etc. The fourth and fifth books are particularly remarkable as a kind of anticipation of modern books on Christian evidences. A curious literary problem arises out of the relations between the "Theophania" and the work "De Laudibus Constantini". There are entire passages which are almost verbatim the same in both works. Lightfoot decides in favour of the priority of the first-named work. Gressel, who has edited the "Theophania" for the Berlin edition of the Greek Fathers, takes the opposite view. He compares the parallel passages and argues that they are improved in the "De Laudibus Constantini". (15) "On the Numerous Progeny of the Ancients". This work is referred to by Eusebius twice, in the "Præp. Ev.", VII, 8, and in the "Dem. Ev.", VII, 8; and also (Lightfoot and Harnack think) by St. Basil ("De Spir. Sanct.", xxix), where he says, "I draw attention to his [Eusebius's] words in discussing the difficulties started in connexion with ancient polygamy." Arguing from St. Basil's words, Lightfoot thinks that in this treatise Eusebius dealt with the difficulty presented by the Patriarchs possessing more than one wife. But he overlooked the reference in the "Dem. Ev.", from which it would appear that the difficulty dealt with was, perhaps, a more general one, viz., the contrast presented by the desire of the Patriarchs for a numerous offspring and the honour in which continence was held by Christians.

C. *Exegetical.*—(16) Eusebius narrates, in his Life of Constantine (IV, 36, 37), how he was commissioned by the emperor to prepare fifty sumptuous copies of the Bible for use in the Churches of Constantinople. Some scholars have supposed that the Codex Sinaiticus was one of these copies. Lightfoot rejects this view chiefly on the ground that "the Text of the codex in many respects differs too widely from the readings found in Eusebius".—(17) Sections and Canons. Eusebius drew up ten canons, the first containing a list of passages common to all four Evangelists; the second, those common to the first three and so on. He also divided the Gospels into sections numbered continuously. A number, against a section, referred the reader to the particular canon where he could find the parallel sections or passages.—(18) The labours of Pamphilus and Eusebius in editing the Septuagint have already been spoken of. They "believed (as did St. Jerome nearly a century afterwards) that Origen had succeeded in restoring the old Greek version to its primitive purity". The result was a "mischievous mixture of the Alexandrian version with the versions of Aquila and Theodotion" (Swete, "Introd. to O. T. in Greek", pp. 77, 78). For the labours of the two friends on the text of the N. T. the reader may be referred to Bousset, "Textcritische Studien zum N. T.", c. ii. Whether as in the case of the Old Testament, they worked on any definite critical principles is not known. —(19) (a) Interpretation of the ethnological terms in the Hebrew Scriptures; (b) Chorography of Ancient Judaea with the Inheritances of the Ten Tribes; (c) A plan of Jerusalem and the Temple; (d) On the Names of Places in the Holy Scriptures. These four works were written at the request of Eusebius's friend Paulinus. Only the fourth is extant. It is known as the "Topics," or the "Onomasticon".—(20) On the nomenclature of the Book of the Prophets. This work gives a short biography of each Prophet and an account of his prophecies.—(21) Commentary on the Psalms. There are many gaps in the MSS. of this work, and they end in the 118th Psalm. The missing portions are in part supplied by extracts from the Catenae. An allusion to the discovery of the Holy Sepulchre fixes the date at about 330. Lightfoot speaks very highly of this commentary.—(22) Commentary on Isaiah, written after the persecution.—(23 to 28) Commentaries on other books of Holy Scripture, of some of which what may be extracts are preserved. (29) Commentary on St. Luke, of which what seem to be extracts are preserved.—(30) Commentary on I Cor., the existence of which seems to be implied by St. Jerome (Ep. xlix).—(31) Commentary on Hebrews. A passage that seems to belong to such a commentary was discovered and published by Mai.—(32) On the Discrepancies of the Gospels, in two parts. An epitome, very probably from the hand of Eusebius, of this work was discovered and published by Mai in 1825. Extracts from the original are preserved. Of the two parts, the first, dedicated to a certain Stephen, discusses questions respecting the genealogies of Christ; the second, dedicated to one Marinus, questions concerning the Resurrection. The Discrepancies were largely borrowed from by St. Jerome and St. Ambrose, and have thus indirectly exercised a considerable influence on Biblical studies.—(33) General Elementary Introduction, consisting of ten books, of which VI-IX are extant under the title of "Prophetical Extracts". These were written during the persecution. There are also a few fragments of the remaining books. "This work seems to have been a general introduction to theology, and its contents were very miscellaneous as the extant remains show" (L., p. 339).

D. *Dogmatic.*—(34) The Apology for Origen. This work has already been mentioned in connexion with Pamphilus. It consisted of six books, the last of which was added by Eusebius. Only the first book is extant, in a translation by Rufinus.—(35) "Against Marcellus, Bishop of Ancyra", and (36) "On the Theology of the Church", a refutation of Marcellus. In two articles in the "Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissenschaft" (vol. IV, pp. 330 sqq. and vol. VI, pp. 250 sqq.), written in English, Prof. Conybeare has maintained that our Eusebius could not have been the author of the two treatises against Marcellus. His arguments are rejected by Prof. Klostermann, in his introduction to these two works published in 1905 for the Berlin edition of the Greek Fathers. The "Contra Marcellum" was written after 336 to justify the action of the synod held at Constantinople when Marcellus was deposed; the "Theology" a year or two later.—(37) "On the Paschal Festival" (a mystical interpretation). This work was addressed to Constantine (Vit. Const., IV, 35, 36). A long fragment of it was discovered by Mai.—(38) A treatise against the Manichæans is perhaps implied by Epiphanius (Haer., lxvi, 21).

E. *Orations and Sermons.*—(39) At the Dedication of the Church in Tyre (see above).—(40) At the Vicennalia of Constantine. This seems to have been the opening address delivered at the Council of Nicæa. It is not extant.—(41) On the Sepulchre of the Saviour, A. D. 325 (Vit. Const., IV, 33) not extant.—(42) At the Tricennalia of Constantine. This work is generally known as the "De Laudibus Constantini". The second part (11–18) seems to have been a separate oration joined on to the Tricennalia.—(43) "In Praise of the Martyrs". This oration is preserved in the same MS. as the "Theophania" and "Martyrs of Palestine". It was published and translated in the "Journal of Sacred Literature" by Mr. H. B. Cowper (New Series, V, pp. 403 sqq., and ibid. VI, pp. 129 sqq.).—(44) On the Failure of Rain, not extant.

F. *Letters.*—The history of the preservation of the three letters, (45) to Alexander of Alexandria, (46) to Euphrasion, or Euphration, (47) to the Empress Constantia, is sufficiently curious. Constantia asked Eusebius to send her a certain likeness of Christ of which she had heard; his refusal was couched in terms which centuries afterwards were appealed to by the Iconoclasts. A portion of this letter was read at the Second Council of Nicæa, and against it were set

portions from the letters to Alexander and Euphrasion to prove that Eusebius "was delivered up to a reprobate sense, and of one mind and opinion with those who followed the Arian superstition" (Labbe, "Conc.", VIII, 1143–1147; Mansi, "Conc.", XIII, 313–317). Besides the passage quoted in the council, other parts of the letter to Constantia are extant.—(48) To the Church of Cæsarea after the Council of Nicæa. This letter has already been described.

F. J. Bacchus.

Eusebius of Dorylæum, Bishop of Dorylæum in Asia Minor, was the prime mover on behalf of Catholic orthodoxy against the heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches. During the earlier part of his life he followed the profession of an advocate at Constantinople, and was already known as a layman of considerable learning when he protested publicly (423) against the erroneous doctrine of a discourse delivered by Anastasius, the syncellus, or chaplain, of Nestorius. Shortly afterwards he again bore public witness against the Nestorian heresy as to the nature of Christ, this time during a discourse by Nestorius himself, which he interrupted with the exclamation that "the eternal Word had undergone a second generation"—i. e. of a woman, according to the flesh. Much disorder followed, but Nestorius replied with arguments against the "second generation".

After the Council of Ephesus (431), at which the teaching of Nestorius had been condemned, a document attributed by general consent to Eusebius was made public, in which the doctrine of Nestorius was shown to be identical with that of Paul of Samosata. Eusebius had at some period contracted a friendship with Eutyches, founded, we may fairly conjecture, on their common opposition to Nestorian error. But when Eutyches allowed himself to be betrayed into opinions which, though directly opposed to those of Nestorius, were equally contrary to the faith of the Church, Eusebius, now Bishop of Dorylæum, was no less zealous against his former friend than he had been against their common opponent. After repeated attempts at persuasion, Eusebius brought a formal charge of false teaching against Eutyches, before Flavian, who was then (448) presiding over a synod at Constantinople. Flavian was reluctant to proceed against Eutyches, and urged Eusebius to remonstrate with him privately once more. Eusebius, however, refused, saying that he had already done all he could to convince Eutyches of his errors, and that further efforts would be useless. Eutyches was then summoned to attend, but did not do so until the summons had been three times issued; he excused his refusal to obey by asserting that he had resolved never to leave his monastery and pleading distrust of Eusebius, whom he now looked upon as his enemy. At last, however, he came, attended by a large escort of soldiers and monks. He was interrogated by Eusebius, who in the meantime had been strongly pressing his case, and who now, as he said, felt some alarm lest Eutyches should succeed in evading condemnation and retaliate upon his accuser by obtaining a decree of banishment against him. Eutyches, however, was condemned and deposed; he immediately wrote a letter to the pope, complaining of Eusebius's proceedings, which he attributed to the instigation of the devil.

In the following year (449) at Constantinople, an examination was held, by imperial authority, of the acts of the synod which had condemned Eutyches, which acts he alleged to have been falsified. Eutyches was represented by three delegates; Eusebius, who wished to withdraw but was not permitted to do so, urged that the doctrinal question should not be considered on that occasion, but should be remitted to a general council. On the assembly of the council then summoned at Ephesus (see Ephesus, Robber Council of), Eusebius was forcibly excluded by the influence of Dioscurus of Alexandria, who had obtained the support of the emperor. The reading of his part in the synod at Constantinople provoked an outburst of reproaches and threats: "Away with Eusebius! Burn him! As he has divided so let him be divided!" Flavian and Eusebius were deposed and banished, and Flavian only survived for three days the physical injuries he had received in the tumultuary council. Eusebius wrote to the Emperors Valentinian and Marcian, asking for a fresh hearing; and both Eusebius and Flavian sent written appeals to Rome. The text of these appeals was discovered in 1879 by Amelli—who was then curator of the Ambrosian Library at Milan and afterwards became Abbot of Monte Cassino—and was published by him in 1882. Eusebius grounds his appeal on the fact of his having been condemned unheard, and prays the pope to quash the sentence (pronuntiate evacuari et inanem fieri meam iniquam condemnationem); he also mentions a written appeal given by him to the papal legates at Ephesus, in which he had begged the Holy See to take cognizance of the matter (in quibus vestræ sedis cognitionem poposci). Eusebius fled to Rome, where he was kindly received by Leo I. In two letters written on the same day (13 April, 451) to Pulcheria and Anatolius, the pope bespeaks their good offices for Eusebius; in the former letter he mentions a report that the Diocese of Dorylæum was being thrown into disorder by an intruder (quam dicitur vastare qui illi injuste asseritur subrogatus). But Liberatus (Breviarium, c. xii) says that no one was put in Eusebius's place, and the report was therefore probably of merely local origin.

Eusebius took part in the Council of Chalcedon, at which he appears as the accuser of Dioscurus. He was one of the commission which drew up the definition of faith finally adopted. The council annulled his condemnation, and made special mention of the fact in the letter to the pope in which it sought his confirmation of its acts. The rescript of the Emperor Marcian (451), issued to clear the memory of Flavian, declares the reputation of Eusebius to be uninjured by the sentence of the Robber Council (injusta sententia nihil obsit Eusebio). He was one of the bishops who signed the 28th canon of Chalcedon giving patriarchal rights over Pontus and Asia to Constantinople. When the papal legates demurred to the passing of the canon in their absence, and the signatories of the region affected were asked to declare whether they had signed willingly or not, Eusebius said that he had done so, because, when in Rome, he had read the canon to the pope, who had accepted it. Though he was doubtless mistaken as to the fact alleged (how the mistake arose cannot now be determined), his professed motive is significant. His name appears among the signatures to the acts of a council held in Rome in 503, but it seems improbable that he was alive at that date. Baronius considers that the signatures of numerous Eastern bishops appended to these acts are misplaced, and properly belong to some much earlier council; since none of the bishops are otherwise heard of later than ten years after the Council of Chalcedon, at which they had all been present.

Flavian said of Eusebius at Constantinople that "fire seemed cold to his zeal for orthodoxy", and Leo wrote of him that he was a man who "had undergone great perils and toils for the Faith". In these two sentences all that is known of him may be fitly summarized.

St. Cyril of Alex., *Adv. Nestor.*, I, 20; Marius Mercator, Part II; Evagrius, *Hist. Eccl.*; Theophanes, *Chronographia;* Leontius Byz., *Contra Nestor. et Eutych;* Leo I, *Epp. xxi, lxxix, lxxx* (all in *P. G.* and *P. L.*); Labbe and Cossart, *Concilia*, IV; Liberatus, *Gesta de nom. Acac.*, also *Breviarium* (Gallandi, X and XII); Hefele, *History of the Councils*, III (tr. Edinburgh, 1883); Amelli, *S. Leone Magno e l'Oriente* (Milan, 1882). See also Bardenhewer, *Patrology*, Shahan tr. (Freiburg-im-B., St. Louis, 1908), 525; Lacey, *Apellatio Flaviani, with historical introduction* (pub. Church Historical Society, No. 70, London, 1891), and same writer's edition of the (two) Amelli letters (Cambridge, 1903), Anglican; Smith and Wace, *Dict. of Christ. Biog.* (London, 1880), s.v.

A. B. Sharpe.

Eusebius of Laodicea, an Alexandrian deacon who had some fame as a confessor and became Bishop of Laodicea in Syria, date of birth uncertain; d. about 268. His story is told by Eusebius of Cæsarea (Hist. Eccl., VII, xi and xxxii). As deacon at Alexandria he had accompanied his bishop, Dionysius (with a priest, two other deacons, and two Romans who were then in Egypt) before the tribunal of Æmilian, Prefect of Egypt, at the time of the Emperor Valerianus (253–260). Dionysius tells the story of their trial in a letter to a certain Bishop Germanus (Eus., Hist. Eccl., VII, xi). They were all sentenced to banishment, but Eusebius managed to remain in the city in hiding, "zealously served the confessors in prison and buried the bodies of the dead and of the blessed martyrs, not without danger to his own life" (ibid.). In 260 there broke out a rebellion at Alexandria and at the same time a plague ravaged the city. Eusebius again risked his life continually by nursing the sick and the wounded (ibid., VII, xxxii). The Romans besieged a part of the town (Bruchium, Πυρουχεῖον, Προύχιον). Anatolius, Eusebius' friend, was among the besieged, Eusebius himself outside. Eusebius went to the Roman general and asked him to allow any who would to leave Bruchium. His petition was granted and Anatolius, with whom he managed to communicate, explained the matter to the leaders of the rebellion and implored them to capitulate. They refused, but eventually allowed the women, children, and old men to profit by the Romans' mercy. A great crowd then came to surrender at the Roman camp. "Eusebius there nursed all who were exhausted by the long siege with every care and attention as a father and a physician" (ibid., xxxii). In 264 Dionysius (who seems to have come back from banishment) sent Eusebius as his legate to Syria to represent him at the discussions that were taking place concerning the affair of Paul of Samosata. Anatolius accompanied his friend. The Syrians were so impressed by these two Egyptians that they kept them both and made Eusebius Bishop of Laodicea as successor to Socrates. Not long afterwards he died and was succeeded by Anatolius. The date of his death is uncertain. Harnack thinks it was before the great Synod of Antioch in 268 (Chron. der altchrist. Litt., I, 34). Another theory is that the siege at Alexandria was in 269, that the friends went to Syria at the end of that year, and that Eusebius's death was not till 279 (so W. Reading in the Variorum notes to his edition of Eusebius Pamph., Cambridge, 1720, I, 367). Gams puts his death in 270 (Kirchenlexikon, s. v. Eusebius von Laodicea). Eusebius's name does not occur in the acts of the Synod of 268.

EUSEBIUS, *Hist. Eccl.*, VII, xi and xxxii; BARONIUS, *Annales eccl.*, ad an. 263, 8–11; HARNACK, *Chron. der altchristl. Litt.*, I, 34, 37, 41, etc.; DUCHESNE, *Hist. ancienne de l'Eglise* (Paris, 1906), I, 488–489.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Eusebius of Nicomedia, BISHOP, place and date of birth unknown; d. 341. He was a pupil, at Antioch, of Lucian the Martyr, in whose famous school he learned his Arian doctrines. He became Bishop of Berytus; but from ambitious motives he managed to get transferred, contrary to the canons of the early Church, to the see of Nicomedia, the residence of the Eastern Emperor Licinius, with whose wife Constantia, sister of Constantine, he was in high favour.

Arius, when he was condemned at Alexandria, by Alexander, bishop of that see, took refuge at Cæsarea, where he was well received by the famous apologist and historian Eusebius, and wrote to Eusebius of Nicomedia for support. The letter is preserved. In it the heretic explains his views clearly enough, and appeals to his correspondent as to a "fellow Lucianist". Eusebius put himself at the head of the party, and wrote many letters in support of Arius. One is preserved, addressed to Paulinus, Bishop of Tyre. We learn from it what Eusebius's doctrine was at this time: the Son, he says, is "not generated from the substance of the Father", but He is "other in nature and power"; He was created, and this is not inconsistent with His Sonship, for the wicked are called sons of God (Is., i, 2; Deut., xxxii, 18) and so are even the drops of dew (Job, xxxviii, 28); He was begotten by God's free will. This is pure Arianism, borrowed from the letters of Arius himself, and possibly more definite than the doctrine of St. Lucian.

Alexander of Alexandria was obliged to address a circular to all bishops. He had hoped, he says, to cover the matter in silence, "but Eusebius, who is now at Nicomedia, considering the Church's affairs to be in his hands, because he has not been condemned for having left Berytus and for having coveted the Church of Nicomedia, is the leader of these apostates, and has sent round a document in their support, in order that he may seduce some of the ignorant into this disgraceful heresy. . . . If Eusebius should write to you, pay no attention". Eusebius replied by assembling a council in his own province, which begged all the Eastern bishops to communicate with Arius, and to use their influence with Alexander in his favour. At the request of Arius, Eusebius of Cæsarea and others met together in Palestine, and authorized him to return to the Church which he had governed in Alexandria.

The situation changed when Constantine had conquered Licinius in 323. The Christian emperor began by comprising Arius and Alexander in a common disapproval. Why could not they agree to differ about subtleties of this kind, as the philosophers did? A letter in this sense to the patriarch was ineffectual; so Constantine preferred the side of authority, and wrote an angry rebuke to Arius. In the case of the Donatists, he had obtained a decision from a "general" council, at Arles, of all the bishops of his then dominions. He now summoned a larger council, from the world of which his victorious arms had made him master. It met at Nicæa in 325. The bishops were nearly all Easterns; but a Western bishop, Hosius of Cordova, who was in the emperor's confidence, took a leading part, and the pope was represented. Constantine ostentatiously declared that his duty at the council went no further than the guardianship of the bishops, but Eusebius of Cæsarea makes it clear that he spoke on the theological question. The Bishop of Nicomedia and his friends put forward an Arian confession of faith, but it had only about seventeen supporters from among some three hundred members of the council, and it was hooted by the majority. The formula which was eventually adopted was resisted for some time by the Arian contingent, but eventually all the bishops signed, with the exception of the two Egyptians who had been before excommunicated by Alexander.

Eusebius of Nicomedia had bad luck. Though he had signed the creed, he had not agreed to the condemnation of Arius, who had been, so he said, misrepresented; and after the council he encouraged in their heresy some Arians whom Constantine had invited to Constantinople with a view to their conversion. Three months after the council, the Emperor sent him like Arius into exile, together with Theognis, Bishop of Nicæa, accusing him of having been a supporter of Licinius, and of having even approved of his persecutions, as well as of having sent spies to watch himself. But the banishment of the intriguer lasted only two years. It is said that it was Constantia, the widow of Licinius, who induced Constantine to recall Arius, and it is probable that she was also the cause of the return of her old friend Eusebius. By 329 he was in high favour with the emperor, with whom he may have had some kind of relationship, since Ammianus Marcellinus makes him a relative of Julian.

From this time onwards we find Eusebius of Nicomedia at the head of a small and compact party called

by St. Athanasius, the Eusebians, *οἱ περὶ τὸν Εὐσέβιον*, whose object it was to undo the work of Nicæa, and to procure the complete victory of Arianism. They did not publicly recall the signatures that had been forced from them. They explained that Arius had repented of any excess in his words, or had been misunderstood. They dropped the Nicene formulæ, as ambiguous. They were the leaders of a much larger party of conservative prelates, who wished to stand well with the emperor, who reverenced the martyr Lucian and the great Origen, and were seriously alarmed at any danger of Sabellianism. The campaign opened with a successful attack on Eustathius of Antioch, the principal prelate of the East properly so called. He had been having an animated controversy with Eusebius of Cæsarea, in which he had accused that learned personage of polytheism, while Eusebius retorted with a charge of Sabellianism. Eustathius was deposed and exiled, for alleged disrespectful expressions about the emperor's mother, St. Helena, who was greatly devoted to the memory of St. Lucian. It is said that he was also charged with immorality and heresy, but it is certain that the whole case was got up by the Eusebians. The great see of Alexandria was filled in 328 by the deacon Athanasius, who had taken a leading part at Nicæa. Small in stature, and young in years, he was at the head of a singularly united body of nearly a hundred bishops, and his energy and vivacity, his courage and determination marked him out as the one foe whom the Eusebians had to dread. The Alexandrian Arians had now signed an ambiguous formula of submission, and Eusebius of Nicomedia wrote to Athanasius, asking him to reinstate them, adding a verbal message of threats. The Meletian schism, in Egypt, had only been partially healed by the mild measures decreed at Nicæa, and the schismatics were giving trouble. Constantine was induced by Eusebius to write to Athanasius curtly telling him he should be deposed, if he refused to receive into the Church any who demanded to be received. Athanasius explained why he could not do this, and the emperor seems to have been satisfied. Eusebius then joined hands with the Meletians, and induced them to trump up charges against Athanasius. They first pretended that he had invented a tribute of linen garments which he exacted. This was disproved, but Athanasius himself was sent for to the court. The Meletians then brought up a charge which did duty for many years, that he had ordered a priest named Macarius to overturn an altar and break up a chalice belonging to a priest named Ischyras, in the Mareotis, though in fact Ischyras had never been a priest, and at the time alleged could not have been pretending to say Mass, for he was ill in bed. It was also said that Athanasius had assisted a certain Philumenus to conspire against the emperor, and had given him a bag of gold. Again the accusers were refuted and put to flight. The saint returned to his Church with a letter from Constantine, in which the emperor sermonized the Alexandrians after his wont, urging them to peace and unity. But the question of the broken chalice was not dropped, and the Meletians further got hold of a bishop named Arsenius, whom they kept in hiding while they declared that Athanasius had put him to death; they carried about a severed hand, which they said was Arsenius's, cut off by the patriarch for the purpose of magic. Athanasius induced Ischyras to sign a document denying the former charge, and managed to discover the whereabouts of Arsenius. Constantine in consequence wrote a letter to the patriarch declaring him innocent.

Eusebius had stood apart from all these false accusations, and he was not disheartened by so many failures. He got the Meletians to demand a synod, and represented to Constantine that it would be right for peace to be obtained before the assembling of many bishops, at Jerusalem, to celebrate the dedication of the new Church of the Holy Sepulchre. This was in 335. A synod met at Tyre, whose history need not be detailed here. Athanasius brought some fifty bishops with him, but they had not been summoned, and were not allowed to sit with the rest. A deputation was sent into the Mareotis to inquire into the question of Ischyras and the chalice, and the chief enemies of Athanasius were chosen for the purpose. The synod was tumultuous, and even the Count Dionysius, who had come with soldiers to support the Eusebians, thought the proceedings unfair. It remains a mystery how so many well-meaning bishops were deceived into condemning Athanasius. He refused to await their judgment. Extricating himself with difficulty from the assembly, he led away his Egyptians and betook himself directly to Constantinople, where he accosted the emperor abruptly, and demanded justice. At his suggestion, the Council of Tyre was ordered to come before the emperor. Meanwhile Eusebius had brought the bishops on to Jerusalem, where the deliberations were made joyous by the reception back into the Church of the followers of Arius. The Egyptian bishops had drawn up a protest, attributing all that had been done at Tyre to a conspiracy between Eusebius and the Meletians and Arians, the enemies of the Church. Athanasius asserts that the final act at Jerusalem had been Eusebius's aim all along; all the accusations against himself had tended only to get him out of the road, in order that the rehabilitation of the Arians might be effected.

Eusebius prevented any of the bishops at Jerusalem from going to Constantinople, save those he could trust, Eusebius of Cæsarea, Theognis of Nicæa, Patrophilus of Scythopolis, and the two young Pannonian bishops Ursacius and Valens, who were to continue Eusebius's policy long after his death. They carefully avoided renewing the accusations of murder and sacrilege, which Constantine had already examined; and Athanasius tells us that five Egyptian bishops reported to him that they rested their case on a new charge, that he had threatened to delay the corn ships from Alexandria which supplied Constantinople. The emperor was enraged. No opportunity of defence was given, and Athanasius was banished to Gaul. But, in public, Constantine said that he had put in force the decree of the Council of Tyre. Constantine the Younger, however, declared later that his father had intended to save Athanasius from his enemies by sending him away, and that before dying he had had the intention of restoring him. The leader of the Meletians, John Arkaph, was similarly exiled. Eusebius wanted him no further, and hence did not care to protect him. One triumph was yet wanting to Eusebius, the reconciliation of Arius, his friend. This was to be consummated at length at Constantinople, but the designs of man were frustrated by the hand of God. Arius died suddenly under peculiarly humiliating conditions, on the eve of the day appointed for his solemn restoration to Catholic communion in the cathedral of New Rome.

Until 337 the Eusebians were busy in obtaining, by calumny, the deposition of the bishops who supported the Nicene faith. Of these the best known are Paul of Constantinople, Asclepas of Gaza, and Marcellus, Metropolitan of Ancyra. In the case of Marcellus they had received considerable provocation. Marcellus had been their active enemy at Nicæa. At Tyre he had refused to condemn Athanasius, and he presented a book to the emperor in which the Eusebians received hard words. He was convicted, not without ground, of Sabellianizing, and took refuge at Rome On 22 May, 337, Constantine the Great died at Nicomedia, after having been baptized by Eusebius, bishop of the place. His brothers and all but two of his nephews were at once murdered, in order to simplify the succession, and the world was divided between his three young sons. An arrangement WILS

effected between them by which all exiled bishops returned, and Athanasius came back to his flock. Eusebius was in reality a gainer by the new regime. Constantius, who was now lord of all the East, was but twenty years old. He wished to manage the Church, and he seems to have fallen an easy prey to the arts of the old intriguer Eusebius, so that the rest of his foolish and obstinate life was spent in persecuting Athanasius, and in carrying out Eusebius's policy. Never himself an Arian, Constantius held orthodoxy to lie somewhere between Arianism and the Nicene faith. The Arians, who were ready to disguise their doctrine to some extent, were therefore able to obtain from him a favour, which he denied to the few uncompromising Catholics who rejected his generalities.

The see of Alexandria had remained vacant during the absence of Athanasius. Eusebius now claimed to put the Synod of Tyre in force, and a rival bishop was set up in the person of Pistus, one of the Arian priests whom Alexander had long ago excommunicated. Until now the East alone had been concerned. The Eusebians were the first to try to get Rome and the West on their side. They sent to the pope an embassy of two priests and a deacon, who carried with them the decisions of the Council of Tyre and the supposed proofs of the guilt of Athanasius, of which the accused himself had been unable to get a sight. Instead of at once granting his communion to Pistus, Pope Julius sent the documents to Athanasius, in order that he might prepare a defence. The latter summoned a council of his suffragans. More than eighty attended, and sent to Julius a complete defence of their patriarch. The arrival of Athanasius's envoys bearing this letter struck terror into the minds of the ambassadors of the Eusebians. The priests fled, and the deacon could think of nothing better than to beg Julius to call a council, and be judge himself. The pope consented, on the ground that in the case of one of the chief Churches such as Alexandria, it was right and customary that the matter should be referred to him. He therefore wrote summoning both accusers and accused to a council of which he was willing that they should determine the place and time.

Thus it was not Athanasius who appealed to the pope, but the Eusebians, and that simply as a means of withdrawing from an awkward predicament. Pistus was not a success, and Constantius introduced by violence a certain Gregory, a Cappadocian, in his place. Athanasius, after addressing a protest to the whole Church against the methods of Eusebius, managed to escape with his life, and at once made his way to Rome to obey the pope's summons. His accusers took good care not to appear. Julius wrote again, fixing the end of the year (339) as the term for their arrival. They detained the legates until the fixed time had elapsed, and sent them back in January, 340, with a letter full of studied and ironical politeness, of which Sozomen has preserved us the tenor. He says: "Having assembled at Antioch, they wrote an answer to Julius, elaborately worded and rhetorically composed, full of irony, and containing terrible threats. They admitted in this letter that Rome was always honoured as the school of the Apostles, and the metropolis of the Faith from the beginning, although its teachers had settled in it from the East. But they thought that they ought not to take a secondary place because they had less great and populous Churches, since they were superior in virtue and intention. They reproached Julius with having communicated with Athanasius, and complained that this was an insult to their synod, and that their condemnation of him was made null; and they urged that this was unjust and contrary to ecclesiastical law. After thus reproaching Julius and complaining of ill usage, they promised, if he would accept the deposition of those whom they had deposed, and the appointment of those whom they had ordained, to grant him peace and communion, but if he withstood their decrees, they would refuse to do so. For they declared that the earlier Eastern bishops had made no objection when Novatian was driven out of the Roman Church. But they wrote nothing to Julius concerning their acts, which were contrary to the decisions of the Council of Nicæa, saying that they had many necessary reasons to allege in excuse, but that it was superfluous to make any defence against a vague and general suspicion that they had done wrong." The traditional belief that Rome had been schooled by the Apostles, and had always been the metropolis of the Faith, is interesting in the mouths of those who were denying her right to interfere in the East, in a matter of jurisdiction; for it is to be remembered that neither then, nor at any time, was Athanasius accused of heresy. This claim of independence is the first sign of the breach which began with the foundation of Constantinople as New Rome, and which ended in the complete separation of that city and all its dependencies from Catholic communion. For Eusebius had not contented himself with Nicomedia, now that it was no longer the capital, but had managed to get St. Paul of Constantinople exiled once more, and had seized upon that see, which was evidently, in his view, to be set above Alexandria and Antioch, and to be in very deed a second Rome.

The Roman council met in the autumn of 340. The Eusebians were not represented, but many Easterns, their victims, who had taken refuge at Rome, were there from Thrace, Cœle-Syria, Phœnicia and Palestine, besides Athanasius and Marcellus. Deputies came to complain of the violence at Alexandria. Others explained that many Egyptian bishops had wished to come, but had been prevented and even beaten or imprisoned. At the wish of the council the pope wrote a long letter to the Eusebians. It is one of the finest letters written by any pope, and lays bare all the deceits of Eusebius, with a clearness which is as unsparing as it is dignified. It is probable that the letter did not trouble Eusebius much, safe as he was in the emperor's favour. It is true that by the death of Constantine II, Constans, the protector of orthodoxy, had inherited his dominions, and was now far more powerful than Constantius. But Eusebius had never posed as an Arian, and in 341 he had a fresh triumph in the great Dedication Synod of Antioch, where a large number of orthodox and conservative bishops ignored the Council of Nicæa, and showed themselves quite at one with the Eusebian party, though denying that they were followers of Arius, who was not even a bishop!

Eusebius died, full of years and honours, probably soon after the council; at all events he was dead before that of Sardica. He had arrived at the summit of his hopes. He may really have believed Arian doctrine, but clearly his chief aim had ever been his own aggrandisement, and the humiliation of those who had humbled him at Nicæa. He had succeeded. His enemies were in exile. His creatures sat in the sees of Alexandria and Antioch. He was bishop of the imperial city, and the young emperor obeyed his counsels. If Epiphanius is right in calling him an old man even before Nicæa, he must now have reached a great age. His work lived after him. He had trained a group of prelates who continued his intrigues, and who followed the Court from place to place throughout the reign of Constantius. More than this, it may be said that the world suffers to this day from the evil wrought by this worldly bishop.

BARONIUS, *Ann.* (1570), 327–42; TILLEMONT (1699), VI; NEWMAN, *The Arians of the Fourth Century* (1833, etc.); IDEM, *Tracts theological and ecclesiastical* (1874); HEFELE, *History of the Councils*, tr. (Edinburgh, 1876), II; REYNOLDS in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*; LOOFS in HERZOG, *Realencycl.*; GWATKIN, *Studies of Arianism*, 2nd ed. (London, 1900); DUCHESNE, *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise* (Paris, 1907), II; CHAPMAN, *Athanasius and Pope Julius I*, in *Dublin Review* (July, 1905); E. SCHWARTZ, *Zur Geschichte des Athanasius* in *Göttinger Nachrichten* (1905).

JOHN CHAPMAN.

Eustace, SAINT, date of birth unknown, d. 29 March, 625. He was second abbot of the Irish monastery of Luxeuil in France, and his feast is commemorated in the Celtic martyrologies on the 29th of March. He was one of the first companions of St. Columbanus, a monk of Bangor (Ireland), who with his disciples did much to spread the Gospel over Central and Southern Europe. When Columbanus, the founder of Luxeuil, was banished from the Kingdom of Burgundy, on account of his reproving the morals of King Thierry, the exiled abbot recommended his community to choose Eustace as his successor. Subsequently Columbanus settled at Bobbio in Italy. Three years after his appointment (613), when Clothaire II became ruler of the triple Kingdom of France, the abbot of Luxeuil was commissioned, by royal authority, to proceed to Bobbio for the purpose of recalling Columbanus. The latter, however, setting forth his reasons in a letter to the king, declined to return, but asked that Clothaire would take under his protection the monastery and brethren of Luxeuil. During the twelve years that followed, under the administration of the abbot Eustace, the monastery continued to acquire renown as a seat of learning and sanctity. Through the royal patronage, its benefices and lands were increased, the king devoting a yearly sum, from his own revenues, towards its support. Eustace and his monks devoted themselves to preaching in remote districts, not yet evangelized, chiefly in the north-eastern extremities of Gaul. Their missionary work extended even to Bavaria. Between the monasteries of Luxeuil in France and that of Bobbio in Italy (both founded by St. Columbanus) connexion and intercourse seem to have long been kept up.

Acta SS., 29 March; MABILLON, *Acta Sanctorum, O.S.B.*; BARONIUS, *Annal. Eccl.*; COLGAN, *Acta Sanctorum Hiberniæ*; BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, I, 417; SMITH in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.

JOHN B. CULLEN.

Eustace, JOHN CHETWODE, antiquary, b. in Ireland, c. 1762; d. at Naples, Italy, 1 Aug., 1815. His family was English, his mother being one of the Chetwodes of Cheshire. He was educated at Sedgley Park School, and after 1774 at the Benedictine house, St. Gregory's, Douay. He did not become a Benedictine though he always retained an attachment to the order, but went to Ireland where he taught rhetoric at Maynooth college, where he was ordained priest. He never had much sympathy for Ireland and, having given some offence there, returned to England to assist Dr. Collins in his school at Southall Park. From there he went to be chaplain to Sir William Jerningham at Costessey. In 1802 he travelled through Italy with three pupils, John Cust (afterwards Lord Brownlow), Robert Rushbroke, and Philip Roche. During these travels he wrote a journal which subsequently became celebrated in his "Classical Tour". In 1805 he resided in Jesus College, Cambridge, as tutor to George Petre. This was a most unusual position for a Catholic priest, and Eustace's intercourse with leading members of the university led to his being charged with indifferentism. Dr. Milner, then vicar Apostolic, charged him with laying aside "the distinctive worship of his priesthood, in compliment, as he professed, to the liberality of the Protestant clergy, with whom he associated" and with permitting Catholics under his care to attend Protestant services. "This conduct", wrote the bishop, "was so notorious and offensive to real Catholics, that I was called upon by my brethren to use every means in my power to put a stop to it." On the other hand, an intimate friend says, "he never for a moment lost sight of his sacred character or its duties" (Gentleman's Magazine, see below). When Petre left Cambridge, Eustace accompanied him on another tour to Greece, Sicily, and Malta. In 1813 the publication of his "Classical Tour" obtained for him sudden celebrity, and he became a prominent figure in literary society, Burke being one of his chief friends. A short tour in France, in 1814, led to his "Letter from Paris", and in 1815 he travelled again to Italy to collect fresh materials, but he was seized with malaria at Naples and died there. Before death he bitterly lamented the erroneous tendency of certain passages in his writings. His works were: "A Political Catechism adapted to the present Moment" (1810); "An Answer to the Charge delivered by the Bishop of Lincoln to the Clergy of that Diocese at the Triennial Visitation in 1812"; "A Tour through Italy" (London, 1813, 2d ed., 1814); "A Classical Tour through Italy", 3d edition of the previous work, revised and enlarged (1815). A seventh edition of it appeared in London in 1841. It was also reprinted at Paris in 1837 in a series "Collections of Ancient and Modern English Authors", and "The Proofs of Christianity" (1814). The manuscript of his course of rhetoric, never published, is at Downside.

Catholicon (1817), V, 205; *Gentleman's Magazine*, LXXXV, ii; KIRK, *Biog. Mem. of Eighteenth Century Cath.* (London, 1908); BUTLER, *Mem. of English Cath.* (London, 1819); HUSENBETH, *Life of Bishop Milner* (Dublin, 1862); GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, II; COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, XVIII.

EDWIN BURTON.

Eustace, MAURICE, eldest son of Sir John Eustace, Castlemartin, County Kildare, Ireland, martyred for the Faith, Nov., 1581. Owing to the penal laws he was sent to be educated at the Jesuit College at Bruges in Flanders, where, after the completion of his secular studies, he desired to enter the Society of Jesus. His father, however, wrote the superiors of the college to send him home. Maurice returned to Ireland, much against his own inclination, but in the hope of being able, later on, to carry out his desire. After a brief stay, during which he tried to dissuade his father from opposing his vocation, he went back to Flanders. His old masters at the college of Bruges on learning his father's determination advised him to return to Ireland, and devote himself in the world to the service of religion. Shortly after his arrival in Ireland, he got an appointment as captain of horse, in which position he did much to edify, and even win back to the Faith, those who served under him. He never abandoned the idea of becoming a priest, and secretly took Holy orders. His servant, who was aware of the fact, told his father, who had his son immediately arrested and imprisoned in Dublin. A younger brother, desiring to inherit the family estates, also reported Maurice to be a priest, a Jesuit, and a friend of the queen's enemies. As a consequence, he was put on trial for high treason. During his imprisonment Adam Loftus, Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, offered him his daughter in marriage, and a large dowry, if he would accept the reformed religion. Yielding neither to bribery nor persecution, Eustace was sentenced to public execution, and hanged.

JOHN B. CULLEN.

Eustachius, BARTOLOMEO, a distinguished anatomist of the Renaissance period—"one of the greatest anatomists that ever lived," according to Hirsch's authoritative "Biographical Dictionary of the Most Prominent Physicians of all Time"—b. at San Severino, in the March of Ancona, Italy, in the early part of the sixteenth century; d. at Rome, August, 1574. Of the details of his life very little is known. He received a good education, and knew Latin and Greek and Arabic very well. After receiving his degree in medicine he devoted himself to the study of anatomy so successfully that with Vesalius and Columbus he constitutes the trio who remade the science of anatomy for modern times. He early attracted attention for his skill and knowledge, and became physician to Cardinal Borromeo, since known as St. Charles Borromeo. He was also physician to Cardinal Giulio della Rovere whom he accompanied to Rome. After the death of Columbus he was chosen professor of anatomy at the Sapienza which had been reorganized

the Roman University by Pope Alexander VI and magnificently developed by Popes Leo X and Paul III. The reason for his selection as professor was that he was considered the greatest anatomist in Italy after Columbus's death, and the policy of the popes of his time was to secure for the papal medical school the best available teachers. This position gave him time and opportunity for original work of a high order and Eustachius took advantage of it. He published a number of works on anatomy in which he added very markedly to the knowledge of the details of the structure of most of the organs of the body accepted up to this time. His first work was a commentary on Erotion's "Lexicon". Subsequently he wrote a treatise on the kidneys, another on the teeth, a third on blood vessels, a paper on the Azygos vein, and other special anatomical structures. Morgagni and Haller declared that there was not a part of the body on whose structure he had not shed light. In the midst of his work he became, in 1570, physician to Cardinal Peretti, afterwards Pope Sixtus V. At the beginning of his career as an anatomist Eustachius criticized Vesalius rather severely for having departed too far from Galen. After having continued his own original investigations for some time, however, he learned to appreciate Vesalius's merits and did ample justice to his work.

Eustachius's greatest contributions to anatomical science passed through many vicissitudes which kept his real merit from being recognized until long after his death. His anatomical investigations were recorded in a series of plates with text attached. Eustachius himself was not afforded the opportunity to arrange for the publication of his work, as he died rather suddenly. Some of his papers and plates went to his heirs, and others were deposited in the Vatican Library. They were unearthed by Lancisi, a distinguished papal physician at the beginning of the eighteenth century, and were published at the expense of Pope Clement XI. This work, "Bartholomæi Eustachii Tabulæ Anatomicæ" (Rome, 1714), demonstrates how much Eustachius had accomplished in anatomy. His special contributions to the science were the descriptions of the stirrup bone in the ear and the canal connecting the ear and the mouth, since called by his name. His monograph on the teeth of the child is very complete and has been surpassed only in recent years. In myology he worked out the insertions and attachment of the sterno-eleido-mastoid muscle, of the coccygeus, the splenius of the neck, the levator of the eyelid, and some others. In neurology his descriptions of the cranial nerves is especially full. In abdominal anatomy he added much. His description of the fœtal circulation was the most complete up to his time and it was he who recognized the valve on the left side of the opening of the inferior vena cava which serves to direct the blood from this vessel through the foramen ovale into the left auricle. This constitutes the most important distinctive structural difference between the circulatory apparatus of the adult and the child and is called the Eustachian valve.

FOSTER, *History of Physiology* (New York, 1901). The *Prolegomena Martini in Eustachii Tab. Anat.* (Edinburgh, 1755), contains a sketch of the life and times of Eustachius; CORRADI, *Gior. Med. di Roma* (1870, VI).

JAMES J. WALSH.

Eustachius and Companions, SAINTS, martyrs under the Emperor Hadrian, in the year 118. Feast, in the West, 20 September; in the East, 2 November. Emblems, a crucifix, a stag, an oven.

The legend relates that Eustachius (before baptism, Placidus), a Roman general under Trajan, while still a heathen, saw a stag coming towards him, with a crucifix between its horns; he heard a voice telling him that he was to suffer much for Christ's sake. He received baptism, together with his wife Tatiana (or Trajana, after baptism, Theopista) and his sons, Agapius and Theopistus. The place of the vision is said to have been Guadagnolo, between Tibur and Præneste (Tivoli and Palestrina), in the vicinity of Rome. Through adverse fortune the family was scattered, but later reunited. For refusing to sacrifice to the idols after a victory, they suffered death in a heated brazen bull. Baronius (Ann. Eccl., ad an. 103, 4) would identify him with Placidus mentioned by Josephus Flavius as a general under Titus.

The Acts are certainly fabulous, and recall the similar story in the Clementine Recognitions. They are a production of the seventh century, and were used by St. John Damascene, but the veneration of the saint is very old in both the Greek and Latin Churches. He is honoured as one of the Holy Helpers, is invoked in difficult situations, and is patron of the city of Madrid and of hunters. The church of Sant' Eustachio in Rome, title of a cardinal-deacon, existed in 827, according to the "Liber Pontificalis", but perhaps as early as the time of Gregory the Great (d. 604). It claims to possess the relics of the saint, some of which are said to be at St-Denis and at St-Eustache in Paris. An island in the Lesser Antilles and a city in Canada bear his name.

STOKES in *Dict. of Christ. Biogr.*, s. v.; *Acta SS.*, Sept., VI, 106; *Anal. Boll.*, III, 65; CHEVALIER, *Bio-bibliogr.*, I, 1422.

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Eustathius, SAINT, Bishop of Antioch, b. at Side in Pamphylia, c. 270; d. in exile at Trajanopolis in Thrace, most probably in 360, according to some already in 336 or 337. He was at first Bishop of Bercœa in Syria, whence he was transferred to Antioch c. 323. At the Council of Nicæa (325), he was one of the most prominent opponents of Arianism and from 325–330 he was engaged in an almost continuous literary warfare against the Arians. By his fearless denunciation of Arianism and his refusal to engage any Arian priests in his diocese, he incurred the hatred of the Arians, who, headed by Eusebius of Cæsarea and his namesake of Nicomedia, held a synod at Antioch (331) at which Eustathius was accused, by subborned witnesses, of Sabellianism, incontinency, cruelty, and other crimes. He was deposed by the synod and banished to Trajanopolis in Thrace by order of the Emperor Constantine, who gave credence to the scandalous tales spread about Eustathius. The people of Antioch, who loved and revered their holy and learned patriarch, became indignant at the injustice done to him and were ready to take up arms in his defence. But Eustathius kept them in check, exhorted them to remain true to the orthodox faith and humbly left for his place of exile, accompanied by a large body of his clergy. The adherents of Eustathius at Antioch formed a separate community by the name of Eustathians and refused to acknowledge the bishops set over them by the Arians. When, after the death of Eustathius, St. Meletius became Bishop of Antioch in 360 by the united vote of the Arians and the orthodox, the Eustathians would not recognize him, even after his election was approved by the Synod of Alexandria in 362. Their intransigent attitude gave rise to two factions among the orthodox, the so-called Meletian Schism (q. v.), which lasted till the second decade of the fifth century (Cavallera, Le schisme d' Antioche, Paris, 1905).

Most of the numerous dogmatic and exegetical treatises of Eustathius have been lost. His principal extant work is "De Engastrimytho", in which he maintains against Origen that the apparition of Samuel (I Kings, xxviii) was not a reality but a mere phantasm called up in the brain of Saul by the witch of Endor. In the same work he severely criticizes Origen for his allegorical interpretation of the Bible. A new edition of it, together with the respective homily of Origen, was made by A. Jahn in Gebhardt and Harnack's "Texte und Untersuchungen zur Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur" (Leipzig, 1886), II, fasc. iv. Cavallera recently discovered a Christological homily

"S. Eustathii ep. Antioch. in Lazarum, Mariam et Martham homilia christologica", which he edited together with a commentary on the literary fragments of Eustathius (Paris, 1905). Fragments of lost writings are found in Migne (P. G., XVIII, 675–698), Pitra and Martin (Analecta Sacra, II, Proleg., 37–40; IV, 210–213 and 441–443). "Commentarius in Hexaemeron" (Migne, P. G., XVIII, 707–794) and "Allocutio ad Imp. Constantinum in Conc. Nicæno" (Migne, P. G., XVIII, 673–676) are spurious. His feast is celebrated in the Latin Church on 16 July, in the Greek on 21 Feb. His relics were brought to Antoch.

BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, 16 July; BARING-GOULD, *Lives of the Saints*, 16 July; VENABLES in *Dict. Christ. Biog.* s. v.; *Acta SS.*, July, IV, 130–144; FESSLER-JUNGMANN, *Institutiones Patrologiæ* (Innsbruck, 1890), I, 427–431; BARDENHEWER, *Patrology*, SHAHAN tr. (Freiburg-im-Br., St. Louis, 1908), 252–53.

MICHAEL OTT.

Eustathius, Greek savant and defender of monasticism, Archbishop of Thessalonica, b. at Constantinople in the early part of the twelfth century; d. at Thessalonica c. 1194. He received his ecclesiastical training in the monastic school of St. Euphemia at Constantinople, became a monk there in the monastery of St. Florus, and afterwards deacon of the "Great Church" (St. Sophia), and teacher of rhetoric and secretary of the petitions addressed to the emperor. He enjoyed the confidence of the Comneni emperors, especially of Manuel Comnenus I (1143–80) who intrusted to him the education of one of his sons. About 1174 he was made Archbishop of Myra in Asia Minor; but before his installation, was transferred to the archiepiscopal See of Thessalonica by special direction of the emperor. In this position he proved himself a real shepherd and father of his people. He tried to reform the worldly and hypocritical lives of the monks and anchorites of his time; he shielded his people against the excessive exactions of the imperial tax-collectors; he remained with his flock at the time of the invasion of Thessalonica by the Normans of Sicily in 1185, and tried to encourage his subjects and alleviate their sufferings. Owing to his opposition to the monastic orders and his frankness of speech towards those in high places, he incurred the displeasure of the emperor and was removed from Thessalonica for a brief period; at what time, however, is not known.

Eustathius was a prolific and elegant writer, and the best Greek author of his age. His works may be classified in two categories: commentaries on ancient authors written during his activity in Constantinople; and his writings, tracts, orations, or letters, which were occasioned by special circumstances during his episcopate in Thessalonica. Of the former class may be mentioned: "The Commentaries on the Iliad and Odyssey of Homer" (Rome, 1542–50; Basle, 1559–60; Leipzig, 1825–30); "A Paraphrase of the geographical epic of Dionysius Periegetes", ed. Bernhardy (Leipzig, 1828); a "Commentary on the works of Pindar", of which, however, only the preface is known, ed. Tafel (Frankfurt, 1832). These works of Eustathius on the ancient classics are much prized by modern philologists. Among the works of the second class the following are to be noted: "A History of the conquest of Thessalonica by the Normans" (ed. Tafel in "Komnenen und Normannen", 2d ed., 1870); several addresses to the Emperor Manuel Comnenus I, and the funeral oration at the death of the same; letters written to the emperor or other distinguished personages of his time; several tracts having reference to his plan of reform, such as: "Considerations on the Monastic Life" (German tr. by Tafel, 1847); a letter written to a stylite of Thessalonica; a tract on hypocrisy; and others. Several purely religious works such as: four Lenten sermons; a sermon for the beginning of the year; and panegyrics for the festivals of various saints. Most of his theological works, first edited by Tafel (1832), are in Migne, P. G., CXXXV, CXXXVI. In these Eustathius shows himself an earnest and zealous ecclesiastic, fully penetrated with the genuine spirit of Christianity.

KRUMBACHER, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur* (Munich, 1897), 536; MÜLLER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Eustathius*; MEYER in *Realencyklopädie* (Leipzig, 1898), V; BRAUN in *Kirchl. Handlexikon* (Munich, 1907), I, 1383; REGEL, *Fontes rer. byzant.* (St. Petersburg, 1892), I, 1, for five additional discourses.

FRANCIS J. SCHAEFER.

Eustathius of Sebaste, born about 300; died about 377. He was one of the chief founders of monasticism in Asia Minor, and for a long time was an intimate friend of St. Basil. He was censured because of the exaggerated asceticism of his followers, hesitated all his life between various forms of Arianism, and finally became a leader of the Pneumatomachians condemned by the First Council of Constantinople (381). Eustathius was apparently the son of Eulalius, Bishop of Sebaste, the metropolis of Armenia (the Roman province). He studied under Arius (Basil, Ep. ccxxiii, 3; ccxliv, 3; cclxiii, 3), and was known from the beginning as one who sympathized with the heretic. He was ordained priest and then founded a community of monks. Partly because of the idea common at that time (Fortescue, The Greek Fathers, London, 1908, pp. 57, 94) that no one could be both a priest and a monk, and partly also because of the extravagance of his community, he was suspended from his priesthood by a synod at Neo-Cæsarea. Later, in 340, a synod at Gangra condemned his followers (*τοὺς περὶ Εὐστάθιον*) for exaggerated and extravagant asceticism. These monks forbade marriage for any one, refused to communicate with married priests, and taught that no married person can be saved; they fasted on Sundays and would not do so on the appointed fast-days; they claimed special grace for their own conventicles and dissuaded people from attending the regular services of the Church. It was evidently a movement like that of the Encratites and Montanists. Against these abuses the council drew up twenty canons, but without directly censuring Eustathius (Hefele, "Conciliengesch.", 1st ed., II, 777 sq.; Braun, "Die Abhaltung der Synode von Gangra" in "Hist. Jahrb.", 1895, pp. 586 sq.). Sozomen (Hist. Eccl., III, xiv, 36) says that Eustathius submitted to this council and gave up his eccentricities. However, a synod at Antioch (341?) condemned him again for "perjury" (Sozomen, IV, xxiv, 9), perhaps because he had broken his promise made on oath. About the year 356 he became Bishop of Sebaste. St. Basil was at that time (357–358) studying the life of monks before founding his own community at Annesus, and he was much attracted by Eustathius's reputation as a zealous leader of monasticism. For years, till about 372 or so, Basil believed in and defended his friend. But Eustathius was anything but a Catholic. Once, apparently in 366, he persuaded the pope (Liberius, 352–366) of his orthodoxy by presenting a confession of the Nicene faith (Socrates, IV, xii); otherwise he wavered between every kind of Arianism and semi-Arianism and signed all manner of heretical and contradictory formulæ. In 385 a synod at Melitene deposed him, it seems rather for the old question of his rigorism than for Arianism. Meletius (later the famous Bishop of Antioch) succeeded him at Sebaste. But the Semi-Arians still acknowledged Eustathius. He wandered about, was present at many synods (at Seleucia in 359, later at Smyrna, in Pisidia, Pamphylia, etc.—Socrates, IV, xii, 8), and signed many formulæ. If one can speak of any principle in so inconsistent a person, it would seem that Eustathius was generally on the side of one of the forms of Semi-Arianism, opposed to Catholics on the one hand and to extreme Arians on the other. St. Basil found him out and broke with him definitively at last (about 372 or 373).

By this time Eustathius had taken up the cause of the people who denied the consubstantial nature of the Holy Ghost (Socrates, Hist. Eccl., II, xlv, 6; Basil, Ep. cciii, 3). We hear of him last about 377; he was then a very old man (Basil, Ep. cciv, 4; cciii, 3). Besides his activity as a founder of monasticism in Roman Armenia, Pontus, and Paphlagonia (Sozomen, III, xiv, 36), Eustathius had merit as an organizer of works of charity, builder of almshouses, hospitals, refuges, etc. (Epiphanius, Hær., lxxv, ½; Sozomen, III, xiv, 36).

Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.*, II, IV; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.*, III. Besides references in the letters of Saint Basil in *P. G.*, XXXII, 219–1110, see also those in his *De Spiritu Sancto*. Loofs, *Eustathius von Sebaste und die Chronologie der Basilius-Briefe* (Halle, 1898); Braun, *Die Abhaltung der Synode von Gangra* in *Hist. Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft*, XVI (1895), p. 586 sq.; Gwatkin, *Studies in Arianism* (Cambridge, 1900); Venables in *Dict. of Christ. Biog.*, s. v. Adrian Fortescue.

Eustochium Julia, Saint, virgin, b. at Rome c. 368; d. at Bethlehem, 28 Sept., 419 or 420. She was the third of four daughters of the Roman Senator Toxotius and his wife St. Paula (q. v.), the former belonging to the noble Julian race, the latter tracing her ancestry through the Scipios and the Gracchi (Jerome, Ep. cxviii). After the death of her husband (c. 380) Paula and her daughter Eustochium lived in Rome as austere a life as the Fathers of the desert. When St. Jerome came to Rome from Palestine in 382, they put themselves under his spiritual guidance. Hymettius, an uncle of Eustochium, and his wife Prætextata tried to persuade the youthful Eustochium to give up her austere life and enjoy the pleasures of the world, but all their attempts were futile. About the year 384 she made the vow of perpetual virginity, on which occasion St. Jerome addressed to her his celebrated letter "De custodiâ virginitatis" (Ep. xxii in P. L., XXII, 394–425). A year later St. Jerome returned to Palestine and soon after was followed to the Orient by Paula and Eustochium. In 386 they accompanied St. Jerome on his journey to Egypt, where they visited the hermits of the Nitrian Desert in order to study and afterwards imitate their mode of life. In the fall of the same year they returned to Palestine and settled permanently at Bethlehem. Paula and Eustochium at once began to erect four monasteries and a hospice near the spot where Christ was born. While the erection of the monasteries was in process (386–9) they lived in a small building in the neighbourhood. One of the monasteries was occupied by monks and put under the direction of St. Jerome. The three other monasteries were taken by Paula and Eustochium and the numerous virgins that flocked around them. The three nunneries, which were under the supervision of Paula, had only one oratory, where all the nuns met several times daily for prayer and the chanting of psalms. St. Jerome testifies (Ep. 308) that Eustochium and Paula performed the most menial services. Much of their time they spent in the study of Holy Scripture under the direction of St. Jerome.

Eustochium spoke Latin and Greek with equal ease and was able to read the Holy Scriptures in the Hebrew text. Many of St. Jerome's Biblical commentaries owe their existence to her influence and to her he dedicated his commentaries on the prophets Isaias and Ezechiel. The letters which St. Jerome wrote for her instruction and spiritual advancement are, according to his own testimony (De viris illustribus, cap. cxxxv), very numerous. After the death of Paula in 404, Eustochium assumed the direction of the nunneries. Her task was a difficult one on account of the impoverished condition of the temporal affairs which was brought about by the lavish almsgiving of Paula. St. Jerome was of great assistance to her by his encouragement and prudent advice. In 417 a great misfortune overtook the monasteries at Bethlehem. A crowd of ruffians attacked and pillaged them, destroyed one of them by fire, besides killing and maltreating some of the inmates. The wicked deed was probably instigated by John, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, and the Pelagians against whom St. Jerome had written some sharp polemics. Both St. Jerome and St. Eustochium informed Pope Innocent I by letter of the occurrence, who severely reproved the patriarch for having permitted the outrage. Eustochium died shortly after and was succeeded in the supervision of the nunneries by her niece, the younger Paula. The Church celebrates her feast on 28 September.

Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, 28 Sept.; Baring-Gould, *Lives of the Saints*, 28 Sept.; Fremantle in *Dict. Christ. Biogr.* s. v.; *Acta SS.*, September, VII, 589–603; St. Jerome, *Epistles*, especially xlvi, liv, cvii, cviii in *P. L.*, XXII; Häusle in *Kirchenlex.* s. v. *Eustochium, or St. Jerome's Letter*, in *Catholic World* XLIII, 181 (New Yok, 1886); Thierry, in *Rev. des Deux Mondes*, LXII, 465 (Paris, 1886).

Michael Ott.

Euthalius (Εὐθαλίος), a deacon of Alexandria and later Bishop of Sulca. He lived towards the middle of the fifth century, and is chiefly known through his work on the New Testament in particular as the author of the "Euthalian Sections". It is well known that the divisions into chapters and verses with which we are familiar were entirely wanting in the original and early copies of the New-Testament writings; there was even no perceptible space between words. To obviate the manifest inconveniences arising from this condition of the text, Ammonius of Alexandria, in the third century, conceived the idea of dividing the Four Gospels into sections varying in size according to the substance of the narrative embodied in them, and Euthalius, following up the same idea, extended a similar system of division to the other books of the New Testament with the exception of the Apocalypse. So obvious were the advantages of the scheme that it was soon adopted throughout the Greek Church. As divisions of the text these sections have no longer any intrinsic value. But as they were at a given period adopted in nearly all the Churches, and noted by the copyists, they are valuable as chronological indications, their presence or absence being an important circumstance in determining the antiquity of a manuscript.

Other labours of Euthalius in connexion with the text of the New Testament refer to the larger sections or lessons to be read in the liturgical services, and to the more minute divisions of the text called στίχοι, or verses. The custom of reading portions of the New Testament in the public liturgical services was already ancient in the Church, but with regard to the choice and delimitation of the passages there was little or no uniformity, the Churches having, for the most part, each its own series of selections. Euthalius elaborated a scheme of divisions which was soon universally adopted. Neither the Gospels nor the Apocalypse enter into this series, but the other portions of the New Testament are divided into 57 sections of varying length, 53 of which are assigned to the Sundays of the year, while the remaining four refer probably to Christmas, the Epiphany, Good Friday, and Easter.

The idea of dividing the Scriptures into στίχοι, or verses, did not originate with Euthalius. It had already been applied to portions of the Old Testament, especially to the poetical parts, and even to some parts of the New. Here, as with regard to the other divisions, Euthalius only carried out systematically and completed a scheme which had been but partially and imperfectly realized by others, and his work marks a stage of that progress which led finally to punctuation of the text. These στίχοι were of unequal length, either containing a few words forming a complete sense, or as many as could be conveniently uttered with one breath. Thus, for instance, the Epistle to the Romans contained 920 of these verses; Galatians, 293; Hebrews, 703; Philemon, 37, and so on.

Besides these textual labours Euthalius framed a catalogue of the quotations from the Old Testament and from profane authors which are found in the New-

Testament writings. He also wrote a short "Life of St. Paul" and a series of "Argumenta" or short summaries which are placed by way of introduction to the different books of the New Testament. Of Euthalius' activities as a bishop little or nothing is known. Even the location of his episcopal see, Sulca, is a matter of doubt. It can hardly be identified with the bishopric of that name in Sardinia. More likely it was situated somewhere in Egypt, and it has been conjectured that it is the same as Psilka, a city of the Thebaid in the neighbourhood of Syene.

After having long lain in oblivion, the works of Euthalius were published in Rome, in 1698, by Lorenzo Alessandro Zaccagni, Prefect of the Vatican Library. They are embodied in the first volume of his "Collectanea Monumentorum Veterum Ecclesiæ Græcæ ac Latinæ." They can also be found in Gallandi (Biblioth. Pat., X, 197) and in Migne (P. G., LXXXV, 621).

VIGOUROUX in *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v.; MILLIGAN in *Dict. of Christian Biography*, s. v.; SCRIVENER, *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament* (London, 1894), 53, 63, 64, etc.

JAMES F. DRISCOLL.

Euthanasia (from Greek εὖ, well, and θάνατος, death), easy, painless death. This is here considered in so far as it may be artificially brought about by the employment of anæsthetics. When these last are of a character to deprive the sufferer of the use of reason, their effect at this supreme hour of human life is not viewed with approbation by the received teaching of the Catholic Church. The reason for this attitude is that this practice deprives a man of the capacity to act meritoriously at a time when the competency is most necessary and its product invested with finality. It is equally obvious that this space is immeasurably precious to the sinner who has still to reconcile himself with his offended God.

An additional motive assigned for this doctrine is that the administration of drugs of the nature specified is in the premises if not formally at all events equivalently a shortening of the life of the patient. Hence as long as the stricken person has as yet made no adequate preparation for death, it is always grievously unlawful to induce a condition of insensibility. The most that may be granted to those charged with responsibility in the case is to take up a passively permissive demeanour whenever it is certain that the departing soul has abundantly made ready for the great summons. This is especially true if there is ground for apprehending, from the dying person's continued possession of his faculties, a relapse into sin. In no contingency, however, can any positive indorsement be given to means whose scope is to have one die in a state of unconsciousness. What has been said applies with equal force and for the same reasons to the case of those who have to suffer capital punishment by process of law.

GENICOT, *Theologiæ Moralis Institutiones* (Louvain, 1898); LEHMKUHL, *Theologia Moralis* (Freiburg, 1887); BALLERINI, *Opus Theologicum Morale* (Prato, 1898).

JOSEPH F. DELANY.

Euthymius, SAINT (styled THE GREAT), abbot in Palestine; b. at Melitene in Lesser Armenia, A.D. 377; d. A.D. 473. He was educated by Bishop Otreius of Melitene, who afterwards ordained him priest and placed him in charge of all the monasteries in the Diocese of Melitene. At the age of twenty-nine he secretly set out on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem and remained for some time with a settlement of monks at a laura called Pharan, about six miles east of Jerusalem. In 411 he withdrew, with St. Theoctistus, a fellow-hermit, into the wilderness, and lived for a while in a rough cavern on the banks of a torrent. When many disciples gathered around them they turned the cavern into a church and built a monastery which was placed in charge of St. Theoctistus.

A miraculous cure which Euthymius was believed to have effected for Terebon, the son of the Saracen chief Aspebetus, spread the fame of the holy hermit far beyond the confines of Palestine.—Aspebetus, was afterwards ordained priest and became bishop over his tribe, in which capacity he attended the Council of Ephesus in 431.

When the report of this miracle had made the name of Euthymius famous throughout Palestine, and large crowds came to visit him in his solitude, he retreated with his disciple Domitian to the wilderness of Ruba, near the Dead Sea. Here he lived for some time on a remote mountain called Marda whence he afterwards withdrew to the desert of Zipho (the ancient Engaddi). When large crowds followed him to this place also, he returned to the neighbourhood of the monastery of Theoctistus, where he took up his abode in a cavern. Every Sunday he came to the monastery to take part in the Divine services. At length, because numerous disciples desired him as their spiritual guide, he founded, in 420, on the right side of the road from Jerusalem to Jericho, a laura similar to that of Pharan. The church connected with this laura was dedicated in 428 by Juvenal, the first Patriarch of Jerusalem. When the Council of Chalcedon (451) condemned the errors of Eutyches, it was greatly due to the authority of Euthymius that most of the Eastern recluses accepted its decrees. The Empress Eudoxia was converted to Catholic unity through his efforts. The Church celebrates his feast on 20 January, the day of his death.

BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, 20 January; BARING-GOULD, *Lives of the Saints*, 20 January; SINCLAIR in *Dict. Christ. Biogr.* s. v.; *Acta SS.*, January, II, 662–92. A very reliable life was written by Cyril of Scythopolis about forty years after the death of Euthymius. It is published in *Acta SS*, loc. cit., also by COTELIER, *Eccl. Græc. Monum.* (Paris, 1692), IV, MONTFAUCON, *Analecta Græca* (Paris, 1688), I, and in *P. G.*, CXIV, 595–734.

MICHAEL OTT.

Eutropius of Valencia, a Spanish bishop; d. about 610. He was originally a monk in the *Monasterium Servitanum*, generally believed to have been situated in the province of Valencia, Spain. It was founded some time in the sixth century by the monk Donatus who had been driven from Roman Africa during one of the Vandal persecutions. The rule he introduced must have been based on that in use among the African monks, which has caused the members of this community to be connected with the Augustinians, without, however, sufficient warrant. The *Monasterium Servitanum* is known only through the references of Sts. Isidore and Ildephonsus to its founder and one of his disciples, Eutropius, who succeeded as abbot.

Eutropius is known as the author of three letters, one to Licinianus, Bishop of Carthagena, and two to Peter, Bishop of Iturbica. In the first, which has been lost, he inquires the reason for anointing baptized children with holy chrism. This letter is known through St. Isidore. The same saint mentions a letter to Bishop Peter, the text of which has been preserved, which he says every monk should read. The title is "De destructione monachorum et ruinâ monasteriorum". In response to a suggestion of some candidates for his monastery, he points out that the number of monks is a small matter compared with their earnestness. He may be criticized for his severity in enforcing the rule and in reprimanding the guilty, but he can easily justify himself, as his whole care consists in applying the rules the founders of the monastery laid down. And thus the reproaches made against him fall back on their authors. In any case he will not swerve from his course; he is indifferent to the criticisms of men. He cannot allow the faults of his monks to go unchecked. The Scriptures and the Fathers agree that correction is one of the first duties of him who is charged with the guidance of others, and negligence on this head would only lead to serious irregularities. The second letter to Bishop Peter touches on the seven deadly sins. Like Cassian, Eutropius enumerates eight: gluttony, lust, covetousness,

anger, sadness, faint-heartedness, vanity, and pride. He analyzes them, traces the links that unite them, and emphasizes their results. A Christian should resist these enemies with all his strength, persuaded that of himself he cannot be victorious, but that he needs the help of God. As Eutropius develops his thought the teaching of Cassian becomes more and more evident. Eutropius was still at the monastery when he wrote these letters. It was not till 589 that he became Bishop of Valencia, and his death cannot be set down earlier than 610. These are the dates found in Florez. Nothing is known of his work during his episcopacy. Historians have usually called him saint, but it does not appear that he was ever honoured by a liturgical cult. His letters are to be found in Migne, "P. L.", LXXX, 9–20.

St. Isidore, *De viris illustribus*, xlii, xlv, in P. L., LXXXIII, 1104–1106; Antonio, *Bibliotheca Hispana vetus*, I, 283; Florez, *España sagrada* (Madrid, 1754—), VIII 57–62, 166–69; Mabillon, *Annales Benedictini* (Lucca, 1739), I, 184–86.

J. M. Besse.

Eutyches, an heresiarch of the fifth century, who has given his name to an opinion to which his teaching and influence contributed little or nothing. The essence of that view is the assertion that Christ has but one nature after the Incarnation, and it is spoken of indifferently as the Eutychian or the Monophysite heresy, though Eutyches was not its originator, and though he was repudiated and condemned by many of the Monophysites, who all looked upon St. Cyril of Alexandria as their great Doctor. Eutyches in 448 was seventy years of age, and had been for thirty years archimandrite of a monastery outside the walls of Constantinople, where he ruled over three hundred monks. He was not a learned man, but was much respected and had influence through the infamous minister of Theodosius II, the eunuch Chrysaphius, to whom he had stood godfather. He was a vehement opponent of Nestorianism, and of the Antiochian party led by Theodoret of Cyrus (Cyrrhus) and John of Antioch. These bishops had, for a time, championed the orthodoxy of Nestorius, but had eventually accepted the Council of Ephesus of 431, making peace with St. Cyril of Alexandria in 434. Mutual explanations had been exchanged between the great theologians Theodoret and Cyril, but their partisans had not been convinced. On the death of Cyril, in 444, his successor Dioscurus was not slow to renew hostilities, and the Cyrillians and anti-Nestorians everywhere took the offensive. It was but as a part of this great movement that Eutyches, at Constantinople, began to denounce a supposed revival of Nestorianism. He wrote to Pope Leo on the subject, and received a sympathetic reply. The Patriarch of Antioch, Domnus, was on his guard, and he addressed a synodal letter to the Emperor Theodosius II, accusing Eutyches of renewing the heresy of Apollinarius (this had been the charge of the Antiochian party against St. Cyril) and of wishing to anathematize the great Antiochian teachers of a past generation, Diodorus and Theodore —a point in which Eutyches was not altogether in the wrong (Facundus, viii, 5, and xiii, 5). This was probably in 448, as St. Flavian, Bishop of Constantinople, had heard of no such accusation when he held a synod, on Nov. 8th, with regard to a point of discipline connected with the province of Sardis. Eutyches had been accusing various personages of covert Nestorianism, and at the end of the session of this synod one of those inculpated, Eusebius, Bishop of Dorylæum, brought the question forward, and proffered a counter charge of heresy against the archimandrite.

Eusebius had been, many years before, while yet a layman, one of the first to detect, and denounce, the errors in the sermons of Nestorius, and he was naturally indignant at being called a Nestorian. Flavian expressed great surprise at this sudden and unexpected charge, and suggested a private conference with Eutyches. Eusebius refused, for he had had frequent interviews without result. At the second session the orthodox view was defined, at Eusebius's request, by the reading of the second letter of St. Cyril to Nestorius, and its approbation by the council of Ephesus, and also of the letter of Cyril to John of Antioch, "Lætentur cæli", written after the agreement between the two patriarchs, in 434. These documents were acclaimed by all. Flavian summed up to the effect that Christ was "of two natures", ἐκ δύο φύσεων, after the Incarnation; Basil of Seleucia and Seleucus of Amasea even spoke explicitly of His being "in two natures", and all the bishops echoed, in their own words, the sentiments of the president. In the third session the messengers, who had been sent to summon Eutyches to attend, returned, bringing his absolute refusal. He had determined, he declared, that he would never set his foot outside his monastery, which he regarded as his tomb. He was ready to subscribe to the councils of Nicæa and Ephesus; though in doing so he ought not to be understood to subscribe to, or to condemn, any errors into which they might have fallen; he searched the Scriptures alone, as being more sure than the expositions of the Fathers, and he adored one nature of God, incarnate and made man after the Incarnation. He complained that he had been accused of saying that God the Word had brought His flesh down from heaven. This was untrue. He acknowledged our Lord Jesus Christ as "of" two natures (ἐκ δύο φύσεων) hypostatically united, as perfect God, and perfect Man born of the Virgin Mary, not having flesh consubstantial with ours. These statements of Eutyches were substantiated by three witnesses. The council therefore addressed a letter to him, summoning him to appear, for his excuse was insufficient in face of so serious a charge. Eusebius of Dorylæum, whose ardour was by no means quenched, then pointed out that Eutyches had been sending round a writing to the different monasteries to stir them up, and that danger to the council might result. Two priests were therefore sent round to the different monasteries in the city, two to those across the Golden Horn, and two across the Bosphorus to Chalcedon, to make enquiries.

Meanwhile the envoys sent to Eutyches had returned. After some difficulties and the plea of illness, Eutyches had consented to receive them. He still refused to leave his monastery, and begged them not to trouble to call a third time (as the canons directed), but to treat him as contumacious at once, if they pleased. The council, however, sent him a third and final summons, to appear on the morning of the next day but one, 17th Nov. or take the consequences. The next day a Priest-Archimandrite Abraham and three deacon monks appeared on behalf of Eutyches. Abraham declared that Eutyches had passed the night in groaning, and that he himself had consequently not slept at all either. St. Flavian replied that the Synod would wait for Eutyches's recovery. He was not asked to come to enemies, but to brothers and fathers. He had formerly entered the city when Nestorius attacked the truth. Let him do the same once more. Repentance will be no disgrace to him. As the assembly rose, Flavian added: "You know the accuser's zeal, and that fire itself seems cold to him, on account of his zeal for piety. And God knows, I have both advised and entreated him to desist. But when he set to work, what was I to do? I desire not your dispersion, God forbid, but rather to gather you in. It is for enemies to disperse, for fathers to gather into one."

On the following day Eutyches did not appear, but promised to come in five days, that is on the following Monday. It was proved that Eutyches had sent round a tome to other monasteries for signature. It was said to contain the Faith of Nicæa and Ephesus, nor was it shown to have contained anything further.

On the Saturday, Eusebius elicited testimony to further heretical remarks of Eutyches, which the envoys had heard him make. In particular he had denied two natures in Christ after the Incarnation, and had said he was ready to be condemned; the monastery should be his tomb. On Monday 22nd Nov., Eutyches was sought vainly in the Church and the Archbishop's palace, but was eventually announced as arriving with a great multitude of soldiers, and monks, and attendants of the Prefect of the Prætorian guard, and this escort only permitted him to enter under the synod's promise that his person should be restored to them. With the cortège came a Silentiary named Magnus, bringing a letter from the Emperor, who desired that the Patrician Florentius should be admitted to the Council; the Silentiary was therefore sent to invite his presence. Eusebius showed more than ever his anxiety that Eutyches should be convicted on the grounds of his former sayings, lest he should now unsay them, and be simply acquitted; for in that case his accuser might be made liable to the penalties due to calumnious accusation: "I am a poor man," he said, "without means. He threatens me with exile; he is rich; he has already depicted the Oasis as my destination!" Flavian and the Patrician replied that any submission made by Eutyches now should not release him from answering the charges as to his past words. Flavian then said: "You have heard, priest Eutyches, what your accuser says. Say now whether you admit the union of two natures, *ἐκ δύο φύσεων ἕνωσιν*." Eutyches replied: "Yes, *ἐκ δύο φύσεων*." Eusebius interrupted: "Do you acknowledge two natures, Lord Archimandrite, after the Incarnation, and do you say that Christ is consubstantial with us according to the flesh; yes or no?" This expressed clearly the whole question between Catholic truth and the heresy of Monophysitism. Eutyches would not give a direct answer. Perhaps he was puzzled and cautious. At all events he saw that a negative reply would mean immediate condemnation, while an affirmative one would contradict his own former utterances. "I did not come here to dispute," he said, "but to make clear my view to your Holiness. It is in this paper. Order it to be read." As he would not read it himself, Flavian ordered him to declare his belief. His vague reply evaded the point, merely asserting that he believed "in the Son's incarnate advent of the flesh of the holy Virgin, and that He was perfectly made Man for our salvation". When urged, Eutyches declared that he had never up till now said that Christ was consubstantial with us, but he acknowledged the holy Virgin to be consubstantial with us. Basil of Seleucia urged that her Son must therefore also be consubstantial with us, since Christ was incarnate from her. Eutyches answered: "Since you say so, I agree with all"; and he further explained that the body of Christ is the body of God, not of a man, though it is a human body. Provided he was not understood to deny that Christ is the Son of God, he would say "consubstantial with us", as the Archbishop wished it and permitted it. Flavian denied that the expression was novel.

Florentius showed that the Emperor had judged rightly that he was a good theologian, for he now pushed the Archimandrite on the essential point, the two natures. Eutyches answered explicitly: "I confess that our Lord was of [*ἐκ*] two natures, before the union; but after the union, I acknowledge one nature." It is very odd that no comment was made on this utterance. The synod ordered Eutyches to anathematize all that was contrary to the letters of Cyril, which had been read. He refused. He was ready enough to accept the letters, according to the synod's wish, but he would not anathematize all who did not use these expressions; otherwise he would be anathematizing the holy Fathers. Nor would he admit that Cyril or Athanasius had taught two natures after the Incarnation (and this was indeed correct, so far as mere words go). But Basil of Seleucia rightly urged: "If you do not say two natures after the union, you say there is mixture or confusion" (though, at the Robber Council, the unfortunate bishop was fain to deny his words). Florentius then declared, that he is not orthodox who does not confess *ἐκ δύο φύσεων* and also *δύο φύσεις*. The synod agreed, and considered the forced submission which Eutyches offered to be insincere. Flavian then pronounced the sentence of degradation, excommunication, and deposition. This was signed by about 30 bishops, including Julian of Cos, the pope's chargé d'affaires at the Court of Theodosius. The acts of this synod are preserved for us, because they were read in full at the Robber Council of Ephesus, in the following year 449, and again, in 451, at the Council of Chalcedon as a part of the Acts of the Robber Council. Flavian took care that the acts should also be signed by many archimandrites of the city. Eutyches, on his side, wrote for support to the chief bishops of the world, and placarded Constantinople with complaints. He sent an appeal to the pope (St. Leo, Ep. xxi) explaining that he had refused to affirm two natures and to anathematize all who did not do so; else he would have condemned the holy Fathers, Popes Julius and Felix, Saints Athanasius and Gregory (he is referring to the extracts from the Fathers which were read in the first session of the Council of Ephesus; later in 535 it was declared that these papal documents were Apollinarian forgeries, and such is still the opinion of critics. See Harnack, Bardenhewer, etc.). Eutyches continues: "I requested that this might be made known to your holiness, and that you might judge as you should think fit, declaring that in every way I should follow that which you approve." It was untrue that Eutyches at the council had appealed to the pope. He could only prove that in a low voice he had said he referred his case to the great patriarchs. When St. Leo had received the Acts of the Council, he concluded that Eutyches was a foolish old man who had erred through ignorance, and might be restored if he repented. Dioscurus of Alexandria, imitating some of his predecessors in assuming a primacy over Constantinople, simply annulled the sentence of Flavian, and absolved Eutyches.

The archimandrite had not been touched by the consideration Flavian had shown. His obstinacy continued. He obtained, through Chrysaphius, a new synod of 32 bishops, which met in April 449 (without the presence of Flavian, but including the Patrician Florentius and several of the bishops who had taken part in the condemnation), in order to examine his complaint that the Acts had been falsified. After a careful revision of them, some slight alterations were made to please Eutyches; but the result was of no practical importance. Dioscurus and Eutyches had obtained the convocation by the Emperor of an œcumenical council to meet at Ephesus on 1st August, 449. The proceedings of the party of Dioscurus before and at that council will be found under Dioscurus, and Robber Council of Ephesus; it is only necessary to say here that in the first session Eutyches was exculpated, and absolved, while violence was done to Flavian and Eusebius, who were imprisoned. The former soon died of his sufferings. Both had appealed to Rome. The Pope annulled the council, but Theodosius II supported it. On that Emperor's sudden death the outlook changed. A new council met at Chalcedon in October, 451, at the wish of the Emperor Marcian and his consort St. Pulcheria, the course of which was directed by imperial commissioners, in accordance with the directions of St. Leo, whose legates presided. Dioscurus was deposed, and exiled to Paphlagonia. Eutyches was also exiled. A letter of St. Leo (Ep. 134), written 15th April, 454, complains that Eutyches is still spreading his poison in banishment, and begs Marcian to transfer him to some more distant and lonely spot. The old man does not seem

to have long survived. His monastery, at Constantinople, was put under the supervision of Julian of Cos as visitor, that prelate being still the papal representative at Constantinople.

The principal authorities for the life of Eutyches are *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon* and *The Letters of St. Leo.* See also under EUTYCHIANISM.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

Eutychianism and Monophysitism are usually identified as a single heresy. But as some Monophysites condemned Eutyches, the name *Eutychian* is given by some writers to only the more extreme of these sectaries, or even only to those in Armenia. It seems best to use the words indifferently, as no party of the sect looked to Eutyches as a founder or a leader, and Eutychian is but a nickname for all those who, like Eutyches, rejected the orthodox expression "two natures" of Christ. The tenet "one nature" was common to all Monophysites and Eutychians, and they affected to call Catholics Diphysites or Dyophysites. The error took its rise in a reaction against Nestorianism, which taught that in Christ there is a human hypostasis or person as well as a Divine. This was interpreted to imply a want of reality in the union of the Word with the assumed Humanity, and even to result in two Christs, two Sons, though this was far from the intention of Nestorius himself in giving his incorrect explanation of the union. He was ready to admit one πρόσωπον, but not one hypostasis, a "prosopic" union, though not a "hypostatic" union, which is the Catholic expression. He so far exaggerated the distinction of the Humanity from the Divine Person Who assumed it, that he denied that the Blessed Virgin could be called Mother of God, Θεοτόκος. His views were for a time interpreted in a benign sense by Theodoret, and also by John, Bishop of Antioch, but they all eventually concurred in his condemnation, when he showed his heretical spirit by refusing all submission and explanation. His great antagonist, St. Cyril of Alexandria, was at first vehemently attacked by Theodoret, John, and their party, as denying the completeness of the Sacred Humanity after the manner of the heretic Apollinarius.

The fiery Cyril curbed his natural impetuosity; mutual explanations followed; and in 434, three years after the Council of Ephesus which had condemned Nestorius, peace was made between Alexandria and Antioch. Cyril proclaimed it in a letter to John beginning *Lætentur cœli*, in which he clearly condemned beforehand the Monothelite, if not the Monophysite, views which were to be unfortunately based on certain ambiguities in his earlier expressions. If he did not arrive quite at the exactness of the language in which St. Leo was soon to formulate the doctrine of the Church, yet the following words, drawn up by the Antiochian party and fully accepted by Cyril in his letter, are clear enough: "before the worlds begotten of the Father according to the Godhead, but in the last days and for our salvation of the Virgin Mary according to the Manhood; consubstantial with the Father in the Godhead, consubstantial with us in the Manhood; for a union of two natures took place, wherefore we confess one Christ, one Son, one Lord. According to the understanding of this unconfused union, we confess the Blessed Virgin to be Theotokos, because the Word of God was incarnate and made man, and through her conception united to Himself the temple He received from her. And we are aware that the words of the Gospels, and of the Apostles, concerning the Lord are, by theologians, looked upon some as applying in common [to the two natures] as belonging to the one Person; others as attributed to one of the two natures; and that they tell us by tradition, that some are of divine import, to suit the Divinity of Christ, others of humble nature belonging to His humanity." In this "creed of the union" between John and Cyril, it is at least implied that the two natures remain after the union (against Monophysitism), and it is quite clearly enunciated that some expressions belong to the Person, others to each of the Natures, as, e. g., it was later defined that activities (ἐνέργειαι) and will are of the Natures (against Monothelites), while Sonship (against the Adoptionists), is of the Person. There is no doubt that Cyril would have understood rightly and have accepted (even apart from papal authority) the famous words of St. Leo's tome: "Agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione quod proprium est" (Ep. xxviii, 4). The famous formula of St. Cyril μία φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη, "one nature incarnate of God the Word" (or "of the Word of God"), derived from a treatise which Cyril believed to be by St. Athanasius, the greatest of his predecessors, was intended by him in a right sense, and has been formally adopted by the Church. In the eighth canon of the Fifth General Council, those are anathematized who say "one Nature incarnate of God the Word", unless they "accept it as the Fathers taught, that by a hypostatic union of the Divine nature and the human, one Christ was effected". In the Lateran Council of 649, we find: "Si quis secundum sanctos Patres non confitetur proprie et secundum veritatem unam naturam Dei verbi incarnatam . . . anathema sit." Nevertheless this formula, frequently used by Cyril (in Epp. i, ii, Ad Successum; Contra Nest. ii; Ad Eulogium, etc.; see Petavius "De Incarn.", IV, 6), was the starting-point of the Monophysites, some of whom understood it rightly, whereas others pushed it into a denial of the reality of the human nature, while all equally used it as a proof that the formula "two natures" must be rejected as heretical, and therefore also the letter of St. Leo and the decree of Chalcedon.

The word φύσις was ambiguous. Just as the earlier writings of Theodoret against Cyril contained passages which naturally permitted a Nestorian interpretation, —they were in this sense condemned by the Fifth General Council—so the earlier writings of Cyril against Nestorius gave colour to the charges of Apollinarianism brought against him by Theodoret, John, Ibas, and their party. The word φύσις produced just the same difficulties that the word ὑπόστασις had aroused in the preceding century. For ὑπόστασις, as St. Jerome rightly declared, was the equivalent of οὐσία in the mouths of all philosophers, yet it was eventually used theologically, from Didymus onwards, as the equivalent of the Latin *persona*, that is, a subsistent essence. Similarly φύσις was an especially Alexandrian word for οὐσία and ὑπόστασις, and was naturally used of a subsistent οὐσία, not of abstract οὐσία, both by Cyril often (as in the formula in question), and by the more moderate Monophysites. The Cyrillian formula, in its genesis and in its rationale, has been explained by Newman in an essay of astounding learning and perfect clearness (Tracts Theol. and Eccl., iv, 1874). He points out that the word ὑπόστασις could be used (by St. Athanasius, for example), without change of meaning, both of the one Godhead, and of the three Persons. In the former case it did not mean the Divine Essence in the abstract, but considered as subsistent, without defining whether that subsistence is threefold or single, just as we say "one God" in the concrete, without denying a triple Personality. Just the same twofold use without change of meaning might be made of the words οὐσία, εἶδος, and φύσις. Again, φύσις was not applied, as a rule, in the fourth century, to the Humanity of Christ, because that Humanity is not "natural" in the sense of "wholly like to our nature", since it is sinless, and free from all the imperfections which arise from original sin (not *pura natura* but *integra natura*), it has no human personality of its own, and it is ineffably graced and glorified by its union with the Word. From this point of view it is clear that Christ is not so fully "consubstantial with us" as He is "consubstantial with the Father". Yet again,

in these two phrases the word *consubstantial* appears in different senses; for the Father and the Son have one substance *numero*, whereas the Incarnate Son is of one substance with us *specie* (not *numero*, of course). It is therefore not to be wondered at, if the expression "consubstantial with us" was avoided in the fourth century. In like manner the word φύσις has its full meaning when applied to the Divine Nature of Christ, but a restricted meaning (as has been just explained) when applied to His Human Nature.

In St. Cyril's use of the formula its signification is plain. "It means", says Newman (loc. cit., p. 316), "(*a*), that when the Divine Word became man, He remained one and the same in essence, attributes and personality; in all respects the same as before, and therefore μία φύσις. It means (*b*), that the manhood, on the contrary, which He assumed, was not in all respects the same nature as that *massa, usia, physis*, etc., out of which it was taken; (1) from the very circumstance that it was only an addition or supplement to what He was already, not a being complete in itself; (2) because in the act of assuming it, He changed it in its qualities. This added nature, then, was best expressed, not by a second substantive, as if collateral in its position, but by an adjective or participle, as σεσαρκωμένη. The three words answered to St. John's ὁ λόγος σάρξ ἐγένετο, *i. e.* σεσαρκωμένος ἦν." Thus St. Cyril intended to safeguard the teaching of the Council of Antioch (against Paul of Samosata, 264–72) that the Word is unchanged by the Incarnation, "that He is ἕν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τῇ οὐσίᾳ from first to last, on earth and in heaven" (p. 317). He intended by his one nature of God, "with the council of Antioch, a protest against that alterableness and imperfection, which the anti-Catholic schools affixed to their notion of the Word. The council says 'one and the same in *usia*': it is not speaking of a human *usia* in Christ, but of the divine. The case is the same in Cyril's Formula; he speaks of a μία θεία φύσις in the Word. He has in like manner written a treatise entitled 'quod unus sit Christus'; and, in one of his Paschal Epistles, he enlarges on the text 'Jesus Christ, yesterday, and to-day, the same, and for ever.' His great theme in these words is not the coalescing of the two natures into one, but the error of making two sons, one before and one upon the Incarnation, one divine, one human, or again of degrading the divine *usia* by making it subject to the humanity" (pp. 321–2). It has been necessary thus to explain at length St. Cyril's meaning in order to be able to enumerate the more briefly and clearly, the various phases of the Eutychian doctrine.

1. The Cyrillian party before Chalcedon did not put forward any doctrine of their own; they only denounced as Nestorians any who taught δύο φύσεις, two natures, which they made equal to two hypostases, and two Sons. They usually admitted that Christ was ἐκ δύο φύσεων "of two natures", but this meant that the Humanity before (that is, logically before) it was assumed was a complete φύσις; it was no longer a φύσις (subsistent) after its union to the Divine nature. It was natural that those of them who were consistent should reject the teaching of St. Leo, that there were two natures: "Tenet enim sine defectu proprietatem suam utraque natura", "Assumpsit formam servi sine sorde peccati, humana augens, divina non minuens", and if they chose to understand "nature" to mean a subsistent nature, they were even bound to reject such language as Nestorian. Their fault in itself was not necessarily that they were Monophysites at heart, but that they would not stop to listen to the six hundred bishops of Chalcedon, to the pope, and to the entire Western Church. Those who were ready to hear explanations and to realize that words may have more than one meaning (following the admirable example set by St. Cyril himself), were able to remain in the unity of the Church. The rest were rebels, and whether orthodox in belief or not, well deserved to find themselves in the same ranks as the real heretics.

2. Eutyches himself was not a Cyrillian. He was not a Eutychian in the ordinary sense of that word. His mind was not clear enough to be definitely Monophysite, and St. Leo was apparently right in thinking him ignorant. He was with the Cyrillians in denouncing as Nestorians all who spoke of two natures. But he had never adopted the "consubstantial with us" of the "creed of the union", nor St. Cyril's admissions, in accepting that creed, as to the two natures. He was willing to accept St. Cyril's letters and the decisions of Ephesus and Nicæa only in a general way, in so far as they contained no error. His disciple, the monk Constantine, at the revision, in April, 449, of the condemnation of Eutyches, explained that he did not accept the Fathers as a canon of faith. In fact Eutyches simply upheld the ultra-Protestant view that nothing can be imposed as of faith which is not verbally to be found in Scripture. This, together with an exaggerated horror of Nestorianism, appears to describe his whole theological position.

3. Dioscurus and the party which followed him seem to have been pure Cyrillians, who by an excessive dislike of Nestorianism, fell into excess in minimizing the completeness of the Humanity, and exaggerating the effects upon it of the union. We have not documents enough to tell us how far their error went. A fragment of Dioscurus is preserved in the "Antirrhetica" of Nicephorus (Spicil. Solesm., IV, 380) which asks: "If the Blood of Christ is not by nature (κατὰ φύσιν) God's and not a man's, how does it differ from the blood of goats and bulls and the ashes of a heifer? For this is earthly and corruptible, and the blood of man according to nature is earthly and corruptible. But God forbid that we should say the Blood of Christ is consubstantial with one of those things which are according to nature (ἑνὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν ὁμοουσίων)." If this is really, as it purports to be, from a letter written by Dioscurus from his exile at Gangra, we shall have to class him with the extreme Monophysite "Incorrupticolæ", in that he rejects the "consubstantial with us" and makes the Blood of Christ incorruptible of its own nature. But the passage may conceivably be a Julianist forgery.

4. Timothy Ælurus, the first Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria, was on the contrary nearly orthodox in his views, as has been clearly shown by the extracts published by Lebon from his works, extant in Syriac in a MS. in the British Museum (Addit. 12156). He denies that φύσις, nature, can be taken in an abstract sense. Hence he makes extracts from St. Leo, and mocks the pope as a pure Nestorian. He does not even accept ἐκ δύο φύσεων, and declares there can be no question of two natures, either before or after the Incarnation. "There is no nature which is not a hypostasis, nor hypostasis which is not a person." So far we have, not heresy, but only a term defined contrary to the Chalcedonian and Western usage. A second point is the way Ælurus understands φύσις to mean that which is "by nature". Christ, he says, is by nature God, not man; He became man only by "οἰκονομία" (economy or Incarnation); consequently His Humanity is not His φύσις. Taken thus, the formula μία φύσις was intended by Ælurus in an orthodox sense. Thirdly, the actions of Christ are attributed to His Divine Person, to the one Christ. Here Ælurus seems to be unorthodox. For the essence of Monothelism is the refusal to apportion the actions (ἐνέργειαι) between the two natures, but to insist that they are all the actions of the one Personality. How far Ælurus was in reality a Monothelite cannot be judged until his works are before us in full. He is, at all events in the main, a schismatic, full of hatred and contempt for the Catholic Church outside Egypt, for the 600 bishops of Chalcedon, for the 1600 of the Encyclia, for Rome and the whole West. But

he consistently anathematized Eutyches for his denial that Christ is consubstantial with us.

5. In the next generation Severus, Bishop of Antioch (511–39), was the great Monophysite leader. In his earlier days he rejected the Henoticon of Zeno, but when a patriarch he accepted it. His contemporaries accused him of contradicting himself in the attempt, it seems, to be comprehensive. He did not, however, conciliate the Incorrupticolæ, but maintained the corruptibility of the Body of Christ. He seems to have admitted the expression *ἐκ δύο φύσεων*. Chalcedon and Pope Leo he treated as Nestorian, as Ælurus did, on the ground that two natures mean two persons. He did not allow the Humanity to be a distinct monad; but this is no more than the view of many modern Catholic theologians that it has no *esse* of its own. (So St. Thomas, III, Q. xvii, a. 2; see Janssens, De Deo-homine, pars prior, p. 607, Freiburg, 1901.) It need not be understood that by thus making a composite hypostasis Severus renounced the Cyrillian doctrine of the unchanged nature of the Word after the unconfused union. Where he is most certainly heretical is in his conception of one nature not Divine (so Cyril and Ælurus) but theandric, and thus a composition, though not a mixture—*φύσις θεανδρική*. To this one nature are attributed all the activities of Christ, and they are called "theandric" (*ἐνέργειαι θεανδρικαί*), instead of being separated into Divine activities and human activities as by the Catholic doctrine. The undivided Word, he said, must have an undivided activity. Thus even if Severus could be defended from the charge of strict Monophysitism, in that he affirmed the full reality of the Human Nature of Christ, though he refused to it the name of nature, yet at least he appears as a dogmatic Monothelite. This is the more clear, in that on the crucial question of one or two wills, he pronounces for one theandric will. On the other hand utterances of Severus which make Christ's sufferings voluntarily permitted, rather than naturally necessitated by the treatment inflicted on His Body, might perhaps be defended by the consideration that from the union and consequent Beatific Vision in the Soul of Christ, would congruously ensue a beatification of the Soul and a spiritualizing of the Body, as was actually the case after the Resurrection; from this point of view it is true that the passibility of the Humanity is voluntary (that is, decreed by the Divine will) and not due to it in the state which is connatural to it after the union; although the Human Nature is of its own nature passible apart from the union (St. Thomas, III, Q. xiv, a. 1, ad 2). It is important to recollect that the same distinction has to be made in considering whether the Body of Christ is to be called corruptible or incorruptible, and consequently whether Catholic doctrine on this point is in favour of Severus or of his adversary Julian. The words of St. Thomas may be borne in mind: "Corruptio et mors non competit Christo ratione suppositi, secundum quod attenditur unitas, sed ratione naturæ, secundum quam invenitur differentia mortis et vitæ" (III, Q. l, a. 5, ad 2). As the Monophysites discussed the question *ratione suppositi* (since they took nature to mean hypostasis, and to imply a *suppositum*) they were bound to consider the Body of Christ incorruptible. We must therefore consider the Julianists more consistent than the Severians.

6. Julian, Bishop of Halicarnassus, was the leader of those who held the incorruptibility, as Severus was of those who held the corruptibility. The question arose in Alexandria, and created great excitement, when the two bishops had taken refuge in that city, soon after the accession of the orthodox Emperor Justin, in 518. The Julianists called the Severians *φθαρτολάτραι* or Corrupticolæ, and the latter retorted by entitling the Julians *Ἀφθαρτοδοκῆται* and Phantasiasts, as renewing the Docetic heresies of the second century. In 537, the two parties elected rival patriarchs of Alexandria, Theodosius and Gaianas, after whom the Corrupticolæ were known as Theodosians, and the Incorrupticolæ as Gaianites. Julian considered, with some show of reason, that the doctrine of Severus necessitated the admission of two natures, and he was unjustly accused of Docetism and Manichæanism, for he taught the reality of the Humanity of Christ, and made it incorruptible not *formaliter* quâ human, but as united to the Word. His followers, however, split upon this question. One party admitted a potential corruptibility. Another party taught an absolute incorruptibility *κατὰ πάντα τρόπον*, as flowing from the union itself. A third sect declared that by the union the Humanity obtained the prerogative of being uncreate; they were called Actistetæ, and replied by denominating their opponents "Ctistolaters", or worshippers of a creature. Heresies, after the analogy of low forms of physical life, tend to propagate by division. So Monophysitism showed its nature, once it was separated from the Catholic body. The Emperor Justinian, in 565, adopted the incorruptibilist view, and made it a law for all bishops. The troubles that arose in consequence, both in East and West, were calmed by his death in November of that year.

7. The famous Philoxenus or Xenaias (d. soon after 518), Bishop of Mabug (Mabbogh, Mambuce, or Hierapolis in Syria Euphratensis), is best known to-day by his Syriac version of the N. T., which was revised by Thomas of Harkel, and is known as the Harkleian or Philoxenian text. It is unfair of Hefele (Councils, tr. III, 459–60) to treat him as almost a Docetist. From what can be learned of his doctrines they were very like those of Severus and of Ælurus. He was a Monophysite in words and a Monothelite in reality, for he taught that Christ had one will, an error which it was almost impossible for any Monophysite to avoid. But this *μία φύσις σύνθετος* was no doubt meant by him as equivalent to the *hypostasis composita* taught by St. Thomas. As Philoxenus taught that Christ's sufferings were by choice, he must be placed on the side of the Julianists. He was careful to deny all confusion in the union, and all transformation of the Word.

8. Peter Fullo, Patriarch of Antioch (471–88), is chiefly famed in the realm of dogma for his addition to the Trisagion or Tersanctus, "Agios o Theos, Agios Ischyros, Agios Athanatos", of the words "who wast crucified for us". This is plain Patripassianism, so far as words go. It was employed by Peter as a test, and he excommunicated all who refused it. There is no possibility of explaining away this assertion of the suffering of the Divine Nature by the *communicatio idiomatum*, for it is not merely the Divine Nature (in the sense of hypostasis) of the Son which is said to have been crucified, but the words are attached to a threefold invocation of the Trinity. Peter may therefore be considered as a full-blooded Monophysite, who carried the heresy to its extreme, so that it involved error as to the Trinity (Sabellianism) as well as with regard to the Incarnation. He did not admit the addition of the words "Christ our King" which his orthodox rival Calandio added to his formula. Some Scythian monks of Constantinople, led by John Maxentius, before the reconciliation with the West in 519, upheld the formula "one of the Trinity was crucified" as a test to exclude the heresy of Peter Fullo on the one hand and Nestorianism on the other. They were orthodox adherents of the Council of Chalcedon. Pope Hormisdas thought very badly of the monks, and would do nothing in approval of their formula. But it was approved by John II, in 534, and imposed under anathema by the Second Council of Constantinople in 553, which closed the so-called "Theopaschite" controversy.

9. We have further to catalogue a number of subdivisions of Monophysitism which pullulated in the sixth century. The Agnoetæ were Corrupticolæ, who denied completeness of knowledge to the Human

Nature of Christ; they were sometimes called Themistians, from Themistus Calonymus, an Alexandrian deacon, their chief writer. They were excommunicated by the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Timotheus (d. 527) and Theodosius. Their views resemble the "Kenotic" theories of our own day. The Tritheists, or Tritheites, or Condobaudites, were founded by a Constantinopolitan philospher, John Asconagus, or Ascunaghes, at the beginning of the sixth century, but their principal teacher was John Philoponus, an Alexandrian philosopher, who died probably towards the end of that century. These heretics taught that there were three natures in the Holy Trinity, the three Persons being individuals of a species. A zealot of the sect was a monk Athanasius, grandson of the Empress Theodora, wife of Justinian. He followed the view of Theodosius, that the bodies to be given in the resurrection are new creations. Stephen Gobaras was another writer of this sect. Their followers were called Athanasians or Philoponiaci. Athanasius was opposed by Conon, Bishop of Tarsus (c. 600), who eventually anathematized his teacher Philoponus. The Cononites are said to have urged that, though the matter of the body is corruptible, its form is not. The Tritheites were excommunicated by the Jacobite Patriarch of Alexandria, Damian (577), who found the unity of God in a ὕπαρξις distinct from the three Persons, which he called αὐτόθεος. His disciples were taunted with believing in four Gods, and were nicknamed Tetradites, or Tetratheites, and also Damianists and Angelites. Peter Callinicus, Patriarch of Antioch (578–91), opposed them, and both he and Damian attacked the Alexandrian philosopher Stephen Niobes, founder of the Niobites, who taught that there was no distinction whatever between the Divine Nature and the Human after the Incarnation, and characterized the distinctions made by those who admitted only one nature as half-hearted. Many of his followers joined the Catholics, when they found themselves excommunicated by the Monophysites.

History.—Of the origin of Eutychianism among the Cyrillian party a few words were said above. The controversy between Cyril and Theodoret was revived with violence in the attacks made in 444–8, after Cyril's death, by his party on Irenæus of Tyre, Ibas of Edessa, and others (see Dioscurus). The trial of Eutyches, by St. Flavian at Constantinople, brought matters to a head (see Eutyches). Theodosius II convened an œcumenical council at Ephesus, in 449, over which Dioscurus, the real founder of Monophysitism as a sect, presided (see Ephesus, Robber Council of). St. Leo had already condemned the teaching of one nature in his letter to Flavian called the tome, a masterpiece of exact terminology, unsurpassed for clearness of thought, which condemns Nestorius on the one hand, and Eutyches on the other (see Leo I, Pope). After the council had acquitted Eutyches, St. Leo insisted on the signing of this letter by the Eastern bishops, especially by those who had taken part in the disgraceful scenes at Ephesus. In 451, six hundred bishops assembled at Chalcedon, under the presidency of the papal legates (see Chalcedon, Council of). The pope's view was assured of success beforehand by the support of the new Emperor Marcian. Dioscurus of Alexandria was deposed. The tome was acclaimed by all, save by thirteen out of the seventeen Egyptian bishops present, for these declared their lives would not be safe, if they returned to Egypt after signing, unless a new patriarch had been appointed. The real difficulty lay in drawing up a definition of faith. There was now no Patriarch of Alexandria; those of Antioch and Constantinople had been nominees of Dioscurus, though they had now accepted the tome; Juvenal of Jerusalem had been one of the leaders of the Robber Council, but like the rest had submitted to St. Leo. It is consequently not surprising that the committee, appointed to draw up a definition of faith, produced a colourless document (no longer extant), using the words ἐκ δύο φύσεων, which Dioscurus and Eutyches might have signed without difficulty. It was excitedly applauded in the fifth session of the council, but the papal legates, supported by the imperial commissioners, would not agree to it, and declared they would break up the council and return to Italy, if it were pressed.

The few bishops who stood by the legates were of the Antiochian party and suspected of Nestorianism by many. The emperor's personal intervention was invoked. It was demonstrated to the bishops that to refuse to assert "two natures" (not merely "of" two) was to agree with Dioscurus and not with the pope, and they yielded with a very bad grace. They had accepted the pope's letter with enthusiasm, and they had deposed Dioscurus, not indeed for heresy (as Anatolius of Constantinople had the courage, or the impudence, to point out), but for violation of the canons. To side with him meant punishment. The result was the drawing up by a new committee of the famous Chalcedonian definition of faith. It condemns Monophysitism in the following words: "Following the holy Fathers, we acknowledge one and the same Son, one Lord Jesus Christ; and in accordance with this we all teach that He is perfect in Godhead, perfect also in Manhood, truly God and truly Man, of a rational soul and body, consubstantial with His Father as regards His Godhead, and consubstantial with us as regards his Manhood, in all things like unto us save for sin; begotten of His Father before the worlds as to His Godhead, and in the last days for us and for our salvation [born] of Mary the Virgin Theotokos as to His Manhood; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, made known as in two natures [the Greek text now has "of two natures", but the history of the definition shows that the Latin "in" is correct] without confusion or change, indivisibly, inseparably [ἐν δύο φύσεσιν ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀχωρίστως γνωριζόμενον]; the distinction of the two natures being in no wise removed by the union, but the properties of each nature being rather preserved and concurring in one Person and one Hypostasis, not as divided or separated into two Persons, but one and the same Son and Only-begotten, God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ; even as the Prophets taught aforetime about Him, and as the Lord Jesus Christ Himself taught us, and as the symbol of the Fathers has handed down to us."

So Monophysitism was exorcised; but the unwillingness of the larger number of the six hundred Fathers to make so definite a declaration is important. "The historical account of the Council is this, that a doctrine which the Creed did not declare, which the Fathers did not unanimously witness, and which some eminent Saints had almost in set terms opposed, which the whole East refused as a symbol, not once, but twice, patriarch by patriarch, metropolitan by metropolitan, first by the mouth of above a hundred, then by the mouth of above six hundred of its bishops, and refused upon the grounds of its being an addition to the Creed, was forced upon the Council, not indeed as a Creed, yet, on the other hand, not for subscription merely, but for its acceptance as a definition of faith under the sanction of an anathema, forced on the Council by the resolution of the Pope of the day, acting through his Legates and supported by the civil power" (Newman, "Development", v, §3, 1st ed., p. 307). Theodosius issued edicts against the Eutychians, in March and July, 452, forbidding them to have priests, or assemblies, to make wills or inherit property, or to do military service. Priests who were obstinate in error were to be banished beyond the limits of the empire. Troubles began almost immediately the council was over. A monk named Theodosius, who had been punished at Alexandria for blaming Dioscurus, now on the contrary opposed the decision of the council, and going to Palestine persuaded the

many thousands of monks there that the council had taught plain Nestorianism. They made a raid upon Jerusalem and drove out Juvenal, the bishop, who would not renounce the Chalcedonian definition, although he had been before one of the heads of the Robber Council. Houses were set on fire, and some of the orthodox were slain. Theodosius made himself bishop, and throughout Palestine the bishops were expelled and new ones set up. The Bishop of Scythopolis lost his life; violence and riots were the order of the day. Eudocia, widow of the Emperor Theodosius II, had retired to Palestine, and gave some support to the insurgent monks. Marcian and Pulcheria took mild measures to restore peace, and sent repeated letters in which the real character of the decrees of Chalcedon was carefully explained. St. Euthymius and his community were almost the only monks who upheld the council, but this influence, together with a long letter from St. Leo to the excited monks, had no doubt great weight in obtaining peace. In 453, large numbers acknowledged their error, when Theodosius was driven out and took refuge on Mount Sinai, after a tyranny of twenty months. Others held out on the ground that it was uncertain whether the pope had ratified the council. It was true that he had annulled its disciplinary canons. The emperor therefore wrote to St. Leo asking for an explicit confirmation, which the pope sent at once, at the same time thanking Marcian for his acquiescence in the condemnation of the twenty-eighth canon, as to the precedence of the See of Constantinople, and for repressing the religious riots in Palestine.

In Egypt the results of the council were far more serious, for nearly the whole patriarchate eventually sided with Dioscurus, and has remained in heresy to the present day. Out of seventeen bishops who represented, at Chalcedon, the hundred Egyptian bishops, only four had the courage to sign the decree. These four returned to Alexandria, and peaceably ordained the archdeacon, Proterius, a man of good character and venerable by his age, in the place of Dioscurus. But the deposed patriarch was popular, and the thirteen bishops, who had been allowed to defer signing the tome of St. Leo, misrepresented the teaching of the council as contrary to that of Cyril. A riot was the result. The soldiers who attempted to quell it were driven into the ancient temple of Serapis, which was now a church, and it was burnt over their heads. Marcian retaliated by depriving the city of the usual largess of corn, of public shows, and of privileges. Two thousand soldiers reinforced the garrison, and committed scandalous violence. The people were obliged to submit, but the patriarch was safe only under military protection. Schism began through the retirement from his communion of the priest Timothy, called Ælurus, "the cat", and Peter, called Mongus, "the hoarse", a deacon, and these were joined by four or five bishops. When the death of Dioscurus (September, 454) in exile at Gangra was known, two bishops consecrated Timothy Ælurus as his successor. Henceforward almost the whole of Egypt acknowledged the Monophysite patriarch. On the arrival of the news of the death of Marcian (February, 457), Proterius was murdered in a riot, and Catholic bishops were everywhere replaced by Monophysites. The new emperor, Leo, put down force by force, but Ælurus was protected by his minister Aspar. Leo wished for a council, but gave way before the objections made by the pope his namesake, and the difficulties of assembling so many bishops. He therefore sent queries throughout the Eastern Empire to be answered by the bishops, as to the veneration due to the Council of Chalcedon and as to the ordination and the conduct of Ælurus. As only Catholic bishops were consulted, the replies were unanimous. One or two of the provincial councils, in expressing their indignation against Timothy, add the proviso "if the reports are accurate", and the bishops of Pamphylia point out that the decree of Chalcedon is not a creed for the people, but a test for bishops. The letters, still preserved (in Latin only) under the name of Encyclia, or Codex Encyclius, bear the signatures of about 260 bishops, but Nicephorus Callistus says, that there were altogether more than a thousand, while Eulogius, Patriarch of Alexandria in the days of St. Gregory the Great, puts the number at 1600. He says that only one bishop, the aged Amphilochius of Side, dissented from the rest, but he soon changed his mind (quoted by Photius, Bibl., CCXXX, p. 283). This tremendous body of testimonies to the Council of Chalcedon is little remembered to-day, but in controversies with the Monophysites it was in those times of equal importance with the council itself, as its solemn ratification.

In the following year Ælurus was exiled, but was recalled in 475 during the short reign of the Monophysite usurper Basiliscus. The Emperor Zeno spared Ælurus from further punishment on account of his great age. That emperor tried to reconcile the Monophysites by means of his Henoticon, a decree which dropped the Council of Chalcedon. It could, however, please neither side, and the middle party which adhered to it and formed the official Church of the East was excommunicated by the popes. At Alexandria, the Monophysites were united to the schismatic Church of Zeno by Peter Mongus who became patriarch. But the stricter Monophysites seceded from him and formed a sect known as Acephali (q. v.). At Antioch Peter Fullo also supported the Henoticon. A schism between East and West lasted through the reigns of Zeno and his more definitely Monophysite successor Anastasius, in spite of the efforts of the popes, especially the great St. Gelasius (q. v.). In 518, the orthodox Justin came to the throne, and reunion was consummated in the following year by him, with the active co-operation of his more famous nephew Justinian, to the great joy of the whole East. Pope Hormisdas (q. v.) sent legates to reconcile the patriarchs and metropolitans, and every bishop was forced to sign, without alteration, a petition in which he accepted the faith which had always been preserved at Rome, and condemned not only the leaders of the Eutychian heresy, but also Zeno's time-serving bishops of Constantinople, Acacius (q. v.) and his successors. Few of the Eastern bishops seem to have been otherwise than orthodox and anxious for reunion, and they were not obliged to omit from the diptychs of their churches the names of their predecessors, who had unwillingly been cut off from actual communion with Rome, in the reigns of Zeno and Anastasius. The famous Monophysite writer Severus was now deposed from the See of Antioch. Justinian, during his long reign, took the Catholic side, but his empress, Theodora, was a Monophysite, and in his old age the emperor leaned in the same direction. We still possess the acts of a conference, between six Severian and seven orthodox bishops, held by his order in 533. The great controversy of his reign was the dispute about the "three chapters", extracts from the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, and Ibas, which Justinian wished to get condemned in order to conciliate the Severians and other moderate Monophysites. He succeeded in driving Pope Vigilius (q. v.) into the acceptance of the Second Council of Constantinople (q. v.), which he had summoned for the purpose of giving effect to his view. The West disapproved of this condemnation as derogatory to the Council of Chalcedon, and Africa and Illyricum refused for some time to receive the council.

The divisions among the heretics have been mentioned above. A great revival and unification was effected by the great man of the sect, the famous Jacob Baradai, Bishop of Edessa (c. 541–78). (See Baradæus.) In his earlier years a recluse in his monastery, when a bishop he spent his life travelling in a

beggar's garb, ordaining bishops and priests everywhere in Mesopotamia, Syria, Asia Minor, in order to repair the spiritual ruin caused among the Monophysites by Justinian's renewal of the original laws against their bishops and priests. John of Ephesus puts the number of clergy he ordained at 100,000, others at 80,000. His journeys were incredibly swift. He was believed to have the gift of miracles, and at least he performed the miracle of infusing a new life into the dry bones of his sect, though he was unable to unite them against the "Synodites" (as they called the orthodox), and he died worn out by the quarrels among the Monophysite patriarchs and theologians. He has deserved to give his name to the Monophysites of Syria, Mesopotamia, and Babylonia, with Asia Minor, Palestine, and Cyprus, who have remained since his time generally united under a Patriarch of Antioch (see JACOBITES). A number of these united in 1646 with the Catholic Church, and they are governed by the Syrian Archbishop of Aleppo. The rest of the Monophysites are also frequently called Jacobites. For the Coptic Monophysites see EGYPT, and for the Armenians see ARMENIA. The Armenian Monophysite Patriarch resides at Constantinople. The Abyssinian Church was drawn into the same heresy through its close connexion with Alexandria. At least since the Mohammedan conquest of Egypt, in 641, the Abuna of the Abyssinians has always been consecrated by the Coptic Patriarch of Alexandria, so that the Abyssinian Church has always been, and is still, nominally Monophysite.

The chief materials for the general history of the Eutychians will be found in the *Collections of the Councils* by MANSI, HARDOUIN, or LABBE, that is to say the councils, letters of popes, and other documents. To these must be added the historians EVAGRIUS, THEOPHANES, etc.. and the Monophysite historians JOHN OF EPHESUS, and ZACHARIAS RHETOR (both in LAND'S *Anecdota Syriaca*, II–III, Leyden, 1879), a German translation of the latter by AHRENS and KRÜGER (Leipzig, 1899) and an English one by HAMILTON and BROOKS (London, 1889). The works of FACUNDUS, the *Breviarium* of LIBERATUS, and information imparted by PHOTIUS are valuable. Of modern authorities, the larger and smaller histories are innumerable, e. g. BARONIUS, FLEURY, GIBBON, HEFELE, and (for the early period) TILLEMONT, XV; also the biographical articles in such large works as CAVE, *Biogr. Litt.* FABRICIUS; the *Kirchenlexikon;* HERZOG, *Realencykl.;* and *Dict. Ch. Biog.;* ASSEMANI, *Bibl. Orient.*, II; WALCH, *Ketzergeschichte* (Leipzig, 1762–85), VI–VIII; for detailed biographies see the articles referred to above.

On the dogmatic side see PETAVIUS, *De Incarn.*, VI; DORNER, *Entwicklungsgeschichte von der Person Christi* (Berlin, 1853), 2nd ed.; tr.: *Doctrine of the Person of Christ* (Edinburgh, 1861–3), 5 vols.—it should be noted that DORNER himself held a Nestorian view; *Dict. de Théol. Cath.;* the histories of dogma such as those of SCHWANE, HARNACK, and (up to 451) BETHUNE-BAKER; KRÜGER, *Monophysitische Streitigkeiten in Zusammenhange mit der Reichspolitik* (Jena, 1884); LOOFS, *Leontius von Byzanz.* in *Texte und Unters.*, 1st series, III, 1–2; new light has come from the Syriac, Arabic, and Coptic of late years. In addition to the histories mentioned above: EVETTS, *History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria*, Arabic and English in *Patrol. Orient.*, I, 2 (Paris, 1905); S. BEN EL MOGAFFA, *Historia patriarcharum Alexandr.* in *Corpus Script. Christ. Orient., Scriptores arabici*, 3rd series, IX; CHABOU, *Chronique de Michel le Syrien* (Paris, 1901), II.

On the works of Timothy Ælurus, CRUM, *Eusebius and Coptic Ch. Hist.*, in *Proc. of Soc. of Bibl. Archæol.* (London, 1902), XXIV; LEBON, *La Christologie de Timothée Ælure* in *Revue d'Hist. Eccl.* (Oct., 1908), IX, 4; on Severus of Antioch, KUGENER, *Vies de Sévère par Zacharie le Rhéteur, et par Jean de Beith Apthonia* in *Patrol. Orient.* II (Paris, 1907); DUVAL, *Les homélies cathédrales de Sévère, trad. syr. de Jacques d'Edesse* in *Patrol. Orient.;* BROOKS, *Sixth book of the select letters of Severus in the Syriac version of Athan. of Nisib. (Text and Transl. Soc.*, London, 1904), besides the fragments published by MAI, etc.; on Julian see LOOFS, loc. cit.; USENER in *Rhein. Mus. für Phil.* (N. S., LV, 1900); the letters of Peter Mongus and Acacius publ. by REVILLOUT (*Rev. des Qu. hist.*, XXII, 1877, ■ French transl.) and by AMÉLINEAU (*Monum. pour servir à l'hist. de l'Egypte chr. aux IV^e et V^e siècles*, Paris, 1888) are spurious; DUVAL, *Litt. Syriaque* (Paris, 1900), 2nd ed.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

Eutychianus, SAINT, POPE.—He succeeded Pope Felix I a few days after the latter's death, and governed the Church from January, 275, until 7 December, 283. We know no details of his pontificate. The rite for blessing the produce of the fields, ascribed to him by the "Liber Pontificalis", undoubtedly belongs to a later period. The statement also that he promulgated rules for the burial of martyrs and buried many of them with his own hands, has but slight claim to acceptance, since after the death of Aurelian (275) the Church enjoyed a long respite from persecution. It is highly probable that Eutychianus did not die a martyr. The fourth-century Roman Calendar



EPITAPH OF POPE EUTYCHIANUS
Papal Crypt, Catacomb of St. Callistus

mentions him (8 December) in the "Depositio Episcoporum", but not in its list of martyrs. His remains were placed in the papal chapel in the Catacomb of Callistus. When this famous crypt was discovered the fragments of the epitaph of Eutychianus were found, i. e. his name (in Greek letters): EUTYCHIANOS EPIS (KOPOS). His feast is celebrated on 8 December.

DUCHESNE (ed.), *Liber Pontificalis*, I, 159; DE ROSSI, *Roma sotterranea*, II (Rome, 1867), 70–72.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Eutychius I, PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE, b. about 512, in Phrygia; d. Easter Day, 5 April, 582. He became a monk and then archimandrite at Amasea, in Pontus. In 552 his bishop sent him on business to Constantinople, where he seems to have made a great impression on Justinian I (527–565), so much so that when Mennas the Patriarch (536–552) died, the emperor procured Eutychius's election as successor, on the very same day (in August). The great quarrel of "the Three Chapters" was then going on. Justinian thought he could conciliate the Monophysites, in Egypt, and Syria, by publishing anathemas against three theologians,—long dead—who were suspect of the opposite heresy, Nestorianism. The three points (called κεφάλαια, *capitula*) were: (1) The condemnation of the person and works of Theodore of Mopsuestia (428); (2) the condemnation of the writings of Theodoret of Cyrus (c. 457) against the Council of Ephesus; (3) a letter of one Ibas, to a Persian named Maris, which attacked that Council. It should be noted that these documents certainly were Nestorian, and that their condemnation involved no real concession to Monophysitism. The question at issue was rather, whether it were worth while, on the chance of conciliating these Monophysites, to condemn people who had died so long ago. It is also true that, in the West, people suspected in these Three Chapters a veiled attack on Chalcedon. Justinian's "Edict of the Chapters" appeared in 544. It was accepted in the East and rejected in the West. Pope Vigilius (540–555) was the unhappy victim of the quarrel. In 548 he accepted the Edict by a Iudicatum, which also carefully guarded Chalcedon. He had himself just come to Constantinople, in order to preside at a Council that should confirm the three anathemas. But he found that, by his Iudicatum, he had grievously offended his own Western bishops. Dacius of Milan, and Facundus of Hermiane led the opposition against him, and in 550 a Synod of Carthage excommunicated the Pope. Vigilius then began that career of indecision that has left him the reputation of being the weakest Pope that reigned. He was still at Constantinople when Eutychius became Patriarch. Eutychius sent him the usual announcement of his own appointment and the usual (and quite orthodox) profession

of faith. At the same time, he urged him to summon the Council at once. Meanwhile Justinian had published a second, and still stronger, condemnation of the Three Chapters (23 Dec., 551). Vigilius gave, and then withdrew, his consent to the Council. Justinian insisted on the exclusion of the African bishops, who were all strongly opposed to his condemnations. In spite of the Pope's refusal, the council met on 5 May, 553, at Constantinople. A hundred and sixty-five bishops attended. This is what was afterwards recognized as the Fifth General Council (Constantinople II). On 14 May the Pope sent them a modified Decree, called the Constitutum, in which he condemned sixty propositions taken from Theodore of Mopsuestia, but forbade the condemnation of the other Chapters. As he would not attend the council Eutychius presided. The Council wrote respectfully to the Pope, but, in spite of the Constitutum, completely confirmed Justinian's edicts, in its eighth session. It also acknowledged the formula *Unus de Trinitate passus est* as orthodox, and incidentally condemned Origen. (Can. 11, 12, 13, 14. For this Council see Liberati Breviarium, infra; Mansi, IX, 163; Hefele, Conciliengesch., 2nd ed., II, 898 seq.) Vigilius gave in on 8 December, after months of ill-treatment, was allowed to go back to Rome, and died on the way, in Sicily, in 554. [There is an account of all this story in Fortescue's Orth. Eastern Church, 82–83.]

Eutychius had, so far, stood by the Emperor throughout. He composed the decree of the Council against The Chapters (Mansi, IX, 367–575). In 562, he consecrated the new church of Sancta Sophia. His next adventure was a quarrel with Justinian about the Aphthartodocetes. These were a sect of Monophysites, in Egypt, who said that Christ's body on earth was incorruptible (*ἀφθορά*), and subject to no pain. The Emperor saw in the defence of these people a new means of conciliating the Monophysites, and, in 564, he published a decree defending their theory (Evagrius, Hist. Eccl., IV, 391). Eutychius resisted this decree, so on 22 January, 565, he was arrested in his church, and banished to a monastery at Chalcedon. Eight days later a synod was summoned to judge him. A ridiculous list of charges was brought against him; he used ointment, he ate deliciously, etc. (Eustathius, Vita S. Eutych., 4, 5). He was condemned, deposed, and sent to Prince's Island in Propontis. Thence he went to his old home at Amasea, where he stayed twelve years. Joannes Scholasticus succeeded as Patriarch (John III, 566–577); and after his death, in 577, the Emperor Justin II (565–578) recalled Eutychius, who came back in October. At the end of his life Eutychius evolved a heretical opinion denying the resurrection of the body. St. Gregory the Great was then Apocrisiarius (legate) of the Roman See, at Constantinople. He argued about this question with the patriarch, quoting Luke, xxiv, 39, with great effect, so that Eutychius, on his death-bed, made a full and orthodox profession of faith as to this point. St. Gregory tells the whole story in his "Exp. in libr. Job" (Moralium lib. XIV, 56): Eutychius dying said: "I confess that we shall all rise again in this flesh". (See also Paul. Diac.: Vita Greg. Mag. I, 9.) His extant works are his letter to Pope Vigilius (Migne, P. L., LXIX, 63, P. G. LXXXVI, 2401), a fragment of a "Discourse on Easter" (Mai: Class. Auct. X, 488, and Script. Vet. Nov. Coll. IX, 623); and other fragments in P. G., LXXXVI. His life was written by his disciple Eustathius, a priest of Constantinople. His feast is kept by the Byzantine Church on 6 April, and he is mentioned in our "Corpus Iuris" (Grat., I pars., Dist. XVI, Cap. x).

EUSTATHIUS, *Vita St. Eutychii* in *Acta SS.*, April, I, 550–573; EVAGRIUS, *Hist. Eccl.*, IV, 37, 38; V, 16, 18; HEFELE, *Conciliengesch.*, II, II, 852, etc. ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Eutychius, Melchite Patriarch of Alexandria, author of a history of the world, b. 876, at Fustāt (Cairo); d. 11 May, 940. He was an Egyptian Arab, named Sa'īd ibn Batriq; his father's name was Batriq (Patricius). He first studied medicine and history, and practised for a time as a physician. He then entered a monastery and eventually became Patriarch of Alexandria, taking the name Eutychius, in 933. Being the Melchite (Orthodox) patriarch, he spent most of his reign in strife with the great majority of Egyptian Christians who were (Monophysite) Copts, and with his Coptic rival. His works (all written in Arabic and preserved only in part) are treatises on medicine, theology, and history. He wrote a compendium called "The Book of Medicine", treatises on fasting, Easter, and the Jewish Passover, various feasts, etc.; also a "Discussion between a Christian and an Infidel", by which he means a Melchite and a Monophysite. But his most important work is "Nazm al-Gawāhir" (Chaplet of Pearls), a chronicle of the history of the world from Adam to 938. The work is dedicated to his brother, Isa ibn Batriq, and is meant to supply a short account of universal history. In Latin it is quoted as "Eutychii Historia universalis", or as the "Annales" of Eutychius. The author states that he has compiled his history only from the Bible and reliable authorities. It contains, however, a great number of strange and improbable additions to Biblical and profane history not found in any other source. There are also in the "Chaplet of Pearls" many valuable details about the Monophysite controversy and the history of the Patriarchate of Alexandria. The book acquired a certain fame when, in the seventeenth century, John Selden published an excerpt of it (London, 1642, see below) in order to prove that originally at Alexandria there was no distinction between bishops and priests (a theory at one time adopted by St. Jerome, "In Ep. ad Titum", I, 5; Ep. cxlvi, "ad Evangelum"). Selden was answered by a Maronite, Abraham Ecchellensis (Rome, 1661), who disputed the accuracy of his translation of the passages in question and proposed another. In the thirteenth century another Arabic historian, Al-Mākin (d. 1275), used Eutychius' work in compiling his own history of the world to 1260 (Krumbacher, Byzantinische Litteratur, Munich, 1897, p. 368).

The first edition of the *Chaplet of Pearls* is that of POCOCKE, *Contextio Gemmarum, seu Eutychii Patriarchæ Alexandrini Annales* (Oxford, 1658, 1659), I, II. This Latin version is reproduced in *P. G.*, CXI, 889–1232. SELDEN's excerpt contains only the history of the origins of the Church of Alexandria, *Eutychii Ægyptii, Patriarchæ orthodoxorum Alexandrini ecclesiæ suæ origines* (London, 1642); ABRAHAM ECCHELLENSIS, *Eutychius Patr. Alex. vindicatus* (Rome, 1661); CAVE, *Scriptores ecclesiastici*, 498; RENAUDOT, *Historia Patriarcharum Alexandrinorum* (Paris, 1713), 346 sqq.; VON GUTSCHMID, *Verzeichniss der Patriarchen von Alexandrien* in his *Kleine Schriften* (Leipzig, 1890), 399 sqq.; GRAF, *Die christliche arab. Literatur* (1905), 40 sqq. ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Evagrius, surnamed SCHOLASTICUS, Ecclesiastical historian and last of the continuators of Eusebius of Cæsarea, b. in 536 at Epiphania in Cœle-Syria; d. after 594, date unknown. He followed the profession of advocate at Antioch (hence his surname) and became the friend of the Patriarch Gregory (569–594), whom he successfully defended in presence of the Emperor Maurice and of the Council at Constantinople (588). Having already been appointed quæstor by Tiberius II (578–582), he received from Maurice the title of honorary prefect (*ex præfectis*). Evagrius, a product of the masters of rhetoric, made a collection of the reports, letters, and decisions which he had written for the Patriarch Gregory. Another collection contained discourses of Evagrius, among them a panegyric of the Emperor Maurice and his son Theodosius. These have all been lost. None of his works survive except his "Ecclesiastical History" in six books. In this he proposes to write the sequel of the narrative begun by Eusebius of Cæsarea and continued by Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret. He begins with the Council of Ephesus (431) and ends with the twelfth year of the

reign of the Emperor Maurice (593–594). This work is very important for the history of the religious controversies of the fifth and sixth centuries, Nestorianism, Eutychianism, and the last phases of Monophysitism. Evagrius furnishes details concerning events and persons, and does not neglect works of art (St. Sophia, H. E., IV, 31). To political history he gives an important place; in a word, he is an authority of the first order for this period. He is sincere, and is conscientious in securing information. But he shares the ideas of his environment and of his time. In his defence of Constantine he goes so far as to deny the murder of Crispus and Faustina. He relates wonders and legends, and it is to him we owe the account of the blood that was taken up with a sponge at certain times from the body of St. Euphemia of Chalcedon (II, 3). Among the sources of his information he mentions the chronicle of Eustathius of Antioch, and the works of Procopius, Menander Protector, John of Epiphania, and John Malalas (whom he calls John the Rhetorician). While he relies on these authors, he does so with discretion. In his ecclesiastical attitude he is strictly orthodox and abides strictly by the decrees of Chalcedon; nevertheless, he judges the heretics with moderation. His was an equable mind, and he is a reliable guide.

The latest ed. of the *Eccl. Hist.* is that of PARMENTIER AND BIDEZ (London, 1898), in *Byzantine Texts*, brought out by METHUEN under the supervision of BURY; KRUMBACHER, *Gesch. der byzantinischen Litt.* (Munich, 1897), 245–47; BARDENHEWER, *Patrologie*, tr. SHAHAN (St. Louis, 1908).

PAUL LEJAY.

Evagrius, surnamed PONTICUS, b. about 345, in Ibora, a small town on the shores of the Black Sea; d. 399. He is numbered among the more important ascetical writers of the fourth century. Instructed by St. Gregory Nazianzen, he was ordained reader by St. Basil the Great and deacon by St. Gregory of Nyssa (380), whom he accompanied to the Second Council of Constantinople (381). According to Palladius, who differs in his account from Socrates and Sozomen, Evagrius remained for a time as archdeacon in Constantinople, while Nectarius was patriarch (381–397). Leaving the city on account of its spiritual dangers, he went first to Jerusalem and then into the Nitrian Desert, where he began an eremitical life under the guidance of the younger Macarius (383). He steadfastly refused a bishopric offered by Theophilus of Alexandria. He became very celebrated for his ascetical life and writings, though St. Jerome (e. g. Ep. 133 ad Ctesiphontem, n. 3) charges him with Origenistic errors and calls him the precursor of Pelagius. The Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Œcumenical Councils condemn Evagrius together with Origen. Rufinus and Gennadius translated the works of Evagrius into Latin; several of them have been lost or have not thus far been recovered (P. L., XL). The best collections of his works are edited by Bigot (Paris, 1680); Gallandi, "Biblioth. vet. patr.", VII, 551–581; Migne, "P. G.", XL; cf. also Elter, "Gnomica" (Leipzig, 1892); Zöckler, "Evagrius Pontikus" (Munich, 1893). We may here name: "Monachus seu de vita activa"; "Rerum monachalium rationes earumque juxta quietem adpositio"; "De octo vitiosis cogitationibus".

BARDENHEWER, *Patrology*, tr. SHAHAN (St. Louis, 1908), 271; *Kirchenlex.*, IV, 1031 sq.; HURTER, *Nomenclator*, I, 227.

A. J. MAAS.

Evangeliaria, liturgical books containing those portions of the Gospels which are read during Mass or in the public offices of the Church. The name does not date back earlier than the seventeenth century. The Greeks called such collections Εὐαγγέλιον, "Gospel", or ἐκλογάδιον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, "Selections from the Gospel". The collection of readings from the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles known as Ἀπόστολος, "Apostle", or πραξαπόστολος. In churches of the Latin Rite, the lessons from the Old Testament, the Epistles from the New Testament, and portions of the Gospels are usually grouped in the same book, under the name *Comes, Liber comitis, Liber comicus* (from *comes*, companion), or *Lectionarium*. Separate Evangeliaria are seldom to be met with in Latin. Tables indicating passages to be read, as well as the Sundays and Holy Days on which they are to be read, are called by the Greeks "Evangelistarium", a name sometimes given to the Evangeliaria proper; they are also called "Synaxarium", and by the Latins are known as "Capitulare". Although the word *Evangeliarium* is of recent origin, it has been universally adopted. The word *Lectioniarium* is employed, however, to denote either the collection of passages from the Old and New Testaments, including the Gospels, or else these passages alone without the corresponding Gospels.

Origin and Use of Evangeliaria.—Following the custom of the Synagogue, the Scriptures of the Old Testament were read at the primitive Christian assemblies. According as the Canon of the New Testament was decided on, certain extracts from it were included in these readings. Justin tells us that in his day, when the Christians met together, they read the Memoirs of the Apostles and the writings of the Prophets (Apol., I, lxvii). Tertullian, Cyprian, and other writers bear witness to the same custom; and in the West the order of lector existed as early as the third century. For want of precise testimony we do not know how the particular passages were decided on. Most likely the presiding bishop chose them at the assembly itself; and it is obvious that on the occurrence of certain festivals the Scripture relating to them would be read. Little by little a more or less definite list would naturally result from this method. St. John Chrysostom in a homily delivered at Antioch exhorts his hearers to read beforehand the Scripture passages to be read and commented on in the Office of the day (Homilia de Lazaro, iii, c. i). In like manner other Churches would form a table of readings. In the margin of the MS. text it was customary to note the Sunday or festival on which that particular passage would be read, and at the end of the manuscript, the list of such passages, the Synaxarium or Capitulare, would be added. Transition from this process to the making of an Evangeliarium, or collection of all such passages, was easy. Gregory is of opinion that we possess fragments of Evangeliaria in Greek dating from the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries, and that we have very many from the ninth century onwards (according to Gregory they number 1072). In like manner, we find Lectionaries in the Latin Churches as early as the fifth century. The Comes of the Roman Church dates from before St. Gregory the Great (P. L., XXX, 487–532). From the tenth century onwards we find the Gospel lessons, together with the Epistles and prayers, united in a new liturgical book, called the Missal.

Evangeliaria and the Text of the New Testament.—Evangeliaria have very little importance for the critic of the Gospel text. At the time when the various Gospel passages began to be collected in book-form for use in liturgical reunions, the various families of the Gospel text and its translations were already in existence; and those Evangeliaria simply reproduce the particular text favoured by the Church which compiled it. They have even exercised an unfortunate influence on the more recent MS. of the Gospels; certain additions of a liturgical nature (e. g. *in illo tempore; dixit Dominus*) which were set at the beginning or end of a reading, have found their way into the text itself. But in the official text of the Vulgate, and in editions of the Greek text of to-day, owing to the labours of Tischendorf and of Westcott and Hort, these liturgical glossaries are very rare. We notice one example in the Vulgate text: Luke, vii, 31 (*ait autem Dominus*).

The Evangeliaria and Liturgy.—It is especially from a liturgical point of view that the study of Evangeliaria is interesting. The general method of Greek Evangeliaria is uniform. The first part contains the Gospels of the Sundays beginning with Easter; the

second part gives the Gospels for the festivals of the saints beginning with 1 September. In the Churches of the West the distribution of the Gospel pericopes was more divergent because of the various rites. And the ceremonial followed in the reading of the Gospel presents many differences of usage between one church and another, which it would be too long to treat of here.

BAUDOT, *Les Evangéliaires* (Paris, 1908), pp. 38–44 and 58–69, on the Latin liturgical books containing passages from the Gospels to be read at the Offices; on the distribution of pericopes in the East, cf. pp. 30–32; at Rome, pp. 44–50 and 69–94; in the Ambrosian Rite, pp. 94–101; GREGORY, *Textkritik des neuen Testaments* (Leipzig, 1900), vol. I, pp. 327–478, on Greek Evangeliaria; vol. II, pp. 521–23, on Syriac Evangeliaria; CASPARI in *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie*, s. v. *Perikopen;* RANKE, *Das kirchliche Perikopensystem;* SCHU, *Die biblische Lesungen der kath. Kirche in dem Officium und der messe de tempore* (Trier, 1861); MANGENOT in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v. *Lectionnaires;* DUCHESNE, *Les origines du culte Chrétien* (Paris, 1908); *Dict. Christ. Ant.*, s. v. *Lectionary;* LECLERCQ in CABROL, *Dict. d'archéologie chrétienne*, s. vv. *Alexandrie, Antioche;* CABROL, *ibid.*, s. v. *Aquilée.* H. COPPIETERS.

ORNAMENTATION OF EVANGELIARIA.—From the beginning the books used in the liturgy, and more particularly the Gospel manuscripts, were highly venerated, and therefore text and cover were often richly ornamented. From an artistic point of view the distinction between Evangeliaria strictly so called and Gospel manuscripts is of little importance and is generally disregarded. It consists merely in the fact that the illuminations of the Evangeliaria occur as a rule at those passages set apart for the greater festivals of the year. The coronation oath-book of Anglo-Saxon kings, which King Athelstan received, it would appear, from his brother-in-law, Otto I, and which he in turn presented to the cathedral church of Canterbury, is ornamented with figures of the Evangelists freely copied from those that adorn the Evangeliarium of Charlemagne preserved at Vienna. We are acquainted with Gospels in rolls only from seeing them in miniatures, especially as emblems of the Evangelists, until well into the Middle Ages.

The roll of the Book of Joshua (ninth—tenth century: Vatican Library) is a specimen of what Evangeliaria in this form with miniatures were like. The roll-form remained long in use for liturgical manuscripts at Milan and in Southern Italy.

Costly Evangeliaria are noted above all for their clear and careful writing. They have helped to perpetuate and propagate certain styles of caligraphy.

The Greek uncial is used in many manuscripts of the ninth and tenth centuries; and the Latin uncial is also employed, especially in Gaul, far into the Middle Ages for Gospel and liturgical works. The copying of the Gospels influenced largely the writings of Irish and Anglo-Saxon scribes, and effected the spread of these characters over the Continent and the development of the Caroline minuscule and the semi-uncial of the school of Tours. The copyists of the Gospels made great use of other helps to beautify their penmanship, such as the use of purple parchment, of liquid gold and silver, and various coloured inks. The part played by Evangeliaria in the history of miniature painting until the twelfth and thirteenth centuries is very great. Especially noteworthy are the miniature insets to the Canons of Eusebius, or tables of Gospel concordance. Illuminated initial letters differed according to the various schools of writing; the Irish scribes used artistic knots and loops, the Merovingian and Lombard writers preferred animal forms, especially fish.

Illuminated scenes, of interest to the iconographist, are often to be met in these copies of the Gospel text. Frequently it is the figure of the Evangelist that stands at the head of his Gospel; the donor, or rather a sketch showing the donation of the book, is often found in miniatures from the days of Charlemagne to the end of the Middle Ages. The prince is shown receiving from the hands of the abbot the Evangeliarium he will use whenever he assists at the holy offices in the abbey church (cf. the picture of Charles the Bald in the Vivien Bible, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris). But in the tenth and eleventh centuries the prince is shown offering the precious manuscript to Christ or to the patron saint of the church or abbey (cf. the Evangeliarium at Bamberg showing the Emperor Henry II offering the book to Christ).

Among the more famous Evangeliaria may be mentioned the following: the portion of an Evangeliarium from Sinope (sixth century: in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris); the Evangeliarium of Rossano (about 600) in Greek uncials; the Syrian codices of Rabula (586, at Florence) and Etschmiadzin (miniatures of the sixth century); the Evangeliarium of Gregory I (at Cambridge) in Latin uncials; the Book of Kells (seventh to ninth century, at Dublin); the Book of Lindisfarne (eighth century, in the British Museum, London) of Irish workmanship; the Irish-Continental Evangeliaria of St. Gall (about 800); the Carlovingian Evangeliarium of Godescalc (about 782, in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris); the Ada Codex (ninth century, at Trier); the Evangeliaria of Echternach (tenth century, at Gotha), and of the Abbess Uta (about 1002, at Munich). Valuable Evangeliaria were carefully treasured, and when used in the offices were placed on a strip of cloth or on a cushion. The back leaf of the binding was usually left plain, but the front cover was enriched with all the skill of the goldsmith. One of the most ancient bindings or covers we possess is that offered by Queen Theodelinda (600) to the cathedral of Monza. At times plaques of ivory, resembling diptychs, were set into these bindings. The earliest of them were of Oriental or Italian origin, and bear isolated figures of Christ or the Blessed Virgin, etc. A number of them, to be found in the countries along the Rhine and the Meuse and in Northern France (tenth and eleventh centuries), have the scene of the Crucifixion.

See general works on palæography, archeology, iconography, the lesser arts, and monographs on the Evangeliaria; especially BEISSEL, *Geschichte der Evangelienbücher im ersten Hälfte des Mittelalters* (Freiburg im Br., 1906). R. MAERE.

Evangelical Alliance, THE, an association of Protestants belonging to various denominations, founded in 1846, whose object, as declared in a resolution passed at the first meeting, is "to enable Christians to realize in themselves and to exhibit to others that a living and everlasting union binds all true believers together in the fellowship of the Church" (Report of the Proceedings of the First General Conference). The points of belief, which the members accept as being the substance of the Gospel, are contained in a document adopted at the first conference and known as the Basis. They are nine in number:—

(1) The Divine inspiration, authority, and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures; (2) the right and duty of private judgment in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures; (3) the unity of the Godhead and the Trinity of Persons therein; (4) the utter depravity of human nature in consequence of the fall; (5) the Incarnation of the Son of God, His work of atonement for sinners, and his mediatorial intercession and reign; (6) the justification of the sinner by faith alone; (7) the work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion and sanctification of the sinner; (8) the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the judgment of the world by Jesus Christ, with the eternal blessedness of the righteous and the eternal punishment of the wicked; (9) the Divine institution of the Christian ministry, and the obligation and perpetuity of the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.—"It being, however, distinctly declared that this brief summary is not to be regarded, in any formal or ecclesiastical sense, as a creed or confession, nor the adoption of it as involving an assumption of the right authoritatively to define the limits of Christian brotherhood, but simply as an indication of the class of persons whom it is desirable to embrace within the Alliance. In this Alliance, it

is also distinctly stated that no compromise of the views of any member, or sanction of those of others, on the points wherein they differ, is either required or expected; but that all are held free as before to maintain and advocate their religious convictions, with due forbearance and brotherly love. It is not contemplated that the Alliance should assume or aim at the character of a new ecclesiastical organization, claiming and exercising the functions of a Christian Church. Its simple and comprehensive object, it is strongly felt, may be successfully promoted without interfering with, or disturbing the order of, any branch of the Christian Church to which its members may respectively belong."

The Alliance thus lays claim to no doctrinal or legislative authority. In a pamphlet issued by the society itself this feature is thus explained: "Then it is an *Alliance*—not a union of Church organizations, much less an attempt to secure an outward uniformity—but the members of the Alliance are *allies:* they belong to different ecclesiastical bodies—yet all of the *One* Church. They are of different nations as well as of many denominations—yet all holding the Head, Christ Jesus. *Unum corpus sumus in Christo.* We are one body in Christ—banded together for common purposes, and to manifest the real unity which underlies our great variety. We are all free to hold our own views in regard to subsidiary matters, but all adhere to the cardinal principles of the Alliance as set forth in its Basis."

The Alliance arose at a time when the idea of unity was much before men's minds. During the years that witnessed the beginning of the Oxford Movement in the Church of England, there progressed a movement in favour of union among men whose sympathies were diametrically opposed to those of the Tractarians, but who in their own way longed for a healing of the divisions and differences among Christians. In 1842 the Presbyterian Church of Scotland tried, though without success, to establish relations with other Protestant bodies. In England the progress of the Tractarian Movement led many distinguished Evangelical Nonconformists to desire "a great confederation of men of all Churches who were loyal in their attachment to Evangelical Protestantism in order to defend the faith of the Reformation" (Dale, History of Eng. Congregationalism, 637). At the annual assembly of the Congregational Union held in London, May, 1842, John Angell James (1785–1859), minister of Craven Chapel, Bayswater, London, proposed the scheme that ultimately developed into the Evangelical Alliance. He asked: "Is it not in the power of this Union to bring about by God's blessing, a Protestant Evangelical Union of the whole body of Christ's faithful followers who have at any rate adopted the voluntary principle? . . . Let us only carry out the principle of a great Protestant Union and we may yet have representatives from all bodies of Protestant Christians to be found within the circle of our own United Empire" (Congregational Magazine, 1842, 435–6). The first definite step towards this was taken by Mr. Patton, an American minister,who proposed a general conference of delegates from various bodies, with the result that a preliminary meeting was held at Liverpool in October, 1845, at which the basis of such a conference was arranged. On 19 Aug., 1846, at a meeting of eight hundred delegates, representing fifty denominations, held in the Freemasons' Hall, London, the Evangelical Alliance was founded. All who would accept the Basis were eligible as members, and the representatives of the various nations were recommended to form national organizations or branches, of which the British Organization, formed in 1846, was the first. These organizations were independent of one another and were at liberty to carry on their work in such a manner as should be most in accordance with the peculiar circumstances of each district. They have been formed in the United States, Germany, France, Switzerland, Holland, Sweden, Italy, Turkey, Australia, India, and several missionary countries. The French national branch abandoned the Basis in 1854 and substituted for it a wider form of a Unitarian character. The Alliance meets and acts as a whole only in the international and general conferences, which are held from time to time. The first of these was held in London, 1851, and has been succeeded by others as follows: Paris, 1855; Berlin, 1857; Geneva, 1861; Amsterdam, 1867; New York, 1873; Basle, 1879; Copenhagen, 1884; Florence, 1891; London, 1896 (Celebration of the Jubilee); London, 1907, on which occasion the Diamond Jubilee of the Alliance was celebrated.

These international conventions are regarded as of special value in the promotion of the aims of the Alliance. Another matter to which much importance is attached is the annual "Universal Week of Prayer", observed the first complete week in January of each year since 1846. At this time the Alliance invites all Christians to join in prayer, the programme being prepared by representatives of all denominations and printed in many different languages. The relief of persecuted Christians is another department of work in which the Alliance claims to have accomplished much good. Finally, in 1905, the Alliance Bible School was founded with headquarters at Berlin, under the direction of Pastor Köhler and Herr Warns, "to place before the students the history and doctrine of the Bible in accordance with its own teaching". The reports of the conferences claim considerable success for these various works, a claim which cannot here be investigated. From its principles the Evangelical Alliance is necessarily opposed to the doctrine and authority of the Catholic Church; and Catholics, while sympathizing with the desire for union among Christians, realize that the unity by which we are made one in Christ is not to be won by such methods. The motto of the Alliance is *Unum corpus sumus in Christo.*

The Evangelical Alliance (London, 1847) and other reports of the International Conferences; LICHTENBERGER, *Encyclop. des sciences religieuses* (Paris, 1877), I, 193–200; TANQUEREY in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, s. v. *Alliance; The Evangelical Alliance: its Basis, History and Aims* (London, s. d.); *Maintaining the Unity: Proceedings of Eleventh International Conference* (London, 1907).

EDWIN BURTON.

Evangelical Church (IN PRUSSIA).—The sixteenth-century Reformers accused the Catholic Church of having adulterated the primitive purity of the Gospel by the admixture of un-Scriptural doctrines and practices; consequently they designated themselves as "Evangelicals", or followers of the pure Evangel, in contradistinction to the un-evangelical followers of Roman traditions and institutions. Almost from the beginning the new Evangelical Church was split, first into two communions, the Lutheran and the Reformed, then into a multitude of sects which baffles the skill of statisticians. The cleavage arose through differences in the doctrine of Christ's presence in the Holy Eucharist. Luther taught the actual bodily presence of Christ in and with the elements, though denying Transubstantiation. Zwingli and the Swiss Reformers admitted only His spiritual presence. The Lutheran and the Reformed Churches form the two great branches of Evangelical Protestantism to which all the other divisions of Protestants are subordinate. The evangelical section of the Anglican Church stands midway between the High Church and the Latitudinarian Low Church. As a proper name with strictly limited meaning the designation "Evangelical Church" applies to a branch of the Protestant Church in Germany, formed in 1817 at the instance of King Frederick William III of Prussia, by a union of the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches.

HISTORY.—At the beginning of the nineteenth century religious life in Germany was at a low ebb. The Rationalism and Illuminism of the eighteenth century, openly encouraged by King Frederick II (the Great), had told severely on the supernatural life of the coun-

try, especially among the Protestants. The "rights of man", proclaimed and ruthlessly carried out by the French Revolutionists, had found a welcome beyond the Rhine and well nigh superseded the rights of God. Luther and Calvin, whilst casting off the authority of the Church, had still bowed to that of the Bible, and their followers adhered to several "Confessions of Faith" as binding on their conscience. These formulæ were now overthrown as inimical to the rights of free inquiry, as the work of men little versed in exegesis and history, as unscientific and un-Protestant. Religious life, thus deprived of its sap, was rapidly withering away. Indifference and infidelity obliterated the differences among Protestant communities and threatened for a time to sweep away Christianity itself.

The Prussian State, owing its origin, growth, and importance to Protestantism, was not sympathetic to its Catholic subjects. The Rhine Province, Westphalia, and the Polish provinces were ever ready to manifest their affection for the Catholic rulers of Austria and even of France. The House of Hohenzollern was Calvinist, the majority of the nation was Lutheran. Frederick William III, King of Prussia (1797–1840), undertook to strengthen his rule and his country by building up a united religion together with a powerful army, efficient schools, and a flourishing trade. As early as 1798 he had expressed the hope of uniting the Reformed and the Lutheran Churches by means of a common "Agenda", or ritual. He matured the idea on his visit to England in 1814, and made the first arrangement for a union and a new liturgy in St. James's Palace in London. It was proposed to celebrate in Germany the third centennial jubilee of the Reformation, and in anticipation of this festival he issued on 27 Sept., 1817, the memorable declaration that it was the royal wish to unite the separate Lutheran and Reformed Confessions in his dominions into one Evangelical Christian Church, and that he would set an example in his own congregation at Potsdam by joining in a united celebration of the Lord's Supper at the approaching festival of the Reformation. It was not intended to fuse the Reformed Church into the Lutheran, or vice-versa, but to establish one Evangelical Church, quickened with the spirit of the Reformation. The epithet "Protestant" was avoided as too partisan; prominence was given to the vague term *evangelical;* Lutherans and Calvinists, whilst maintaining their own specific doctrines, were to form a single church under a single government and to present a united front to the Catholic Church.

The execution of the royal plan was entrusted to the provincial consistories, synods, and clergy generally. The Synod of Berlin and nearly all the clergy and laity of Prussia responded cordially to the decree. External union, facilitated by the prevailing religious indifference, was adopted in Nassau and in the Rhenish Palatinate (1818), in Baden (1821), in Rhenish Hesse (1822), in Würtemberg (1827). But Saxony, Hanover, and Bavaria proper were too exclusively Lutheran, while Switzerland was too exclusively Reformed to join the Evangelical Church, and the Austrian Protestants also divided their allegiance between the Helvetic and the Augsburg Confessions. Instead of the former two Protestant bodies in Germany, there were now three: the Reformed Church, the Lutheran, and the united Evangelical. The Reformed was the weakest in numbers; and in doctrine its sole distinctive tenet was the rejection of Luther's teaching concerning the Eucharist. Neither was the Lutheran flourishing; true Lutheranism existed only in the pious aspirations of a few theologians, pastors, and jurists. A union without a uniform confession and liturgy is but a loose mass, unworthy to be called a church. Frederick William, therefore, attempted to consolidate his Evangelical Church by giving it a common liturgy composed by himself with the assistance of the court chaplains and a pious layman. This "Agenda" was made obligatory by royal order for the royal chapel, the cathedral of Berlin, and for the army; its general adoption was only recommended. It met with determined opposition as a measure oppressive of evangelical freedom, antiquated, leaning to "Romanish" practices, unsettling men's consciences. None the less, by 1825 it had been adopted by 5343 churches out of 7782. The Protestant bishops Eylert and Neander in Berlin were in favour of it and of the measures taken to enforce it. In 1828–29 the "Agenda" was issued in a revised form and made binding on all Protestant churches, some concessions being granted to Silesia, Saxony, Pomerania, and other parts of the kingdom, in deference to provincial uses. The Lutherans, fearing the loss of their confessional status, offered increased resistance. But the king was inexorable. Dr. Scheibel, professor in Breslau, and others of the Lutheran clergy who had refused to accept the new liturgy, were suspended from their offices. For several years a fierce persecution raged against the "Old Lutherans", especially in Silesia and the Grand Duchy of Posen. Preacher Hahn headed the troops which were sent to subdue the recusant villagers by seizure of their goods, imprisonment, and all manner of violence. Minister von Altenstein justified these measures on the principle that it was the Government's duty to protect these blind sectarians against the consequences of their own folly. Thousands of the recusants were driven to emigrate to America and Australia. Not a voice was raised in their defence; the whole Liberal press lauded the energy of the Prussian Government. By a royal decree of 28 Feb., 1834, all Lutheran worship was declared illegal.

Frederick William III ruled his Church as *summus episcopus*, as a pope without a fixed deposit of faith to guard, or a hierarchy Divinely ordained to co-operate with him. The result was arbitrariness in the rule, disorganization in the ruled. The king's first royal decrees aimed at the conciliation of religion with the prevailing rationalistic philosophy, but the misfortunes of the year 1806 and the death of his beloved consort turned his mind more and more to the religion of revelation and mysteries. Considering himself the protector and leader of the Church in Germany he endeavoured to raise it from degradation by forcing unity upon it with a strong hand; unity not in dogma, for he disliked theologians "who pretend to be more Christian than Christ", but in liturgy, wherein his sincere piety found sufficient satisfaction. In 1831 he surprised Superintendent Eylert with an essay on the power of the keys and the binding and loosing power in the Church; it contained an attempt to reintroduce auricular confession and the old church discipline. All his efforts, however, only ended in greater division. At his death, in 1840, the Church of his creation was still a chaos of warring sects, irresponsive to the brooding of the royal mind and restive to the royal arm.

Frederick William IV immediately set free the imprisoned Lutheran clergy and allowed the formation of separate congregations. The Old Lutherans now founded a "separate Lutheran Church" at Breslau under the direction of the lawyer Huschke. By the "general concession" of 1845 they were recognized as Dissenters with legal status but without pecuniary support from the State. The new sect was, however, wanting in union and cohesion: Diedrich opposed Huschke and the *Oberkirchencollegium* (supreme ecclesiastical council); frictions among members were of frequent occurrence. But few of the discontented clergymen had left the established Evangelical Church to join the Old Lutherans; the majority remained at their posts for various reasons: within the Union they had a better opportunity for working its destruction than without; they were unwilling to sacrifice their incomes from the State and consequent independence from the financial support of their pa-

rishioners; they feared, in many cases, to be altogether abandoned by indifferent congregations. The defenders of the union argued that its disruption would produce at least five particular churches at war with one another and powerless to withstand the inroads of the Catholic Church; that the union was a Prussian achievement to be supported by all true lovers of Prussia. The theologians of the Union demanded a *consensus-symbolum*, "an ordination formula in which the consensus of the two Churches was to be contained without depriving the individual congregation of the right of giving a call on the ground of the particular confession" (Gardner, I, 967); others were satisfied with a confederation professing no formulated creed and resting solely on unfettered science. The trend of religious thought during this period, the middle of the nineteenth century, followed the impulse given by the king. Frederick William IV's motto was: "I and my house intend to serve the Lord". He was piously, even pietistically, inclined, hated infidelity and pantheism, cherished the Divine right of kings, and loved to dream of ancient institutions in Church and State. In a short time the Prussian universities, and in their wake the other German universities, except Giessen and Jena, became centres of positive beliefs and tendencies. The king favoured men of his own thinking and made known his dislike to transfer the arduous duties of his "supreme episcopate" to free parishes formed on the apostolic model. Theological teaching in schools and press, although starting from the same positive creeds, diverged in two different streams. On the one side there were the partisans of a *via media*, endeavouring to find the golden mean between the Lutheran Confession of Faith and the Rationalism of the period. On the other side stood the Neo-Lutherans. These theologians held to Luther's doctrine on justification but rejected his invisible Church and universal priesthood; they defended a Divinely ordained hierarchy, and their teaching on sacrifice, orders, and sacraments nearly approached the Roman. This current runs parallel with Puseyism in England; Hengstenberg (d. 1869) was its main support.

The General Synod of Berlin (2 June–29 Aug., 1846) had given rise to great hopes for the consolidation of the Union. It was resolved that the National Evangelical Church should have no other basis than the "consensus"; that the parish councils (*Gemeinde-Presbyterien*) and consistories be amalgamated so that clergy and laity might work together; that a standing general synod be added to the standing supreme consistory (*Oberconsistorium*). The crucial task of the synod was to find an acceptable formula of consensus. Karl Immanuel Nitzsch, of Bonn, set up a profession of faith intended to take the place of the reformed formularies: it consisted of vague Biblical texts into which both Lutherans and Reformed might easily read their particular doctrines or no particular doctrine at all. The synod accepted the formula. But the country received it with scorn and contempt, and it was rejected by everyone. Hengstenberg in his "Kirchenzeitung" branded the synod as a Robber Synod, a denial of Christ; its decrees were not to be executed, because they failed to give expression to "the general Protestant consciousness". The consensus only served to increase existing dissensions. The most vital questions divided the leading minds: Was the territorial ruler by right the *summus episcopus* within his territory? Was it advisable to impose an evangelical church discipline, and if so, which? What part was to be conceded to laymen in the ministry of the Word and of the sacraments?

The very sterility of controversy turned some practical men from words to works: the "Inner Mission" was originated (1848) by Wicheren, the founder of the Hamburg *Rauhes Haus* (properly Rüge's House, from the name of its former occupant), an institution which covers almost the whole field of Christian charity. The preacher Fliedner (d. 1864) instituted the order of Protestant deaconesses, an imitation of the Catholic Sisters of Charity in the main objects of their life. Court preacher Zimmermann of Darmstadt founded the Gustav-Adolfs-Verein (1841–2), a union whose avowed primary object is to support the evangelical missions in outlying districts (the Diaspora), its secondary object being to bind together all Protestants regardless of denominational differences, and to oppose a solid bulwark to the encroachments of Catholicism. The secondary object caused a split in the Union. At the general assembly in Berlin (1846) the Königsberg preacher Rupp, who had been deprived of his office for breaking away from the Protestant formularies and from the national Church, presented himself as a deputy. On the question of his admission as such the assembly disagreed: Rupp was, however, excluded by a small majority, a distinct breach of the principles of the Union. The meeting of 1847 resolved that henceforth the Union should direct its main efforts to the "conversion of the Roman Catholics", a resolution to which it has remained faithful to this day.

The short-lived movement of the "Protestant Friends", or "Friends of Light", was started in opposition to pietistic orthodoxy which threatened freedom in teaching. Article 3 of the programme which they issued from the Moravian settlement at Gnadenau, in 1841, runs: "We hold it to be our right and our duty to submit to the test of our reason whatever is set before us as religion." Ulich, a simple-minded man who had the gift of popular preaching, and Pastor Wislicenus, a downright Rationalist, were the soul of this movement. The Berlin magistrates presented to King Frederick William IV an address conceived in the spirit of the Protestant Friends. They entreated him to grant the Church a free constitution in keeping with the needs of the time, and freedom of teaching limited only by public morality and the safety of the State. The king in person received his theological municipality, who paraded in fourteen state coaches before the royal castle. His pietism was ruffled by the pretensions of the town councillors; in language not over gracious he told them to mind their own business. This happened 22 August, 1845; it marks the end of the Protestant Friends but also the beginning of the "Free Communities" (*Freie Gemeinden*). As formerly the right wing of the Union had seceded to form Neo-Lutheran communities, so now the left wing withdrew to form dissenting rationalistic congregations. Their meetings were prohibited, but Rupp, Ulich, and Wislicenus resisted until by royal decree of 30 March, 1847, the new dissenters were allowed to separate from the Established Church without the loss of their civil rights; yet not without many vexatious formalities and expenses. The Free Communities, wanting internal cohesion to resist the royal disfavour and the ceaseless assaults of the dominant pietist clique, came to a speedy end.

The wave of liberal aspirations which rolled over Europe in 1848 left its mark on the Churches in Prussia. Paragraph 15 of the new Constitution read: "The Evangelical, and the Roman Catholic Church, and every other religious society, orders and manages its own affairs independently (*selbstständig*)." The Catholics had the benefit of this law until the beginning of the Kulturkampf, but among the Protestants, the ruling orthodox pietists, led by Hengstenberg, were determined that no freedom should be given to any other party. They evaded the law by a new theory, viz. the king, being the *præcipuum membrum ecclesiæ*, i. e. the chief member of the Church, rules it by an inherent right which no law can take from him; in fact Par. 15 makes the territorial lord quite independent of all State interference with his management of his own Church. The king himself did not favour this extraordinary doctrine. "Do I look like a bishop?" he said, pointing to his uniform and spurs. His ideal

was "the small independent Christian community managing its own affairs in the spirit of the universal Church" as in the days of the Apostles. The ideal of his minister von Raumer and of Hengstenberg was to train Prussian *Unterthanenverstand*, i. e. a mentality fit for people under strict authority: believe in Luther, obey the king, and ask no questions. The alliance of politics, Lutheran orthodoxy and pietism, royal cabinet-orders and counter-orders, general unsettledness and discontent, and five authorized churches instead of one—such was the result of the Union of 1817 in the fourth decade of its existence. Many attempts at a more real and more general union were made on the basis of practical charity, federation, opposition to Catholicism; church conferences were held in Berlin, Wittenberg, Eisenach, and elsewhere; the Gustav-Adolf-Verein and the Inner Mission were founded; the English Evangelical Alliance was invited to Berlin (1857). The result was greater discord and disruption.

William I, who as Regent, King of Prussia, and German Emperor reigned from 1858 to 1888, was an honest, single-minded, and industrious ruler. He had little sympathy with the Constitution and none at all with Hengstenberg's agitation for enforcing Lutheran orthodoxy. He maintained the Constitution as the law of the land. But of the orthodox party he said in an address to his newly constituted ministry: ". . .In both Churches [Catholic and Protestant] all endeavours to make religion a cloak for politics must be strenuously opposed. In the Evangelical Church—we cannot deny it—an orthodoxy has found a footing which is in contradiction with the fundamental idea of the Union, and which has hypocrites in its train. That orthodoxy has impeded the work of the Union, has almost wrecked it. Now it is my will that the Union be maintained intact . . ." Until 1866, however, little was done to carry out William's programme; it was impossible and unadvisable to dismiss all the clerical office-bearers and professors appointed for their opinions during the last eighteen years. The new minister of worship, von Muehler, was dominated by Queen Augusta, a highly educated woman devoted to orthodoxy, who suggested candidates for higher positions and insisted on their appointment (Hase, Neue Kircheng., 305). By her stood Hengstenberg and Hoffman, a fanatical Swabian. Together they worked for the preservation of the old regime. The Liberal party meanwhile found a common centre and a driving power in the *Protestantenverein* (Protestant Union), founded in 1863 at Frankfort-on-the-Main with the object of defeating both Protestant and Catholic orthodoxy. It spread at first but slowly, as it found little support among the still faithful masses and met with open hostility among the ruling classes. In 1906 it numbered 27,000 members.

After the war with Austria (1866) the acquisition of new territories laid upon William I the task of again regulating the religious situation of his kingdom. The Hengstenberg party proposed a measure which would have dealt the death-blow to the Union, viz. to divide the Supreme Church Council into three senates: a Lutheran, a Reformed, and a United, each with circumscribed territorial jurisdiction. But the Supreme Council refused to take this step and persuaded the king to leave to the new provinces their existing church constitutions as long as they chose to maintain them. This was done. To a deputation from the Hanover Consistory William I expressed his conviction that "the Evangelical Union was best furthered by free and unprejudiced hearts working towards unity in charity." The slight difficulties which arose locally, e. g. in Hesse, were probably due as much to political as to religious sentiments. The political unity of Germany achieved through the Franco-German War (1870–71) naturally aroused a strong desire for religious unity in the new empire. Bismarck started the Kulturkampf to bring the Catholics into line with the Protestant majority, but had to acknowledge himself vanquished in 1886. For the unification of the Protestants in the empire only one way was open: to abolish legal pressure and to allow the various religious bodies to work out their own salvation in their own way. The emperor, however, was loath to dismiss at once the ministers and officials who had so faithfully stood by him in the war; von Muehler retained his post and Empress Augusta her influence; the old system continued for a while with but slight concessions to liberty. The relation between the State and the Evangelical Church was finally fixed by the laws of 10 Sept., 1873, and 30 May, 1876. At the head of the whole organization stands the Supreme Ecclesiastical Council (*Oberkirchenrat*) in Berlin, consisting of twelve regular members, one ecclesiastical vice-president, and a lay president. Under this council are eight provincial consistories, Königsberg, Berlin, Stettin, Breslau, Posen, Magdeburg, Münster, and Coblenz; and under them the superintendents numbering 415. In the Evangelical State Church the two types of Protestantism are united; no distinction is made between Lutheran and Reformed either in the theological faculties or in the seminaries. Luther's Bible is in common use, the various collections of hymns have no denominational character. The emperor, or King of Prussia, is *summus episcopus*, which, however, is a title rather than an office. In matters of faith the royal pronouncements neither claim, nor are they credited with, infallibility; and matters of administration are left to the councils and consistories elected by the people.

The doctrinal status of the United Evangelical Church in Germany may be fitly described as Modernism in the sense of the Encyclical "Pascendi". The simple country folk, who practise more than they think, still follow the religion of older generations, but the socialist masses of the towns are either indifferent or openly hostile to all supernatural religion. Owing to the principle sanctioned in 1648 "that all the subjects must follow the religion of their ruler" the population, from a religious point of view, is less mixed in Germany than in England or America. Numerically, the two confessions are in the same proportion as they were 300 years ago: two Protestants to one Catholic. Conversions from one religion to the other almost balance with a slight excess in favour of Protestantism. This is entirely due to mixed marriages and temporal allurements. The efforts of proselytizing societies, such as the Gustav-Adolf-Verein, the Protestant and the Evangelical Unions, show but poor results. Statistics from the census of 1900 are as follows: Evangelical Church in Prussia: 8158 parishes with 17,246 churches, etc., 10,071 clergy, and 21,817,577 adherents against 12,110,229 Catholics, which gives the proportion of 5 Catholics to 9 Protestants. For the whole German Empire the proportion is 7 Catholics to 12 Protestants, i. e. 20,321,441 to 35,231,104.

No English work deals exhaustively with the subject. German sources:—FOERSTER, *Die Entstehung der preussischen Landeskirche unter der Regierung Friedrich Wilhelm III, nach den Quellen* (Tübingen, 1905–07); VON HASE, *Gesch. der prot. Kirche im 19. Jahrh.* (Leipzig, 1892), 299–308; HERGENRÖTHER, *Kirchengesch.* (Freiburg, 1886), III, 919 sqq.; DÖLLINGER, *Kirche u. Kirchen*, 422 sqq.; tr. MACCABE (London, 1862).

J. WILHELM.

Evangelical Counsels. See COUNSELS, EVANGELICAL.

Evangelist.—In the New Testament this word, in its substantive form, occurs only three times: Acts, xxi, 8; Eph., iv, 11; II Tim., iv, 5. It seems to indicate not so much an order in the early ecclesiastical hierarchy as a function. The Apostles, indeed, were evangelists, inasmuch as they preached the Gospel (Acts, viii, 25; xiv, 20; I Cor., i, 17); Philip likewise was both a deacon (Acts, vi, 5) and an evangelist (Acts, viii, 4–5; 40; xxi, 8); in like manner was St. Timothy exhorted by St. Paul to do the work of an evangelist (II Tim., iv, 5).

From the various statements contained in the New Testament, we may gather with some probability that evangelists were travelling missionaries, occasionally solemnly set apart, as seems to have been the case with Sts. Paul and Barnabas (Acts, xiii, 1–3), to go about and preach the Gospel, yet sometimes with a settled place of abode, as Philip at Cæsarea, and Timothy at Ephesus. They were endowed with a special *charisma* to preach to those unacquainted with the Christian Faith and pave the way for the more thorough and systematic work of the pastors and teachers. But their office, as such, seems to have extended no further; so, for instance, we understand from Acts, viii, 4 sqq., that Philip, who preached successfully in Samaria and baptized many, was not qualified to impart the Holy Ghost to the converts (verse 14). Accordingly, St. Paul, in his list of the gifts bestowed by Christ for the edification of the Church, Eph., iv, 11 (in I Cor., xii, 28, they are omitted), mentions the evangelists in the third place, only after the Apostles and the Prophets. In the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, no reference is made to evangelists; travelling missionaries are sometimes called "apostles", sometimes also, as in the Didache, they are styled "teachers".

In the later ecclesiastical literature the word *evangelist*, perhaps sporadically still used for some time in its old sense (Euseb., Hist. Eccl., V, x), received, in most parts of the Church, another meaning. Applied occasionally to the reader in the Liturgy (Apost. Const., III), even to the deacon (Lit. of St. John Chrysost., P. G., LXIII, 910), it became gradually confined to the writers of the Four Gospels (Euseb., Hist. Eccl., III, xxxix, etc.). It is exclusively in this sense that common modern parlance employs it.

As early as the second century, Christian writers sought in Ezechiel's vision (i, 5 sqq.) and in Apoc. (iv, 6–10) symbolical representations of the Four Evangelists. The system, which finally prevailed in the Latin Church, consisted in symbolizing St. Matthew by a man, St. Mark by a lion, St. Luke by an ox, and St. John by an eagle (see SYMBOLISM). It is fully explained by St. Jerome (In Ezech., i, 7), and had been adopted by St. Ambrose (Expos. Ev. S. Luc., Procem.), St. Gregory the Great (In Ezech., Hom., I, iv, 1), and others. St. Irenæus, on the one hand, and Augustine, followed by the Venerable Bede, on the other, had devised different combinations. Christian artists followed in the footsteps of the ecclesiastical writers, and made use, in different manners, of the four traditional figures to represent the Evangelists. Among the most remarkable works of this description it will suffice here to mention only the old mosaics of the churches of S. Pudentiana, S. Sabina, S. Maria Maggiore, and S. Paolo fuori le Mura, at Rome.

BRUDERS, *Die Verfassung der Kirche* (Mainz, 1904); HARNACK, *Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums* (Leipzig 1902; ZÖCKLER, *Diakonen und Evangelisten* (Munich, 1893); PATRICK in HAST., *Dict. of Christ and the Gospels* (New York, 1906), 549–50; KRAUS, *Evangelisten u. Evangelistiche Zeichen* in *Real-encyc.* (Freiburg, 1882), I, 458–63.

CHARLES L. SOUVAY.

Evangelistarium. See EVANGELIARIUM.

Evaristus, SAINT, POPE, date of birth unknown; d. about 107. In the Liberian Catalogue his name is given as Aristus. In papal catalogues of the second century used by Irenæus and Hippolytus, he appears as the fourth successor of St. Peter, immediately after St. Clement. The same lists allow him eight years of reign, covering the end of the first and the beginning of the second century (from about 98 or 99 to about 106 or 107). The earliest historical sources offer no authentic data about him. In his "Ecclesiastical History" Eusebius says merely that he succeeded Clement in the episcopate of the Roman Church, which fact was already known from St. Irenæus. This order of succession is undoubtedly correct. The "Liber Pontificalis" says that Evaristus came of a Hellenic family, and was the son of a Bethlehem Jew. It also attributes to him the allotment of definite churches as *tituli* to the Roman presbyters, and the division of the city into seven *diaconias* or deaconries; in this statement, however, the "Liber Pontificalis" arbitrarily refers to the time of Evaristus a later institution of the Roman Church. More trustworthy is the assertion of the "Liber Pontificalis" that he was laid to rest *in Vaticano*, near the tomb of St. Peter. The martyrdom of Evaristus, though traditional, is not historically proven. His feast occurs 26 Oct. The two decretals ascribed to him by Pseudo-Isidore are forged.

Acta SS., Oct., XI, 799 sq.; *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. DUCHESNE (Paris, 1886), I, 126; DUCHESNE, *Hist. Ancienne de l'Eglise* (Paris, 1906), I; JAFFÉ, *Regesta Rom. Pont.*, 2nd ed., I, 4; HARNACK, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* (Leipzig, 1893), II: *Die Chronologie*, I, 144 sq.; *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, XXIX (1905), 163 sq.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Eve (Heb. חוה, *ḥawwah*).—The name of the first woman, the wife of Adam, the mother of Cain, Abel, and Seth. The name occurs only five times in the Bible. In Gen., iii, 20, it is connected etymologically with the verb חיה or חוה, "to live": "And Adam called the name of his wife Eve [חוה, *ḥawwah*]: because she was the mother of all the living". The Septuagint rendering in this passage is Ζωή (=life, or life-giver), which is a translation; in two other passages (Gen., iv, 1 and 25) the name is transliterated Εὔα. The Biblical data concerning Eve are confined almost exclusively to the second, third, and fourth chapters of Genesis (see ADAM).

The first account of the creation (Gen. i, "P") sets forth the creation of mankind in general, and states simply that they were created male and female. The second narrative (Gen., ii, "J") is more explicit and detailed. God is represented as forming an individual man from the slime of the earth, and breathing into his nostrils the breath of life. In like manner the creation of the first woman and her relation to man is described with picturesque and significant imagery. In this account, in which the plants and animals appear on the scene only after the creation of man, the loneliness of the latter (Gen., ii, 18), and his failure to find a suitable companion among the animals (Gen., ii, 20), are set forth as the reason why God determines to create for man a companion like unto himself. He causes a deep sleep to fall upon him, and taking out one of his ribs, forms it into a woman, who, when she is brought to him, is recognized at once as bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh. A discussion of the arguments in favor of the historical, or the more or less allegorical character of this narrative would be beyond the scope of the present notice. Suffice it to say that the biblical account has always been looked upon by pious commentators as embodying, besides the fact of man's origin, a deep, practical and many-sided significance, bearing on the mutual relationship established between the sexes by the Creator.

Thus, the primitive institution of monogamy is implied in the fact that one woman is created for one man. Eve, as well as Adam, is made the object of a special creative act, a circumstance which indicates her natural equality with him, while on the other hand her being taken from his side implies not only her secondary rôle in the conjugal state (I Cor., xi, 9), but also emphasizes the intimate union between husband and wife, and the dependence of the latter on the former "Wherefore a man shall leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they shall be two in one flesh." The innocence of the newly created couple is clearly indicated in the following verse, but the narrator immediately proceeds to relate how they soon acquired, through actual transgression, the knowledge of good and evil, and with it the sense of shame which had been previously unknown to them. In the story of the Fall, the original cause of evil is the serpent,

which in later Jewish tradition is identified with Satan (Wisdom, ii, 24). He tempts Eve presumably as the weaker of the two, and she in turn tempts Adam, who yields to her seduction. Immediately their eyes are opened, but in an unexpected manner. Shame and remorse take possession of them, and they seek to hide from the face of the Lord.

For her share in the transgression, Eve (and womankind after her) is sentenced to a life of sorrow and travail, and to be under the power of her husband. Doubtless this last did not imply that the woman's essential condition of equality with man was altered, but the sentence expresses what, in the nature of things, was bound to follow in a world dominated by sin and its consequences. The natural dependence and subjection of the weaker party was destined inevitably to become something little short of slavery. But if woman was the occasion of man's transgression and fall, it was also decreed in the Divine counsels, that she was to be instrumental in the scheme of restoration which God already promises while in the act of pronouncing sentence upon the serpent. The woman has suffered defeat, and infinitely painful are its consequences, but henceforth there will be enmity between her and the serpent, between his seed and her seed, until through the latter in the person of the future Redeemer, who will crush the serpent's head, she will again be victorious.

Of the subsequent history of Eve the Bible gives little information. In Gen., iv, 1, we read that she bore a son whom she named Cain, because she got him (קנה—to acquire, possess) through God—this at least is the most plausible interpretation of this obscure passage. Later she gave birth to Abel, and the narrative does not record the birth of another child until after the slaying of Abel by his elder brother, when she bore a son and called his name Seth; saying: "God hath given me [שית—put or appoint] another seed, for Abel whom Cain slew". Of daughters no specific mention is made in this account, but in Gen., v, 4 ("P") we find the general statement that "the days of Adam, after he begot Seth, were eight hundred years: and he begot sons and daughters".

Eve is mentioned in the Book of Tobias (viii, 8; Sept., viii, 6) where it is simply affirmed that she was given to Adam for a helper; in II Cor., xi, 3, where reference is made to her seduction by the serpent, and in I Tim., ii, 13, where the Apostle enjoins submission and silence upon women, arguing that "Adam was first formed; then Eve. And Adam was not seduced, but the woman being seduced, was in the transgression".

As in the case of the other Old Testament personages, many rabbinical legends have been connected with the name of Eve. They may be found in the "Jewish Encyclopedia", s. v. (see also, ADAM), and in Vigouroux, "Dictionnaire de la Bible", I, art. "Adam". They are, for the most part, puerile and fantastic, and devoid of historical value, unless in so far as they serve to illustrate the mentality of the later Jewish writers, and the unreliability of the "traditions" derived from such sources, though they are sometimes appealed to in critical discussions.

PALIS in VIGOUROUX, *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, II, 2118; BENNETT in HASTINGS, *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v.; *Encyclopedia Biblica*, s. v. *Adam and Eve;* GIGOT, *Special Introduction to the Study of the Old Testament*, Part I, p. 162; *Jewish Encyclopedia*, s. v., V, 275.

JAMES F. DRISCOLL.

Eve of a Feast (or VIGIL; Lat. *Vigilia;* Gr. παννυχίς). —In the first ages, during the night before every feast, a vigil was kept. In the evening the faithful assembled in the place or church where the feast was to be celebrated and prepared themselves by prayers, readings from Holy Writ (now the Offices of Vespers and Matins), and sometimes also by hearing a sermon. On such occasions, as on fast days in general, Mass also was celebrated in the evening, before the Vespers of the following day. Towards morning the people dispersed to the streets and houses near the church, to wait for the solemn services of the forenoon. This vigil was a regular institution of Christian life and was defended and highly recommended by St. Augustine and St. Jerome (see Pleithner, Aeltere Geschichte des Breviergebetes, pp. 223 sq.). The morning intermission gave rise to grave abuses; the people caroused and danced in the streets and halls around the church (Durandus, "Rat. Div. off.", VI, 7). St. Jerome speaks of these improprieties (Epist. ad Ripuarium).

As the feasts multiplied, the number of vigils was greatly reduced. But the abuses could be stopped only by abolishing the vigils. And where they could not be abrogated at once and entirely they were to begin in the afternoon. A synod held at Rouen in 1231 prohibited all vigils except those before the patronal feast of a church (Hefele, "Conciliengeschichte", V, 1007). In place of nocturnal observances, the bishops introduced for the laity a fast on the day before the feast, which fast Durandus (loc. cit.) calls "jejunium dispensationis". Honorius of Auxerre, in 1152 (Gemma Animae, III, 6), and others explain in this way the origin of this fast. It existed, however, long before the abolition of the nocturnal meetings. The fast on Christmas Eve is mentioned by Theophilus of Alexandria (d. 412), that before the Epiphany by St. John Chrysostom (d. 407), that before Pentecost by the Sacramentary of St. Leo I. Pope Nicholas I (d. 867), in his answer to the Bulgarians, speaks of the fast on the eves of Christmas and of the Assumption. The Synod of Erfurt (932) connects a fast with every vigil. The very fact that the people were not permitted to eat or drink before the services of the vigil (Vespers and Matins) were ended, after midnight, explains the excesses of which the councils and writers speak.

The Synod of Seligenstadt (1022) mentions vigils on the eves of Christmas, Epiphany, the feasts of the Apostles, the Assumption of Mary, St. Laurence, and All Saints, besides the fast of two weeks before the Nativity of St. John. After the eleventh century the fast, Office, and Mass of the nocturnal vigil were transferred to the day before the feast; and even now the liturgy of Holy Saturday (vigil of Easter) shows, in all its parts, that originally it was not kept on the morning of Saturday, but during Easter Night. The day before the feast was henceforth called vigil. A similar celebration before the high feasts exists also in the Orthodox (Greek) Church, and is called παννυχίς or ἀγρυπνία. In the Occident only the older feasts have vigils; even the feasts of the first class introduced after the thirteenth century (Corpus Christi, the Sacred Heart) have no vigils, except the Immaculate Conception, which Pope Leo XIII (30 Nov., 1879) singled out for this distinction. The number of vigils in the Roman Calendar besides Holy Saturday is seventeen, viz., the eves of Christmas, the Epiphany, the Ascension, Pentecost, the Immaculate Conception, the Assumption, the eight feasts of the Apostles, St. John the Baptist, St. Laurence, and All Saints. Some dioceses and religious orders have particular vigils, e. g. the Servites, on the Saturday next before the feast of the Seven Dolours of Our Lady; the Carmelites, on the eve of the feast of Mount Carmel. In the United States only four of these vigils are fast days: the vigils of Christmas, Pentecost, the Assumption, and All Saints.

The vigils of Christmas, the Epiphany, and Pentecost are called *vigiliæ majores;* they have a proper Office (semi-double), and the vigil of Christmas, from Lauds on, is kept as a double feast. The rest are *vigiliæ minores*, or *communes*, and have the ferial office. On the occasion of the reform of the Breviary, in 1568, a homily on the Gospel of the vigil was added, an innovation not accepted by the Cistercians. If a vigil falls on a Sunday, according to the present rubrics, it is kept on the preceding Saturday; during the Middle

Ages in many churches it was joined to the Sunday Office. If it occurs on a double or a semi-double feast, it is limited to a commemoration in the Lauds and Mass (a feast of the first class excludes this commemoration), the ninth lesson in the Breviary, and the last Gospel in Mass. If it occurs on a day within an ordinary octave, the Mass is said of the vigil, the Office of the octave; if it occurs on a *feria major*, the vigil is omitted in the Breviary and commemorated only in the Mass, if the feria has a proper mass; if not (e. g. in Advent), the mass is said of the vigil, the feria is commemorated. In the Ambrosian Liturgy of Milan only the vigils of Christmas and Pentecost are kept, at least by a special Mass; the other vigils exist only in the Calendar, but are not kept in the liturgy. In the Mozarabic Rite only Christmas has a vigil; three days before Epiphany and four days before Pentecost a fast is observed; the other vigils are unknown.

Evesham Abbey in 1530
(Reconstruction)

Binterim, *Die Denkwürdigkeiten der christ-katholischen Kirche* (Mainz, 1829); Scheod in *Kirchenlexicon*, s. v. *Vigil; Rubricæ generales Breviarii Romani*, tit. 6; *Rubricæ generales Missalis Rom.*, tit. 3; Pleithner, *Aelteste Geschichte des Breviergebets* (Kempten, 1887).

F. G. Holweck.

Evesham Abbey, founded by St. Egwin, third Bishop of Worcester, about 701, in Worcestershire, England, and dedicated to the Blessed Virgin. The founder's charter of endowment, dated 714, records that a herdsman of the bishop, named Eoves, was one day favoured with a vision of Our Lady. St. Egwin, being informed, visited the spot and there the Mother of God appeared to him also, commanding him to erect in that place a monastery in her honour for Benedictine monks. The bishop at once set about the task, being liberally assisted in the work by Ethelred and Kenred, successive kings of Mercia, and others. The derivation of the name Evesham is accounted for by the above legend. It is stated, though contemporary charters make the fact doubtful, that St. Egwin resigned his see in order to become first abbot of the new foundation, which he ruled until his death in 717. He was buried in the abbey church and his shrine, beautified by subsequent abbots, became in after years one of the richest and most popular in the West of England, and many miracles are recorded as having taken place there. In 941, after the havoc wrought by the Danes, the few remaining monks who had survived were ejected and secular canons installed in their place. Their possession of the abbey, however, did not last long, for in 960 St. Dunstan and St. Ethelwold, then engaged upon their great reform of the English monasteries, restored the Benedictines to their own. A second expulsion occurred in 977 and it was not until 1014 that the monks effected their final return. With the Norman conquest and the consolidation of the kingdom of England, Evesham grew and prospered, and enjoying royal favour became one of the most important abbeys of Black Monks in the country, so much so, indeed, that the jealousy of the bishops of Worcester was aroused.

As in the case of many other monasteries they claimed rights of visitation and diocesan authority over the monks. The dispute continued for a long time, but eventually the exemption from episcopal jurisdiction, originally obtained by St. Egwin, was confirmed by Rome in 1206. In this as in other matters, the internal history of the abbey, as recorded in the "Evesham Chronicle", differs only in detail from that of any other great Benedictine house of the same period. A succession of worthy abbots, seldom broken, guided its fortunes wisely and religiously through the eight centuries of its existence. The use of abbatial *pontificalia* was obtained in 1160 by Abbot Adam from the reigning pope. At the height of its prosperity the abbey was one of the largest and most stately in England. It had two dependent "cells"—Penwortham, in Lancashire, and Alcester, in Warwickshire—besides another in Denmark; the abbots were also the patrons of seventeen neighbouring parishes; they had a seat in the House of Lords; and they exercised civil jurisdiction within the bounds of the monastic territory. The great abbey church, which, besides the magnificent shrine of St. Egwin, contained fifteen altars, was commenced in the eleventh century by Abbot Walter and gradually completed by several subsequent abbots. It was cruciform, with a central tower, and was nearly 300 feet in length. The previous campanile having fallen, after being struck by lightning, a magnificent bell tower, still standing, was built by Abbot Clement Lichfield about 1533.

Great Tower of Evesham Abbey
(Actual Condition)

Within the abbey precincts and under the very shadow of its minster, were two parish churches, erected by the monks for the use of the people of the town which had grown up around its walls. That of St. Lawrence dates from the thirteenth century and that of All Saints is of a century later. The last of the great abbots of Evesham, Clement Lichfield, who reigned from 1514 to 1539, added chantries to both of these churches. Unwilling to yield to the rapacity of Henry VIII, when the suppression of the monasteries was threatening, he resigned his abbacy, acting, it is said, at Cromwell's suggestion. His unworthy successor was Philip Hawford, who surrendered the abbey into the king's hands in the same year, 1539. For this service he was rewarded with a pension of £240, and afterwards became first Protestant Dean of Worcester, in which cathedral his tomb may still be seen. The revenues of the abbey at the time of its suppression are given by Dugdale as £1183. The demolition of the buildings commenced almost immediately, and the ruins became, as in the case of so many others, a stone quarry for the neighbourhood. Besides the two parish churches and the bell tower, only a gateway, a cloister arch, the almonry, and a few other isolated fragments remain intact to show what man-

ner of building the once glorious abbey of Evesham was.

TANNER, *Notitia Monastica* (London, 1794); DUGDALE, *Monasticon Anglicanum* (London, 1817–30); *Chronicon Abbatiæ de Evesham* in *Rolls Series*, MACRAY ed. (London, 1863); TINDAL, *History and Antiquities of Evesham* (Evesham, 1794); MAY, *Descriptive History of Evesham* (Evesham, 1845); BENEDICTINE NUNS OF STANBROOK, *St. Egwin and his Abbey of Evesham* (London, 1904).

G. CYPRIAN ALSTON.

Evil, in a large sense, may be described as the sum of the opposition, which experience shows to exist in the universe, to the desires and needs of individuals; whence arises, among human beings at least, the suffering in which life abounds. Thus evil, from the point of view of human welfare, is what ought not to exist. Nevertheless, there is no department of human life in which its presence is not felt; and the discrepancy between what is and what ought to be has always called for explanation in the account which mankind has sought to give of itself and its surroundings. For this purpose it is necessary (1) to define the precise nature of the principle that imparts the character of evil to so great a variety of circumstances, and (2) to ascertain, as far as may be possible, the source from which it arises.

With regard to the nature of evil, it should be observed that evil is of three kinds—physical, moral, and metaphysical. *Physical* evil includes all that causes harm to man, whether by bodily injury, by thwarting his natural desires, or by preventing the full development of his powers, either in the order of nature directly, or through the various social conditions under which mankind naturally exists. Physical evils directly due to nature are sickness, accident, death, etc. Poverty, oppression, and some forms of disease are instances of evil arising from imperfect social organization. Mental suffering, such as anxiety, disappointment, and remorse, and the limitation of intelligence which prevents human beings from attaining to the full comprehension of their environment, are congenital forms of evil which vary in character and degree according to natural disposition and social circumstances.

By *moral* evil are understood the deviation of human volition from the prescriptions of the moral order and the action which results from that deviation. Such action, when it proceeds solely from ignorance, is not to be classed as moral evil, which is properly restricted to the motions of the will towards ends of which the conscience disapproves. The extent of moral evil is not limited to the circumstances of life in the natural order, but includes also the sphere of religion, by which man's welfare is affected in the supernatural order, and the precepts of which, as depending ultimately upon the will of God, are of the strictest possible obligation (see SIN). The obligation to moral action in the natural order is, moreover, generally believed to depend on the motives supplied by religion; and it is at least doubtful whether it is possible for moral obligation to exist at all apart from a supernatural sanction.

Metaphysical evil is the limitation by one another of the various component parts of the natural world. Through this mutual limitation natural objects are for the most part prevented from attaining to their full or ideal perfection, whether by the constant pressure of physical conditions, or by sudden catastrophes. Thus, animal and vegetable organisms are variously influenced by climate and other natural causes; predatory animals depend for their existence on the destruction of life; nature is subject to storms and convulsions, and its order depends on a system of perpetual decay and renewal due to the interaction of its constituent parts. It is evident that metaphysical evil does not, like the other two kinds, necessarily connote suffering. If animal suffering is excluded, no pain of any kind is caused by the inevitable limitations of nature; and they can only be called evil by analogy, and in a sense quite different from that in which the term is applied to human experience. Clarke, moreover, has aptly remarked (Correspondence with Leibniz, letter ii) that the apparent disorder of nature is really no disorder, since it is part of a definite scheme, and precisely fulfils the intention of the Creator; it may therefore be counted as a relative perfection rather than an imperfection. It is, in fact, only by a transference to irrational objects of the subjective ideals and aspirations of human intelligence, that the "evil of nature" can be called evil in any sense but a merely analogous one. The nature and degree of pain in the lower animals is very obscure, and in the necessary absence of data it is difficult to say whether it should rightly be classed with the merely formal evil which belongs to inanimate objects, or with the suffering of human beings. The latter view was generally held in ancient times, and may perhaps be referred to the anthropomorphic tendency of primitive minds which appears in the doctrine of metempsychosis. Thus it has often been supposed that animal suffering, together with many of the imperfections of inanimate nature, was due to the fall of man, with whose welfare, as the chief part of creation, were bound up the fortunes of the rest (see Theoph. Antioch., Ad Autolyc., II; cf. Gen. iii, and I Cor. ix). The opposite view is taken by St. Thomas (I, Q. xcvi, a. 1, 2). Descartes supposed that animals were merely machines, without sensation or consciousness; he was closely followed by Malebranche and Cartesians generally. Leibnitz grants sensation to animals, but considers that mere sense-perception, unaccompanied by reflexion, cannot cause either pain or pleasure; in any case he holds the pain and pleasure of animals to be far less acute than those of human beings, and comparable in degree to those resulting from reflex action in man (see also Maher, Psychology, Supp't. A., London, 1903).

It is evident again that all evil is essentially negative and not positive; i. e. it consists not in the acquisition of anything, but in the loss or deprivation of something necessary for perfection. Pain, which is the test or criterion of physical evil, has indeed a positive, though purely subjective existence as a sensation or emotion; but its evil quality lies in its disturbing effect on the sufferer. In like manner, the perverse action of the will, upon which moral evil depends, is more than a mere negation of right action, implying as it does the positive element of choice; but the morally evil character of wrong action is constituted not by the element of choice, but by its rejection of what right reason requires. Thus Origen (In Joh., ii, 7) defines evil as *στέρησις*; the Pseudo-Dionysius (De. Div. Nom. iv) as the non-existent; Maimonides (Dux perplex. iii, 10) as "privatio boni alicujus"; Albertus Magnus (adopting St. Augustine's phrase) attributes evil to "aliqua causa *deficiens*" (Summa Theol., I, xi, 4); Schopenhauer, who held pain to be the positive and normal condition of life (pleasure being its partial and temporary absence), nevertheless made it depend upon the failure of human desire to obtain fulfilment —"the wish is in itself pain". Thus it will be seen that evil is not a real entity; it is relative. What is evil in some relations may be good in others; and probably there is no form of existence which is exclusively evil in all relations. Hence it has been thought that evil cannot truly be said to exist at all, and is really nothing but a "lesser good." But this opinion seems to leave out of account the reality of human experience. Though the same cause may give pain to one, and pleasure to another, pain and pleasure, as sensations or ideas, cannot but be mutually exclusive. No one, however, has attempted to deny this very obvious fact; and the opinion in question may perhaps be understood as merely a paradoxical way of stating the relativity of evil.

There is practically a general agreement of authorities as to the nature of evil, some allowance being made for varying modes of expression depending on a corresponding variety of philosophical presuppositions. But on the question of the origin of evil there has been, and is, a considerable diversity of opinion. The problem is strictly a metaphysical one; i. e. it cannot be solved by a mere experimental analysis of the actual conditions from which evil results. The question, which Schopenhauer has called "the *punctum pruriens* of metaphysics", is concerned not so much with the various detailed manifestations of evil in nature, as with the hidden and underlying cause which has made these manifestations possible or necessary; and it is at once evident that enquiry in a region so obscure must be attended with great difficulty, and that the conclusions reached must, for the most part, be of a provisional and tentative character. No system of philosophy has ever succeeded in escaping from the obscurity in which the subject is involved; but it is not too much to say that the Christian solution offers, on the whole, fewer difficulties, and approaches more nearly to completeness than any other. The question may be stated thus. Admitting that evil consists in a certain relation of man to his environment, or that it arises in the relation of the component parts of the totality of existence to one another, how comes it that though all are alike the results of a universal cosmic process, this universal agency is perpetually at war with itself, contradicting and thwarting its own efforts in the mutual hostility of its progeny? Further, admitting that metaphysical evil in itself may be merely nature's method, involving nothing more than a continual redistribution of the material elements of the universe, human suffering and wrongdoing still stand out as essentially opposed to the general scheme of natural development, and are scarcely to be reconciled in thought with any conception of unity or harmony in nature. To what, then, is the evil of human life, physical and moral, to be attributed as its cause? But when the universe is considered as the work of an all-benevolent and all-powerful Creator, a fresh element is added to the problem. If God is all-benevolent, why did He cause or permit suffering? If He is all-powerful, He can be under no necessity of creating or permitting it; and on the other hand, if He is under any such necessity, He cannot be all-powerful. Again, if God is absolutely good, and also omnipotent, how can He permit the existence of moral evil? We have to enquire, that is to say, how evil has come to exist, and what is its special relation to the Creator of the universe.

The solution of the problem has been attempted by three different methods.

I. It has been contended that existence is fundamentally evil; that evil is the active principle of the universe, and good no more than an illusion, the pursuit of which serves to induce the human race to perpetuate its own existence (see Pessimism). This is the fundamental tenet of Buddhism (q. v.), which regards happiness as unattainable, and holds that there is no way of escaping from misery but by ceasing to exist otherwise than in the impersonal state of Nirvana. The origin of suffering, according to Buddha, is "the thirst for being". This was also, among Greek philosophers, the view of Hegesias the Cyrenaic (called πεισιθάνατος, the counsellor of death), who held life to be valueless, and pleasure, the only good, to be unattainable. But the Greek temper was naturally disinclined to a pessimistic view of nature and life; and while popular mythology embodied the darker aspects of existence in such conceptions as those of Fate, the avenging Furies, and the envy (φθόνος) of the gods, Greek thinkers, as a rule, held that evil is not universally supreme, but can be avoided or overcome by the wise and virtuous.

Pessimism, as a metaphysical system, is the product of modern times. Its chief representatives are Schopenhauer and von Hartmann, both of whom hold the actual universe to be fundamentally evil, and happiness in it to be impossible. The origin of the phenomenal universe is attributed by Schopenhauer to a transcendental Will, which he identifies with pure being; and by Hartmann to the Unconscious, which includes both the Will and the Idea (*Vorstellung*) of Schopenhauer. According to both Schopenhauer and Hartmann, suffering has come into existence with self-consciousness, from which it is inseparable.

II. Evil has been attributed to one of two mutually opposed principles, to which respectively the mingled good and evil of the world are due. The relation between the two is variously represented, and ranges from the co-ordination imagined by Zoroastrianism to the mere relative independence of the created will as held by Christian theology. Zoroaster attributed good and evil respectively to two mutually hostile principles (ῥίζαι, or ἀρχαι) called Ormuzd (Ahura Mazda) and Ahriman (Angra Mainyu). Each was independent of the other; but eventually the good were to be victorious with Ormuzd, and Ahriman and his evil followers were to be expelled from the world. This mythological dualism passed to the sect of the Manichees, whose founder, Manes, added a third, but subordinate principle, emanating from the source of good (and perhaps corresponding, in some degree, to the Mithras of Zoroastrianism), in the "living spirit", by whom was formed the present material world of mingled good and evil. Manes held that matter was essentially evil, and therefore could not be in direct contact with God. He probably derived the notion from the Gnostic sects, which, though they differed on many points from one another, were generally agreed in following the opinions of Philo, and the neo-Platonist Plotinus, as to the evil of matter. They held the world to have been formed by an emanation, the Demiurge, as a kind of intermediary between God and impure matter. Bardesanes, however, and his followers regarded evil as resulting from the misuse of created free will.

The notion that evil is necessarily inherent in matter, independent of the Divine author of good, and in some sense opposed to Him, is common to the above theosophical systems, to many of the purely rational conceptions of Greek philosophy, and to much that has been advanced on this subject in later times. In the Pythagorean idea of a numerical harmony as the constitutive principle of the world, good is represented by unity and evil by multiplicity (Philolaus, Fragm.). Heraclitus set the "strife", which he held to be the essential condition of life, over against the action of the immanent deity. "God is the author of all that is right and good and just; but men have sometimes chosen good and sometimes evil" (Fragm. 61). Empedocles, again, attributed evil to the principle of hate (νεῖκος), inherent together with its opposite, love (φίλια), in the universe. Plato held God to be "free from blame" (ἀναίτιος) for the evil of the world; its cause was partly the necessary imperfection of material and created existence, and partly the action of the human will (Timæus, xlii; cf. Phædo, lx). With Aristotle, evil is a necessary aspect of the constant changes of matter, and has in itself no real existence (Metaph., ix, 9). The Stoics conceived evil in a somewhat similar manner, as due to necessity; the immanent Divine power harmonizes the evil and good in a changing world. Moral evil proceeds from the folly of mankind, not from the Divine will, and is overruled by it to a good end. In the hymn of Cleanthes to Zeus (Stob. Ecl., I, p. 30) may be perceived an approach to the doctrine of Leibniz, as to the nature of evil and the goodness of the world. "Nothing is done without thee in earth or sea or sky, save what evil men commit by their own folly; so thou hast fitted together all evil and good in one, that there might be one

reasonable and everlasting scheme of all things." In the mystical system of Eckhart (d. 1329), evil, sin included, has its place in the evolutionary scheme by which all proceeds from and returns to God, and contributes, both in the moral order and in the physical, to the accomplishment of the Divine purpose. Eckhart's monistic or pantheistic tendencies seem to have obscured for him many of the difficulties of the subject, as has been the case with those by whom the same tendencies have since been carried to an extreme conclusion.

Christian philosophy has, like the Hebrew, uniformly attributed moral and physical evil to the action of created free will. Man has himself brought about the evil from which he suffers by transgressing the law of God, on obedience to which his happiness depended. Evil is in created things under the aspect of mutability, and possibility of defect, not as existing *per se:* and the errors of mankind, mistaking the true conditions of its own well-being, have been the cause of moral and physical evil (Dion. Areop., De Div. Nom., iv, 31; St. Aug., De Civ. Dei, xii). The evil from which man suffers is, however, the condition of good, for the sake of which it is permitted. Thus, "God judged it better to bring good out of evil than to suffer no evil to exist" (St. Aug., Enchirid., xxvii). Evil contributes to the perfection of the universe, as shadows to the perfection of a picture, or harmony to that of music (De Civ. Dei, xi). Again, the excellence of God's works in nature is insisted on as evidence of the Divine wisdom, power, and goodness, by which no evil can be directly caused. (Greg. Nyss., De. opif. hom.) Thus Boethius asks (De Consol. Phil., I, iv) Who can be the author of good, if God is the author of evil? As darkness is nothing but the absence of light, and is not produced by creation, so evil is merely the defect of goodness. (St. Aug., In Gen. ad lit.) St. Basil (Hexæm., Hom. ii) points out the educative purposes served by evil; and St. Augustine, holding evil to be permitted for the punishment of the wicked and the trial of the good, shows that it has, under this aspect, the nature of good, and is pleasing to God, not because of what it is, but because of where it is; i. e. as the penal and just consequence of sin (De Civ. Dei, XI, xii, De Vera Relig. xliv). Lactantius uses similar arguments to oppose the dilemma, as to the omnipotence and goodness of God, which he puts into the mouth of Epicurus (De Ira Dei, xiii). St. Anselm (Monologium) connects evil with the partial manifestation of good by creation; its fullness being in God alone.

The features which stand out in the earlier Christian explanation of evil, as compared with non-Christian dualistic theories are thus (1) the definite attribution to God of absolute omnipotence and goodness, notwithstanding His permission of the existence of evil; (2) the assignment of a moral and retributive cause for suffering in the sin of mankind; and (3) the unhesitating assertion of the beneficence of God's purpose in permitting evil, together with the full admission that He could, had He so chosen, have prevented it (De Civ. Dei, xiv). How God's permission of the evil which He foreknew and could have prevented is to be reconciled with His goodness, is not fully considered; St. Augustine states the question in forcible terms, but is content by way of answer to follow St. Paul, in his reference to the unsearchableness of the Divine judgments (Contra Julianum, I, 48).

The same general lines have been followed by most of the modern attempts to account in terms of Theism for the existence of evil. Descartes and Malebranche held that the world is the best possible for the purpose for which it was created, i. e. for the manifestation of the attributes of God. If it had been more perfect in detail, it would have been less fitted as a whole for the attainment of this object. The relation of evil to the will of a perfectly benevolent Creator was elaborately treated by Leibniz, in answer to Bayle, who had insisted on the arguments derived from the existence of evil against that of a good and omnipotent God. Leibnitz founded his views mainly on those of St. Augustine and St. Thomas, and deduced from them his theory of Optimism (q. v.). According to it, the universe is the best possible; but metaphysical evil, or imperfection, is necessarily involved in its constitution, since it must be finite, and could not have been endowed with the infinite perfection which belongs to God alone. Moral and physical evil are due to the fall of man, but all evil is overruled by God to a good purpose. Moreover, the world with which we are acquainted is only a very small factor in the whole of creation, and it may be supposed that the evil it contains is necessary for the existence of other regions unknown to us. Voltaire, in "Candide", undertook to throw ridicule upon the idea of the "best possible world"; and it must be admitted that the theory is open to grave objections. On the one hand, it is scarcely consistent with belief in the Divine omnipotence; and on the other, it fails to account for the permission (or indirect authorship) of evil by a good God, to which Bayle had specially taken exception. We cannot know that this world is the best possible; and if it were, why, since it must include so much that is evil, should a perfectly good God have created it? It may be urged, moreover, that there can be no degree of finite goodness which is not susceptible of increase by omnipotence, without ceasing to fall short of infinite perfection.

Leibniz has been more or less closely followed by many who have since treated the subject from the Christian point of view. These have, for the most part, emphasized the evidence in creation of the wisdom and goodness of its Author, after the manner of the Book of Job, and have been content to leave undiscovered the reason for the creation, by Him, of a universe in which evil is unavoidable. Such was the view of King (Essay on the Origin of Evil, London, 1732), who insisted strongly on the doctrine of the best possible world; of Cudworth, who held that evil, though inseparable from the nature of imperfect beings, is largely a matter of men's own fancy and opinions, rather than of the reality of things, and therefore not to be made the ground of accusation against Divine Providence. Derham (Physico-Theology, London, 1712) took occasion from an examination of the excellence of creation to commend an attitude of humility and trust towards the Creator of "this elegant, this well-contrived, well-formed world, in which we find everything necessary for the sustentation, use and pleasure both of man and every other creature here below; as well as some whips, some rods, to scourge us for our sins". Priestley held a doctrine of absolute Determinism, and consequently attributed evil solely to the Divine will; which, however, he justified by the good ends which evil is providentially made to subserve (Doctrine of Philosophical Necessity, Birmingham, 1782). Clarke, again, called special attention to the evidence of method and design, which bear witness to the benevolence of the Creator, in the midst of apparent moral and physical disorder. Rosmini, closely following Malebranche, pointed out that the question of the possibility of a better world than this has really no meaning; any world created by God must be the best possible in relation to its special purpose, apart from which neither goodness nor badness can be predicated of it. Mamiani also supposed evil to be inseparable from the finite, but that it tended to disappear as the finite approached its final union with the infinite.

III. The third way of conceiving the place of evil in the general scheme of existence is that of those systems of Monism, by which evil is viewed as merely a mode in which certain aspects or moments of the development of nature are apprehended by human consciousness. In this view there is no distinctive principle to

which evil can be assigned, and its origin is one with that of nature as a whole. These systems reject the specific idea of creation; and the idea of God is either rigorously excluded, or identified with an impersonal principle, immanent in the universe, or conceived as a mere abstraction from the methods of nature; which, whether viewed from the standpoint of Materialism or from that of Idealism, is the one ultimate reality. The problem of the origin of evil is thus merged in that of the origin of being. Moral evil, in particular, arises from error, and is to be gradually eliminated, or at least minimized, by improved knowledge of the conditions of human welfare (Meliorism). Of this kind, on the whole, were the doctrines of the Ionic Hylozoists, whose fundamental notion was the essential unity of matter and life; and on the other hand, also, that of the Eleatics, who found the origin of all things in abstract being. The Atomists, Leucippus and Democritus, held what may be called a doctrine of materialistic Monism. This doctrine, however, found its first complete expression in the philosophy of Epicurus, which explicitly rejected the notion of any external influence upon nature, whether of "fate", or of Divine power. According to the Epicurean Lucretius (De Rerum Natura, II, line 180) the existence of evil was fatal to the supposition of the creation of the world by God:

Nequaquam nobis divinitus esse creatam
Naturam mundi, quæ tanta est prædita culpa.

Giordano Bruno made God the immanent cause of all things, acting by an internal necessity, and producing the relations considered evil by mankind. Hobbes regarded God as merely a corporeal first cause; and applying his theory of civil government to the universe, defended the existence of evil by simple assertion of the absolute power to which it is due—a theory which is little else than a statement of materialistic Determinism in terms of social relations. Spinoza united matter and spirit in the notion of a single substance, to which he attributed both thought and extension; error and imperfection were the necessary consequence of the order of the universe. The Hegelian Monism, which reproduces many of the ideas of Eckhart, and is adopted in its main features by many different systems of recent origin, gives to evil a place in the unfolding of the Idea, in which both the origin and the inner reality of the universe are to be found. Evil is the temporary discord between what is and what ought to be. Huxley was content to believe that the ultimate causes of things are at present unknown, and may be unknowable. Evil is to be known and combated in the concrete and in detail; but the Agnosticism professed, and named, by Huxley refuses to entertain any question as to transcendental causes, and confines itself to experimental facts. Haeckel advances a dogmatic materialism, in which substance (i. e. matter and force) appears as the eternal and infinite basis of all things. Professor Metchnikoff, on similar principles, places the cause of evil in the "disharmonies" which prevail in nature, and which he thinks may perhaps be ultimately removed, for the human race at least, together with the pessimistic temper arising from them, by the progress of science. Bourdeau has asserted in express terms the futility of seeking a transcendental or supernatural origin for evil, and the necessity of confining the view to natural, accessible, and determinable causes (Revue Philosophique, I, 1900).

The recently constructed system, or method, called Pragmatism, has this much in common with Pessimism, that it regards evil as an actually unavoidable part of that human experience which is in point of fact identical with truth and reality. The world is what we make it; evil tends to diminish with the growth of experience, and may finally vanish; though, on the other hand, there may always remain an irreducible minimum of evil. The origin of evil is, like the origin of all things, inexplicable; it cannot be fitted into any theory of the design of the universe, simply because no such theory is possible. "We cannot by any possibility comprehend the character of a cosmic mind whose purposes are fully revealed by the strange mixture of goods and evils that we find in this actual world's particulars—the mere word *design*, by itself, has no consequences and explains nothing." (James, Pragmatism, London, 1907. Cf. Schiller, Humanism, London, 1907.) Nietzsche holds evil to be purely relative, and in its moral aspect at least, a transitory and non-fundamental concept. With him, mankind in its present state, is "the animal not yet properly adapted to his environment". In this mode of thought the individual necessarily counts for comparatively little, as being merely a transient manifestation of the cosmic force; and the social aspects of humanity are those under which its pains and shortcomings are mostly considered, with a view to their amelioration. Hence, the various forms of Socialism; the idea conceived by Nietzsche of a totally new, though as yet undefined, form of social morality, and of the constitution and mutual relations of classes; and the so-called ethical and scientific religions inculcating morality as tending to the general good. The first example of such religions was that of Auguste Comte, who upon the materialistic basis of Positivism, founded the "religion of humanity", and professed to substitute an enthusiasm for humanity as the motive of right action, for the motives of supernatural religion.

In the light of Catholic doctrine, any theory that may be held concerning evil must include certain points bearing on the question that have been authoritatively defined. These points are (1) the omnipotence, omniscience, and absolute goodness of the Creator; (2) the freedom of the will; and (3) that suffering is the penal consequence of wilful disobedience to the law of God. A complete account may be gathered from the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas, by whom the principles of St. Augustine are systematized, and to some extent supplemented. Evil, according to St. Thomas, is a privation, or the absence of some good which belongs properly to the nature of the creature. (I, Q. xiv, a. 10; Q. xlix, a. 3; Contra Gentiles, III, ix, x). There is therefore no "summum malum", or positive source of evil, corresponding to the "summum bonum", which is God (I, Q. xlix, a. 3; C. G., III, 15; De Malo, I, 1); evil being not "ens reale" but only "ens rationis"—i. e. it exists not as an objective fact, but as a subjective conception; things are evil not in themselves, but by reason of their relation to other things, or persons. All realities (*entia*) are in themselves good; they produce bad results only incidentally; and consequently the ultimate cause of evil is fundamentally good, as well as the objects in which evil is found (I, Q. xlix; cf. I, Q. v, 3; De Malo, I, 3). Thus the Manichæan dualism has no foundation in reason.

Evil is threefold, viz., *malum naturæ* (metaphysical evil), *culpæ* (moral), and *pœnæ* (physical, the retributive consequence of *malum culpæ*) (I, Q. xlviii, a. 5, 6; Q. lxiii, a. 9; De Malo, I, 4). Its existence subserves the perfection of the whole; the universe would be less perfect if it contained no evil. Thus fire could not exist without the corruption of what it consumes; the lion must slay the ass in order to live; and if there were no wrongdoing, there would be no sphere for patience and justice (I, Q. xlviii, a. 2). God is said (as in Is., xlv) to be the author of evil in the sense that the corruption of material objects in nature is ordained by Him, as a means for carrying out the design of the universe; and on the other hand, the evil which exists as the consequence of the breach of Divine laws is in the same sense due to Divine appointment; the universe would be less perfect if its laws could be broken with impunity. Thus evil, in one aspect, i. e. as counter-balancing the deordination of sin, has the na-

ture of good (II, Q. ii, a. 19). But the evil of sin (*culpæ*), though permitted by God, is in no sense due to Him (I, Q. xlix, a. 2); its cause is the abuse of free will by angels and men (I-II, Q. lxxiii, a. 6; II-II, Q. x, a. 2; I-II, Q. ix, a. 3). It should be observed that the universal perfection to which evil in some form is necessary, is the perfection of *this* universe, not of *any* universe: metaphysical evil, that is to say, and indirectly, moral evil as well, is included in the design of the universe which is partially known to us; but we cannot say without denying the Divine omnipotence, that another equally perfect universe could not be created in which evil would have no place.

St. Thomas also provides explanations of what are now generally considered to be the two main difficulties of the subject, viz., the Divine permission of foreseen moral evil, and the question finally arising thence, why God chose to create anything at all. First, it is asked why God, foreseeing that His creatures would use the gift of free will for their own injury, did not either abstain from creating them, or in some way safeguard their free will from misuse, or else deny them the gift altogether? St. Thomas replies (C. G., II, xxviii) that God cannot change His mind, since the Divine will is free from the defect of weakness or mutability. Such mutability would, it should be remarked, be a defect in the Divine nature (and therefore impossible), because if God's purpose were made dependent on the foreseen free act of any creature, God would thereby sacrifice His own freedom, and would submit Himself to His creatures, thus abdicating His essential supremacy—a thing which is, of course, utterly inconceivable. Secondly, to the question why God should have chosen to create, when creation was in no way needful for His own perfection, St. Thomas answers that God's object in creating is Himself; He creates in order to manifest His own goodness, power, and wisdom, and is pleased with that reflection or similitude of Himself in which the goodness of creation consists. God's pleasure is the one supremely perfect motive for action, alike in God Himself and in His creatures; not because of any need, or inherent necessity, in the Divine nature (C. G., I, xxviii; II, xxiii), but because God is the source, centre, and object, of all existence. (I, Q. lxv, a. 2; cf. Prov., 26, and Conc. Vat., can. i, v; Const. Dogm., 1.) This is accordingly the sufficient reason for the existence of the universe, and even for the suffering which moral evil has introduced into it. God has not made the world primarily for man's good, but for His own pleasure; good for man lies in conforming himself to the supreme purpose of creation, and evil in departing from it (C. G., III, xvii, cxliv). It may further be understood from St. Thomas, that in the diversity of metaphysical evil, in which the perfection of the universe as a whole is embodied, God may see a certain similitude of His own threefold unity (cf. I, Q. xii); and again, that by permitting moral evil to exist He has provided a sphere for the manifestation of one aspect of His essential justice (cf. I, Q. lxv, a. 2; and I, Q. xxi, a. 1, 3).

It is obviously impossible to suggest a reason why this universe in particular should have been created rather than another; since we are necessarily incapable of forming an idea of any other universe than this. Similarly, we are unable to imagine why God chose to manifest Himself by the way of creation, instead of, or in addition to, the other ways, whatever they may be, by which He has, or may have, attained the same end. We reach here the utmost limit of speculation; and our inability to conceive the ultimate reason for creation (as distinct from its direct motive) is paralleled, at a much earlier stage of the enquiry, by the inability of the non-creationist schools of thought to assign any ultimate cause for the existence of the order of nature. It will be observed that St. Thomas's account of evil is a true Theodicy, taking into consideration as it does every factor of the problem, and leaving unsolved only the mystery of creation, before which all schools of thought are equally helpless. It is as impossible to know, in the fullest sense, *why* this world was made as to know *how* it was made; but St. Thomas has at least shown that the acts of the Creator admit of complete logical justification, notwithstanding the mystery in which, for human intelligence, they can never wholly cease to be involved. On Catholic principles, the amelioration of moral evil and its consequent suffering can only take place by means of individual reformation, and not so much through increase of knowledge as through stimulation or re-direction of the will. But since all methods of social improvement that have any value must necessarily represent a nearer approach to conformity with Divine laws, they are welcomed and furthered by the Church, as tending, at least indirectly, to accomplish the purpose for which she exists.

For ancient views of evil, see: Histories of philosophy by ZELLER and UEBERWEG; DARMESTETER AND MILLS, *The Zend-Avesta* (London, 1887); MONIER-WILLIAMS, *Buddhism, Brahmanism and Hinduism* (London, 1889); ALZOG, *Univ. Church Hist.* (Dublin, 1900); COPLESTON, *Buddhism* (London, 1908), 2nd ed.

Modern writers: MALEBRANCHE, *Entrétiens sur la metaphysique* (Paris, 1688, tr., London, 1712); JOACHIM, *Ethics of Spinoza* (Oxford, 1901); LEIBNITZ, *Théodicée* (Paris, 1846, etc.); CUDWORTH, *Intellectual system of the universe* (London, 1678, 1845); RAY, *Three Physico-theol. Discourses* (London, 1721); SCHOPENHAUER, *The World as Will and Idea*, tr. HALDANE AND KEMP (London, 1906); HARTMANN, *Philosophy of the Unconscious*, tr. COUPLAND (London, 1893); SULLY, *Pessimism* (London, 1901); CARO, *Le Pessimisme au XIX^e siécle* (Paris, 1878); WENLEY, *Aspects of Pessimism* (London and Edinburgh, 1894); HUXLEY, *Essays and Lectures* (London, 1902); HAECKEL, *Riddle of the Universe*, tr. (London, 1904); METCHNIKOFF, *The Nature of Man*, and *Prolongation of Life*, tr. (London, 1904 and 1908); CARUS, *The Religion of Science* (Chicago, 1899); NIETZSCHE, *Beyond Good and Evil*, tr. (London, 1907); MAMIANI, *Confessioni di un Metafisico* (Turin, 1865); RENOUVIER, *Nouvelle Monadologie* (Paris, 1907).

Catholic writers, besides those already referred to: MIGNE in *Encycl. Theol.*, XXXV, s. v. *mal* (Paris, 1851); ROSMINI, *Theodicy*, tr. (London, 1886); BILLOT, *De Deo Trino et Uno* (Rome, 1900); REINSTADLER, *Elem. Phil. Schol.* (Freiburg, 1904); MERCIER, *Cours de Philosophie* (Louvain, 1905), II; R. F. CLARKE, *The existence of God; a Dialogue* (London, 1887); BOEDDER, *Natural Theology*, tr. (New York, 1901); J. RICKABY, *Moral Phil.* (London, 1903), chap. 6; IDEM, *Evil and Necessity* in *Month* (London, Nov., 1898); SMITH, *The Problem of Evil* (London, 1906).

A. B. SHARPE.

Evodius, first Bishop of Antioch after St. Peter. Eusebius mentions him thus in his "History": "And Evodius having been established the first [bishop] of the Antiochians, Ignatius flourished at this time" (III, 22). The time referred to is that of Clement of Rome and Trajan, of whom Eusebius has just spoken. Harnack has shown (after discarding an earlier theory of his own) that Eusebius possessed a list of the bishops of Antioch which did not give their dates, and that he was obliged to synchronize them roughly with the popes. It seems certain that he took the three episcopal lists of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch from the "Chronography" which Julius Africanus published in 221. The "Chronicle of Eusebius" is lost; but in Jerome's translation of it we find in three successive years the three entries (1) that Peter, having founded the Church of Antioch, is sent to Rome, where he perseveres as bishop for 25 years; (2) that Mark, the interpreter of Peter, preaches Christ in Egypt and Alexandria; and (3) that Evodius is ordained first Bishop of Antioch. This last year is given as Claudius III by the Codex Freherianus, but by the fifth-century Bodleian Codex (not used in Schoene's edition) and the rest as Claudius IV (A. D. 44). The Armenian translation has Claudius II. We have no mention of Evodius earlier than that by Africanus; but the latter is confirmed by his contemporary, Origen, who calls Ignatius the second bishop after Peter (Hom. IV, in Luc., III, 938A). It is curious that the ordination of Evodius should not have been given in the "Chronography" in the same year as the founding of the Antiochian Church by Peter, and Hort supposed that the three entries must have belonged to a single year in

Eusebius. But the evidence is not in favour of this simplification. The year of the accession of Ignatius, that is of the death of Evodius, was unknown to Eusebius, for he merely places it in the "Chronicle" together with the death of Peter and the accession of Linus at Rome (Nero 14–68), while in the "History" he mentions it at the beginning of Trajan's reign.

The fame of Ignatius has caused later writers, such as Athanasius and Chrysostom, to speak of him as though he were the immediate successor of the Apostles. Jerome (De viris ill., 16) and Socrates (H. E., VI, 8) call him the "third" bishop after St. Peter; but this is only because they illogically include Peter among his own successors. Theodoret and Pseudo-Ignatius represent Ignatius as consecrated by Peter. The difficulty which thus arose about Evodius was solved in the Apostolical Constitutions by stating that Evodius was ordained by Peter and Ignatius by Paul. The Byzantine chronographer, John Malalas (X, 252), relates that as Peter went to Rome, and passed through the great city of Antioch, it happened that Evodus (*sic*), the bishop and patriarch, died, and Ignatius succeeded him; he attributes to Evodius the invention of the name Christian. Salmon does not seem to be justified in supposing that Malalas ascribes any of this information to Theophilus, the second-century Bishop of Antioch. We may be sure that Evodius is an historical personage, and really the predecessor of St. Ignatius. But the dates of his ordination and death are quite uncertain. No early witness makes him a martyr.

The Greeks commemorate together "Evodus" and Onesiphorus (II Tim., i, 16) as of the seventy disciples and as martyrs on 29 April, and also on 7 Sept. Evodius was unknown to the earlier Western martyrologies the Hieronymian, and those of Bede and Florus; but Ado introduced him into the so-called "Martyrologium Romanum parvum" (which he forged not long before 860) and into his own work, on 6 May. His source was Pseudo-Ignatius, whom he quotes in the "Libellus de fest. Apost.", prefixed to the martyrology proper. From him the notice came to Usuard and the rest, and to the present Roman Martyrology.

Acta SS., 6 May; SALMON in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.; HARNACK, *Gesch. der Altchr. Litt.*, I, 781, II, s. v. *Chronol.* part I, esp. 116–122; QUENTIN, *Les Martyrologes historiques* (1908). NICEPHORUS CALLISTI (II, 3), attributes writings to EVODIUS, of which one was called Φῶς, *The Light;* in it was stated that three years elapsed from the Baptism of Christ until His Passion, and seven years more until the stoning of Stephen. A *Sermon* is attributed to him in a Coptic papyrus published by ROSSI in *Memorie della R. Acad. delle Scienze di Torino*, Series II, XLII, 1892). See HARNACK, I, loc. cit.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

Evolution.—This subject will here receive a twofold treatment, as follows: A. The Theory Broadly Considered, and the Catholic Attitude in its Regard; B. Its History and Scientific Foundations.

A. ATTITUDE OF CATHOLICS TOWARDS THE THEORY.—One of the most important questions for every educated Catholic of to-day is: What is to be thought of the theory of evolution? Is it to be rejected as unfounded and inimical to Christianity, or is it to be accepted as an established theory altogether compatible with the principles of a Christian conception of the universe? We must carefully distinguish between the different meanings of the words *theory of evolution* in order to give a clear and correct answer to this question. We must distinguish (1) between the theory of evolution as a scientific hypothesis and as a philosophical speculation; (2) between the theory of evolution as based on theistic principles and as based on a materialistic and atheistic foundation; (3) between the theory of evolution and Darwinism; (4) between the theory of evolution as applied to the vegetable and animal kingdoms and as applied to man.

(1) As a scientific hypothesis, the theory of evolution seeks to determine the historical succession of the various species of plants and of animals on our earth; and, with the aid of palæontology and other sciences, such as comparative morphology, embryology, and bionomy, to show how in the course of the different geological epochs they gradually evolve from their beginnings by purely natural causes of specific development. The theory of evolution, then, as a scientific hypothesis, does not consider the present species of plants and of animals as forms directly created by God, but as the final result of an evolution from other species existing in former geological periods. Hence it is called "the theory of evolution", or "the theory of descent", since it implies the descent of the present from extinct species. This theory is opposed to the theory of constancy, which assumes the immutability of organic species. The scientific theory of evolution, therefore, does not concern itself with the origin of life. It merely inquires into the genetic relations of systematic species, genera, and families, and endeavours to arrange them according to natural series of descent (genetic trees).

How far is the theory of evolution based on observed facts? It is understood to be still only an hypothesis. The formation of new species is directly observed in but a few cases, and only with reference to such forms as are closely related to each other; for instance, the systematic species of the plant-genus Œnothera, and of the beetle-genus Dinarda. It is, however, not difficult to furnish an indirect proof of great probability for the genetic relation of many systematic species to each other and to fossil forms, as in the genetic development of the horse (Equidæ), of ammonites, and of many insects, especially of those that dwell as "guests" with ants and termites, and have adapted themselves in many ways to their hosts. Upon comparing the scientific proofs for the probability of the theory of evolution, we find that they grow the more numerous and weighty, the smaller the circle of forms under consideration, but become weaker and weaker, if we include a greater number of forms, such as are comprised in a class or in a sub-kingdom. There is, in fact, no evidence whatever for the common genetic descent of all plants and animals from a single primitive organism. Hence the greater number of botanists and zoologists regard a polygenetic (polyphyletic) evolution as much more acceptable than a monogenetic (monophyletic). At present, however, it is impossible to decide how many independent genetic series must be assumed in the animal and vegetable kingdoms. This is the gist of the theory of evolution as a scientific hypothesis. It is in perfect agreement with the Christian conception of the universe; for Scripture does not tell us in what form the present species of plants and of animals were originally created by God. As early as 1877 Knabenbauer stated "that there is no objection, so far as faith is concerned, to assuming the descent of all plant and animal species from a few types" (Stimmen aus Maria Laach, XIII, p. 72).

Passing now to the theory of evolution as a philosophical speculation, the history of the plant and animal kingdoms upon our globe is but a small part of the history of the entire earth. Similarly, the geological development of our earth constitutes but a small part of the history of the solar system and of the universe. The theory of evolution as a philosophical conception considers the entire history of the cosmos as an harmonious development, brought about by natural laws. This conception is in agreement with the Christian view of the universe. God is the Creator of heaven and earth. If God produced the universe by a single creative act of His will, then its natural development by laws implanted in it by the Creator is to the greater glory of His Divine power and wisdom. St. Thomas says: "The potency of a cause is the greater, the more remote the effects to which it extends" (Summa c. Gent., III, c. lxxvii); and Suarez: "God does not inter-

fere directly with the natural order, where secondary causes suffice to produce the intended effect" (De opere sex dierum, II, c. x, n. 13). In the light of this principle of the Christian interpretation of nature, the history of the animal and vegetable kingdoms on our planet is, as it were, a versicle in a volume of a million pages in which the natural development of the cosmos is described, and upon whose title-page is written: "In the beginning God created heaven and earth."

(2) The theory of evolution just stated rests on a theistic foundation. In contradistinction to this is another theory resting on a materialistic and atheistic basis, the first principle of which is the denial of a personal Creator. This atheistic theory of evolution is ineffectual to account for the first beginning of the cosmos or for the law of its evolution, since it acknowledges neither creator nor lawgiver. Natural science, moreover, has proved that spontaneous generation—i. e. the independent genesis of a living being from non-living matter—contradicts the facts of observation. For this reason the theistic theory of evolution postulates an intervention on the part of the Creator in the production of the first organisms. When and how the first seeds of life were implanted in matter, we, indeed, do not know. The Christian theory of evolution also demands a creative act for the origin of the human soul, since the soul cannot have its origin in matter. The atheistic theory of evolution, on the contrary, rejects the assumption of a soul separate from matter, and thereby sinks into blank materialism.

(3) Darwinism and the theory of evolution are by no means equivalent conceptions. The theory of evolution was propounded before Charles Darwin's time, by Lamarck (1809) and Geoffroy de Saint-Hilaire. Darwin, in 1859, gave it a new form by endeavouring to explain the origin of species by means of natural selection. According to this theory the breeding of new species depends on the survival of the fittest in the struggle for existence. The Darwinian theory of selection is Darwinism—adhering to the narrower, and accurate, sense of the word. As a theory, it is scientifically inadequate, since it does not account for the origin of attributes fitted to the purpose, which must be referred back to the interior, original causes of evolution. Haeckel, with other materialists, has enlarged this selection theory of Darwin's into a philosophical world-idea, by attempting to account for the whole evolution of the cosmos by means of the chance survival of the fittest. This theory is Darwinism in the secondary, and wider, sense of the word. It is that atheistical form of the theory of evolution which was shown above—under (2)—to be untenable. The third signification of the term *Darwinism* arose from the application of the theory of selection to man, which is likewise impossible of acceptance. In the fourth place, *Darwinism* frequently stands, in popular usage, for the theory of evolution in general. This use of the word rests on an evident confusion of ideas, and must therefore be set aside.

(4) To what extent is the theory of evolution applicable to man?—That God should have made use of natural, evolutionary, original causes in the production of man's body, is *per se* not improbable, and was propounded by St. Augustine (see AUGUSTINE OF HIPPO, SAINT, under V. *Augustinism in History*). The actual proofs of the descent of man's body from animals is, however, inadequate, especially in respect to palæontology. And the human soul could not have been derived through natural evolution from that of the brute, since it is of a spiritual nature; for which reason we must refer its origin to a creative act on the part of God.

For a thorough exposition, WASMANN, *Modern Biology and the Theory of Evolution* (Freiburg im Br., 1904). Of the older literature, MIVART, *On the Genesis of Species* (London and New York, 1871).

E. WASMANN.

B. HISTORY AND SCIENTIFIC FOUNDATIONS.—The world of organisms comprises a great system of individual forms, generally classified according to structural resemblances into kingdoms, classes, orders, families, genera, species. The species is considered as the unit of the system. It is designated by a double name, the first of which indicates the genus, e. g. *canis familiaris*, the dog, and *canis lupus*, the wolf. Comparing the species of the present day with their fossil representatives in the geological layers, we find that they differ from one another the more the farther we retrace the geological record. To explain this remarkable fact two theories have been proposed, the one maintaining the stability and special creation of species, the other the instability and evolution, or genetic relation, of species. As is plain from the preceding section of this article, the principal difference between the two theories consists in this: that the theory of evolution derives the species of to-day by a progressive development from one or more primitive types, whilst the theory of constancy insists upon the special creation of each true species. It is generally admitted that the determination of specific forms depends largely on the subjective views and experience of the naturalist.

We shall here confine our attention to the history and scientific foundations of the biological theory of evolution, leaving all purely philosophical and theological discussions to others. The entire subject will here be divided into the following parts: I. HISTORY OF THE SCIENTIFIC THEORIES OF EVOLUTION; II. DEFINITION OF SPECIES; III. VARIABILITY AND EXPERIMENTAL FACTS RELATING TO THE EVOLUTION OF SPECIES; IV. THE PALÆONTOLOGICAL ARGUMENT; V. THE MORPHOLOGICAL ARGUMENT; VI. THE ONTOGENETIC ARGUMENT; VII. THE BIOGEOGRAPHICAL ARGUMENT.

Before we begin, we wish to remind the reader of the important distinction brought out in the preceding essay, that the general theory referring to the mere fact of evolution must be well distinguished from all special theories which attempt to explain the assumed fact by ascribing it to certain causes, such as natural selection, the influence of environment, and the like. In other words, an evolutionist—that is, a defender of the general scientific theory of evolution—is not *eo ipso* a Darwinian, or a Lamarckian, or an adherent of any special evolutionary system. No less important are the other definitions and distinctions emphasized above under A.

I. HISTORY OF THE SCIENTIFIC THEORIES OF EVOLUTION.—The historical development of the scientific theories of evolution may be divided into three periods. The main figure of the first period is Lamarck. The period ends with an almost complete victory of the theory of constancy (1830). The second period commences with Darwin's "Origin of Species" (1859). The idea of evolution, and in particular Darwin's theory of natural selection, enters into every department of the biological sciences and to a great extent transforms them. The third period is a time of critical reaction. Natural selection is generally considered as insufficient to explain the origin of new characters, while the ideas of Lamarck and G. Saint-Hilaire become prevalent. Besides, the theory of evolution is tested experimentally. Typical representatives of the period are Bateson, Hugo de Vries, Morgan.

First Period.—Linnæus based his important "Systema naturæ" on the principle of the constancy and special creation of every species—"Species tot numeramus quot diversæ formæ in principio sunt creatæ" ("Philosophia botanica", Stockholm, 1751, p. 99). For, "contemplating the works of God, it is plain to every one that organisms produce offspring perfectly similar to the parents" ("Systema", Leipzig, 1748, p. 21). Linnæus had a vast influence upon the naturalists of his time. Thus his principle of the con-

stancy of species was universally acknowledged, and this all the more because it seemed to be connected with the first chapter of the Bible. Georges Louis Leclerc Buffon (1707–88), the "suggestive" author of the "Histoire naturelle générale et particulière", was the first to dispute the Linnæan dogma on scientific grounds. Till 1761 he had defended the theory of constancy, but he then became an extreme evolutionist, and finally held that through the direct influence of environment species could undergo manifold modifications of structure. Similar views were expressed by the German Gottfried Reinhold Treviranus in his work "Biologie oder Philosophie der lebenden Natur" (1802), and by "the poet of evolution", J. W. Goethe (1749–1832). However, none of these men worked out the details of a definite theory. The same must be said of the grandfather of Charles Darwin, Erasmus Darwin (1731–1802), physician, poet, and naturalist, the first who seems to have anticipated Lamarck's main views. "All animals undergo transformations which are in part produced by their own exertions in response to pleasures and pains, and many of these acquired forms and propensities are transmitted to their posterity" (Zoonomia, 1794). Jean-Baptiste de Lamarck (b. 1744) was the scientific founder of the modern theory of evolution and its special form, known as Lamarckism. At the age of forty-nine Lamarck was elected professor of invertebrate zoology at the Jardin des Plantes (Paris). In 1819 he became completely blind, and died ten years later in great poverty and neglected by his contemporaries, socially and scientifically. The main ideas of his theory are contained in his "Philosophie zoologique" (1809) and his "Histoire des animaux sans vertèbres" (1816–22). Lamarck disputes the immutability of specific characters, and denies that there is any objective criterion for determining, with any degree of accuracy, which forms ought to be considered as true species. Consequently, according to him, the name *species* has only a relative value. It refers to a collection of similar individuals "que la génération perpétue dans le même état tant que les circonstances de leur situation ne changent pas assez pour fair varier leurs habitudes, leur caractère et leur forme" (Phil. zool., I, p. 75). But how are species transformed into new species? As to plants, Lamarck believes that all changes of structure and function are due to the direct influence of environment. In animals the changed conditions of the environment first call forth new wants and new activities. New habits and instincts will be produced, and through use and disuse organs may be strengthened or weakened, newly adapted to the requirements of new functions, or made to disappear. The acquired changes are handed down to the offspring by the strong principle of inheritance. Thus the web in the feet of water birds was acquired through use, while the so-called rudimentary organs, e. g. the teeth of the baleen whale, the small eyes of the mole, were reduced to their imperfect condition through disuse. Lamarck did not include the origin of man in his system. He expressed his belief in abiogenesis, but he maintained at the same time that "rien n'existe que par la volonté du sublime Auteur de toutes choses" (Phil. zool., I, p. 56).

Lamarck's theory was not sufficiently supported by facts. Besides, it offered no satisfactory explanation of the origin and development of new organs, though he did not ascribe the effect to a mere wish of the animal. Finally, he offered no proof whatever for his position that acquired characters are inherited. Lamarck had very little influence upon his own time. Shortly after his death the famous discussion took place between Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire and Cuvier. As professor of vertebrate zoology Saint-Hilaire (1772–1844) had long been the colleague of Lamarck. Saint-Hilaire held the mutability of species, but ascribed the main influence in its evolution to the "monde ambiant". Besides, in order to account for the discontinuity of species, he imagined that the environment could produce sudden changes in the specific characters of the embryo (Philosophie anatomique, 1818). In 1830 G. Saint-Hilaire presented to the French Academy of Sciences his doctrine of the universal unity of plan and composition in the animal kingdom. Cuvier opposed it with his celebrated theory of the four "embranchements", and showed that his adversary had mistaken resemblance for unity. Cuvier brought convincing facts in support of his attitude; Saint-Hilaire did not. That settled the issue. The theory of evolution was officially abandoned. Naturalists left speculation and returned for a few decades to an almost exclusive study of positive facts. A single writer of some celebrity, Bory de Saint-Vincent (1780–1846), took up Lamarck's doctrines, but not without modifying them by insisting upon the final constancy of specific characters through heredity. Isidore Saint-Hilaire (1805–61), who shared the views of his father concerning environment and heredity, defended a very moderate theory of evolution. He assumed a limited variability of species according to the variability of the environment.

Second Period.—Charles Robert Darwin's book, on the "Origin of Species by means of natural selection or the preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life", published 24 November, 1859, marks a new epoch in the history of the evolution idea. Though the principal factors of Darwin's theory, namely "struggle, variation, selection", had been enunciated by others, it was mainly Darwin who first combined them into a system which he tried to support by an extensive empirical foundation. Assisted by a number of influential friends, he succeeded in obtaining an almost universal acknowledgment for the general theory of evolution, though his special theory of natural selection gradually lost much of the significance attached to it, especially by Darwin's extreme followers. Charles Robert Darwin was born at Shrewsbury, 12 February, 1809. From 1831–36 he accompanied as naturalist an English scientific expedition to South America. In 1842 he retired to his villa at Down in Kent, where he wrote his numerous works. He died on 19 April, 1882, and was buried in Westminster Abbey a few feet from the grave of Newton. Biogeographical observations on his voyage to South America led Darwin to abandon the theory of special creation. "I had been deeply impressed", he says in his Autobiography, "by discovering in the Pampean formation great fossil animals covered with armour like that on the existing armadillos; secondly by the manner in which closely allied animals replace one another in proceeding southward over the continent; and thirdly by the South American character of most of the productions of the Galapagos archipelago and more especially by the manner in which they differ slightly on each island of the group. . . . It was evident that such facts could only be explained on the supposition that species gradually became modified." In order to account for the transformation, Darwin began with a systematic study of numerous facts referring to domesticated animals and cultivated plants. This was in July, 1837. He soon perceived that selection was the keystone of man's success in making useful races, namely, by breeding only from useful variations. But it remained a mystery to him how selections could be applied to organisms living in nature. In October, 1838, Darwin read Malthus's "Essay on Population" and understood at once that in the struggle for existence described by Malthus "favourable variations would tend to be preserved and unfavourable ones to be destroyed, and that the result of this selection or survival would be the formation of new species". The struggle itself appeared to him as a necessary consequence of the high rate at which organic beings tend to increase. The result of the selec-

tion—that is the survival of the fittest variations—was supposed to be transmitted and accumulated through the principle of inheritance. In this manner Darwin defined and tried to establish the theory of natural selection. Long after he had come to Down he added an important complement to it. The formation of new species implies that organic beings tend to diverge in character as they become modified. But how could this be explained? Darwin answered: Because the modified offspring of all dominant and increasing forms tend to become adapted to many and highly diversified places in the economy of nature. In short, according to Darwin, species are continuously transformed "by the preservation of such variations as arise and are beneficial to the being under its conditions of life", that is, by the survival of the fittest, which is to be considered "not the exclusive", but the "most important means of modification".



CHARLES DARWIN

As his studies and observations progressed, Darwin lost his almost exclusive belief in his own theory, as he held it in 1859, and gradually adopted, at least as secondary causes in the origin of species, the Lamarck factor of the inheritance of the effects of use and disuse and the Buffon factor of the direct action of the environment, especially in case of the geographical isolation of species. As to the human species, Darwin was, as early as 1837 or 1838, of the opinion that it was likewise no special creation, but a product of evolutionary processes. The numerous facts which, according to Darwin, might be adapted to substantiate his views are contained in his work, "The Descent of Man" (1871). As a supplementary work to "The Origin of Species", Darwin published, in 1868, "The Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication", which contains many valuable facts and theoretical discussions concerning variation and heredity. The principle of natural selection is certainly a very useful factor in removing variations not well adapted to their surroundings, but the action is merely negative. The main point (that is the origin and teleological development of useful variations) is left untouched by the theory, as Darwin himself has indicated. Moreover, no proof is brought forward that variations must accumulate in the same direction and that the result must be a higher form of organization. On the contrary, as we shall point out below, the experimental evidence of the post-Darwinian period has failed to substantiate Darwin's claim. It is, however, well to note that Darwin did not wish to ascribe the origin and survival of useful variations to chance. That word, he declares, is a wholly incorrect expression which merely serves to acknowledge plainly our ignorance of the cause of each particular variation. Later on, it is true, he seems to have abandoned the idea of design. "The old argument", he says in his "Autobiography" (1876) . . . "fails, now that the law of natural selection has been discovered." Similarly, his belief in the existence of God, which was strong in him when he wrote the "Origin", seems to have vanished from his mind in the course of years. In 1874 he confessed: "I for one must be content to remain Agnostic".

Of the numerous friends of Darwin who contributed so much to the development and spread of his theories, we mention in the first place Alfred Russel Wallace, whose essay on natural selection was read before the Linnæan Society, in London, 1 July, 1858, together with Darwin's first essay on the subject. The main work of Wallace, "Darwinism, an Exposition of the Theory of Natural Selection with Some of its Applications" (1889), "treats the problem of the origin of species on the same general lines as were adopted by Darwin; but from the standpoint reached after nearly 30 years of discussion." In fact the book is a defence of pure Darwinism. Wallace, too, assumed the animal origin of man's bodily structure, but, contrary to Darwin, he ascribed the origin of man's "intellectual and moral faculties to the unseen Universe of spirit" (Darwinism). Thomas H. Huxley (1825–1895) was one of the most strenuous defenders of Darwin's views; his book on "Man's Place in Nature" (1863) is a defence of man's "Oneness with the brutes in structure and in substance". Besides Wallace and Huxley, there were the geologist Sir Charles Lyell, the zoologist Sir John Lubbock, and the botanists Asa Gray and J. D. Hooker, who supported Darwin's theory almost from the beginning. Quatrefages and Dana accepted it in part, but declared that there were no arguments in favour of the animal origin of man. Spencer's views are not very much different from those of Darwin's later years. Natural selection is more aptly called by him "the survival of the fittest" ("Principles of Biology", 1898, I, p. 530). Trying to harmonize the Lamarckian and Darwinian factors of evolution, he was among the first to defend the so-called neo-Lamarckian theory, which insists upon the direct influence of the environment and the inheritance of newly acquired characters.

Before we enter upon the last phase in the development of the evolution idea, it is necessary to devote some space to the extreme defenders of Darwinism in Germany. Ernst Haeckel, of Jena, is in some sense the founder of the science of phylogeny, which seeks at least by way of hypothesis, to determine the genetic relation of past and present species. In 1868 Darwin wrote to Haeckel: "Your boldness makes me sometimes tremble". This refers especially to the phylogeny, which is in fact an aprioristic structure often contradicted, and at almost no point supported, by experiment and observation. The tetrahedral carbon atom is, according to Haeckel, the external fountain head of all organic life. Through abiogenesis certain most primitive organisms are said to have been formed, such as "moners", which Haeckel described as unicellular beings without structure and without any nuclear differentiation. During ages of unknown duration these simple masses of protoplasm have been

evolved into higher plants and animals, man included. As one of his main arguments, Haeckel refers to the so-called "biogenetic law of development". The supposed law maintains that ontogeny is a short and rapid repetition of phylogeny, that is, the stages in the individual development of an organism correspond more or less to the stages which the species passed through in their evolution. The causes of development are, according to Haeckel, the same as were proposed by Darwin and by Lamarck; but Haeckel denies the existence of God and rejects the idea of teleology.

Our leading scientists do not care to support the unfounded generalities of Haeckel's doctrines. They have even, most severely, but justly, censured Haeckel's scientific methods, mainly his frauds, his want of distinction between fact and hypothesis, his neglect to correct wrong statements, his disregard of facts not agreeing with his aprioristic conceptions and his unacquaintance with history, physics, and even modern biology. They have also pointed out that the biogenetic law of development is by no means a trustworthy guide in retracing the phylogenetic succession of species, and that many other theories suggested by Haeckel are without foundation. But above all we must reject Haeckel's popular writings because they contain numerous errors of every kind, and ridicule in a shameful manner the most sacred convictions and moral principles of Christianity. It is a sad fact, that especially through the influence of "Die Welträtsel" great harm was done to religion and morality, especially in Germany and in the English-speaking countries.

The present leader of extreme Darwinism is August Weismann of Freiburg (Vorträge über Descendenztheorie, 2d ed., 1904), the energetic opponent of Lamarck's idea that acquired characters are inherited. According to Weismann, every individual and specific character which may be transmitted by heredity is preformed and prearranged in the architecture of certain ultra-microscopical particles composing the chromatin of the germ-cells. On account of qualitative differences the various groups of these ultimate particles or "biophores" have a different power of assimilation. Besides, they are present in different numbers. In consequence thereof an intracellular struggle for existence will arise, especially after the germ-cells are united in fertilization. The outcome of the struggle will be that the weaker particles always or at times succumb. Thus the principle of the survival of the fittest is transferred to the germ-cells. Weismann, moreover, admits an indirect influence of the environment upon the germ-cells. In order to account for the facts of regeneration and reorganization established by Driesch, Morgan, and others, Weismann appeals at times to unknown forces of vital affinities, without, however, dismissing his thoroughly materialistic and antiteleological suppositions. It will be superfluous to add that Weismann's theory is a mere hypothesis whose foundation can probably never be controlled by observation and experiment. But it must be acknowledged that Weismann was among the first to point out the intrinsic connexion between the evolution of species and the science of the cell. As extreme scientific opponents of Darwinism and evolution we mention above all the botanist Albert Wiegand and the zoologist and palæontologist Louis Agassiz, the well-known adversary of Asa Gray. These men produced many an excellent argument against the extreme defenders of pure Darwinism, but, probably by attending too much to the exceedingly weak foundations of the current theory of the general development by small changes, they rejected evolution almost entirely. The most recent representative of such extreme views is the zoologist Albert Fleischmann, who has become a complete scientific agnostic.

Third Period.—The third period in the history of the biological evolution theory has only in recent years assumed the form which marks it as a new epoch. Its path was prepared by the fact that two classes of naturalists had in course of time been drawing nearer to one another. On the one hand were those whose work was merely critical, by discriminating clearly between Darwinism and evolution, and on the other hand those who gave their undivided attention to the work of experimental investigation. Only in recent years have the two classes joined hands and, in men like de Vries, Bateson, Morgan, have gained very efficient assistance. At the present time the greatest importance is laid on the explanation of the gaps in species, on the adaptation of organisms to environment, and on the inheritance of characters thus acquired, and above all on the idea of the segregation and the independence of biological characters, as was pointed out almost fifty years ago by Gregor Johann Mendel.

As far back as 1865, K. von Nägeli decided in favour of the general theory of evolution and against Darwinism. According to him progressive evolution required intrinsic laws of development, which, however, as he added, were to be sought for in molecular forces. Natural selection alone could only eliminate, that is to say, could only explain the survival of the more useful, but not its origin. Like Spencer, Nägeli was a determined precursor of neo-Lamarckism. This theory, which is now defended by many evolutionists, attempts to reconcile Lamarck's principle of the use and disuse of organs with Saint-Hilaire's theory of the influence of external circumstances. There are many evolutionists, such as Th. Eimer, Packard, Cunningham, Cope, who defend this view. However, the experimental evidence for the foundation of neo-Lamarckism—namely, the inheritance of acquired characters—is still wanting, or at least strongly debated. Nägeli's most important work, "Mechanisch-physiologische Theorie der Abstammungslehre", appeared in 1884. The embryologist K. E. von Baer, who did not share the antiteleological views of Nägeli, opposed no less energetically Darwin's theory of natural selection, because, as he argued, that theory does not explain teleology and correlation, and is at the same time in contradiction to the persistence of species and varieties. He also vigorously controverted Haeckel's system, especially his biogenetic law of development. But he maintained the transformation of species within certain limits through the agency of gradual and sudden changes. This leads us to the theory of saltatory evolution which is to-day most strongly defended by Bateson, de Vries and others. Some of the first scientific expositors of this view were R. von Kölliker and St. George Mivart. In his work "On the Genesis of Species" (1871) Mivart proposed a number of convincing arguments against the opinion of the power of natural selection as a prevailing factor. According to him species are suddenly born and originate by some innate force, which works orderly and with design. Mivart concedes that external conditions play an important part in stimulating, evoking, and in some way determining evolutionary processes. But the transformation of species will mainly, if not exclusively, be produced by some constitutional affection of the generative system of the parental forms, an hypothesis which Mivart would extend also to the first genesis of the body of man. Hugo de Vries (Die Mutationstheorie, 1901–03) is, with Bateson, Reinke, and Morgan, a typical representative of the exponents of the modern theory of saltatory evolution. He first endeavoured to show experimentally that new species cannot arise by selection. Then he attempted to demonstrate the origin of new forms by saltatory evolution. The principal illustration to establish his theory of "mutation" was the large flower, evening primrose (*Œnothera Lamarckiana*). Th. H. Morgan ("Evolution and Adaptation", 1903) summarizes this view as follows: "If we suppose that new mutations and

'definitely' inherited variations suddenly appear, some of which will find an environment to which they are more or less well fitted, we can see how evolution may have gone on without assuming new species to have been formed through a process of competition. Nature's supreme test is survival. She makes new forms to bring them to this test through mutation and does not remodel old forms through a process of individual selection." We shall see that de Vries overrated the importance of his experiments. Still it is not to be denied that he has become through his method a master for the experimental investigation of the problems of evolution. Of especial value is his analysis of the concept of species, though probably his greatest service is the rediscovery of Mendel's laws and their introduction into the realm of biological investigations.



HUGO DE VRIES

The earliest forerunners of Mendel were the first scientific hybridists J. G. Köhlreuter (1733–1806) and T. A. Knight (1758–1838). Köhlreuter's results are of special interest because, through the repeated crossing of a hybrid with the pollen or ovules of one of the parents, forms appeared which more and more reverted to the characteristics of the respective parent. K. F. von Gärtner (1772–1850) was the most prolific writer on hybridism of his time, though he did not surpass Köhlreuter as to the positive results of his experimental research. C. Naudin's essay on the hybridity in plants (1862) represented a considerable advance. The author pointed out that the facts of the reversion of the hybrids to the specific forms of their parents, when repeatedly crossed with the latter, are naturally explained by the hypothesis of the segregation of the two specific essences in the pollen grains and ovules of the hybrids (Leck). This formed in after years no small part of Mendel's discovery, which is indeed one of the most brilliant results of experimental investigation.

Gregor Mendel was born 22 July, 1822, at Heinzendorf near Odrau (Austrian Silesia). After finishing his studies he entered, in 1843, the Augustinian monastery at Brünn. Having been for fourteen years professor of the natural sciences, he was elected abbot of the monastery in 1868, and died in January, 1884. Mendel's celebrated memoir, "Versuche über Pflanzenhybriden", appeared in 1865, but attracted little attention, and remained unknown and forgotten till 1900. It was based on experiments that had been carried out during the course of eight years on more than 10,000 plants. The principal result of these experiments was the recognition that the peculiarities of organisms produced entities independent of one another, so that they can be joined and separated in a regular way. As we have said above, H. de Vries was the first to recognize the value of Mendel's paper. Other investigators who have taken up the same line of work are Correns, Tschermak, Morgan, and, most of all, Bateson, the principal founder of "Mendelism", or the science of genetics.

II. DEFINITION OF SPECIES.—Before Linnæus's time genera were considered to be the units of the plant and animal kingdoms, and it was assumed these had been created by God, while the species were descended from them. By the *nomen specificum* was understood the more or less short description by which Tournefort and his contemporaries distinguished the various species of genera. Linnæus introduced the binomial system establishing the species as the unit of the organic world. There are as many species as there were different forms created in the beginning. The same theoretical norm had already been adopted before Linnæus by the English physician John Ray (died 1678). The practical criterion for determining genera and species was taken from characteristic morphological features. For instance, the essential generic characteristic of the quadrupeds was derived from the teeth; that of birds from the bill. The species was designated in a similar manner "by retaining the primary characteristic among the various differences which separated two individuals of the same species." The establishment therefore of a genus or of a species depended ultimately, then as now, on the knowledge and subjective views of the systematizer. The whole system was an artificial one precisely because it took note of one single feature alone, leaving the rest out of consideration; for instance, in the vegetable kingdom the character of the flower alone was taken into consideration. Later on Linnæus entertained the idea that originally God created only one species of each genus, and that the rest had been derived from these original species by cross-breeding. Linnæus's conception of species was strengthened by Georges Cuvier, who defended the unchangeableness of the categories beginning with the species up to the four types (*embranchement*). He was supported in this, as was later L. Agassiz, by the absolute dearth of intermediate forms in geological strata. Hence arose his Theory of Catastrophes, which in turn gave way to his Migration Theory. Cuvier came victorious out of the controversy with Etienne Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, who maintained the unity of the plan of animal structure and the continuous transition of forms in the animal kingdom.

GREGOR MENDEL

The views prevailing under Linnæus and Cuvier were then divided into two main branches. (1) The more moderate Transmutationists held that genera were the originally created units, and that from these all species and varieties were derived. (2) The followers of Linnæus, on the other hand, affirmed that the Linnæan species were the created units, and the subdivisions of these were the derived ones. Then followed the Jordan schools, which asserted that within the Linnæan species were what they called "small species", individually variable, but specifically immutable (not connected by intermediate forms), and, as such, to be considered the true units or "elementary species". Linnæus's *Draba verna*, for instance, comprehends about 200 "elementary species". The norm or

criterion of the elementary species is the experimentally proved constancy of the features (it is quite immaterial how small they may be) during a series of generations.

How are we to regard these opinions? Before answering this question we must strongly emphasize the fact that the biological idea of species has nothing whatever in common with the Scriptural conception or with that of Scholastic philosophy. The Mosaic story of Creation signifies nothing more than this, that ultimately all organisms owe their existence to the Creator of the world. The concrete *how* has nothing to do with the proposition of faith regarding creation. The enumeration of certain popular groups of organisms, such as fruit-trees, draft-animals, and the like, could have no other design than to manifest to the simplest as well as to the most cultivated mind the action of the Creator of all things; at least, there can be no question of a scientific conception of genera and species. The biological concept of species is likewise removed from the philosophical concept which designates either the metaphysical or the physical species. The former is identical with the *integra essentia* (Urraburú)—"integral essence"—of a being; the latter is founded on the essence (*fundatur in essentiâ*—T. Pesch), and is to be recognized by some attribute (*gradus alicujus perfectionis*) which remains constant and unchangeable in every individual of every generation and so appears to be necessarily connected with the most intimate essence of the organism (*necessario cum rei naturâ connecti*—Haan). The concept, therefore, of species according to Holy Scripture, Philosophy, and Science, is by no means a synonymous one for the natural units of the organic world. And particularly, the first chapter of Genesis should not be brought into connexion with Linnæus's "Systema naturæ".

As far as the biological concept of species is concerned there is not up to the present time any decisive criterion by which we may determine in practice whether a given group of organisms constitute a particular species or not. Genuine species are differentiated from one another by the fact of their possessing some important morphological difference which remains constant during a series of generations without the production of any intermediate form. If the differences are of less importance, but constant, we speak of sub-species (elementary species, Jordan species), while intermediate forms and all deviations which are not strictly constant are set down as varieties. Are such distinctions and criteria acceptable? Expressions such as "considerable", "essential", "more or less considerable" signify relative propositions. Hence it follows that the morphological determination of species depends to a great extent on the subjective estimate of the naturalist and on his intimate knowledge of the geographical distribution and habits of the organism concerned. In fact, the force of the term *species* differs greatly in the different classes of organisms. On this account the fact that species do not cross-breed, or at least that after a cross they do not produce fertile descendants, was added as an auxiliary criterion. This criterion, however, is an impracticable one in the case of palæontological species, and in the plant world in particular has many exceptions. In botany, therefore, the auxiliary criterion has been limited in the sense that within the species itself the fertility always maintains the same general level, while by the crossing of different species it diminishes very materially—propositions which do not admit of conversion and in their generalization can scarcely be called correct. Consequently, it would almost appear that Darwin was right when he said that the idea of species was "undefinable". Still, it is not to be denied that there are in nature definite and often important gradations and gaps by which the "good species", in contradistinction to the "bad species", are separated from one another. The same is also proved by the modern "mutation theories" which, on account of unconnected differences, admit a development of species by jumps.

The Darwinian principle of indefinite variability is contrary to facts, which in general show that, both in living nature and in geological strata, there exist types sharply discriminated from one another. However, it is quite impossible to say how many types compose the organic world. It will be the task of future research to determine the affinity which exists between the various groups of organisms, beginning with the lower limit of similar sub-species and ascending to the highest forms whose common ancestry can be proved. These highest forms, which *per se* have nothing in common with the Linnæan species or genera, or with any other systematic groups, are the true units of nature; for they are composed of those organisms only which are related among themselves without being connected with the rest by common descent. We may, if we wish, identify these highest units with Wasmann's "natural species", or primeval ancestral forms, but, according to our opinion, neither the Linnæan species nor any other of the so-called systematic groups can be considered as the natural subdivisions of it. The Linnæan species are indeed indispensable for an intelligible classification of organisms, but they are not suitable for the solution of the problem of development. In concluding this section we may add that the best example of a natural species, and one ratified by revelation, is the species Man, which, by reason of its wide range of variation and the relative constancy of its races, may offer many a happy point of comparison for defining the limits of the species in the vegetable and animal kingdoms.

In the following sections we shall see that there cannot be any doubt as to the evolution of species, if by *species* we understand such groups of organisms as are generally styled by botanists and zoologists systematic, or Linnæan, species. But if by the term *species* we are to understand groups of organisms whose range of variability would correspond to that of "the human species", then we believe that up to the present day there are no clear facts in favour of specific evolution. In particular, it will be seen that thus far there is no evidence of fact as to an ascending development of organic forms, though we do not deny the possibility of it provided an innate power of development be assumed, which operates teleologically.

III. Variation and Experimental Facts relating to the Evolution of Species.—By *variation* we generally understand three groups of phenomena: (1) individual differences; (2) single variations; (3) forms produced by crossing and Mendelian segregation. The question is, what influence these variations actually have on the formation of species.

(1) *Individual Differences.* Individual differences include all fluctuating inequalities of an individual and of its organs—e. g., the size of the leaves of a tree, the percentage of sugar contained in the beet, and even more important morphological and physiological features. These differences may be quantitative (according to size and weight), meristic (as to numbers), and individually quantitative (e. g., the mountain and valley forms of a plant). They are generally recognized from the fact that they oscillate around a certain mean, from which they deviate in inverse proportion to their frequency, a rule which primarily pertains only to quantitative differences. According to Darwinians, useful individual differences can be increased indefinitely by selection and may finally become independent of it. In this manner new species would result: Darwin himself sometimes considered single variations as of greater importance. The same view is strongly defended by modern evolutionists, who defend, at the same time, a direct influence of environment to which an organism adapts itself.

In order first of all to obtain a just estimate of the influence of selection, it must be pointed out that not everything that is attributed to selection has originated through selection. The origin of many pure breeds (e. g., of pigeons) is unknown, and cannot therefore without further investigation be ascribed to selection. Furthermore, many cultivated forms have arisen through crosses and segregation of characters, but not through merely strengthening individual characters. If we restrict our examination only to well attested facts, we find, first, that nothing new is brought about by selection; secondly that the maximum amount in quantitative modification is obtained in a few generations (mostly in three to five) and that this amount can only be maintained through constant selection. In case selection is stopped, a regression will follow proportional to the length of time required for the progress. In short, as far as facts teach us, new species do not arise by selection. But if qualitative changes were produced by some other cause, selection would probably be a potent principle in order to explain why some peculiarities survive and others disappear. The question is: Whether changes in the environment may furnish such a cause. There can be no doubt that the environment *does* influence organisms and mould them in many ways. As proof of this we need only draw attention to the different forms of Alpine and valley plants, to the formation of the leaves of plants according to the humidity, shadiness,

(*a*) Dinarda Märkeli; (*b*) D. Dentata; (*c*) D. Hagensi; (*d*) D. Pygmæa

or sunniness of the habitat, to the influence of light and temperature on the formation of pigment and colouring of the surface, to the strange and considerable differences produced, for instance, in knotweeds by merely changing the environment, and so forth. But as far as actual experiments show, the changes of characteristics and niceties of adaptation go to and fro, as it were, without transgressing definite ranges of variation. Moreover, it is not at all clear how discontinuity of species could have arisen "by a continuous environment, whether acting directly, as Lamarck would have it, or as a selective agent, as Darwin would have it" (Bateson), unless one takes into account the accidental destruction and isolation of intermediate forms.

In spite of these conclusions it has been assumed that individual differences might lead to the formation of new species under the continuous influence of natural selection. Wasmann's well-known Dinarda-forms may serve as an example. The four forms of the rove-beetle, *Dinarda*, namely *D. Märkeli*, *D. dentata*, *D. Hagensi* and *D. pygmæa*, bear a certain relation with regard to size to the four forms of ants, *Formica rufa*, *sanguinea*, *exsecta*, *fusco-rufibarbis*, and to their nests, in which they live as tolerated guests. *D. Märkeli*, which is 5 mm. long, dwells with *F. rufa*, which is comparatively large and builds spacious hill-nests. *D. dentata*, which is 4 mm. long, lives with *F. sanguinea*, which is comparatively large, but builds small earth-nests. *D. Hagensi*, which is 3–4 mm. long, lives with *F. exsecta*, which is smaller than *F. sanguinea*, but builds a fairly roomy hill-nest. *D. pygmæa*, which is 3 mm. long, lives with *F. fusco-rufibarbis*, which is relatively small and builds small earth-nests. Moreover, the three first-named ants are two-coloured (red and black), and so are the corresponding *Dinarda*. The last-named ant, however, is of a more uniform dark colour, as is also the corresponding *Dinarda*. Now comparative zoogeography contains some indications according to which the similarity of colour and proportion of size must be attributed to actual adaptation. For (1) there are regions in Central Europe in which only *F. sanguinea* with *D. dentata*, and *F. rufa* with *D. Märkeli* are found, whereas *F. exsecta* and *F. rufibarbis* do not harbour any Dinarda-forms at all. Secondly, there are districts in which the four forms of Dinarda are living with their four hosts and yet hardly ever showing transitional forms. Thirdly, in other parts there are more or less continuous intermediate forms, *D. dentata-Hagensi* living with *F. exsecta*, and *D. Hagensi-pygmæa* living with *F. fusco-rufibarbis*. The nearer a Dinarda approaches the form of *D. pygmæa*, the more frequently it is found with *F. fusco-rufibarbis*. To all this must be added, that the adaptation in general appears to have kept pace with the historical freeing of Central Europe from ice, though numerous exceptions must be explained by local circumstances, especially by isolation. Considering these facts, we are inclined to believe that *D. pygmæa* especially presents an example of real adaptation *in fieri*, though this adaptation cannot be called a progressive one, since the more recent forms, *Hagensi* and *pygmæa*, are only smaller in size and of a more uniform colour. But at the same time it seems to us that the adaptation of the Dinarda cannot be considered as an example to illustrate specific evolution, because, as we have shown elsewhere, there are many instances in nature—we mention only the races and other sub-divisions of the human species—that likewise present different degrees of adaptation far more pronounced than that found in the Dinarda, but which are not, and cannot on that account be, quoted as examples of the formation of new specific characters.

Œnothera Lamarckiana (after de Vries)

Œnothera Gigas (after de Vries)

(2) *Single Variations* are presumably of far greater importance for the solution of the evolution problem

than individual differences; for they are discontinuous and constant, and are therefore capable of explaining the gaps between existing species and those of palæontology. We use the term *single variation* when, from among a large number of offspring, some one particular individual stands out that differs from the rest in one or more characteristics which it transmits unchanged to posterity. It is said to be peculiar to the single variations that they cannot be reduced to crosses. If this is possible, we speak of "analytical variations". Favourable conditions for the appearance of single variations are altered environment, a liberal sowing of seed, and excellent nourishment. It is a remarkable fact that the fertility of single variations decreases considerably, and this the more so the greater the deviation from the parents. Besides, the newly produced forms are comparatively weak. This weakness and inclination to sterility are facts which must be carefully weighed when determining the probable importance of single variations for specific evolution. Besides, it is—to our knowledge—in no case excluded that the suddenly arising form may be traced back to former crossings. Probably the only case which is quite generally interpreted to demonstrate specific evolution experimentally is that of the primrose observed by de Vries. After many failures with more than 100 species, de Vries, in 1886, determined to cultivate the evening primrose (*Œnothera Lamarckiana*), whose extraordinary fertility had attracted his attention. He chose nine well-developed specimens and transplanted them into the Botanical Garden of Amsterdam. The cultivation was at first continued through eight generations. In all he examined 50,000 plants, among which he discovered 800 deviating specimens, which could be arranged in seven different groups, as shown in the following table:—

Generation	O. gigas	albida	oblonga	rubrinervis	Lamarckiana	nanella	lata	scintillans
I. 1886–87	—	—	—	—	9	—	—	—
II. 1888–89	—	—	—	—	15000	5	5	—
III. 1890–91	—	—	—	1	10000	3	3	—
IV. 1895	1	15	176	8	14000	60	73	1
V. 1896	—	25	135	20	8000	49	142	6
VI. 1897	—	11	29	3	1800	9	5	1
VII. 1898	—	—	9	—	3000	11	—	—
VIII. 1899	—	5	1	—	1700	21	1	—

The specimen of *O. gigas* (1895) was self-fertilized and yielded 450 *O. gigas* forms, among which there was only one dwarf form, *O. gigas-nanella*. The three following generations remained constant. *O. albida* was a very sickly form, though it succeeded, thanks to regular attention, in breeding constant offspring. Among the *O. oblonga* descendants there was one specimen, *albida*, and in a later generation one specimen of *O. rubrinervis*. *O. rubrinervis* proved to be as fertile as Lamarckiana, and yielded besides a new variation, *leptocarpa*. The offspring of *O. nanella* was constant, though among the 1800 descendants of nanella in 1896 three specimens showed *oblonga* characteristics. *O. lata* was purely female; but, fertilized with pollen of other variants, it yielded 15 to 20 per cent *O. lata* descendants. *O. scintillans* was not constant. According to de Vries' observations (since 1886), new forms also originated in nature, but they succumbed in the struggle for existence. The differences between the single forms relate to various parts and degrees of development, though in several they are very slight. The plants become either stronger or weaker, with broader or narrower leaves; the flowers become larger and darker yellow, or smaller and lighter, the fruit longer or shorter, the outer skin rougher or smoother, etc.

It may be conceded that the Œnothera has developed constant forms corresponding to the so-called "small or elementary species". The question, however, is, whether the forms are really new ones or whether they owe their origin to some unexpected original cross. In fact, if we are to suppose a previous cross, perhaps *O. Lamarckiana* and *O. sublinearis*, then the *O. Lamarckiana* of Hilversum had contained the different variations in a latent form and through cultivation gradually reverted by throwing off the different variations. At any rate, there cannot be any question of a progressive development, for the reason that none of the new forms shows the slightest progress in organization or even development of any kind advancing in that direction.

(3) *Crosses and Mendelian Segregations.* Crossbreeding can in nature hardly be considered as a factor in the progressive development of species; in particular, forms of different degrees of organization do not cross, and if they did, all deviations would soon be equalized according to the laws of chance and probability. All the greater seems to be the importance of the Mendelian segregations. It may be known to the reader that the famous experiments of the Abbot Mendel were carried on with seven different pairs of characters which he crossed with one another, and then, by letting the cross-breds self-fertilize, he continued the cultivation of the plants through a series of generations. In the first generation it was found that the offspring exhibited without exception the character of one of the parents, that of the other parent not appearing at all. Mendel therefore called the former —the prevailing—character the "dominant" and the other the "recessive". In the following generation, which was produced by letting the cross-breds fertilize themselves, the recessive character appeared and, moreover, in a definite proportion. On an average this proportion was 2.89 : 1 or 3 : 1. In the second generation 75 per cent of the whole number of plants exhibited the dominant character, and 25 per cent the recessive. No intermediate forms were observed in any case. In the third generation the offspring of the recessives was constant and remained pure recessives, but among the offspring of the dominants some remained constant dominants, while others were hybrids. The average proportion of the constant dominants (D) to variable cross-breds (DR) was as 1 : 2. Thus, besides the 25 per cent of constant recessives (R), there was also 25 per cent (one-third of 75 per cent) constant dominants (D) and 50 per cent (two-thirds of 75 per cent) variable crossbreds (DR) or 1D+ 2DR+ 1R. The same proportion resulted from the following generations of the crossbreds, and since 1900 this has been confirmed by other investigators in the case of other plants (e. g. maize) and also of animals (e. g. gray and white mice).

Mendel's rule of segregation, therefore, runs thus:

The hybrids of any two different characters produce seeds, one half of which again develop the hybrid forms, while the other half yield offspring which remains constant, and possess the dominant and recessive characters in equal proportion. A simple analysis of this rule shows that it consists of three parts: (a) By fertilization the characters of the parents are united, without, however, thereby losing their purity and independence; (b) In the offspring the characters of both parents may again be separated from each other; (c) The character of one of the parents may completely conceal that of the other. This last part of the rule is not, according to later investigators, necessarily connected with the other two parts. We may add that Mendel's rule also holds good for the offspring of hybrids, in which several constant characters are combined, and that in it there is found a splendid confirmation of the modern theory of the cell. Cross-breeding, therefore, does not by any means lead to the mixing of characteristics. These, on the contrary, remain pure, or, at most, form new combinations or split up into simpler components. Hence, the idea that gaps in nature originate through such segregation is well founded. But the question, whether the idea is to be applied to the formation of species, and how this is to be carried out, can scarcely be answered at present. This much, however, is evident: that there is no progress in organization any more than there is any progressive specific development, brought about by segregation.

Hence this important conclusion follows: That the central idea of modern evolution theories—namely,



CORRENS URTICA

progressive specific development—has not up to the present received any confirmation from observation of the world of organisms as it now exists. It is quite true, however, that the plasticity of organisms has been proved by a number of experiments to be very considerable; so that, in a constant environment, and by single variations, changes may be brought about which a systematist would classify as specific or even generic, if it were not clear from other sources that they are not such. In the same way forms could be developed by segregation, the characteristics of which would suffice "to constitute specific differences in the eyes of most systematists, were the plants or animals brought home by collectors" (Bateson). Yet such criteria are meaningless for the demonstration of the formation of species. The question as to the transmission of acquired characters is not by any means decided. It follows from the doctrine of propagation that only such characters can be transmitted as are contained in the germ-cells or which have been either directly or indirectly transmitted to them. Hence it is clear that all peculiarities acquired by the cells of the body through the influence of environment, or by use or disuse, can only be inherited if they are handed over, as it were, to the germ-cells. But it is useless to discuss the question before we have sufficient experimental evidence that acquired characters are at all inherited.

IV. THE PALÆONTOLOGICAL ARGUMENT.—(1) *Historical Method.* Before entering upon the discussion of the evidence furnished by palæontology we must briefly refer to the method which ought to be employed in the interpretation of the palæontological records. The great archives of the geological strata are very incomplete. Almost three-quarters of the earth's surface is covered with water, and another part with perpetual ice, while of the rest but a fraction has remained free from the ravages of water and the elements; of this small portion, again, only certain regions are accessible to the investigator, and these have been but partially examined. Besides, in most cases only the hard portions of organisms are preserved, and even these are often so badly mutilated that their correct classification is sometimes difficult. Many of them, especially in the oldest rocks, must have perished under the crushing force of metamorphic processes. Further, the geographic distribution of plants and animals must have varied according to climatological and topographical mutations. It may suffice to cite the glacial periods of which there are clear indications in various geological epochs. Finally, the geological strata themselves underwent many violent strains and displacements, being upheaved, tilted, folded again, and even entirely inverted. It is evident that every one of these phenomena increases the chaos in its own way and makes the work of classifying and restoring all the harder. It gives at the same time to the scientist the right to formulate hypotheses probable in themselves and adapted to bridge over the numerous gaps in the work of reconstruction in the organic world. But these working hypotheses ought never to assume the form of scientific dogmas. For after all, the documents which have really been deciphered are the only deciding factor. At all events, the chronological succession and the genetic relation of organisms cannot be determined by aprioristic reasoning, or by means of our present system of classification, or by applying the results of ontogenetic studies. One illustration may suffice. Some maintain that trilobites are descended from blind ancestors because certain blind forms exhibit a number of simple characteristics which are common to all specimens. And yet we know that, e. g., *Irinucleus* possesses eyes in the earlier stages of its development, and only becomes blind in the later stages. The non-existence of eyes is, therefore, due to degeneration, and does not point to a former eyeless state. As a matter of fact, specimens of trilobites possessing eyes are found side by side with eyeless specimens in the lower Cambrian strata. Other examples of false à priori conclusions are to be found in the extraordinary genealogies constructed by extreme evolutionists, and which dissolve like so many mists in the light of advancing investigations. In fact, up to the present the agreement on ontogeny and phylogeny has not been proved in any single instance. In short, if we disregard observation and experiment on living organisms, it is the historical method alone which can decide the limits of evolution and the succession and genetic relations of the different forms. "In the substitution of the hypothetical ancestors by real ones lies the future of true phylogenetic science" (Handlisch).

(2) *The Oldest Fossils.* Now let us turn to the documents themselves and see what they have to show us. The foundation of the Archives is formed of gneiss and crystallized slate, a rigid mass containing no trace of organic life, and one which offers to the palæontologist the hopeless outlook that his science must remain in a very incomplete state, perhaps forever. Immediately above this foundation, nature has imbedded the multitudinous, highly-developed Cambrian fauna, with-

out leaving the slightest trace of their antecedents, origin, birth, or age. Some 800 species of this remotest period are known to us. They belong almost without exception to marine fauna, and are distributed over all the chief groups of the invertebrates. Nearly one-half of them are arthropods. They are the well-known trilobites which occupy a position about the middle of the scale of animal development. Other groups belong to cœlenterates, brachiopods, gastropods, and cephalopods. Sponges, too, and traces of worms are found, as also very imperfect fragments of scorpions and other insects. Moreover, there can be no doubt that various types of fishes must have existed, since in the Silurian age numerous representatives, such as selachians, ganoids, marsipobranchs, dipnoans, are found from the very beginning side by side. Where are the ancestors of these highly specialized beings? The one thing we may affirm is that we know absolutely nothing whatever of a primitive fauna and of the numberless series of organisms which must have followed them up to the Cambrian era, for the simple reason that we possess absolutely no evidence. Moreover, there is not the least trace of palæontological evidence in favour of the spontaneous awakening of life or of the ascending development out of primitive protoplasmic masses up to the time of the Cambrian era. The Cambrian types were all of them specialized forms perfectly adapted to time and environments, and not generalized types of zoological systems. The origin of the plant world is also shrouded in impenetrable darkness for the palæontologist. The enormous layers of anthracite and graphite are, according to the most recent investigations, of inorganic origin. Clearly established evidence of plant life only dates from post-Silurian times, and consists of contents of the oldest turf moors—giant-ferns and horsetails, plants akin to the club-mosses, like the *Lepidodendron*, and Gymnosperms, like the slender *Cordaites*. One is astounded at the rich forms of this long-lost flora, and we search in vain for their ancestors.

It is certainly remarkable, and a fact which clearly proves the transformation of species, that plants belonging to these remote times vary considerably from their later representatives. But, as Kerner von Marilaun insists, the "fundamental structure of the type" is never obliterated, and the degree of organization has at least remained the same. In particular, the present dwarf-forms of the horse-tails and club-mosses are but miserable remains of their mighty ancestors, and the *Cordaites*, though different from the present conifers, were as highly organized as they. To this must be added the recently discovered fact that seed-bearing plants, which constitute a considerable part of the fern flora of the Carboniferous, are found among the ferns of the Devonian era.

(3) *Angiosperms and Vertebrates.* But how did the undoubtedly higher forms of a later period originate? To begin with the angiosperms, we are confronted with the fact that these organisms appear quite suddenly in the Cretaceous era and, what is more remarkable, in forms as highly organized as their present representatives. It is a fact that principally the dicotyledons (at least those in the more recent strata) correspond more and more to the present-day forms, clearly indicating the relationship they bear to one another. But whence the earliest forms of the cretaceous came, is shrouded in mystery. Similarly, the gradual transformation of one species into another cannot be proved in any concrete case. Only this much is certain, that if evolution took place, it involved a change which did not imply attainment to a higher stage of organization. It must be borne in mind, moreover, that we know of no intermediate forms capable of justifying even as much as a hypothesis that angiosperms were evolved from lower plants. If the origin of the angiosperms is for the present an insoluble problem, the genesis of the vertebrates is no less so. However, in order not to pass entirely over the post-Cambrian history of the invertebrates, we must at least make mention of the significant fact that this fauna seems to be constantly changing, but without ascending to higher forms of organization. The modification is especially manifest in the shell-bearing groups, owing to the changed size, form, and ornamentation of their shells, and in this offers a very acceptable basis for the establishment of a series of kindred forms—e. g., with the gastropod genus *Paludina* of the Slavonian tertiary strata. But since such structures depend almost entirely on the calcareous nature of the medium, and on the varying kind and amount of movement, we can scarcely be inclined to regard an increased ornamentation of the shell as a mark of real progress in organization, but at most as a temporary development of actual dispositions due to varying conditions of life.

The first authenticated ancestors of the vertebrates are the fish-remains of the lower Silurian era. Widely removed from them we find in the carboniferous strata the oldest remains of the amphibian quadrupeds and, associated with them, forms of reptiles whose sudden appearance and equally sudden disappearance belong to the unsolved problems of palæontology. Among the Mesozoic fishes we encounter old forms together with teleosts which suddenly appear in the Jurassic strata without producing any transitional forms. It is generally supposed that the teleosts represent a higher grade of organization than the ganoids; as a matter of fact, the teleosts, it would seem, have no structural advantage over the cartilaginous fishes in the lesser hardness of the scale and the greater hardness of the skeleton. This is, however, but a shifting, as it were, of development, as the disappearance of the rigid body-covering is compensated for by the ossification of the skeleton. At any rate, the origin of the teleosts is an unsolved problem, as is that of the Silurian ganoids. The appearance of birds and mammals is likewise very mysterious. The first known bird is the famous "bird-reptile" *Archæopteryx* of the Jurassic strata at Soluhofen. In spite of some characteristics that remind one of reptiles—as for instance the twenty homologous caudal vertebræ, the talons, the separated metacarpal bones and the toothed jaw—yet the true bird nature is evinced by the plumage, the pinions, and the bill. In fact *Archæopteryx* is far removed from the reptiles, nor does it constitute any connecting link with the later birds, not even with the toothed Ichthyornis and Hesperonis of the upper Cretaceous era. Certainly the two isolated specimens from Soluhofen indicate that birds must have existed a long time before; but where their place of origin is, none can tell.

Palæontology is silent likewise about the early history of mammals. The mesozoic representation of this class may have some connexion with marsupials, monotremes, and insectivorous animals, but as to the early history of the great majority of placental mammals we have no evidence whatever. A vast number of intermediate forms would certainly be required to connect the mammals with the reptiles. No such series of forms is known. Even the genealogy of the horse, which is considered the most striking example of an evolutionary series within a mammalian family, is scarcely more than a very moderately supported hypothesis. Let the reader consider the accompanying table of differences in the palæontological representatives of the Equidæ. Upon the facts embodied in this table, which chiefly refer to fossils found in North American strata, the following comments are suggested: The genera of the Equinæ lived contemporaneously, though it must be conceded that in some sedimentary deposits their series seems to be continuous. Secondly, the sub-families show great differences between one another. Of the *Merychippus*, which connects the *Equinæ* with the *Palæotherinæ*, we know only

the teeth. Thirdly, if we take the European material into consideration as well, we are confronted with widely divergent opinions, so much so that the brilliant pedigree becomes greatly dimmed. In particular, the Eocene forms and the still more remote genus *Phenacodus* are avowedly very dubious ancestors of the horse. Lastly, it is well within the range of possibility that the ancestors of the *Equinæ* and the descendants of the older sub-families have remained undiscovered up to the present time.

Period	Sub-family	Genus	Size	Fore foot	Hind foot	Radius and Ulna; Tibia and Fibula	Teeth
Diluvian and Pliocene	*Equinæ*	*Equus*	Ass	One toe between two similar rudiments		United	Long-crowned
		Pliohippus				"	"
		Protohippus		Three toes (1 main, 2 secondary)		"	"
		Merychippus	?	?		"	"
Upper Miocene	*Palæotherinæ* (with a greatly different skull)	*Miohippus*	Sheep	Three toes with larger middle one		"	"
Lower Miocene		*Mesohippus*		Three toes and rudimentary splint	Three toes	"	"
Middle Eocene	*Hyracotherinæ*	*Orohippus*	Fox	Four toes	Three toes	Divided	Short-crowned
		Hyracotherium		" "	" "	"	"
Lower Eocene		*Eohippus*		" " and rudiment	" "	"	"

Table of Differences in Palæontological Equidæ

(4) *Man.* It remains for us briefly to examine the historical records to see if we can obtain reliable information concerning the last and most important "ascent" to *Homo sapiens*. The oldest authenticated traces of man consist of stone implements, and they are derived from the lower Quaternary strata. Whether the so-called "eoliths" of the Tertiary Era are really the handiwork of man, cannot be decided with certainty. Eminent scientists, as Boule, Obermaier, de Lapparent, in their works published in 1905, have denied the human origin of these objects. Concerning the first stages in the civilization of diluvian man little can be said. This period, according to Hoernes, falls under three sub-groups, separated from one another and preceded by a glacial period. The first intermediate epoch (*époque du grand ours*) lies close to the Pliocene age, and is called, after the principal place of its discovery, the stage of Tilloux-Taubach (Krapina), or Chelléo-Moustérien. The fauna is mostly tropical and includes, among others, *Elephas antiquus*, *Rhinoceros Merckii*, and, most important of all, *Ursus spelæus*. Taubach's field of discovery was a camp in which the fireplace, remnants of food, and the simple utensils of Germany's first inhabitants were found *in situ* (Hoernes). The second intermediate epoch (*époque du mammouth*) is named the Solutréen stage, after the place where important discoveries were made in France. It contains, besides the mammoth, the wild horse and numerous predatory animals such as *Leo*, *Ursus*, *Hyæna*, etc., though the numbers greatly decrease as we draw to the end of the period, while the *Ursus spelæus* becomes entirely extinct. A large number of the stone implements are of fine workmanship and there are, besides these, various kinds of carving on bone and ivory, plastic figures of men, and drawings of animals on the walls of the caves. The cave of Combarelles (Dordogne), for example, is decorated with 109 drawings of animals. The ornamentation in the Solutréen, with its wavelike curves and spirals, indicates an almost enigmatical degree of development which would appear to be more in keeping with the culture of the metal age than with the more remote stone age. The third intermediate epoch (*époque du renne*) had a bleaker climate. It is called the Magdaleine stage, after La Magdaleine, in France. The stone implements are homely, but often very finely constructed, "small implements made for delicate hands by delicate hands" (Hoernes). Pointed and hooked hunting weapons were also found, as well as numerous instruments of various kinds manufactured out of bone and horn, and all of them reveal considerable artistic taste and judgment. Real frescoes adorn the walls of the Font-de-Faune cave. In all, eighty figures are represented, of which number forty-nine are those of bisons.

From what has been said we may conclude that man, in the first stage of civilization known to us, appears as a true *Homo sapiens;* but how he arrived at that stage is a problem we are quite unable to answer, because all records are wanting. The bones, too, which are supposed to date from the primeval age of man are little calculated to solve the problem. A short résumé of the results of recent investigations will make this clear. *Pithecanthropus erectus*, the famous ape-man of Trinil (Java), cannot be considered "the long-sought missing link in the chain of the highest Primates". As is well known, we have to do with a cranium of 850 sq. cm. capacity, a thigh-bone, and two molar teeth; the skull and the thigh-bone were found lying about 16 yards apart. It is true the skull differs somewhat from the skulls of present-day anthropoids; it is, however, in general characteristics thoroughly apelike, as was pointed out recently by Schwalbe, Klaatsch, Macnamara, and Kohlbrugge. The thigh-bone, according to Bumüller, bears the closest resemblance to the femur of the ape *Hylobates*. Hence the appellation *erectus* is a misnomer. Add to this that, according to the latest researches, *Pithecanthropus* must have been a contemporary of primitive man, since the strata in which the bones were found are diluvial. Hence *Pithecanthropus* cannot belong to the ancestral line of man. The bones of the Neandertal race of the *Homo primigenius* are undoubtedly

Cranium of Pithecanthropus Erectus

Cranium of the Neandertal Man

human, and have given rise to renewed interest through the valuable discoveries made in Krapina. The Neandertal skull itself serves as a type which, owing to the low, receding forehead and the strongly developed supra-orbital ridges, appears to be very primitive, though no one knows the actual geological conditions of the place where it was originally deposited. We pass over the fact that twenty scientists have expressed twelve different opinions on this mysterious cranium, and confine ourselves to the latest opinion of Schwalbe, who says that the Neandertal cranium exhibits forms which are never found in either a normal or a pathologically altered *Homo sapiens*, whether Negro, European, or Australian, and yet at the same time the skull does exhibit human characteristics. In a word, the Neandertal skull does not belong to any variety of *Homo sapiens*. Kohlbrugge very aptly compares Schwalbe's hypothesis to an upturned pyramid balancing on a fine point, since a single Australian or Negroid skull which may be found to agree with the Neandertal skull suffices to overthrow the hypothesis. Such a skull has not as yet been found, but there are other factors which suffice to shake Schwalbe's hypothesis. These have reference to the other diluvial bone remains of *Homo primigenius*, amongst others to the petrified Gibraltar skull, to two molar teeth from the Taubach cave, to the two fragments of a skull from the mammoth caves of Spy, and the jawbones from La Naulette, Schipka, Ochos, and, finally, to considerable remains of bones, such as fragments of skulls, lower jawbones, pelvic bones, thigh and shin bones, from a cave near Krapina in Croatia. To these must be added the "Moustier skull" which was dug up in August, 1908, in Vézèretal (Dordogne). All these fragments possess fairly uniform characteristics. Especially worthy of note are, above all, the cranium with its prominent supra-orbital ridges and receding forehead. These qualities, however, are not infrequently found in men of the present day. Australians exhibit here and there even the genuine supra-orbital ridges (Gorjanowic-Kramberger). It cannot be clearly decided whether we are dealing with purely individual characteristics or with peculiarities which would justify us in classifying the Krapina fragments as belonging to a special race. But this much is clear, that the formation of the skull and the degree of civilization of that race are quite sufficient to permit of our designating *Homo primigenius* not as a species of itself, but merely as a local sub-division of the *Homo sapiens*. The Galley Hill skull, from England, which is still older than the Krapina bones, points to the same conclusion and corresponds with the more recent skulls of post-diluvial man. Hence, to sum up, we may affirm that we are acquainted with no records of Tertiary man, that the most ancient remains of the Quaternary belong to the Galley Hill man, whose skull worthily represents *Homo sapiens*. The same is to be said of the oldest traces of civilization as yet known to us.

Moustier Skull (1908)

Palæontology, therefore, can assert nothing whatever of a development of the body of man from the animal. It may be added that Haeckel's curious "Progonotaxis", or genealogy of man, is a pure fiction. It consists of thirty stages, beginning with the "moners" and ending with *homo loquax*. The first fifteen stages have no fossil representatives. As to the rest, we may concede that many of these groups actually exist, but we do not see a single argument of any probability for Haeckel's assertion that these groups are genetically related. As to the age of the human species, no assertion can be made with any degree of certainty; thus far there are no indications whatever that would justify an estimate of more than 10,000 years. Still less are we enabled to say anything definite as to the probable age of life. The numbers given by different authors vary between twenty-four and upwards of one hundred million years. De Vries's calculation is of especial interest because it is based on his *Œnothera* studies. Mainly to show the superiority of the mutation theory to the selection theory, de Vries assumes that the primrose contains 6000 characteristics, and that a "mutation", or acquisition of a new character, takes place after every 4000 years; so that 4000x6000=24,000,000 (=Lord Kelvin's average value) would represent the biothronic equation, which of course consists of unknown variables only, and rests, moreover, on the unproved assumption that a mutation consists in the acquisition of a new character and that such mutations have really occurred.

IV. The Morphological Argument.—(1) *In General.*—The groups and sub-groups of the plant and animal world are built up according to the same fundamental plan of organization. This important fact, on which all classification rests, is said to be explained by the hypothesis that the different groups (e. g. the vertebrates) have been evolved from forms possessing the peculiarities of the type, while the differences are said to have been brought about by modifications (e. g. adaptation to the environment). The original form or type is imagined to be as primitive as possible, while its modification is said to mark progress, so that those organisms which have the simplest structure are said to correspond to the most ancient forms, the more perfect specialized forms being the most recent.

Are these conclusions well founded?—The plain facts are these: (a) Groups of organisms exhibit similar fundamental forms, which, however, (b) show various differences, so that (c) the groups fall into similar divisions with a more or less perfect degree of organization. In the first place it is difficult to understand why the lower organized forms should be historically the older. According to the evidence furnished by palæontology, this is in many instances positively false, and in no case is it demonstrable, while philosophically it is only possible in as far as the simple forms actually possess the peculiarities of their descendants at least in some latent condition. Secondly, it is hard to see why similarity of structure should prove common origin. As a matter of fact, palæontology knows nothing of common primeval forms; on the contrary, it points to parallel series whose origins are unknown. It is not improbable, moreover, that resemblances of structure and function in nature frequently represent instances of convergence, through which widely different organisms assume similar modifications of form under similar conditions of life. For example, certain species of the *asclepiadaceæ* (*Stapelia*), *euphorbiaceæ* (*Euphorbia*), and cactus have, in all probability, acquired their similar fleshy form from the adaptation of leafy forms to the aridity of the locality in which they grew, and only preserved the different family characteristics in the structure of the flower. The similarity which exists between whales and fishes can be considered merely as an instance of convergence, and no one will assert that the whale has developed from the fish because it happens to be provided with fins. As a matter of fact there are numberless analogies which no serious student would ever dream of reducing to a common origin. Take, for example, the cell-division in plants and animals, the method of fertilization, and other

analogies of structure and function in vastly different groups. Finally, the chief problem, which refers to teleology of adaptive modifications, is not even touched by the doctrine of descent from common ancestors.

Skull of Orang-Utang

(2) *Man and the Anthropoids.*—Palæontology knows of no records that point to the relationship between the body of man and that of the anthropoid. Hence it follows that the argument of analogy and classification is of little worth. But, as ever and again attempts are made to discover analogies between every bone of man and the corresponding part of the ape (e. g. Wiedersheim), it will be useful to gather a few of the more important morphological discrepancies which exist between man's body and that of the anthropoids (orang-utang, chimpanzee, gorilla). It is, however, far from our intention to attribute to these differences any great argumentative force, especially against those who suppose that there was a common primeval ancestor from which both man and ape finally descend; nor do we wish to deny that zoologically the human body belongs to the class of the mammalia, nor that within this class there is any representative more similar to it than the anthropoids.

Of these differences the most important lies in the development of the brain of man and of the anthropoid, which is seen from the comparison of the weights. According to Wiedersheim we are forced to admit that the relative mass of the human brain is twice that of the chimpanzee, while, absolutely, it is from three to four times as great. The same is probably true of the orang-utang, while the brain of the gorilla, which, according to Wiedersheim, is the most humanlike of any of the anthropoid brains, is relatively only one-fifth that of man's. The human skull is from three to four times as large as that of the anthropoids. The difference becomes much more striking still when we compare the cerebral hemispheres and their convolutions. The weight of the brain of a male Teuton of from thirty to forty years of age is on the average 1424 grammes, that of a female 1273 grammes, and that of a full-grown orang only 79·7 grammes (Wundt). The proportion is therefore from 18:1 to 16:1. If we measure the superficial area of man's brain with all its convolutions and that of the orang we have, according to Wagner, from 1877 sq. cm. to 2196 sq. cm. for the human brain and 533·5 sq. cm. for that of the orang—that is a proportion of 4·4:1. It is further to be taken into consideration that, as Wiedersheim points out, the human brain is not to be looked upon as an enlarged anthropoidal one, but as a "new acquisition with structures which the anthropoidal does not as yet [!] possess". These new acquisitions are presumably qualitative and refer mainly to the centre within the great cerebral hemispheres. Intimately connected with the development of the brain is the moderate development of the dentition of man in comparison with the chinless snout of the monkey, which is armed with powerful teeth. Again, "the human face slides as it were down from the forehead and appears as an appendix to the front half of the skull. The gorilla's face, on the contrary, protrudes from the skull, which on return slides almost entirely backwards from the face. . . . It is only on account of its protruding, strongly developed lower parts that the small skull-cap of the animal can mask as a kind of human face" (Ranke).

A second group of differences is obtained by comparing the limbs of man and the anthropoid. Owing to his upright stature, man's appendicular skeleton is quite different in form and structure from that of the anthropoid. This is shown not merely by the length of the single parts, which, strangely enough, exhibit inverse proportions, but also in the interior structure of the bones, as was proved by Walkhoff (1905) in the case of the femur. If we suppose the length of the body to be 100 we have, according to Ranke, the following proportions:—

Part	Gorilla	Chimpanzee	Orang	Negro	German
Arm and hand	64·9	67·7	80·7	45·16	45·43
Leg	34·9	35·2	34·7	48·5	48·8

Special measurements taken from the skeletons of an adult Frenchman and an orang, represented in

Human Skull

the accompanying plate, gave the following particulars:—

	Humerus	Radius	Ulna	Femur	Tibia
Man	28 cm.	22 cm.	25 cm.	47 cm.	37 cm.
Orang	36 "	39·8 "	41 "	31 "	25 "

The sponge-like structure in the femur of man and anthropoid exhibits considerable difference, so that it could be established by means of radiogrammes whether the femur was that of an upright walking individual or not; e. g., it was possible to prove the Neandertal and Spy femora to be human. The foot of man is, moreover, very characteristic. It is not furnished with a thumb that can be bent across the whole member, and hence it does not represent a typical prehensile organ, as is the case with the hind feet of the monkey. In general, each bone and organ of man could in some sense be styled ape-like, but in no case does this similarity go so far that the form peculiar to man would pass over into the form which is peculiar to the ape. This conclusion is confirmed by the fact that, according to Ranke and Weisbach, all the efforts to discover a series of bodily formations which would lead from the most apelike savages to the least apelike Caucasians have till now resulted in utter failure, since the apelike forms of organs actually found in some individuals are not confined to a single race or nation, but are distributed throughout all of them. Tailed ape-men, in the proper sense of the word, have no existence. If sometimes tail-like appendages occur, they are genuine deformities, pathological remnants of the individual's embryonic life. Cretins and microcephali are likewise pathological cases. The theory that such were the ancestors of the human species is certainly excluded by the fact that they are unable to procure independently the necessary means of existence.

Skeleton of Frenchman

(3) *"Blood Relationship" between Man and the Anthropoid.*—In 1900 Friedental thought that he was able to prove the kinship of man and the anthropoid biochemically by showing, first, that the transfusion of human blood-serum into the chimpanzee was not followed by any signs of blood-poisoning, as usually happens on the introduction of foreign blood, and, secondly, that human serum did not produce a reaction when introduced into a solution of the blood of the orang and gibbon, while on the other hand it dissolved the blood corpuscles of the lower apes. A little later Nutall and others proved that anti-sera exercised an opposite effect. An "anti-man-serum" was prepared by injecting subcutaneously sterile human serum into a rabbit till the animal became immune to poisoning from the foreign blood-serum. The "anti-man-serum" of rabbit-blood thus prepared gave a precipitate with the blood-serum of man or of an animal with chemically similar blood, for instance anthropoids, but not with the serum of chemically different blood. The force of the argument lies, therefore, in this, that the chemical reaction obtained seems to be on the whole proportional to the degree of their chemical affinity.

What follows from these facts?—Only this, that the blood of man is chemically similar to that of the anthropoids; but it does not follow that this chemical similarity must be attributed to any kinship of race. The mistake arises from the confusion of the ideas "similarity of blood" and "blood-relationship" in the genealogical sense of the term; otherwise it would be at once perceived that the fact of chemical similarity of blood is of no more importance for the theory of evolution than any other fact of comparative morphology or physiology.

(4) *Rudimentary Organs.*—One of the special arguments commonly cited in favour of the evolution theory is based on the frequent occurrence of rudimentary structures in organisms. As examples we may mention the following: Pythons and boas possess vestiges of hind legs and of a pelvis separated from the vertebral column.—The slow-worm is without external limbs, and yet possesses the shoulder-girdle and the pelvis, as well as a slightly developed breast-bone.—The ostrich has merely stunted wing-bones, while the nearly extinct kiwi (apteryx) of New Zealand has only extremely small stumps of wings, which are clothed with hair-like feathers.—The gigantic birds of New Zealand which became extinct in past ages were entirely wingless.—Well worthy of note, also, are the rudimentary organs of the whale (*Cetacea*), since of the hind limbs only a few minute bones remain, and these are considered to be the pelvic bones, while the Greenland whale (*Balæna mysticetus*) also possesses thigh and leg bones. The bones of the fore-limbs are not movable independently of one another, being bound together by means of tendons—.Other remarkable vestigial structures are the teeth of the Arctic right whale, which never penetrate the gums and are reabsorbed before birth, the upper teeth of the ox, the milk teeth and the eyes of the mole. The deep sea fish, like the *Barathronus*, have instead of eyes "two golden metallic concave mirrors" (Chun).—Nor is man devoid of rudimentary organs. Wiedersheim mentions no fewer than one hundred But of these only a few are genuine. The vermiform appendix may serve as an example, though according to recent research it is not entirely functionless. Its length oscillates between 2 cm. and 23 cm., while its breadth and external form vary exceedingly. Probable reasons for its partially rudimentary character are, besides its extreme variability, especially two facts in particular: the length of the organ compared with that of the large intestine is as 1:10 in the embryo, and as 1: 20 in the adult; secondly, in 32 per cent of all cases among adults of over twenty years of age the appendix is found to be closed.

Skeleton of Orang-Utang

Do such rudimentary organs furnish us with an acceptable proof for the theory of evolution?—It is to be admitted that in many instances the organs were

formerly in a more perfect condition, so as to perform their typical functions—e. g., the eyes of the mole as organs of sight; and the limbs of the kiwi as means of locomotion for running or even for flying. Hence those individuals which now possess rudimentary organs are descended from ancestors which were in possession of these same organs in a less degenerated condition. But it cannot be ascertained from the structures whether those ancestors were of another kind than their offspring. The vermiform appendix in man is fully explained by supposing it to have had in antediluvian man a more perfect function of secretion, or even of digestion. Until the palæontological records furnish us with more evidence we can only conclude from the occurrence of rudimentary structures that in former ages the whale possessed better developed limbs, that the moles had better eyes, the kiwi wings, etc. In short, rudimentary organs per se do not prove more than that structures may dwindle away by disuse.

Haeckel's endeavour to invalidate the teleological argument has no foundation in fact. In many cases the function of rudimentary organs has been discovered—e. g., the rudimentary teeth of the whale are probably of use in the growth of the jaw; the breast-bone of the slow-worm as a protection of the chest. But even in instances in which we have not succeeded in discovering the function of such structures, it must not be forgotten that degeneration may be eminently teleological in furnishing material for other organs whose functions become more important. Moreover, as long as rudimentary organs remain, they may become, under altered circumstances, the starting-point for an appropriately modified reorganization. It is indeed difficult to see how "dysteleology", as Haeckel calls it, follows from the fact that an organ adapted to specified means of livelihood disappears, probably in order to strengthen other organs when those means of livelihood are changed; and, until the contrary is proved, we may assume that we have to deal with instances of teleological adaptation and correlation, as has already been demonstrated in many cases—e. g., in the development of amphibians.

VI. The Ontogenetic Argument.—Comparisons between the embryos of higher forms and the adult stages of lower groups were made long before the evolution theory was generally accepted by biologists. But it was only after 1859 that the facts of embryology were interpreted by means of that theory. Fritz Müller (1864) was one of the first to advance the view that the ontogenetic development of an individual is a short and simplified repetition of the stages through which the species had passed. Haeckel modified the proposition by introducing the term "kenogenesis", which should account for all points of disagreement between the two series of development. In its new form the theory of recapitulation received the name "the biogenetic law of development". Later on Hertwig reformed the law a second time by changing the expression "repetition of forms of extinct ancestors", into "repetition of forms necessary for organic development and leading from the simple to the complex". Besides, considerable changes, generally in an advancing direction, are said to have been brought about by the action of external and internal factors, so that in reality "a later condition can never correspond to a preceding one". Both Haeckel's and Hertwig's views were rejected by Morgan, who does not believe in the recapitulation of ancestral adult stages by the embryo, but tries to show that the resemblance between the embryos of higher forms might be due to "the presence in the embryos of the lower groups of certain organs that remain in the adult forms of this group". According to Morgan, we are justified in comparing "the embryonic stages of the two groups" only—a theory which he calls "the repetition theory".

Perhaps the most striking fact to illustrate the ontogenetic argument is the resemblance between the gill-system of fishes and certain analogous structures in the embryos of the other vertebrates, man included. However, contrary to the statements of most scientists, we do not think that the resemblance is such as to justify us in concluding "with complete certainty that all vertebrates must in the course of their history have passed through stages in which they were gill-breathing animals" (Wiedersheim). The embryos of fishes are at a certain very early stage of development furnished with vertical pouches which grow out from the wall of the pharynx till they fuse with the skin. Then a number of vertical clefts (gill-slits) are formed by the fact that the walls of the pouches separate. In the adult fishes the corresponding openings serve to let water pass from the mouth through the gill-slits, which are covered by the capillaries of the gill-filaments. In this way the animal is enabled to provide the blood with the necessary oxygen and to remove the carbon dioxide. Now it is quite true that in all vertebrates there is some resemblance as to the first formation of the pouches, the slits, and the distribution of blood-vessels. But it is only in fishes that real gill-structures are formed. In the other vertebrates

The Rudimentary Eye of the Mole

the development does not proceed beyond the formation of the apparently indifferent pouches which never perform any respiratory function nor show the least tendency to develop into such organs. On the contrary, the gill-slits and arches seem to have, from the very beginning, a totally different function, actually subserving, at least in part, the formation of other organs. Even the amphibians that are furnished with temporary gills form them in quite a peculiar manner, which cannot be compared with that of fish-embryos. Besides, the distribution of blood-vessels and the gradual disappearance of seemingly useless structures, as the "gill-systems" of vertebrates seem to be, may likewise be observed in cases where no one would seriously suspect a relation to former specific characteristics. In short, there is (1) no evidence that the embryos of mammals and birds have true incipient gill-structures; (2) it is probable that the structures interpreted as such really subserve from the very beginning quite different functions, perhaps only of a temporary nature.

In general it may be said that the biogenetic law of development is as yet scarcely more than a *petitio principii*. Because (1) the agreement between ontogeny and phylogeny has not been proved in a single instance; on the contrary—e. g., the famous pedigree of the horse's foot begins ontogenetically with a single digit; (2) the ontogenetic similarity which may be observed, for instance, in the larval stages of insects may be explained by the similarity of the environment; (3) the ontogenetic stages of organisms are throughout specifically dissimilar, as is proved by a careful concrete comparison. The same conclusion is indicated

by Hertwig's and Morgan's modifications of the biogenetic law, which, in turn, are of a merely hypothetical nature. In addition to this a short reference to Weismann's "confirmation" of Haeckel's law may be useful. Weismann knew that in the larval development of certain butterflies transverse stripes were preceded by longitudinal ones. Hence he concluded that in certain similar butterflies, whose early larval stages were then unknown, a similar succession of markings ought to be found. Ten years later the "predicted" marking was discovered. It is plain that such facts are no confirmation of the biogenetic law, but find their simple explanation in the fact that similar organisms will show similar ontogenetic stages. This fact, too, seems to account sufficiently for the observations advanced by Morgan in support of his theory of repetition.

VII. The Biogeographical Argument.—The biogeographical argument is a very complex one, composed of a vast number of single facts whose correlation among one another, and whose bearing upon the problem of evolution, can hardly be determined before many years of detailed research have gone by. The theories established, for instance, by Wallace are certainly not sufficiently supported by facts. On the contrary, they have serious defects. One of them is the well-known "Wallace line"; another, much more important, the unfounded assertion that the higher vertebrates must have originated from marsupials and monotremes because these animals are almost entirely extinct in all countries except in isolated Australia, where they survive, as the highest representatives of the Australian vertebrates, in greatly varying forms till to-day. Besides, in most cases we have no sufficient knowledge of the geographical distribution of organisms and of its various causes. But in order to give the reader an idea of the argument, we shall briefly refer him to a group of facts which is well adapted to support the view of evolution explained in the preceding pages. Volcanic islands and such as are separated from the continent by a sea or strait of great depth exhibit a fauna and flora which have certainly come from the neighbouring continents, but which at the same time possess features altogether peculiar to them. The flora of Socotra, in the Indian Ocean, for instance, comprises 565 systematic species; among these there are 206 endemic ones. Similarly, on Madagascar there are 3000 endemic plant-species among 4100; on the Hawaian Islands, 70 endemic species of birds among 116; on the Galapagos, 84 among 108. Many such facts are known. They certainly form an excellent demonstration in favour of the proposition defended throughout this article: that such forms as the endemic species, which may well be compared with the races of the human species, were not directly created, but arose by some process of modification which was greatly facilitated by their complete isolation.

The most important General Conclusions to be noted are as follows:—

1. The origin of life is unknown to science.

2. The origin of the main organic types and their principal subdivisions are likewise unknown to science.

3. There is no evidence in favour of an ascending evolution of organic forms.

4. There is no trace of even a merely probable argument in favour of the animal origin of man. The earliest human fossils and the most ancient traces of culture refer to a true *Homo sapiens* as we know him to-day.

5. Most of the so-called systematic species and genera were certainly not created as such, but originated by a process of either gradual or saltatory evolution. Changes which extend beyond the range of variation observed in the human species have thus far not been strictly demonstrated, either experimentally or historically.

6. There is very little known as to the causes of evolution. The greatest difficulty is to explain the origin and constancy of "new" characters and the teleology of the process. Darwin's "natural selection" is a *negative* factor only. The moulding influence of the environment cannot be doubted; but at present we are unable to ascertain how far that influence may extend. Lamarck's "inheritance of acquired characters" is not yet exactly proved, nor is it evident that really new forms can arise by "mutation". In our opinion the principal of "Mendelian segregation", together with Darwin's natural selection and the moulding influence of environment, will probably be some of the chief constituents of future evolutionary theories.

Many works referring to the subject have been mentioned in the body of the article. We shall here enumerate mainly such as are of more recent date and will be of special value for further study.

General.—Gerard, *The Old Riddle and the Newest Answer* (London, 1908); Gutberlet, *Der Mensch, sein Ursprung und seine Entwicklung* (Paderborn, 1896); Kerner von Marilaun, *Pflanzenleben* (Leipzig and Vienna, 1890–91), II; Mivart, *On the Genesis of Species* (London, 1871); Wasmann, *Die moderne Biologie und die Entwicklungstheorie* (Freiburg, 1906); Id., *Der Kampf um das Entwicklungsproblem in Berlin* (Freiburg, 1907); Quatrefages, *L'Espèce humaine* (Paris, 1880); Zapletal, *Der Schöpfungsbericht* (Freiburg, 1902); Morgan, *Evolution and Adaptation* (New York, 1903); Lotsy, *Vorlesungen über Descendenztheorien* (Jena, 1908); Kohlbrugge, *Die morphologische Abstammung des Menschen* (Stuttgart, 1908); *Die Deszendenztheorie* (Leipzig, 1901); Osborn, *From the Greeks to Darwin* (New York, 1905); Hartmann, *Das Problem des Lebens* (Bad Sachsa, 1906); Brooks, *The Foundation of Zoology* (New York, 1899); Wilson, *The Cell* (New York, 1906); Hertwig, *Allgemeine Biologie* (Jena, 1906); Id., *Die Elemente der Entwicklungslehre des Menschen und der Wirbeltiere* (Jena, 1900); Korschelt and Heider, *Lehrbuch der vergleichenden Entwicklungsgeschichte der Wirbelosen Tiere* (Jena, 1902–03); Reinke, *Einleitung in theoretische Biologie* (Berlin, 1901); F. Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin* (London, 1887); Id. and Seward, *More Letters of Charles Darwin* (London, 1908); Weismann, *Vorträge über Deszendenztheorie* (Jena, 1904); Fleischmann, *Die Darwinsche Theorie* (Leipzig, 1903); Plate, *Selektionsprinzip und Probleme der Artbildung* (Leipzig, 1908).

Experimental Evidence.—Lock, *Recent Progress in the Study of Variation, Heredity, and Evolution* (London, 1907); Muckermann, *Variabilität und Artbildung* in *Natur und Offenb.* (Münster, Jan., 1909); de Vries, *Die Mutationstheorie* (Leipzig, 1901–03); Johannsen, *Ueber Erblichkeit in Populationen und in reinen Linien* (Jena, 1903); Wasmann, *Gibt es tatsächlich Arten*, etc., in *Biol. Zentralbl.* (1901); Galton, *Natural Inheritance* (London, 1889); Mendel, *Versuche über Pflanzenhybriden*, in *Ostwolds Klassiker*, No. 121; Bateson, *Mendel's Principles of Heredity* (Cambridge, 1902); Id., *The Progress of Genetics since the Rediscovery of Mendel's Papers*, in *Progressus Rei Botanicæ* (Jena, 1907), I, 386; Correns, *Ueber Vererbungsgesetze* (Berlin, 1906); Padtberg and Muckermann, *Mendel und Mendelismus* (Munich, 1909); Gross, *Ueber einige Beziehungen zwischen Vererbung und Variation*, in *Biol. Zentralbl.* (1906); Strasburger, *Die stofflichen Grundlagen der Vererbung* (Jena, 1905); Ziegler, *Die Vererbungslehre in der Biologie* (Jena, 1905).

Historical Evidence.—Muckermann, *Paläontologische Urkunden und das Problem der Artbildung*, in *Stimm. aus Maria Laach*, Jan., 1909; Steinmann, *Die geologischen Grundlagen der Abstammungslehre* (Leipzig, 1908); Laurent, *Les progrès de la paléobotanique angiospermique dans la dernière décade*, in *Progr. R. Bot.* (Jena, 1907), I; Koken, *Die Vorwelt und ihre Entwicklungsgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1893); Id., *Paläontologie und Deszendenzlehre* (Jena, 1902); Zittel, *Paläozoologie* (Munich and Leipzig, 1876–93); Schimper and Schenk, *Paläophytologie* (Munich and Leipzig, 1890); Lapparent, *Traité de géologie* (Paris, 1900); Dana, *Manual of Geology* (New York, —); Geikie, *Text-book of Geology* (London, 1893); Cope, *The Primary Factors of Organic Evolution* (Chicago, 1895); Steinmann, *Einführung in die Paläontologie* (Leipzig, 1907); Credner, *Elemente der Geologie* (Leipzig); Kayser, *Geologische Formationskunde* (Stuttgart, 1908); Neumayr, *Erdgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1887); Scharff, *European Animals: their Geological History and Geographical Distribution* (London, 1907); Ward, *Sketch of Paleobotany* (Washington, 1885); Handlirsch, *Die fossilen Insekten und die Phylogenie der rezenten Formen* (Leipzig, 1908); Hoernes, *Der diluviale Mensch* (Brunswick, 1903); Schimpfer, *Pflanzengeographie* (Jena, 1908); Lydekker, *A Geographical History of Mammals* (London, 1896).

H. Muckermann.

Evora, Archdiocese of, in Portugal, raised to archiepiscopal rank in 1544, at which time it was given as suffragans Leiria and Portalegre; in 1570 and later were added Sylves, Ceuta, Congo, Santo Thomé, Funchal, Cabo Verde, and Angra. In the Roman period Julius Cæsar gave it the name of *Liberalitas Julia;* inscriptions and coins remain to prove its high rank among the municipalities of Roman Spain. Its

bishop, Quintianus, was present at the Council of Elvira early in the fourth century. There exists no complete list of his successors for the next two centuries, though some are known from ancient diptychs. In 584 the Visigothic king, Leovirgild, incorporated with his state the Kingdom of the Suevi, to which Evora had hitherto belonged. From the sixth and seventh centuries there remain a few Christian inscriptions pertaining to Evora. In one of them has been interpolated the name of a Bishop Julian (1 Dec., 566); he is, however, inadmissible. Thenceforth the episcopal list is known from the reign of Reccared (586) to the Arab invasion (714), after which the succession is quite unknown for four centuries and a half, with the exception of the epitaph of a Bishop Daniel (January, 1100). Until the reconquest (1166) by Alfonso I of Portugal, Evora was suffragan to Merida. Under this king it became suffragan to Braga, despite the protests of the Archbishops of Compostella, administrators of Merida. In 1274, however, the latter succeeded in bringing Evora within their jurisdiction. Finally, it became suffragan to Lisbon from 1394 to 1544, when it was made an archbishopric. Its large and splendid cathedral has undergone many architectural changes. Among its illustrious prelates may be mentioned Enrique (1540–64, 1578–80), the founder of its university and King of Portugal (1578–80); Teutonio de Braganza (1570–1602); and the scholarly writers Alfonso de Portugal (1486–1522) and Father Manuel de Cenaculo Villasboas (1802–14). Portuguese writers have maintained that the first bishop of Evora was St. Mantius, a Roman, and a disciple of Jesus Christ, sent by the Apostles into Spain as a missionary of the Gospel; from his genuine acts it appears that he was a devout Christian, put to death by the Jews after the fourth century. Spanish Jews, it is known, are mentioned in the fourth-century Council of Elvira (can. 49).

Fonseca, *Evora gloriosa* (Rome, 1728), 261–315; *España Sagrada* (Madrid, 1786), XIV, 102–141; Gams, *Series episcoporum* (1873), 98–100; *Supplem.* (1879), 91; Hübner, *Inscriptiones Hispaniæ christianæ* (Berlin, 1871), n. 1, 9, 10, 11, 213, 324; Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica medii ævi* (Munich, 1901), I, 165, II, 245.

F. Fita.

Evreux, Diocese of (Ebroicensis), in the Department of Eure, France; suffragan of the Archbishopric of Rouen. A legend purporting to date from a certain Deodatus, who is said to have been converted and then later ordained by St. Taurinus, makes the latter first Bishop of Evreux. According to this legend St. Taurinus was baptized at Rome by St. Clement and sent into Gaul as a companion to St. Denis. According to Mgr. Duchesne this legend arose about the ninth century, when Abbot Hilduin of Saint-Denis was intent on proving the identity of Dionysius the Areopagite with Dionysius (Denis), first Bishop of Paris. It is certain that in the time of Charles the Bald (ninth century) St. Taurinus was held in high esteem at Evreux; still earlier, Bishop Landulphus, who seems to have occupied the See of Evreux at the beginning of the seventh century, had built the basilica in his honour.

It is also impossible to fix the date of the reign of St. Gaud, who died a hermit at St. Pair, in the Cotentin. The first historically known Bishop of Evreux is Maurusio, who was present at the Council of Orléans in 511. Other bishops of Evreux are: St. Landulphus, St. Eternus, and St. Aquilinus (seventh century); Gilbert (1071–1112), sent by William the Conqueror to Alexander II, who preached the funeral oration over the Conqueror; Gilles de Perche (1170–79), sent by Henry II of England as ambassador to Rome; Jean (1181–92), a friend of Henry II, who in Cyprus (1190) crowned Berengaria Queen of England; Guillaume de Contiers (1400–18), an active member of the Council of Constance; Jean de la Balue (1465–67), who later became a prisoner of Louis XI; Claude de Saintes, the Apologist (1575–91); Du Perron (1593–1606), a great factor in the abjuration of Henry IV. Thomas Lindet (1743–1823), a member of the Convention, was appointed constitutional Bishop of Evreux from March, 1791, to November, 1792. The following saints are venerated in the diocese: St. Maximus and St. Venerandus, martyrs, at Acquigny on the Eure; St. Leufroy (Leufredus), founder of the Benedictine monastery at La-Croix Saint-Ouen (Audoenus), who died 21 June, 738, and his brother St. Aifroy (Agofredus), who succeeded him.

The cathedral of Evreux is one of the oldest in France; its octagonal dome was built at Cardinal Balue's expense; the church of Gisors has fine sculp-

Cathedral of Notre-Dame, Evreux

tures, among them a statue by Jean Goujon. There are pilgrimages to the shrine of Notre-Dame de la Couture at Bernay (since the tenth century); to that of Notre-Dame des Arcs at Pont de l' Arche; and to a relic of St. Clotilda venerated at Andelys. Previous to the anti-Congregations law of 1901, there were Jesuits and Lazarists at Evreux. Communities of nuns devoted to teaching and the relief of the poor were: the Dominicans of St. Catherine of Siena, an institute founded in 1878 at Etrépagny, which has three houses in the English West Indies; and especially the Sisters of Providence of Evreux, an order founded in 1700 by Justine Duvivier and her brother Father Duvivier in a small hamlet called Caer. It was organized by Father James, an Eudist missionary, and re-established in 1804 by Charlotte Le Mesle; it had several houses in the diocese. The charitable institutions in charge of religious orders were in 1900: 2 crèches, 10 day-nurseries, 1 orphan asylum for boys, 12 for girls, 3 workrooms, 19 homes for the aged, 11 dispensaries, 2 houses of retreat, and 1 insane asylum. The Diocese of Evreux comprised in 1905 (close of the Concordat period) 334,781 inhabitants, 37 parishes, 545 succursal parishes (mission churches), and 25 vicariates paid by the State.

Gallia Christiana (*Nova*), (1759), XI, 564, 625; *instrumenta*, 123, 152; Chassant and Sauvage, *Histoire des évêques d'Evreux*

(Evreux, 1840); Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux*, II, 224–29; Le Brasseur, *Histoire du comté d'Evreux* (Paris, 1722); Fossey, *Monographie de la cathédrale d'Evreux* (Evreux, 1897); Langlois, *Histoire de la congrégation de la Providence d'Evreux* (Evreux, 1901); Chevalier, *Topo-Bibl.*, 1066–1068.

Georges Goyau.

Ewald (or Hewald), Saints, Martyrs in Old Saxony about 695. They were two priests and natives of Northumbria, England. Both bore the same name, but were distinguished as Ewald the Black and Ewald the Fair, from the difference in the colour of their hair and complexions. According to the example of many at that time, they spent several years as students in the schools of Ireland. Ewald the Black was the more learned of the two, but both were equally renowned for holiness of life. They were apparently acquainted with St. Willibrord, the Apostle of Friesland, and were animated with his zeal for the conversion of the Germans. Indeed, by some they have been actually numbered among the eleven companions of that saint, but it is more probable they did not set out from England till after St. Willibrord's departure. They entered upon their mission about 690. The scene of their labours was the country of the ancient Saxons, now part of Westphalia, and covered by the dioceses of Münster, Osnabrück, and Paderborn. At first the Ewalds took up their abode in the house of the steward of a certain Saxon earl or ealdorman (satrapa). Bede remarks that "the old Saxons have no king, but they are governed by several ealdormen [satrapas] who during war cast lots for leadership, but who in time of peace are equal in power" (Hist. Eccl., V, 10). The steward entertained his two guests for several days, and promised to conduct them to the chieftain, as they affirmed they had a message of considerable importance to deliver to him.

Meanwhile, the Ewalds omitted nothing of their religious exercises. They prayed often, recited the canonical hours, and celebrated Mass, for they carried with them all that was necessary for the Holy Sacrifice. The pagan Saxons, understanding from these things that they had Christian priests and missionaries in their midst, began to suspect that their aim was to convert their over-lord, and thus destroy their temples and their religion. Inflamed with jealousy and anger, they resolved that the Ewalds should die. Ewald the Fair they quickly despatched with the sword, but Ewald the Black they subjected to torture, because he was the spokesman and showed greater boldness. He was torn limb from limb, after which the two bodies were cast into the Rhine. This is understood to have happened on 3 October at a place called Aplerbeck, where a chapel still stands.

When the ealdorman heard of what had been done he was exceedingly angry, and took vengeance by ordering the murderers to be put to death and their village to be destroyed by fire. Meanwhile the martyred bodies were miraculously carried against the stream up the Rhine, for the space of forty miles, to the place in which the companions of the Ewalds were residing. As they floated along, a heavenly light, like a column of fire, was seen to shine above them. Even the murderers are said to have witnessed the miraculous brightness. Moreover, one of the martyrs appeared in vision to the monk Tilmon (a companion of the Ewalds), and told him where the bodies would be found: "that the spot would be there where he should see a pillar of light reaching from earth to heaven". Tilmon arose and found the bodies, and interred them with the honours due to martyrs. From that time onwards, the memory of the Ewalds was annually celebrated in those parts. A spring of water is said to have gushed forth in the place of the martyrdom.

Pepin, Duke of Austrasia, having heard of the wonders that had occurred, caused the bodies to be translated to Cologne, where they were solemnly enshrined in the collegiate church of St. Cunibert. The heads of the martyrs were bestowed on Frederick, Bishop of Münster, by Archbishop Anno of Cologne, at the opening of the shrine in 1074. These relics were probably destroyed by the Anabaptists in 1534. When St. Norbert visited Cologne, in 1121, he obtained two small vessels containing the relics of several saints, and among them were bones of the sainted Ewalds. These were deposited either at Prémontré, or at Florennes, a Premonstratensian monastery in the province of Namur. The two Ewalds are honoured as patrons in Westphalia, and are mentioned in the Roman Martyrology on 3 October. Their feast is celebrated in the dioceses of Cologne and Münster.

Bede, *Historia Eccl.*, V, 10; *Acta SS.*, 11 Oct.; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, Oct. 3; Dalgairns, *Apostles of Europe* (London, 1876), II, 11; (Tractarian) *Lives of English Saints, St. Willibrord* (London, 1844), 39.

Columba Edmonds.

Ewing, Thomas, jurist and statesman, b. in West Liberty, Virginia (now West Virginia), U. S. A., 28 December, 1789; d. at Lancaster, Ohio, 26 October, 1871. His father, George Ewing of New Jersey, who had served as an officer in the Continental Army after the Revolution, settled in the Northwest Territory, in the Muskingum Valley, and then, in 1798, in what is now Ames Township, Athens County, Ohio. Here, amid the privations of pioneer life, Ewing was taught to read by his elder sister, Sarah, and by extraordinary efforts acquired a fair elementary education. At the age of nineteen he left home and worked in the Kanawha salt establishments, pursuing his studies at night by the light of the furnace fires. He remained there until he had earned sufficient to enable him to enter the Ohio University at Athens, where, in 1815, he received the degree of A.B., the first degree conferred by any college in the western country. Ewing then studied law at Lancaster, Ohio, and was admitted to the bar in 1816. He entered into a partnership with his preceptor, in the firm of Beecher & Ewing, and then, after Mr. Beecher's death, with his own son Philemon, in the firm of Ewing & Son. He achieved high prominence as a lawyer and won notable success at the state and national bar.

In March, 1831, Ewing entered public life as a member from Ohio of the United States Senate, and became prominent therein, with Webster and Clay, in resistance of the acts of President Jackson and in support of Whig measures. He upheld the protective tariff system of Clay, and presented one of the first of the memorials for the abolition of slavery.

In March, 1837, on the expiration of his term, he resumed the practice of the law. Upon the election of President Harrison, he was appointed Secretary of the Treasury in March, 1841. He prepared the second bill for the re-charter of the Bank of the United States, and, on its veto by Tyler, he resigned from the cabinet, in September, 1841. In March, 1849, he was appointed by President Taylor secretary of the then recently created Department of the Interior. He organized the department, and in his report to congress urged the construction of a railroad to the Pacific. On the death of Taylor in 1850, Ewing resigned from the cabinet and was appointed senator from Ohio to fill an unexpired term. On the expiration of his term in March, 1851, he returned to the practice of the law. In 1860 Ewing was appointed by the Governor of Ohio a member of the famous Peace Conference, and he was prominent in the efforts to avert the secession of the Southern States. During the war he unreservedly supported the government, and his judgment on matters of state was frequently sought by Mr. Lincoln. When the capture of Mason and Slidell brought England and the United States to the verge of hostilities, Ewing sent Mr. Lincoln the famous telegram that was decisive of the whole trouble: "There can be no contraband of war between neutral points." It was his advice that finally prevailed and secured the freeing of

the envoys and the averting of hostilities. Conservative in his opinions, Ewing opposed the radical measures of Reconstruction at the close of the war and supported the administration of President Johnson. In February, 1868, after the removal of Stanton, the President sent to the Senate the nomination of Ewing as Secretary of War, but it was not confirmed.

Descended of Scottish Presbyterian stock, Ewing, after a lifelong attraction to the Catholic Church, entered it in his latter years. Reared outside the fold of any religious body, he married, 7 January, 1820, Maria Wills Boyle, daughter of Hugh Boyle, an Irish Catholic. He was deeply influenced by the living faith and pious example of his wife during their long married life, and all his children were reared in the Faith. In October, 1869, Ewing was stricken while arguing a cause before the Supreme Court of the United States and he was baptized in the court room. In September, 1871, his lifelong friend, Archbishop Purcell of Cincinnati, received him into the Church.

PHILEMON BEECHER, eldest son of Thomas, b. at Lancaster, 3 November, 1820; d. there 15 April, 1896. He graduated in 1838 from Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, and then entered upon the study of the law. Admitted to the Bar in 1841, he formed with his father the firm of T. Ewing & Son. In both State and Federal courts, through his grasp of the philosophy of the law and his judicial temperament, he won a place beside his illustrious father. He was also the main support of his father in his political life and labours, and was an active figure first in the Whig and then in the Republican party. In 1862 he was appointed Judge of the Court of Common Pleas. Being opposed to the Reconstruction measures of his party he took part in the Liberal Republican movement. He was nominated to the supreme bench of Ohio in 1873. During the sixties and seventies he engaged in the banking business, and was prominent in the development of the Hocking Valley coal-fields. The later years of his life were spent in retirement.

He married at Lancaster 31 August, 1848, Mary Rebecca Gillespie, a sister of Eliza Maria Gillespie (Mother Mary of St. Angela of the Sisters of the Holy Cross of Notre Dame, Indiana). He was a man of wide culture and a writer of vigorous and limpid English. He was ever foremost where the interests of the Church were concerned, and was a delegate from the Diocese of Columbus to the Catholic Congresses of 1889 and 1893.

HUGH BOYLE, third son of Thomas, b. at Lancaster, 31 October, 1826; d. there 30 June, 1905. He was educated at the United States Military Academy at West Point, and in 1849 went to California, returning to Lancaster, in 1852, to enter on the study of the law. On his admission to the Bar, he practised in St. Louis, Missouri, from 1854 to 1856, and then, in partnership with his brother Thomas, at Leavenworth, Kansas, from 1856 to 1858. In April, 1861, he was appointed brigade-inspector of Ohio Volunteers with the rank of major, and in August, 1861, was commissioned colonel, commanding the Thirtieth Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and rendered conspicuous service. In November, 1862, he was commissioned brigadier-general. He took part in the operations against Vicksburg, and his command led in the assault of 22 May, 1863. In July following he was appointed to the command of the Fourth Division, Fifteenth Army Corps. In the operations about Chattanooga he led his division in the assault upon Missionary Ridge and its capture. In the latter part of the war he was placed in command of the district of Kentucky, and at its close was brevetted major-general. In 1866 President Johnson appointed him Minister to The Hague, which post he filled until 1870. On his return to the United States, he bought a small estate near Lancaster, in 1876, on which he lived until his death. He was married at Washington, D. C., 3 August, 1858, to Henrietta Elizabeth Young. He was a man of wide culture, and an interesting writer. He published several stories, among them "The Grand Ladron, a tale of Early California", "Koche, a King of Pit", "A Castle in the Air", and "The Black List".

CHARLES, fifth child of Thomas, b. at Lancaster, 6 March, 1835; d. at Washington, 20 June, 1883. Commencing his studies at the college of the Dominican Fathers in Perry County, Ohio, he later attended Gonzaga College, Washington, and the University of Virginia. In 1860 he began the practice of law in St. Louis, Missouri. The Civil War breaking out soon afterwards, he was commissioned a captain in the Thirteenth Infantry of the United States Regulars in May, 1861, and in the Spring of 1862, joined his brother-in-law, General William T. Sherman, in the Arkansas and Mississippi campaigns. In the siege of Vicksburg he was thrice wounded. On the 22nd of June, 1862, he was commissioned lieutenant-colonel and assistant inspector-general of volunteers, and on the 15th of June, 1863, inspector-general of the Fifteenth Army Corps. He served with much distinction in the Atlanta campaign and the famous march through Georgia. On the 8th of March, 1865, he was commissioned brigadier-general, and on the mustering out of the volunteers was transferred to the regular force, from which he resigned as brevet-colonel on the 31st of July, 1867. He was brevetted three times in the regular service for gallant and meritorious services at the Vicksburg and Atlanta campaigns. After his retirement from the Army, he took up his residence in Washington and began the practice of law, in which profession he obtained considerable prominence. In 1873 he accepted the appointment of Indian Commissioner, and laboured energetically to restore to the Catholic Indian Missions the schools among the Indians which they had maintained for twenty years. Pope Pius IX, 3 May, 1877, created him a Knight of the Order of St. Gregory the Great. General Ewing married Virginia, daughter of John K. Miller of Mt. Vernon, Ohio.

ELEANOR BOYLE (MRS. WILLIAM TECUMSEH SHERMAN), daughter of Thomas, b. at Lancaster, 4 October, 1824; d. in New York City, 28 November, 1888. She was educated at the Visitation Convent at Georgetown, D. C. In 1829, just after his father's death, William Tecumseh Sherman, the subsequent famous General of the United States army, then a boy of nine years, was adopted by Mr. Ewing, reared in his household, and appointed by him to the U. S. Military Academy. Sherman married the daughter of his benefactor, 1 May, 1850. She was devoted throughout her life, after the duties of her household, to the relief of suffering and of want, and to the advancement of the Church. Mentally, she inherited the brilliant intellectual powers of her father and was a true helpmate of her husband in his distinguished career. She was the author of "Thomas Ewing, a Memorial", published in 1872. Father P. J. De Smet, S.J., the missionary among the Indians, was an old and intimate friend of the Shermans, and through this intimacy Mrs. Sherman was led to take a special interest in the cause of the Catholic Indians. Her influence and great personal exertions were of much assistance at Washington, to her brother, General Charles Ewing, in the work of saving and promoting the missions for the Catholic Indians.

The Catholic Telegraph (Cincinnati), files; ALERDING, *The Diocese of Fort Wayne* (Fort Wayne, 1907); *A Story of Fifty Years* (Notre Dame, 1905); *Encyclopedia of Am. Biog.*, s. v.

JOHN G. EWING.

Exaltation of the Holy Cross. See CROSS.

Examination, a process prescribed or assigned for testing qualification; an investigation, inquiry. Examinations are in use in parochial schools, Catholic academies, seminaries, and universities as tests of proficiency. Examinations or something equivalent

must enter into all effectual instruction, for it is not sufficient that a book be placed in the hands of a pupil or that he be compelled to attend lectures, but it is necessary to see that he grasps the ideas conveyed. Such tests are widely in vogue in Catholic institutions, as they are in those not subject to the Church. Examinations, however, have other purposes, especially as tests of qualifications for offices or positions, and as investigations to arrive at the truth. It is particularly under these aspects that the question of examinations now presents itself.

Examination for Appointment to Parochial Benefices.—The Council of Trent, realizing that parishes should be ruled over by men of virtue and learning, decreed (Sess. XXIV, c. xviii, De ref.) that the cure of souls should be entrusted only to those who, in a competitive examination or concursus, have demonstrated their fitness. The purpose of this examination is not only to exclude unworthy candidates, but to secure the selection of the best. Clement XI and Benedict XIV determined the form of this examination (see Concursus; Examiners, Synodal).

Examination for Promotion to Orders.—The Council of Trent (Sess. XXIII, c. vii, De ref.), repeating the legislation of previous councils, prescribes that a bishop promote no one to orders in the Church till priests and others prudent and learned, appointed by the bishop, pass upon the candidate's qualifications. This investigation is concerned with legitimate birth, baptism, confirmation, freedom from irregularity, age, title of ordination, morals, faith, and knowledge. In practice, however, the examination is confined to learning, as other requisites are investigated in advance and attested by proper documents, of the chancellor, pastor, rector of seminary, etc. The place, form, matter, number of examiners, and other details of the examination are left to the bishop. A prelate commissioned by another to ordain the latter's subject is free to submit the candidate to an examination or not, as he may deem proper, unless, for grave reasons, he suspect the unfitness of the candidate, notwithstanding a previous examination, or unless he be commissioned by the candidate's bishop to hold the examination. Members of religious orders are examined by their own superiors and likewise by the ordinary prelate, except the Jesuits and some others who by special privilege are exempt from examination by the ordinary prelate (see Examiners, Apostolic).

Examination of Bishops-Elect.—In addition to the examination in the Roman Pontifical, Gregory XIV prescribed another for bishops-elect, while Clement VIII instituted a congregation of cardinals for this purpose. This examination, however, developed into little else than a ceremony, since bishops are not selected till assurance is given of their prudence, piety, and learning. The late reorganization of the Roman Curia puts this matter under the Consistorial Congregation. Cardinals who are to receive episcopal consecration are exempt from this examination.

Examination of Confessors.—The Council of Trent (Sess. XXIII, c. xv, De ref.) established the necessary requirements of episcopal approbation for all priests, both secular and regular, to hear confessions, advising an examination as a test of fitness, though bishops are free to approve, without such test, those priests who in their judgment are qualified for the work. Members of the regular clergy, without exception, may be obliged by the ordinary of the diocese to undergo this test, if they would hear the sacramental confessions of secular persons. Once approved, however, they are not to be subjected to another examination, unless some grave cause relating to confessions arise (see Examiners, Apostolic).

Examination of Preachers.—The ordinary of a diocese may submit to an examination members of religious bodies who desire to preach in the diocese in churches other than those of their own order. Once, however, he has given his approbation, he may not insist on a second examination, though for just cause he may withdraw the permission given to preach. The bishop's successor in office may demand a re-examination.

Examination of Those Wishing to Contract Marriage.—Before publishing the banns of marriage the pastor questions separately the contracting parties regarding their place of residence, to ascertain whether he has a right to unite them in matrimony. He inquires, likewise, whether they are acting with perfect freedom, or perhaps under duress, fear, or other motive which might invalidate the contract. He learns of any opposition on the part of parents to the proposed union, as well as of the possible existence of any matrimonial impediment. He must ascertain, moreover, whether the parties are sufficiently grounded in the rudiments of the Catholic religion and capable, consequently, of instructing their offspring. If the parties belong to different parishes, by whom is this investigation to be conducted? Local regulations and customs are to be observed, since there is neither positive universal legislation nor uniform practice in this matter.

Examination of Witnesses.—In ecclesiastical, as in civil, courts witnesses are examined under oath, administered by the auditor or judge, who should first call the witness's attention to the nature and binding effect of an oath and to his duty of telling the truth. The oath must be to the effect that the witness will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. If thought advisable by the judge, the oath may also contain the promise of secrecy. A statement not sworn to does not constitute evidence. Witnesses are examined separately. In civil trials the interested parties have a right to be present when witnesses are deposing and may not be excluded except in rare cases approved by the judge. In criminal or other cases, where public rather than private interest is at stake, the practice is to exclude the plaintiff and defendant, as well as other witnesses. Here, also, in extreme cases an exception may be made. If, however, the defendant is not allowed to confront the witnesses cited by the plaintiff and vice versa, he is permitted to see the witnesses take the oath and may suggest interrogatories to be proposed.

Witnesses are to be asked or cited, but not necessarily in a formal manner, to appear in court and testify. He who offers his testimony unsolicited is suspected. The examination of witnesses is conducted by the judge. The interrogatories, which are general and special, should be clear and capable of a direct and definite answer. The general questions concern the name, residence, profession, age, and religion of the witness. His relations to plaintiff or defendant, his habits, prejudices, associations, motives, his physical defects, and, at times, his mental qualities, his means of knowledge, powers of discernment, and his memory may be relevant. The special queries are drawn from the crime or charge, and should be relevant or material to the fact at issue. The judge must ascertain how much of the deposition is of personal knowledge, or only hearsay evidence or rumour, or perhaps mere opinion or inference. Circumstances of place, persons, time, etc. may be pertinent. Leading or suggestive questions, which suggest the answer desired, are not permitted. The rules of competency of witnesses are reducible to two, a knowledge of the facts in the case and veracity. In weighing the evidence, however, the judge must consider not only the knowledge and credibility of the witness, but also the quality of the deposition and its weight in comparison with that of other witnesses. While exception may be taken to a witness, if unsustained it does not disqualify him. The testimony is written down by the secretary or clerk and is read by him to the witness. Additions or corrections, if necessary, are made. The witness affixes his signature, or, if unable to write, he makes his mark.

which must be attested by the clerk. If the witness refuses to subscribe, the fact and the reason thereof must be noted. Finally, both the judge and the clerk sign the document.

FERRARIS, *Prompta Bibliotheca*, s. v.; LAURENTIUS, *Institutiones*, s. v. *Examen;* TAUNTON, *The Law of the Church*, s. v. *Examination.*

ANDREW B. MEEHAN.

Examination of Conscience.—By this term is understood a review of one's past thoughts, words, and actions for the purpose of ascertaining their conformity with, or difformity from, the moral law. Directly, this examination is concerned only with the will, that is, with the good or bad intention that inspires one's thoughts, words, and actions. Some of the ancient philosophers—the Stoics in particular—studied to be blameless in their own sight, and for this they made frequent use of self-inspection. They professed the doctrine that the happiness and dignity of man consist in virtue, or compliance with the law of reason, or with conscience; and thus examinations of conscience were a regular practice in the schools of the Stoics and of their later followers, such Eclectics as Quintus Sextius and Seneca. In the hearts of all men there is heard at times the voice of conscience bidding them seek their moral perfection, not so much for the dignity and happiness it confers on them as through regard for the holiness of the Supreme Author of the moral law. This precept of rational nature has been enforced by the voice of revelation. Thus God said to Abraham, "Walk before me, and be perfect" (Gen., xvii, 1). To this precept the Prophet Jeremias referred when he sang in his Lamentations: "Let us search our ways, and seek, and return to the Lord" (iii, 40).

In the fullness of time Christ came to perfect the knowledge of the moral law and draw the human heart into closer union with God. Frequent examination of conscience then became more imperative than before. In particular it was commanded by the Apostle St. Paul to be performed by the faithful each time they received Holy Communion: "Let a man prove"—that is examine—"himself: and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of the chalice; for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh judgment to himself . . . . . if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged" (I Cor., xi, 28–31). And, as the early Christians received Holy Communion very frequently, examination of conscience became a familiar exercise of their spiritual life. Thus we read of the great hermit St. Anthony, that he examined his conscience every night, while St. Basil, St. Augustine, and St. Bernard, and founders of religious orders generally, made the examination of conscience a regular daily exercise of their followers. What was thus enjoined on religious by rule was inculcated upon the faithful at large by the masters of the spiritual life as a most effectual means to advance in virtue.

The devotional examination of conscience is quite distinct from that required as a proximate preparation for sacramental confession. If a Christian judges himself unworthy of receiving the Body of the Lord, he is to make himself worthy by obtaining pardon of his sins; and the means is provided for the purpose by Christ in the power He has given His ministers to remit sins. As discretion is to be used in remitting or retaining sins, the confession of the sinner is necessary; and to confess his faults he must examine his conscience with proper diligence. By self-examination he intensifies his contrition and purpose of amendment. In preparing for confession, the penitent is strictly obliged to examine his conscience with such diligence as a prudent man ordinarily devotes to important business, but the impossible is not demanded. The more protracted his wanderings have been, the weaker the prodigal may have become to travel back to his Father, and the more help he may need to accomplish the task. When he has made some earnest efforts in this matter, the priest is to lend his assistance to perfect the work; as Vasquez and de Lugo remark, a prudent confessor can accomplish more with most penitents by a few questions than they themselves can by a long examination. Suarez takes notice that the Fathers of the Church have not taught any set system for such examinations. The ordinary method followed in the examination for confession is to consider in succession the Ten Commandments of God, the Commandments of the Church, the Seven Capital Sins, the duties of one's state of life, the nine ways of partaking in the sins of others. For persons who have led a uniform life it will often suffice to recall where they have been, the persons with whom they have dealt, the duties or pursuits in which they have been engaged; how they have behaved on ordinary occasions—as, for instance, when busied in their usual employment on working-days—and on unusual occasions, such as Sundays and holidays.

As to the daily examination of conscience, two species must be distinguished, the general and the particular. The former aims at the correction of all kinds of faults, the latter at the avoidance of some particular fault or the acquisition of some particular virtue. For the general examination a good method is laid down by St. Ignatius of Loyola in his "Spiritual Exercises". It contains five points. In the first point we thank God for the benefits received; in the second we ask grace to know and correct our faults; in the third we pass in review the successive hours of the day, noting what faults we have committed in deed, word, thought, or omission; in the fourth we ask God's pardon; in the fifth we purpose amendment.

Of the particular examination of conscience St. Ignatius is generally considered as the author, or at least as the first who reduced it to system and promoted its practice among the faithful. It concentrates one's attention on some one fault or virtue. On rising in the morning we resolve to avoid a certain fault during the day, or to perform certain acts of a particular virtue. About noon we consider how often we have committed that fault, or practised that virtue; we mark the number in a booklet prepared for the purpose, and we renew our resolution for the rest of the day. At night we examine and mark again, and make resolutions for the following day. We thus act like careful business men who watch for a while a special portion of their mercantile transactions to see where losses come in or where greater gain may be secured. St. Ignatius further suggests that we impose upon ourselves some penance for every one of the faults committed, and that we compare the numbers marked each time with those of the preceding day, the total sum at the end of the week with that of the preceding week, etc. (See CONSCIENCE; DUTY; SIN.)

Text of the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius (London, 1893), 13–19; RODRIGUEZ, *Pract. of Christian Perfection* (New York, 1897), I, vii; DE LA PALMA, *A Treatise on the Particular Exam.* (tr., London, 1873); DRUZBICKI, *The Tribunal of Conscience* (London, 1884); BRO. PHILIP, *Subjects of Part. Exam.* (New York, 1870); SCHIELER-HEUSER, *Theory and Practice of the Confessional* (New York, 1905); LEHMKUHL, *Theol. Mor.* (Freiburg, 1885), II, nn. 341–344.

CHARLES COPPENS.

Examiners, APOSTOLIC, so called because appointed by the Apostolic See for service in Rome. In 1570 Pius V instituted the Apostolic examiners to conduct examinations of candidates for orders and of confessors. These examiners, who are chosen by the pope, take an oath in the presence of the cardinal vicar to discharge their duties faithfully. By virtue of a Constitution of Alexander VII, in 1662, the examination of those who would receive orders is held in the vicariate, or palace of the cardinal vicar, in the presence of at least three examiners. It is only after consultation with the pope that the cardinal vicar may dispense

from this examination, except in case of tonsure, when he may allow candidates to be examined privately by one examiner. All, whether affiliated to the Diocese of Rome or not, must undergo this examination. Those who have been in Rome four months or more, and who intend to return to the Eternal City, must, under pain of suspension, be examined in the vicariate before receiving orders (not tonsure) elsewhere. An exception is made in regard to the canons of the basilica of St. Peter, who are examined and promoted to orders by their cardinal archpriest. They must, however, have testimonial letters from the cardinal vicar. Even prelates of the Roman Curia must present themselves at the vicariate, but out of respect for their dignity they occupy seats among the examiners and examine one another.

As regards confessors they are not approved in Rome till they have passed a satisfactory examination before the Apostolic examiners. Although the cardinal vicar may dispense in this matter, the exercise of this prerogative is exceedingly rare. Generally, after a first and second test faculties to hear confessions are granted only for a limited time, while a third successful examination meets with unlimited approbation.

HUMPHREY, *Urbs et Orbis* (London, 1899), 188–192; GASPARRI, *De Sacrâ Ordinatione* (Paris, 1894), nn. 750 sq.

ANDREW B. MEEHAN.

Examiners, SYNODAL, so called because chosen in a diocesan synod. The Council of Trent prescribes at least six synodal examiners. The number twenty has been fixed upon by the Congregation of the Council as an ample sufficiency. The chief purpose of synodal examiners is to conduct competitive examinations or concursus, though they may be designated to hold other examinations. Suitable candidates for this office are proposed singly, not all together, each year in the diocesan synod, by the bishop or his vicar-general; they must be satisfactory to the synod and meet the approval of a majority of those present, the voting being secret or public as the bishop may determine. They should have the academic degree at least of licentiate in theology or canon law, but where clerics with such degrees are not available, others qualified, either of the diocesan or religious clergy, are eligible. Synodal examiners, once appointed, hold office till the ensuing synod, though several years have elapsed. Those chosen take an oath—in the synod, if present, otherwise privately in the presence of the bishop or vicar-general—to fulfil their duties conscientiously, without prejudice, favouritism, or other unworthy motive. Neglect on the part of only one to take this oath renders null and void the concursus in which he takes part. They are admonished, moreover, not to accept presents in the discharge of their office, failing in which they become guilty of simony and are punishable accordingly. Neither the diocesan synod nor the bishop personally may establish a salary, however insignificant, for the fulfilment of their office.

If, within a year after their appointment in synod, the number of examiners, through death, resignation, or other cause, fall below six, the bishop may, with the consent of the cathedral chapter, fill up the number; if the number six decrease after the expiration of a year, permission of the Sacred Congregation of the Council is also requisite. Examiners thus chosen out of synod are termed pro-synodal. There is no positive legislation regarding the removal from office of examiners, synodal or pro-synodal. In some countries, where ecclesiastical benefices do not exist, the regulations of the Council of Trent anent synodal examiners are not observed, kindred duties as far as necessary being performed by clerics who are styled "examiners of the clergy" or something similar. The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore prescribes for the United States that these examiners, at least six in number if possible, be selected in synod. It is only with permission of the Holy See and after consultation with the diocesan consultors that a bishop may choose them out of synod. In case of vacancy the bishop, with the advice of said consultors, may supply the deficiency. These examiners are required to take the oath as above and likewise to swear not to accept gifts on the occasion of examinations. Whether these examiners, thus appointed out of synod, hold office till death or only till the convening of the next synod is not determined. In many dioceses these same examiners conduct the examinations for the junior clergy, confessors, candidates for orders, and the like. (Cf. Council of Trent, Sess. XXIV, c. xviii, De ref.; also Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, nos. 24 sqq.)

ANDREW B. MEEHAN.

Exarch (Gr. Ἔξαρχος), a title used in various senses both civilly and ecclesiastically. In the civil administration of the Roman Empire the exarch was the governor or viceroy of any large and important province. The best-known case is that of the Exarch of Italy, who, after the defeat of the Goths, ruled from Ravenna (552–751) in the name of the emperor at Constantinople. In ecclesiastical language an exarch was, at first, a metropolitan whose jurisdiction extended beyond his own (metropolitical) province, over other metropolitans. Thus, as late as the time of the Council of Chalcedon (451), the patriarchs are still called exarchs (can. ix). When the name "patriarch" became the official one for the Bishops of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch (and later of Constantinople and Jerusalem), the other title was left as the proper style of the metropolitans who ruled over the three remaining (political) dioceses of Diocletian's division of the Eastern Prefecture, namely the Exarchs of Asia (at Ephesus), of Cappadocia and Pontus (at Cæsarea), and of Thrace (at Heraclea). The advance of Constantinople put an end to these exarchates, which fell back to the state of ordinary metropolitan sees (Fortescue, Orth. Eastern Church, 21–25). But the title of exarch was still occasionally used for any metropolitan (so at Sardica in 343, can. vi). Since the use of all these titles became gradually fixed with definite technical meanings, that of exarch has disappeared in the West, being replaced by the names "Apostolic vicar" and then "primate". A few cases, such as that of the Archbishop of Lyons, whom the Emperor Frederick I named Exarch of Burgundy in 1157, are rare exceptions. In Eastern Christendom an exarch is a bishop who holds a place between that of patriarch and that of ordinary metropolitan. The principle is that, since no addition may be made to the sacred number of five patriarchs, any bishop who is independent of any one of these five should be called an exarch. Thus, since the Church of Cyprus was declared autocephalous (at Ephesus in 431), its primate receives the title of Exarch of Cyprus. The short-lived medieval Churches of Ipek (for Servia), Achrida (for Bulgaria), Tirnova (for Rumania), were governed by exarchs, though these prelates occasionally usurped the title of patriarch (Fortescue, Orth. Eastern Church, 305 sq., 317 sq., 328 sq.). On the same principle the Archbishop of Mount Sinai is an exarch, though in this case, as in that of Cyprus, modern Orthodox usage generally prefers the (to them) unusual title, "archbishop" (Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος). When the Bulgarians constituted their national Church (1870), not quite daring to call its head a patriarch, they made him an exarch. The Bulgarian exarch, who resides at Constantinople, is the most famous of all persons who bear the title now. Because of it his adherents throughout Macedonia are called exarchists (as opposed to the Greek patriarchists). It was an inaccurate use of this title when Peter the Great, after abolishing the Patriarchate of Moscow (1702), for twenty years before he founded the Russian Holy Directing Synod, appointed a vicegerent with the title of exarch as president of a tem-

porary governing commission. Since Russia destroyed the old independent Georgian Church (1802) the Primate of Georgia (always a Russian) sits in the Holy Synod at St. Petersburg with the title of Exarch of Georgia (Fortescue, Orth. Eastern Church, 304–305). Lastly, the third officer of the court of the Patriarch of Constantinople, who examines marriage cases (our *defensor matrimonii*), is called the exarch (ibid., 349).

Lübeck, *Reichseinteilung und kirchliche Hierarchie des Orients bis zum Ausgange des 4. Jahrhunderts* (Münster, 1901); Silbernagl–Schnitzer, *Verfassung und gegenwärtiger Bestand sämtlicher Kirchen des Orients* (2nd ed., Munich, 1904); Kattenbusch, *Vergleichende Konfessionskunde* in *Die orthodoxe anatolische Kirche* (Freiburg im Br., 1892), I, 81–89; Hinschius, *System des katholischen Kirchenrechtes* (Freiburg im Br., 1869), I, 538 sq.; Milasch, *Das Kirchenrecht der morgenländischen Kirche* (2nd ed., Mostar, 1905); Fortescue, *The Orthodox Eastern Church* (London, 1907), 8, 21–25, 319, 349.

Adrian Fortescue.

Excardination. See Incardination.

Ex Cathedra, literally "from the chair", a theological term which signifies authoritative teaching and is more particularly applied to the definitions given by the Roman pontiff. Originally the name of the seat occupied by a professor or a bishop, *cathedra* was used later on to denote the magisterium, or teaching authority. The phrase *ex cathedra* occurs in the writings of the medieval theologians, and more frequently in the discussions which arose after the Reformation in regard to the papal prerogatives. But its present meaning was formally determined by the Vatican Council, Sess. IV, Const. de Ecclesiâ Christi, c. iv: "We teach and define that it is a dogma Divinely revealed that the Roman pontiff when he speaks ex cathedra, that is when in discharge of the office of pastor and doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the universal Church, by the Divine assistance promised to him in Blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed in defining doctrine regarding faith or morals, and that therefore such definitions of the Roman pontiff are of themselves and not from the consent of the Church irreformable." (See Infallibility; Pope.)

E. A. Pace.

Exclusion, Right of (Lat. *Jus Exclusivæ*), the alleged competence of the more important Catholic countries, Austria, France, and Spain, to indicate to their respective cardinal protector, or cardinal procurator, those members of the Sacred College who were *personæ minus gratæ*, so that, if there was a possibility of one of these becoming pope, the authorized cardinal might, before the decisive ballot, give his veto, in the name of his government, against such election. At one time this veto was given orally; later it was given in writing. The cardinal protector, or cardinal procurator, who cast the veto, was, as a rule, that member of the Sacred College who had been created a cardinal at the desire of his government. This declaration could only be made at the last moment, for the reason that, by traditional usage, a government might invoke this alleged right only once at the same conclave, and consequently would not wish to employ it unnecessarily. A veto made after the election was not recognized. Opinions differ widely as to the antiquity of this right. It cannot be proved that it is in any way related to the rights in the papal election, exercised by German kings and emperors in the early Middle Ages. Indeed, it was not until the sixteenth century, that the more important European countries obtained larger influence over papal elections, owing to the contentions of France, Spain, and the German emperor, for the control of Italy. These governments were originally satisfied with the so-called "ballot of exclusion", i. e., they sought to unite more than one-third of the voters against an undesirable candidate and thus make his election impossible, through lack of the necessary two-thirds majority. About the beginning of the seventeenth century, however, in the conclaves that elected Leo XI and Paul V (1605), Spain raised the claim, that it could exclude a candidate by a general declaration addressed to the College of Cardinals. Soon after, in the conclaves of 1644 and 1655, which elected, respectively, Innocent X and Alexander VII, and in both of which Cardinal Sacchetti was excluded as a candidate, the term used for this action was *Jus Exclusivæ* (right of exclusion). This right was, therefore, claimed about the middle of the seventeenth century; later dates suggested, e. g., 1691, or 1721, must be abandoned. It was also about the middle of the seventeenth century that treatises and polemic writings began to appear, in which the alleged right of exclusion was discussed; among such controversialists were the Cardinals Albizzi and Lugo.

In the following period repeated use was made of this so-called right. In 1721 the German emperor formally excluded Cardinal Paolucci; in 1730 the King of Spain excluded Cardinal Imperiali; in 1758 France exercised this right to exclude Cardinal Cavalchini. In the nineteenth century Austria maintained the right of exclusion, in 1830, against Cardinal Severoli, and Spain, in 1830, against Cardinal Giustiniani; in 1903 Austria again exercised this right, this time against Cardinal Rampolla. As a matter of fact, no government has a right to exercise any veto in a papal election. On the contrary the popes have expressly repudiated the exercise of such right. Pius IV in the Bull "In eligendis", of 9 October, 1562 (Magnum Bullarium, II, 97 sqq.), ordered the cardinals to elect a pope "Principum sæcularium intercessionibus, cæterisque mundanis respectibus, minime attentis" (without any regard to the interference of secular rulers, or to other human considerations). That he meant thereby what is now known as the right of exclusion cannot, indeed, be proved; according to the foregoing account of its origin such claim did not then exist. Gregory XV, in the Bull "Æterni Patris Filius" (15 November, 1621, in "Magnum Bullarium", III, 444 sqq.) declared authoritatively: "Cardinales omnino abstineant ab omnibus pactionibus, conventionibus, promissionibus, intendimentis, condictis, fœderibus, aliis quibuscunque obligationibus, minis, signis, contrasignis suffragiorum seu schedularum, aut aliis tam verbo quam scripto aut quomodocunque dandis aut petendis, tam respectu inclusionis quam exclusionis, tam unius personæ quam plurium aut certi generis, etc.", the sense of which is, that the cardinals must abstain from all agreements, and from acts of any kind, which might be construed as binding them to include or exclude any one candidate, or several, or candidates of a certain class. It may be that the pope does not even here refer to exclusion by a state, but only to the so-called "ballot of exclusion"; it has already been stated, however, that the governments at this time laid claim to a formal right of exclusion. In the Bull "Apostolatus officium" (11 October, 1732, in "Magnum Bullarium", XIV, 248 sqq.) Clement XII ordered the cardinals in the words of Pius IV, already quoted, to elect, "principum sæcularium intercessionibus cæterisque mundanis respectibus ... minime attentis et postpositis" (i. e. without regard to the interference of secular rulers or to other human considerations).

By this time, however, governmental exclusion had long been the accepted form of the interference of secular rulers (intercessio principum) in papal elections. It is, therefore, precisely this exclusion which the pope forbids. This command has all the more weight since we know that this pope was urged to recognize, within certain limits, the right of exclusion put forth by the Catholic states; in the minutes of the deliberations of the commission of cardinals appointed to draw up this Bull the right of exclusion is explicitly characterized as an abuse. By the Constitution "In hâc sublimi", of 23 August, 1871 (Archiv für kath. Kirchenrecht,

1891, LXV, 303 sqq.), Pius IX forbade any interference of the secular power in papal elections. It is plain, therefore, that the popes have rejected all right of exclusion by a Catholic state in a papal election. Nor can it be admitted that this right has arisen through custom. None of the requisites essential to the growth of a customary right are present; reasonableness and prescription are especially lacking. To debar precisely the most capable candidates is an onerous limitation of the liberty of the electors, and injurious to the Church. Moreover, the cases of exclusion by Catholic states are too few to permit the inference of a right acquired by customary possession. Recent legislation by Pope Pius X has absolutely repudiated and abolished forever this *Jus Exclusivæ*. In the Constitution "Commissum Nobis" (20 Jan., 1904) he declared that the Apostolic See had never approved the civil veto, though previous legislation had not succeeded in preventing it: "Wherefore in virtue of holy obedience, under threat of the Divine judgment, and pain of excommunication *latæ sententiæ* ..... we prohibit the cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, all and single, and likewise the Secretary of the Sacred College of Cardinals, and all others who take part in the Conclave, to receive even under the form of a simple desire the office of proposing the veto in whatever manner, either by writing or by word of mouth ..... And it is our will that this prohibition be extended ..... to all intercessions, etc. ..... by which the lay powers endeavour to intrude themselves in the election of a pontiff .....

"Let no man infringe this our inhibition ..... under pain of incurring the indignation of God Almighty and of his Apostles, Sts. Peter and Paul." The new form of oath to be taken by all cardinals contains these words: "we shall never in any way accept, under any pretext, from any civil power whatever, the office of proposing a veto of exclusion even under the form of a mere desire ... and we shall never lend favour to any intervention, or intercession, or any other method whatever, by which the lay powers of any grade or order may wish to interfere in the election of a pontiff".

WAHRMUND, *Das Ausschliessungsrecht (jus exclusivæ) der kath. Staaten Oesterr., Frankr. und Span. bei den Papstwahlen* (Vienna, 1888); IDEM, *Die Bulle "Æterni Patris Filius" und der staatl. Einfluss auf die Papstwahlen* in *Archiv für kath. Kirchenrecht* (1894), LXXII, 201 sqq.; SÄGMÜLLER, *Die Papstwahlen und die Staaten von 1447 bis 1555* (Tübingen, 1890); IDEM, *Die Papstwahlbullen und das staatl. Recht der Exclusive in der Papstwahl* (Tübingen, 1892); IDEM, *Das Recht der Exclusive in der Papstwahl* in *Archiv. für kath. Kirchenrecht* (1895), LXXIII, 193 sqq.; LECTOR, *Le conclave* (Paris, 1894); GIOBBIO, *Austria, Francia, e Spagna e l'Esclusiva nel Conclave* (Rome, 1903); PIVANO, *Il diritto di Veto, "Jus Exclusivæ", nell' elezione del Pontefice* (Turin, 1905); VIDAL, *Le veto d'exclusion en matière d'élection pontificale* (Toulouse, 1906); MACK, *Das Recht der Exclusive bei der Papstwahl* (Leipzig, 1906); HERRE, *Papstum und Papstwahl im Zeitalter Phillips II.* (Leipzig, 1907); EISLER, *Das Veto der kath. Staaten bei der Papstwahl seit dem Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Vienna, 1907); EVRARD, *Le droit de veto dans les conclaves* (Paris, 1908); THURSTON, *The Intervention of the State in the Papal Elections* in *The Month* (1903).

JOHANNES BAPTIST SÄGMÜLLER.

Excommunication.—This subject will be treated under the following heads: I. General Notions and Historical Summary; II. Kinds of Excommunication; III. Who Can Excommunicate? IV. Who Can Be Excommunicated? V. Effects of Excommunication; VI. Absolution from Excommunication; VII. Excommunications *Latæ Sententiæ* Now in Force.

I. GENERAL NOTIONS AND HISTORICAL SUMMARY.—Excommunication (Lat. *ex*, out of, and *communio* or *communicatio*, communion—exclusion from the communion), the principal and severest censure, is a medicinal, spiritual penalty that deprives the guilty Christian of all participation in the common blessings of ecclesiastical society. Being a penalty, it supposes guilt; and being the most serious penalty that the Church can inflict, it naturally supposes a very grave offence. It is also a medicinal rather than a vindictive penalty, being intended, not so much to punish the culprit, as to correct him and bring him back to the path of righteousness. It necessarily, therefore, contemplates the future, either to prevent the recurrence of certain culpable acts that have grievous external consequences, or, more especially, to induce the delinquent to satisfy the obligations incurred by his offence. Its object and its effect are loss of communion, i. e. of the spiritual benefits shared by all the members of Christian society; hence, it can affect only those who by baptism have been admitted to that society. Undoubtedly there can and do exist other penal measures which entail the loss of certain fixed rights; among them are other censures, e. g. suspension for clerics, interdict for clerics and laymen, irregularity *ex delicto*, etc. Excommunication, however, is clearly distinguished from these penalties in that it is the privation of all rights resulting from the social status of the Christian as such. The excommunicated person, it is true, does not cease to be a Christian, since his baptism can never be effaced; he can, however, be considered as an exile from Christian society and as non-existent, for a time at least, in the sight of ecclesiastical authority. But such exile can have an end (and the Church desires it), as soon as the offender has given suitable satisfaction. Meanwhile, his status before the Church is that of a stranger. He may not participate in public worship nor receive the Body of Christ or any of the sacraments. Moreover, if he be a cleric, he is forbidden to administer a sacred rite or to exercise an act of spiritual authority.

Right of the Church to Excommunicate.—The right to excommunicate is an immediate and necessary consequence of the fact that the Church is a society. Every society has the right to exclude and deprive of their rights and social advantages its unworthy or grievously culpable members, either temporarily or permanently. This right is necessary to every society in order that it may be well administered and survive. The fundamental proof, therefore, of the Church's right to excommunicate is based on her status as a spiritual society, whose members, governed by legitimate authority, seek one and the same end through suitable means. Members who, by their obstinate disobedience, reject the means of attaining this common end deserve to be removed from such a society. This rational argument is confirmed by texts of the New Testament, the example of the Apostles, and the practice of the Church from the first ages down to the present. Among the Jews, exclusion from the synagogue was a real excommunication (Esd., x, 8). This was the exclusion feared by the parents of the man born blind (John, ix, 21 sq.; cf. xii, 42; xvi, 2); the same likewise that Christ foretold to His disciples (Luke, vi, 22). It is also the exclusion which in due time the Christian Church should exercise: "And if he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican" (Matt., xviii, 17). In the celebrated text: "Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven" (Matt., xviii, 18; cf. xvi, 19), it is not only the remission of sins that is referred to, but likewise all spiritual jurisdiction, including judicial and penal sanctions. Such, moreover, was the jurisdiction conferred on St. Peter by the words: "Feed my lambs"; "feed my sheep" (John, xxi, 15, 16, 17). St. Paul excommunicated regularly the incestuous Corinthian (I Cor., v, 5) and the incorrigible blasphemers whom he delivered over to Satan (I Tim., i, 20). Faithful to the Apostolic teaching and example, the Church, from the very earliest ages, was wont to excommunicate heretics and contumacious persons; since the fourth century numerous conciliary canons pronounce excommunication against those who are guilty of certain offences. Of the facts there can be no doubt (Seitz, Die Heilsnotwendigkeit der Kirche, Freiburg, 1903).

Excommunication not only External.—In the first

Christian centuries it is not always easy to distinguish between excommunication and penitential exclusion; to differentiate them satisfactorily we must await the decline of the institution of public penance and the well-defined separation between those things appertaining to the *forum internum*, or tribunal of conscience, and the *forum externum*, or public ecclesiastical tribunal; nevertheless, the admission of a sinner to the performance of public penance was consequent on a previous genuine excommunication. On the other hand, formal exclusion from reception of the Eucharist and the other sacraments was only mitigated excommunication and identical with minor excommunication (see below). At any rate, in the first centuries excommunication is not regarded as a simple external measure; it reaches the soul and the conscience. It is not merely the severing of the outward bond which holds the individual to his place in the Church; it severs also the internal bond, and the sentence pronounced on earth is ratified in heaven. It is the spiritual sword, the heaviest penalty that the Church can inflict (see the patristic texts quoted in the Decree of Gratian, cc. xxxi, xxxii, xxxiii, C. xi, q. iii). Hence in the Bull "Exsurge Domine" (16 May, 1520) Leo X justly condemned Luther's twenty-third proposition according to which "excommunications are merely external punishments, nor do they deprive a man of the common spiritual prayers of the Church". Pius VI also condemned (Auctorem Fidei, 28 Aug., 1794) the forty-sixth proposition of the Pseudo-Synod of Pistoia, which maintained that the effect of excommunication is only exterior because of its own nature it excludes only from exterior communion with the Church, as if, said the pope, excommunication were not a spiritual penalty binding in heaven and affecting souls. The aforesaid proposition was therefore condemned as false, pernicious, already reprobated in the twenty-third proposition of Luther, and, to say the least, erroneous. Undoubtedly the Church cannot (nor does it wish to) oppose any obstacle to the internal relations of the soul with God; she even implores God to give the grace of repentance to the excommunicated. The rites of the Church, nevertheless, are always the providential and regular channel through which Divine grace is conveyed to Christians; exclusion from such rites, especially from the sacraments, entails therefore regularly the privation of this grace, to whose sources the excommunicated person has no longer access.

History of Excommunication.—While excommunication ranks first among ecclesiastical censures, it existed long before any such classification arose. From the earliest days of the Christian society it was the chief (if not the only) ecclesiastical penalty for laymen; for guilty clerics the first punishment was deposition from their office, i. e. reduction to the ranks of the laity. Subsequently, when ecclesiastical discipline allowed clerics more easily to resume their ministry, the ancient deposition became suspension; thenceforth even clerics were subject to excommunication, by which they lost at once their rights as Christians and as clerics. Both laymen and clerics were henceforth threatened or punished with excommunication for offences that became daily more definite and numerous, particularly for refusing obedience either to special ecclesiastical precepts or the general laws of the Church. Once the *forum externum*, or public ecclesiastical tribunal, was distinctly separated from the *forum sacramentale*, or tribunal of sacramental penance, say from the ninth century on, excommunication became gradually an ever more powerful means of spiritual government, a sort of coercive measure ensuring the exact accomplishment of the laws of the Church and the precepts of her prelates. Excommunication was either threatened or inflicted in order to secure the observance of fasts and feasts, the payment of tithes, the obedience of inferiors, the denunciation of the guilty, also to compel the faithful to make known to ecclesiastical authority matrimonial impediments and other information.

Abuse.—This extension of the use of excommunication led to abuses. The infliction of so grave a penalty for offences of a less grievous kind and most frequently impossible to verify before the public ecclesiastical authority, begot eventually a contempt for excommunication. Consequently the Council of Trent was forced to recommend to all bishops and prelates more moderation in the use of censures (Sess. XXV, c. iii, De ref.). The passage is too significant to be here omitted: "Although the sword of excommunication is the very sinews of ecclesiastical discipline, and very salutary for keeping the people to the observance of their duty, yet it is to be used with sobriety and great circumspection; seeing that experience teaches that if it be wielded rashly or for slight causes, it is more despised than feared, and works more evil than good. Wherefore, such excommunications which are wont to be issued for the purpose of provoking a revelation, or on account of things lost or stolen, shall be issued by no one whomsoever but the bishop; and not then, except on account of some uncommon circumstance which moves the bishop thereunto, and after the matter has been by him diligently and very maturely weighed." Then follow equally explicit measures for the use of censures in judicial matters. This recommendation of the Council of Trent has been duly heeded, and the use of censures as a means of coercion has grown constantly rarer, the more so as it is hardly ever possible for the Church to obtain from the civil power the execution of such penalties.

Excessive Number of Excommunications.—In the course of time, also, the number of canonical excommunications was excessively multiplied, which fact, coupled with their frequent desuetude, made it difficult to know whether many among them were always in force. The difficulty was greater as a large number of these excommunications were reserved, for which reason theologians with much ingenuity construed favourably said reservation and permitted the majority of the faithful to obtain absolution without presenting themselves in Rome, or indeed even writing thither. In recent times the number of excommunications in force has been greatly diminished, and a new method of absolving from them has been inaugurated; it will doubtless find a place in the new codification of the canon law that is being prepared. Thus, without change of nature, excommunication *in foro externo* has become an exceptional penalty, reserved for very grievous offences detrimental to Christian society; *in foro interno* it has been diminished and mitigated, at least in regard to the conditions for absolution from it. However, as can readily be seen from a perusal of the excommunications actually in force, it still remains true that what the Church aims at is not so much the crime as the satisfaction to be obtained from the culprit in consequence of his offence.

Refusal of Ecclesiastical Communion.—Finally, real excommunication must not be confounded with a measure formerly quite frequent, and sometimes even known as excommunication, but which was rather a refusal of episcopal communion. It was the refusal by a bishop to communicate *in sacris* with another bishop and his church, in consideration of an act deemed reprehensible and worthy of chastisement. It was undoubtedly with this withdrawal of communion that Pope Victor threatened (or actually punished) the bishops of Asia in the paschal controversy (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., V, xxiv); it was certainly the measure to which St. Martin of Tours had recourse when he refused to communicate with the Spanish bishops who caused Emperor Maximinus to condemn to death the heretic Priscillian with some of his adherents (Sulpicius Severus, Dial., iii, 15). Moreover, a similar pri-

vation of communion was in early Christian times imposed by councils as a regular penalty for bishops found guilty of certain minor faults; the most frequent example is that of bishops who, without good reason, neglected to attend the provincial council (so the Councils of Carthage, 401, can. xi; Agde, 506, can. xxxv; Tarragona, 516, can. vi; II Macon, 585, can. xx; etc.). These bishops were evidently not excommunicated, properly speaking; they continued to govern their dioceses and publicly to hold ecclesiastical services; they were simply deprived, as the aforesaid texts say, of the consolation of communion with their episcopal brethren.

II. Kinds of Excommunication.—(1) *Major and Minor.*—Until recently excommunication was of two kinds, major and minor. (a) Minor excommunication is uniformly defined by canonists and by Gregory IX (cap. lix, De sent. exc., lib. V, tit. xxxix) as prohibition from receiving the sacraments, what theologians call the passive use of the sacraments. In order to receive the Eucharist and the other sacraments, those who had incurred this penalty had to be absolved therefrom; as it was not reserved, this could be done by any confessor. Indirectly, however, it entailed other consequences. The canon law (cap. x, De cler. excomm. ministrante, lib. V, tit. xxvii) taught that the priest who celebrates Mass while under the ban of minor excommunication sins grievously; also that he sins similarly in administering the sacraments; and finally, that while he can vote for others, he himself is ineligible to a canonical office. This is readily understood when we remember that the cleric thus excommunicated was presumed to be in the state of grievous sin, and that such a state is an obstacle to the lawful celebration of Mass and the administration of the sacraments. Minor excommunication was really identical with the state of the penitent of olden times who, prior to his reconciliation, was admitted to public penance. Minor excommunication was incurred by unlawful intercourse with the excommunicated, and in the beginning no exception was made of any class of excommunicated persons. Owing, however, to many inconveniences arising from this condition of things, especially after excommunications had become so numerous, Martin V, by the Constitution "Ad evitanda scandala" (1418), restricted the aforesaid unlawful intercourse to that held with those who were formally named as persons to be shunned and who were therefore known as *vitandi* (Lat. *vitare*, to avoid), also with those who were notoriously guilty of striking a cleric. But as this twofold category was in modern times greatly reduced, but little attention was paid to minor excommunication, and eventually it ceased to exist after the publication of the Constitution "Apostolicæ Sedis". The latter declared that all excommunications *latæ sententiæ* that it did not mention were abolished, and as it was silent concerning minor excommunication (by its nature an excommunication *latæ sententiæ* of a special kind), canonists concluded that minor excommunication no longer existed. This conclusion was formally ratified by the Holy Office (6 Jan., 1884, ad 4).

(b) Major excommunication, which remains now the only kind in force, is therefore the kind of which we treat below, and to which our definition fully applies. Anathema is a sort of aggravated excommunication, from which, however, it does not differ essentially, but simply in the matter of special solemnities and outward display.

(2) *A jure and ab homine.*—Excommunication is either *a jure* (by law) or *ab homine* (by judicial act of man, i. e. by a judge). The first is provided by the law itself, which declares that whosoever shall have been guilty of a definite crime will incur the penalty of excommunication. The second is inflicted by an ecclesiastical prelate, either when he issues a serious order under pain of excommunication or imposes this penalty by judicial sentence and after a criminal trial.

(3) *Latæ and Ferendæ Sententiæ.*—Excommunication, especially *a jure*, is either *latæ* or *ferendæ sententiæ*. The first is incurred as soon as the offence is committed and by reason of the offence itself (*eo ipso*) without intervention of any ecclesiastical judge; it is recognized in the terms used by the legislator, for instance: "the culprit will be excommunicated at once, by the fact itself [*statim, ipso facto*]". The second is indeed foreseen by the law as a penalty, but is inflicted on the culprit only by a judicial sentence; in other words, the delinquent is rather threatened than visited with the penalty, and incurs it only when the judge has summoned him before his tribunal, declared him guilty, and punished him according to the terms of the law. It is recognized when the law contains these or similar words: "under pain of excommunication"; "the culprit will be excommunicated".

(4) *Public and Occult.*—Excommunication *ferendæ sententiæ* can be public only, as it must be the object of a declaratory sentence pronounced by a judge; but excommunication *latæ sententiæ* may be either public or occult. It is public through the publicity of the law when it is imposed and published by ecclesiastical authority; it is public through notoriety of fact when the offence that has incurred it is known to the majority in the locality, as in the case of those who have publicly done violence to clerics, or of the purchasers of church property. On the contrary, excommunication is occult when the offence entailing it is known to no one or almost no one. The first is valid in the forum externum and consequently in the forum internum; the second is valid in the forum internum only. The practical difference is very important. He who has incurred occult excommunication should treat himself as excommunicated and be absolved as soon as possible, submitting to whatever conditions will be imposed upon him, but this only in the tribunal of conscience; he is not obliged to denounce himself to a judge nor to abstain from external acts connected with the exercise of jurisdiction, and he may ask absolution without making himself known either in confession or to the Sacred Penitentiaria. According to the teaching of Benedict XIV (De synodo, X, i, 5), "a sentence declaratory of the offence is always necessary in the forum externum, since in this tribunal no one is presumed to be excommunicated unless convicted of a crime that entails such a penalty". Public excommunication, on the other hand, is removed only by a public absolution; when it is question of simple publicity of fact (see above), the absolution, while not judicial, is nevertheless public, inasmuch as it is given to a known person and appears as an act of the forum externum.

(5) *Vitandi and Tolerati.*—Public excommunication in foro externo has two degrees according as it has or has not been formally published, or, in other words, according as excommunicated persons are to be shunned (*vitandi*) or tolerated (*tolerati*). A formally published or nominative excommunication occurs when the sentence has been brought to the knowledge of the public by a notification from the judge, indicating by name the person thus punished. No special method is required for this publication; according to the Council of Constance (1414–18), it suffices that "the sentence have been published or made known by the judge in a special and express manner". Persons thus excommunicated are to be shunned (*vitandi*), i. e. the faithful must have no intercourse with them either in regard to sacred things or (to a certain extent) profane matters, as we shall see farther on. All other excommunicated persons, even though known, are *tolerati*, i. e. the law no longer obliges the faithful to abstain from intercourse with them, even in religious matters. This distinction dates from the aforesaid Constitution "Ad evitanda scandala", published by Martin V at the Council of Constance in 1418; until

then one had to avoid communion with all the excommunicated, once they were known as such. "To avoid scandal and numerous dangers", says Martin V, "and to relieve timorous consciences, we hereby mercifully grant to all the faithful that henceforth no one need refrain from communicating with another in the reception or administration of the sacraments, or in other matters Divine or profane, under pretext of any ecclesiastical sentence or censure, whether promulgated in general form by law or by a judge, nor avoid anyone whomsoever, nor observe an ecclesiastical interdict, except when this sentence or censure shall have been published or made known by the judge in special and express form, against some certain, specified person, college, university, church, community, or place." But while notoriously excommunicated persons are no longer vitandi, the pope makes an exception of those who have "incurred the penalty of excommunication by reason of sacrilegious violence against a cleric, and so notoriously that the fact can in no way be dissimulated or excused". He declares, moreover, that he has not made this concession in favour of the excommunicated, whose condition remains unchanged, but solely for the benefit of the faithful. Hence, in virtue of ecclesiastical law, the latter need no longer deprive themselves of intercourse with those of the excommunicated who are "tolerated". As to the vitandi, now reduced to the two aforementioned categories, they must be shunned by the faithful as formerly. It is to be noted now that the minor excommunication incurred formerly by these forbidden relations has been suppressed; also, that of the major excommunications inflicted on certain definite acts of communion with the vitandi, only two are retained in the Constitution "Apostolicæ Sedis" (II, 16, 17): that inflicted on any of the faithful for participation in a crime that has merited nominative excommunication by the pope, and that pronounced against clerics alone for spontaneous and conscious communion *in sacris* with persons whom the pope has excommunicated by name. Moreover, those whom bishops excommunicate by name are as much vitandi as are those similarly excommunicated by the pope.

(6) *Reserved and Non-Reserved.*—Finally, excommunication is either reserved or non-reserved. This division affects the absolution from censure. In the forum internum any confessor can absolve from non-reserved excommunications; but those that are reserved can only be remitted, except through indult or delegation, by those to whom the law reserves the absolution. There is a distinction between excommunications reserved to the pope (these being divided into two classes, according to which they are either specially or simply reserved to him) and those reserved to bishops or ordinaries. As to excommunications ab homine, absolution from them is reserved by law to the judge who has inflicted them. In a certain sense excommunications may also be reserved in view of the persons who incur them; thus absolution from excommunications in foro externo incurred by bishops is reserved to the pope; again, custom reserves to him the excommunication of sovereigns.

III. Who Can Excommunicate?—Excommunication is an act of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the rules of which it follows. Hence the general principle: whoever has jurisdiction in the forum externum, properly so called, can excommunicate, but only his own subjects. Therefore, whether excommunications be a jure (by the law) or ab homine (under form of sentence or precept), they may come from the pope alone or a general council for the entire Church; from the provincial council for an ecclesiastical province; from the bishop for his diocese; from the prelate *nullius* for quasi-diocesan territories; and from regular prelates for religious orders. Moreover, anyone can excommunicate who, by virtue of his office, even when delegated, has contentious jurisdiction in the forum externum; for instance, papal legates, vicars capitular, and vicars-general. But a parish priest cannot inflict this penalty nor even declare that it is incurred, i. e. he cannot do so in an official and judicial manner. The subjects of these various authorities are those who come under their jurisdiction chiefly on account of domicile or quasi-domicile in their territory; then by reason of the offence committed while on such territory; and finally by reason of personal right, as in the case of regulars.

IV. Who Can Be Excommunicated?—Since excommunication is the forfeiture of the spiritual privileges of ecclesiastical society, all those, but those only, can be excommunicated who, by any right whatsoever, belong to this society. Consequently excommunication can be inflicted only on baptized and living persons. Although the Church recites against the devil exorcisms in which the word *anathema* occurs, he cannot be excommunicated, for he in no way belongs to the Church. Among living persons, those who have not been baptized have never been members of the Christian society and therefore cannot be deprived of spiritual benefits to which they have never had a right; in this way, infidels, pagans, Mohammedans, and Jews, though outside of the Church, are not excommunicated. As the baptized cease, at death, to belong to the Church Militant, the dead cannot be excommunicated. Of course, strictly speaking, after the demise of a Christian person, it may be officially declared that such person incurred excommunication during his lifetime. Quite in the same sense he may be absolved after his death; indeed, the Roman Ritual contains the rite for absolving an excommunicated person already dead (Tit. III, cap. iv: Ritus absolvendi excommunicatum jam mortuum). However, these sentences or absolutions concern only the effects of excommunication, notably ecclesiastical burial. With the foregoing exceptions, all who have been baptized are liable to excommunication, even those who have never belonged to the true Church, since by their baptism they are really her subjects, though of course rebellious ones. Moreover, the Church excommunicates not only those who abandon the true faith to embrace schism or heresy, but likewise the members of heretical and schismatic communities who have been born therein. As to the latter, however, it is not question of personal excommunication; the censure overtakes them in their corporate capacity, as members of a community in revolt against the true Church of Jesus Christ.

Catholics, on the contrary, cannot be excommunicated unless for some personal, grievously offensive act. Here, therefore, it is necessary to state with precision the conditions under which this penalty is incurred. Just as exile presupposes a crime, excommunication presupposes a grievous external fault. Not only would it be wrong for a Christian to be punished without having committed a punishable act, but justice demands a proportion between the offence and the penalty; hence the most serious of spiritual chastisements, i. e. forfeiture of all the privileges common to Christians, is inconceivable unless for a grave fault. Moreover, in order to fall within the jurisdiction of the forum externum, which alone can inflict excommunication, this fault must be external. Internal failings, e. g. doubts entertained against the Catholic Faith, cannot incur excommunication. Note, however, that by external fault is not necessarily meant a public one; an occult external fault calls forth occult excommunication, but in foro interno, as already seen. Most authors add that the offence must be consummated, i. e. complete and perfected in its kind (*in genere suo*), unless the legislator have ordained otherwise. This, however, is a rule of interpretation rather than a real condition for the incurring of censure, and is tantamount to saying that attempt at a crime does not entail the penalty meted out to the crime itself,

but that if the legislator declares that he wishes to punish even the attempt, excommunication is incurred (cf. Const. "Apost. Sedis", III, 1, for attempt at marriage on part of clerics in major orders).

Considered from a moral and juridical standpoint, the guilt requisite for the incurring of excommunication implies, first, the full use of reason; second, sufficient moral liberty; finally, a knowledge of the law and even of the penalty. Where such knowledge is lacking, there is no contumacy, i. e. no contempt of ecclesiastical law, the essence of which consists in performing an action known to be forbidden, and forbidden under a certain penalty. The prohibition and the penalty are known either through the text of the law itself, which is equivalent to a juridical warning, or through admonitions or proclamations issued expressly by the ecclesiastical judge. Hence arise various extenuating reasons (*causæ excusantes*), based on lack of guilt, which prevent the incurring of excommunication: (1) Lack of the full use of reason. This excuses children, also those who have not attained the age of puberty, and, a fortiori, the demented. Inadvertence, however, is not presumed; while it may affect moral responsibility and excommunication in foro externo, it is no obstacle to juridical guilt. (2) Lack of liberty resulting from grave fear. Such fear impairs the freedom of the will, and while it exists contumacy or rebellion against the laws of the Church cannot be presumed. Evidently, a proper estimation of this extenuating reason depends on the circumstances of each particular case and will be more readily accepted as an excuse for violating a positive law than in palliation of an offence against the natural or Divine law. (3) Ignorance. The general principle is, that whosoever is ignorant of the law is not responsible for transgressing it; and whosoever is ignorant of the penalty does not incur it. But the application of this principle is often complicated and delicate. The following considerations, generally admitted, may serve as a guide: (a) All ignorance, both of law and of fact, is excusatory. (b) The ignorance known as "invincible" always excuses; it may also be called inculpable or probable ignorance. (c) There are two kinds of culpable ignorance, one known as *crassa* or *supina*, i. e. gross, improbable ignorance, and supposing a grievously guilty neglect in regard to knowledge of the law; the other is affected ignorance, really a deliberate ignorance of the law through fear of incurring its penalty. (d) Ordinarily, gross ignorance does not excuse from punishment. But it does so only when the law formally exacts a positive knowledge of the prohibition. The laws that inflict excommunication contain as a rule two kinds of expressions. Sometimes the offence only is mentioned, e. g. "all apostates, heretics", etc., or "those who absolve their accomplices in a sin against chastity" (Const. "Apost. Sedis", I, 1, 10). Sometimes clauses are inserted that exact, as a necessary condition, the knowledge or effrontery of the culprit, e. g., "those who knowingly read books" condemned under pain of excommunication, "regulars who have the audacity to administer the Viaticum without permission of the parish priest" (Const. "Apost. Sedis", I, 2; II, 14). Gross ignorance excuses in the second case but not in the first. (e) For many authors, affected ignorance is equivalent to a knowledge of the law, since by it some avoid enlightening themselves concerning a dreaded penalty; these authors conclude that such ignorance never excuses. Other canonists consider that every penal law is to be strictly interpreted; when, therefore, it positively exacts knowledge on the part of the culprit, he is excused even by affected ignorance. As, in practice, it is not always easy to establish the shades of difference, it will suffice to remark that in a case of occult excommunication the culprit has the right to judge himself and to be judged by his confessor according to the exact truth, whereas, in the forum externum the judge decides according to presumptions and proofs. Consequently, in the tribunal of conscience he who is reasonably persuaded of his innocence cannot be compelled to treat himself as excommunicated and to seek absolution; this conviction, however, must be prudently established.

V. Effects of Excommunication.—If we consider only its nature, excommunication has no degrees: it simply deprives clerics and laymen of all their rights in Christian society, which total effect takes on a visible shape in details proportionate in number to the rights or advantages of which the excommunicated cleric or layman has been deprived. The effects of excommunication must, however, be considered in relation also to the rest of the faithful. From this point of view arise certain differences according to the various classes of excommunicated persons. These differences were not introduced out of regard for the excommunicated, rather for the sake of the faithful. The latter would suffer serious inconveniences if the nullity of all acts performed by excommunicated clerics were rigidly maintained. They would also be exposed to grievous perplexities of conscience if they were strictly obliged to avoid all intercourse, even profane, with the excommunicated. Hence the practical rule for interpreting the effects of excommunication: severity as regards the excommunicated, but mildness for the faithful. We may now proceed to enumerate the immediate effects of excommunication. They are summed up in the two well-known verses:—

Res sacræ, ritus, communio, crypta, potestas,
prædia sacra, forum, civilia jura vetantur,

i. e. loss of the sacraments, public services and prayers of the Church, ecclesiastical burial, jurisdiction, benefices, canonical rights, and social intercourse.

(1) *Res Sacræ.*—These are the sacraments; the excommunicated are forbidden either to receive or administer them. The sacraments are of course validly administered by excommunicated persons, except those (penance and matrimony) for whose administration jurisdiction is necessary; but the reception of the sacraments by excommunicated persons is always illicit. The licit administration of the sacraments by excommunicated ecclesiastics hinges upon the benefit to be derived by the faithful. Ecclesiastics excommunicated by name are forbidden to administer the sacraments except in cases of extreme necessity; apart from this necessity penance and matrimony administered by such ecclesiastics are null (Decret. "Ne temere", art. iv). Excommunicated ecclesiastics tolerati, however, may licitly administer the sacraments to the faithful who request them at their hands, and the acts of jurisdiction thus posited are maintained by reason of the benefit accruing to the faithful, most frequently also because of common error (*error communis*), i. e. a general belief in the good standing of such ecclesiastics. The faithful, on their side, may, without sin, ask tolerated excommunicated ecclesiastics to administer sacraments to them; they would, however, sin grievously in making this request of the vitandi, except in case of urgent necessity.

(2) *Ritus.*—Hereby are meant the Mass, the Divine Office, and other sacred ceremonies. An excommunicated person may not and should not assist at these ceremonies. If he be a toleratus, his presence need not be taken into account, and the service can be continued. If he be a vitandus he must be warned to retire, and in case of refusal he must be forcibly compelled to withdraw; but if he still persists in remaining, the service must be discontinued, even the Mass, unless the Canon has been commenced. (Benedict XIV, De sacr. Miss., sect. ii, n. 117.) Nevertheless, since the condition of an excommunicated person, even a vitandus, is no worse than that of an infidel, he may assist at sermons, instructions, etc., venerate images and relics, take holy water, and use privately other sacramentals. The excommunicated cleric is

not released from any of his obligations in regard to the Divine Office and, if bound to it, must recite it, but privately and not in the choir. A toleratus may be admitted to the choir, but a vitandus must be expelled therefrom. All excommunicated clerics are prohibited from celebrating Mass and performing other strictly liturgical functions, under penalty of the irregularity *ex delicto* for violation of the censure; participation in the liturgical acts performed by an excommunicated cleric is a forbidden *communicatio in sacris*; however, no censure would result from it except in the case of clerics voluntarily communicating *in sacris* with those whom the pope had excommunicated by name (Const. "Apost. Sedis", II, 17). In each case the fault should be estimated according to circumstances.

(3) *Communio.*—These are, properly speaking, the public suffrages of the Church, official prayers, Indulgences, etc., in which the excommunicated have no share. But they are not excluded from the private suffrages (i. e. intercessory petitions) of the faithful, who can pray for them.

(4) *Crypta.*—This word signifies ecclesiastical burial, of which the excommunicated are deprived. In chapter xii, de sepulturis (lib. III, tit. xxviii), Innocent III says: "The canons have established that we should not hold communion after their death with those with whom we did not communicate during their lifetime, and that all those should be deprived of ecclesiastical burial who were separated from the unity of the Church, and at the moment of death were not reconciled thereunto." The Ritual (tit. VI, cap. ii, n. 2) renews this prohibition for those publicly excommunicated, and most writers interpret this as meaning those whose excommunication has been publicly proclaimed (Many, De locis sacris, p. 354), so that, under this head, the ancient discipline is no longer applicable, except to the vitandi. However, this does not mean that the tolerati can always receive ecclesiastical burial; they may be deprived of it for other reasons, e. g. as heretics or public sinners. Apropos of this leniency, it must be remembered that it is not the excommunicated the Church wishes to favour, but rather the faithful for whose sake communion with the tolerati is allowed in the matter of burial as well as in other matters. The interment of a toleratus in a consecrated cemetery carries with it no longer the desecration of said cemetery; this would follow, however, in the case of the vitandi. (See BURIAL.)

(5) *Potestas* signifies ecclesiastical jurisdiction, of which both the passive and the active use, to speak canonically, are forbidden the excommunicated. Jurisdiction is used passively when a person is the object of one of its acts, of a concession. Now, ecclesiastical authority has no official relations with the exile unless, at his request, it negotiates the conditions for his return to society. Connected with this discipline is the rule forbidding the excommunicated to receive from the pope any kind of rescript (of grace or justice), except in regard to their excommunication, under pain of nullity of such rescript (c. xxvi, de rescriptis, lib. I, tit. iii, and c. i, eod., in VI). Hence the custom of inserting in papal rescripts the so-called *ad effectum* absolution from censures, intended solely to ensure the value of the rescript, but affecting in no wise the excommunication, if already existent. Jurisdiction is used actively when exercised by its depositaries. It is easy to understand that the Church cannot leave her jurisdiction in the hands of those whom she excludes from her society. In principle, therefore, excommunication entails the loss of jurisdiction both in foro externo and in foro interno and renders null all acts accomplished without the necessary jurisdiction. However, for the general good of society, the Church maintains jurisdiction, despite occult excommunication, and supplies it for acts performed by the tolerati. But as the vitandi are known to be such, this merciful remedy cannot be applied to them except in certain cases of extreme necessity, when jurisdiction is said to be "supplied" by the Church.

(6) *Prædia sacra* are ecclesiastical benefices. The excommunicated ecclesiastic is incapable of acquiring a benefice, and his presentation to it would be legally null. A benefice already held is not forfeited at once, even when to the censure the law adds privation of benefice; this is carried into effect only through a sentence which must be at least declaratory and issue from a competent (i. e. the proper) judge. Nevertheless, from the very first the excommunicated beneficiary loses those fruits of his benefice belonging to choir service, provided he is bound thereunto. Moreover, should he live a year in the state of excommunication, he can be deprived of his benefice through judicial sentence. The aforesaid effects do not result from occult excommunication.

(7) *Forum.*—The excommunicated person is an exile from ecclesiastical society, consequently from its tribunals; only inasmuch, however, as they would be to his advantage. On the other hand, if he be summoned before them to satisfy a third party he is obliged to appear. Hence he cannot appear as plaintiff, procurator, or advocate; he may be the defendant, or the party accused. At this point the difference between the vitandi and the tolerati consists in this, that the former must be prevented from introducing any legal action before an ecclesiastical tribunal, whereas the latter can be debarred from so doing only when the defendant alleges and proves excommunication as already incurred. It is a question here only of public excommunication and before ecclesiastical tribunals.

(8) *Civilia jura*, i. e. the ordinary relations between members of the same society, outside of sacred and judicial matters. This privation, affecting particularly the person excommunicated, is no longer imposed on the faithful except in regard to the vitandi. The medieval canonists enumerated the prohibited civil relations in the following verse:—

Os, orare, vale, communio, mensa negatur,

namely: (a) conversations, exchange of letters, tokens of benevolence (*osculum*); (b) prayer in common with the excommunicated; (c) marks of honour and respect; (d) business and social relations; (e) meals with the excommunicated. But at the same time they specified the reasons that rendered these relations licit:—

Utile, lex, humilis, res ignorata, necesse,

that is to say: (a) both the spiritual and the temporal benefit of the excommunicated and of the faithful; (b) conjugal law; (c) the submission owed by children, servants, vassals, and subordinates in general; (d) ignorance of excommunication or of the prohibition of a particular kind of intercourse; (e) finally, any kind of necessity, as human law, is not binding to this degree.

Remote Effects.—All the effects that we have just enumerated are the immediate results of excommunication, but it also causes remote effects, which are not a necessary consequence and are only produced when the person censured occasions them. They are three in number: (1) The cleric who violates excommunication by exercising one of the liturgical functions of his order, incurs an irregularity *ex delicto*. (2) The excommunicated person who remains a year without making any effort to obtain absolution (*insordescentia*) becomes suspected of heresy and can be followed up and condemned as guilty of such (Council of Trent, Sess. XXV, cap. iii, De ref.; cf. Ferraris, s. v. "Insordescens"). (3) This neglect makes it the judge's duty to deprive the excommunicated cleric of all benefices, though some judges postpone for three years the fulfilment of this obligation (see Hollweck, Die kirchlichen Strafgesetze, art. 1, note 3).

Effects of Invalid or Unjust Excommunication.—An excommunication is said to be null when it is invalid because of some intrinsic or essential defect, e. g. when

the person inflicting it has no jurisdiction, when the motive of the excommunication is manifestly incorrect and inconsistent, or when the excommunication is essentially defective in form. Excommunication is said to be unjust when, though valid, it is wrongfully applied to a person really innocent but believed to be guilty. Here, of course, it is not a question of excommunication latæ sententiæ and in foro interno, but only of one imposed or declared by judicial sentence. It is admitted by all that a null excommunication produces no effect whatever, and may be ignored without sin (cap. ii, de const., in VI). But a case of unjust excommunication brings out in a much more general way the possibility of conflict between the forum internum and the forum externum, between legal justice and the real facts. In chapter xxviii, de sent. excomm. (Lib. V, tit. xxxix), Innocent III formally admits the possibility of this conflict. Some persons, he says, may be free in the eyes of God but bound in the eyes of the Church; vice versa, some may be free in the eyes of the Church but bound in the eyes of God: for God's judgment is based on the very truth itself, whereas that of the Church is based on arguments and presumptions which are sometimes erroneous. He concludes that the chain by which the sinner is bound in the sight of God is loosed by remission of the fault committed, whereas that which binds him in the sight of the Church is severed only by removal of the sentence. Consequently, a person unjustly excommunicated is in the same state as the justly excommunicated sinner who has repented and recovered the grace of God; he has not forfeited internal communion with the Church, and God can bestow upon him all necessary spiritual help. However, while seeking to prove his innocence, the censured person is meanwhile bound to obey legitimate authority and to behave as one under the ban of excommunication, until he is rehabilitated or absolved. Such a case seems practically impossible nowadays.

VI. Absolution from Excommunication.—Apart from the rare cases in which excommunication is imposed for a fixed period and then ceases of itself, it is always removed by absolution. It is to be noted at once that, though the same word is used to designate the sacramental sentence by which sins are remitted and that by which excommunication is removed, there is a vast difference between the two acts. The absolution which revokes excommunication is purely jurisdictional and has nothing sacramental about it. It reinstates the repentant sinner in the Church; restores the rights of which he had been deprived, beginning with participation in the sacraments; and for this very reason, it should precede sacramental absolution, which it thenceforth renders possible and efficacious. After absolution from excommunication has been given in foro externo, the judge sends the person absolved to a confessor, that his sin may be remitted; when absolution from censure is given in the confessional, it should always precede sacramental absolution, conformably to the instruction in the Ritual and the very tenor of the formula for sacramental absolution. It may be noted at once that the principal effect of absolution from excommunication may be acquired without the excommunicated person's being wholly reinstated in his former position. Thus, an ecclesiastic might not necessarily recover the benefice which he had lost; indeed he might be admitted to lay communion only. Ecclesiastical authority has the right to posit certain conditions for the return of the culprit, and every absolution from excommunication calls for the fulfilment of certain conditions which vary in severity, according to the case.

Excommunication, it must be remembered, is a medicinal penalty intended, above all, for the correction of the culprit; therefore his first duty is to solicit pardon by showing an inclination to obey the orders given him, just as it is the duty of ecclesiastical authority to receive back the sinner as soon as he repents and declares himself disposed to give the required satisfaction. This satisfaction is often indicated in the law itself; for instance, usurpers of ecclesiastical property are excommunicated until such time as they make restitution (Council of Trent, Sess. XXII, c. xi); and again, it is determined by the judge who grants absolution or the indult for absolving. Besides expiatory practices habitually known as "penance", such satisfaction exacts opportune measures for the reparation of the past, as well as guarantees for the future. It is not always necessary that these measures be executed prior to absolution, which is frequently granted on the solemn promise of the excommunicated party either to accomplish a specified act, such as coming to an agreement with the Church for the property usurped, or simply to abide by the orders of ecclesiastical authority (*standi mandatis ecclesiæ*). In such cases absolution is not unusually given under pain of "reincidence" (*ad reincidentiam*), i. e., if within a definite period the person censured has not accomplished a certain specified act, he reincurs the same excommunication; his status is just as if he had never been absolved. However, this clause of reincidence is not to be presumed; when occasion requires, it is inserted in the sentence of absolution or in the indult granted for that purpose.

The formula of absolution from excommunication is not strictly determined, and, since it is an act of jurisdiction, it suffices if the formula employed express clearly the effect which it is desired to attain. The formula for remitting the excommunication in foro externo should be such as to absolve validly from public excommunication. Similarly, an excommunication imposed by judicial sentence is to be revoked by an absolution in the same form; occult excommunication may be revoked in the confessional by the sacramental formula. The Roman Ritual (tit. III, c. ii) gives the formula of absolution used in foro externo and states that in foro interno absolution is given in the usual sacramental form.

Who Can Absolve from Excommunication?—The answer is given in the customary rules of jurisdiction. The right to absolve evidently belongs to him who can excommunicate and who has imposed the law, moreover to any person delegated by him to this effect, since this power, being jurisdictional, can be delegated. First, we must distinguish between excommunication ab homine, which is judicial, and excommunication a jure, i. e. latæ sententiæ. For the former, absolution is given by the judge who inflicted the penalty (or by his successor), in other words by the pope, or the bishop (ordinary), also by the superior of said judge when acting as judge of appeal. As to excommunication latæ sententiæ, the power to absolve is either ordinary or delegated. Ordinary power is determined by the law itself, which indicates to what authority the censure is reserved in each case. Delegated power is of two kinds: that granted in permanency and set down in the law and that granted or communicated by personal act, e. g. by authority (faculties) of the Roman Penitentiaria, by episcopal delegation for special cases, or bestowed upon certain priests. Of this second kind of delegation there is no need to speak, as it belongs to each one to verify the power (faculties) that he possesses. Delegation of the first kind carries with it the power to absolve from excommunication without special request or particular faculties. Such power is in this case conferred by the law itself. Nevertheless this power is subject to the general law that governs delegation and is valid only for the cases and under the conditions mentioned in the concession. Thus faculties granted for the forum internum cannot be extended to the forum externum, nor can those granted for simply reserved excommunications be used for specially reserved cases, and so on. However, the faculties proceeding from

both kinds of delegation may be "cumulated", i. e. may be held and exercised in favour of the same person.

These principles admitted, we must remember that with reference to reservation or the right to absolve, excommunications are divided into four classes: excommunications specially reserved to the pope; excommunications simply reserved to the pope; excommunications reserved to the bishop (ordinary); and, finally, excommunications that are not reserved (*nemini reservatæ*). According to this classification, as a general rule, only the pope can absolve from the first two kinds of excommunication, although his power extends to the others; bishops (ordinaries), but not other priests, can remove excommunications of the third class; finally, those of the fourth class, and those only, can be revoked by any approved priest, without further special delegation. At this point, however, must be considered certain concessions of the law that may be grouped in three categories: the permanent faculties of bishops; concessions for urgent cases; and concessions for the point of death.

(1) The Faculties of Bishops.—The Council of Trent (Sess. XXIV, c. vi, De ref.) authorizes bishops to absolve their own subjects in their own dioceses from all excommunications, consequently from those reserved to the Holy See, when occult or, rather, not pertaining to the forum externum. They can exercise this power either in person or through a special delegate of their choice, but in the tribunal of conscience only. However, the Constitution "Apostolicæ Sedis" restricted this provision of the council to excommunications simply reserved to the pope, so that, without special indult, bishops can no longer absolve from specially reserved cases, even in foro interno. On the other hand, the indults they receive are more or less liberal and widely communicable.

(2) Urgent Cases.—In the chapter "Nuper" (xxix, de sent. excomm., lib. V, tit. xxxix), Innocent III sets forth the principle that governs such cases: "When it is difficult for the excommunicated person to go to him who excommunicated him, he may be absolved by his bishop or even by his own priest, on promising to obey the orders of him by whom excommunication was pronounced." This is the principle that moralists and canonists formulated as an axiom: *Impedito casus papalis fit episcopalis:* in case of one who is prevented from presenting himself to the pope, the excommunication reserved to the pope may be removed by the bishop. But most authors carried the analogy still further: for him who is prevented from presenting himself to the bishop, the excommunication may be removed by any confessor. In regard to the obligation of submitting to the orders of the pope or the bishop, the moralists and canonists generally taught as follows: First, no one was obliged to apply in writing (correct as to the removal of excommunication, though Innocent III says nothing of this kind concerning a request for information). Then they distinguished between obstacles that were more or less prolonged: perpetual obstacles were such as exceed five years; obstacles of long duration were those lasting over six months; and obstacles of short duration, those continuing for less than six months. When the obstacle was perpetual the bishop or, if he could not be reached, any priest might absolve without appealing to the superior; this could also be done, but not without obligation of recourse to the superior on the cessation of the obstacle, when the latter was of long duration, provided there were urgency. Finally, the authors drew up a long list of those who were supposed to be unable to present themselves in person to the pope; and this list included almost every one (Gury, Theol. Moralis, II, nn. 952 and 375). This practice, far more lenient than was intended by Innocent III, has been recently profoundly modified by a decree of the Congregation of the Inquisition (Holy Office) dated 23 June, 1886. Henceforth "in urgent cases when absolution cannot be deferred without danger of grave scandal or infamy, which is left to the conscientious appreciation of the confessor, the latter, after having imposed the necessary satisfaction, can absolve, without other faculties, from all censures, even those specially reserved to the Holy See, but under pain of reincidence under the same censure if, within a month, the penitent thus absolved does not recur to the Holy See by letters and through the medium of the confessor." This new method has been more precisely explained and even rendered easier by subsequent papal decisions. The absolution thus given is direct (Holy Office, 19 Aug., 1891), and although recourse to the Penitentiaria is obligatory, its object is not to ask a new absolution, but only to solicit the order of the Church, the penitent, as stated above, having had to make a serious promise to conform to them (*standi mandatis Ecclesiæ*). The power thus granted in urgent cases is valid for all cases, without exception, reserved by law to the pope or the ordinary, even for the absolution of an accomplice (Holy Office, 7 June, 1899).

As to what constitutes a state of urgency, the reply of 16 June, 1897, is very reassuring, since it permits absolution from censures "as soon as it becomes too distressing to the penitent to remain in the state of sin during the time necessary for soliciting and receiving from Rome the power to absolve". Now, according to the moralists it is too much to remain even a day or two in the state of sin, especially for priests. The appeal, though usually made through the medium of the confessor, can be made by the penitent himself if he be capable; indeed he should write himself if he cannot easily return to the same confessor (Sacra Penitentiaria, 7 Nov., 1888). Finally, if both confessor and penitent find it impossible to appeal by letters, these may be dispensed with (Holy Office, 18 Aug., 1898). The letters should be addressed to the Cardinal Penitentiarius and should contain information concerning all necessary circumstances, but under a false name (Sacr. Pen., 7 Nov., 1888). If the interested party, though able to appeal to the Holy See, fails to do so within a month from the time of receiving absolution, he or she incurs the former censures, which remain effective until there is a new absolution followed by recourse to Rome. There would, however, be no reincidence if the interval of a month were to expire through the confessor's fault. It is to be noted that this sanction of reincidence applies to all censures reserved to the pope, but not to those reserved by law to the ordinaries. Finally, this method is not obligatory for censures reserved to ordinaries by diocesan law. Bishops, however, could profitably apply it to such censures, and some have already done so.

(3) In Danger of Death.—It is a principle repeatedly set forth in canon law that at the point of death all reservations cease and all necessary jurisdiction is supplied by the Church. "At the point of death", says the Council of Trent (Sess. XIV, c. vii), "in danger of death", says the Ritual (tit. III, cap. i, n. 23), any priest can absolve from all sins and censures, even if he be without the ordinary faculties of confessors, or if he himself be excommunicated; he may do so even in presence of another priest properly authorized (Holy Office, 29 July, 1891). The Constitution "Apostolicæ Sedis" expressly maintains this merciful concession, merely adding, for the case in which the moribund is restored to health, the obligation of having recourse to the Holy See, if he has been absolved from excommunication specially reserved to the pope, unless he prefers to ask absolution of a confessor provided with special faculties. This recourse, although identical with that of which we have just spoken for urgent cases, nevertheless differs from it on two points: it is not imposed for the absolution from excommunications simply reserved, and the short delay

of a month is not counted from the time of receiving absolution, but from the time of recovery.

VII. Excommunications Latæ Sententiæ Now in Force.—In the preamble of the Constitution "Apostolicæ Sedis", Pius IX stated that during the course of centuries, the number of censures latæ sententiæ had increased inordinately, that some of them were no longer expedient, that many were doubtful, that they occasioned frequent difficulties of conscience, and finally, that a reform was necessary. On this head Pius IX had anticipated the almost unanimous request of the Catholic episcopate presented at the Vatican Council (Collectio Lacensis, VII, col. 840, 874, etc.). The number of excommunications latæ sententiæ enumerated by the moralists and canonists is really formidable: Ferraris (Prompta Biblioth., s. v. Excommunicatio, art. ii-iv) gives almost 200. The principal ones were destined to protect the Catholic Faith, the ecclesiastical hierarchy and its jurisdiction, and figured in the Bull known as "In Cœna Domini" read publicly each year in Rome, on Holy Thursday. In time, this document had received various additions (Ferraris, loc. cit., art. ii, the text of Clement XI), and from it the Constitution "Apostolicæ Sedis" derives excommunications specially reserved, with exception of the tenth. The Constitution of Pius IX deals with no penalties other than censures; it leaves intact all censures ferendæ sententiæ but suppresses all censures latæ sententiæ that it does not retain. Now, besides those which it enumerates it retains: (1) the censures decreed (and not simply mentioned) by the Council of Trent; (2) the censures of special law, i. e. those in vigour for papal elections, those enforced in religious orders and institutes, in colleges, communities, etc. As to the censures enumerated, they should be interpreted as if pronounced for the first time, and ancient texts should be consulted for them only in so far as such texts have not been modified by the new law.

Thus the excommunications latæ sententiæ enforced to-day by common law in the Catholic Church proceed from three sources: (A) those enumerated in the Constitution "Apostolicæ Sedis"; (B) those pronounced by the Council of Trent; and (C) those introduced subsequently to the Constitution "Apostolicæ Sedis", i. e. later than 12 October, 1869. We enumerate them here with a brief commentary.

A. *Excommunications of the Constitution "Apostolicæ Sedis".*—These are divided into four categories: (a) those specially reserved to the pope; (b) those simply reserved to the pope; (c) those reserved to the bishop (ordinary); (d) those not reserved to anyone.

(a) Excommunications Specially Reserved to the Pope.—These are twelve in number and are imposed upon the following persons:—

(1) "All apostates from the Christian Faith, heretics of every name and sect, and those who give them credence, who receive or countenance them, and generally all those who take up their defence." Strictly speaking, an apostate is one who goes over to a non-Christian religion, e. g. Islam; to such apostates are assimilated those who publicly renounce all religion; this apostasy is not to be presumed; it is evident that both kinds of apostates exclude themselves from the Church. A heretic is one who rejects a Catholic dogma. The first to be considered is the heretic who becomes such of his own volition; who, being in the Catholic Church, obstinately repudiates a truth of faith. Excommunication is incurred by him, if, with full knowledge, he exteriorly formulates an heretical proposition; and if he seeks to propagate his error he is *dogmatizans* and should be denounced. Next comes the heretic who belongs to an heretical association; for such a person his heretical membership alone is sufficient to bring him under sentence of excommunication. In his case the penalty is incurred by adhesion to the heresy, notably by wilful and active participation *in sacris* (i. e. in public worship) with heretics; hence the excommunication of those who contract a mixed marriage before an heretical minister as such (Holy Office, 28 Aug., 1888). Finally, the penalty extends to those who believe in heretics (*credentes*) and join their ranks; to those who receive them, i. e. who give them shelter in their homes, so as to protect them from the pursuit of authority; and to those who countenance or defend them as heretics and in view of the heresy, provided it be a positive and efficacious assistance.

(2) "All those who knowingly read, without permission of the Apostolic See, books by these same apostates and heretics and upholding heresy, as also the books of any authors whomsoever specifically prohibited by Letters Apostolic, and all who keep, print, or in any way defend these same books." After heretical persons come heretical books. The act that incurs excommunication is, first, reading done to a considerable extent and culpably, i. e. by one who knows the nature of the books and of the excommunication, and who, moreover, has not the necessary permission. The secondary acts punishable with the same penalty are the keeping in one's possession, the printing (rather the publishing), and, finally, the defence, by word or by writing, of the books in question. These books are of two kinds: first, those written by apostates, or heretics, and which uphold and commend heresy, two conditions that must exist simultaneously; second, books specifically condemned, i. e., by mention of their titles, not by decree of the Index, but by Letters from the pope himself, Bulls or Briefs, and under pain of excommunication (for a list of these books see Hilgers, "Der Index der verbotenen Bücher", Freiburg, 1904, p. 96; and "Die Bücherverbote in Papstbriefen", Freiburg, 1907).

(3) "Schismatics and those who elude or obstinately withdraw from the authority of the reigning Roman pontiff." The schismatics here referred to are of two kinds: those who are such because they belong to separated Churches which reject the authority of the pope, and those who, being Catholics, become schismatics by reason of obstinate disobedience to the authority of the pope as such.

(4) "All those, of no matter what state, rank, or condition, who appeal from the ordinances or mandates of the reigning Roman pontiff to a future œcumenical council, and all who have given aid, counsel, or countenance to this appeal." The appeal from the commands of the pope to a future œcumenical council, not only implies the superiority of the council over the pontiff, but is pre-eminently an act of injurious disobedience to the Head of the Church. Were this appeal efficacious it would render all church government impossible, unless it be accepted that the normal state of the Church is a general council in perpetual session, or at least meeting at short intervals. This extreme Gallicanism is justly punishable with excommunication. The penalty is visited upon all those who have influenced such act of appeal, either by aid, counsel, or support. This excommunication, however, is to be strictly interpreted; it would not be incurred in consequence of an appeal made to a future pope, the Holy See being vacant, or to a general council actually assembled.

(5) "All who kill, mutilate, strike, seize, incarcerate, detain or pursue with hostile intent, cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, legates or nuncios of the Holy See, or drive them from their dioceses, jurisdictions, estates, or domains, as also those who ratify these measures or further them by aid or countenance." The object of this penalty is not so much to protect the members of the clergy, like the celebrated excommunication of the canon "Si quis suadente diabolo", of which we shall speak below, but rather to safeguard the prelates or superiors in whom the Church has lodged her jurisdiction. The text clearly

indicates the acts punished by excommunication, i.e. all violent attacks on the person of a prelate as such; it likewise specifies the culprits, i. e. those who perpetrate such assaults and those who are responsible for them, as also their active accomplices.

(6) "Those who directly or indirectly prevent the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, either in foro interno or in foro externo, and who, for this purpose, have recourse to the secular tribunal; also those who provoke or deliver the orders of this tribunal or lend it their aid, counsel, or support." The preceding article protects those who are the depositaries of jurisdiction; the present article protects the exercise of said jurisdiction. It punishes any obstacle raised against the delivery or execution of a sentence or decision of the ecclesiastical authority. It is not question here of the power of order (*potestas ordinis*) or of facts that do not really imply jurisdiction, e. g. a simple contract. Nor is it question of measures taken with prelates so as to influence them into exercising their jurisdiction in a given direction, e. g. to confer a benefice on Caius or withhold one from Titius; this censure is meant to punish any obstacle that really prevents action on the part of a prelate who wishes to perform an act of jurisdiction or to carry it into effect. He is directly prevented when violence is used against him; indirectly, when his subordinates are prevented from acting. The chief opposition here considered is recourse to secular and especially judicial authority. Excommunication is therefore incurred under this head by all who provoke the intervention of secular tribunals, provided such intervention actually follow; by all who deliver orders or directions intended to prevent the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction; finally, by all who co-operate in these acts with aid, counsel, or support, unless under compulsion. Moralists and canonists exempt from this penalty the clerks and servants of the secular courts.

(7) "Those who directly or indirectly oblige lay judges to cite ecclesiastical persons before their tribunal, except in cases provided for by canonical agreements, also those who enact laws or decrees against the liberty or rights of the Church." The first part of this article has for its object the protection of the privileges of the ecclesiastical forum, i. e. of those ecclesiastics whose right it is to be judged by ecclesiastical tribunals; consequently, those are excommunicated who oblige lay judges to summon clergymen before their tribunal in cases where this ecclesiastical privilege (*privilegium fori*) should be respected. But the judges themselves, who act by virtue of their office, are not excommunicated (Holy Office, 1 Feb., 1870). Those who thus force lay judges to violate the privilegium fori are of two kinds: namely, those who actually cite ecclesiastics before secular judges, and the legislators or makers of laws detrimental to the rights of the Church. The first are not excommunicated provided they have no other means of obtaining justice, i. e. when the laws of the country in question do not recognize the aforesaid ecclesiastical privilegium fori (Holy Office, 23 Jan., 1886). There remains, therefore, of this censure little more than the second part of the article, which now affects chiefly the legislators responsible for laws and decrees against the liberty and rights of the Church.

(8) "Those who have recourse to lay power for the prevention of Apostolic Letters or Acts of any kind emanating from the Apostolic See or from its legates or delegates; those who directly or indirectly prohibit the promulgation of these acts or letters, or who, on the occasion of such promulgation, strike or terrify either the parties interested or third parties." This article should be compared with number 6 (above), from which it differs in that it protects, not all exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but that which the Holy See exercises in its official letters, it being eminently important to ensure the free communication of the faithful with Rome. The letters in question are: first, Apostolic Letters, in which the pope himself speaks, Bulls, Briefs, Encyclicals, etc.; second, the Acts of the Holy See emanating from Roman Congregations or other organs of the Curia, which constitute but one authority with the pope (Holy Office, 13 Jan., 1892); finally, the acts of the official representatives of the pope, e. g. papal legates and delegates. The excommunication considers not only Letters that concern all the faithful, but also those regarding individuals, e. g. grants of benefices, dispensations, etc. This admitted, the penalty applies to three classes of persons, namely: those who resort to secular power, not only judicial but administrative, to prevent these Letters from being published or from producing their effect; those who, by means of authority, prevent such publication or execution; and finally, those who, on the occasion of these Letters, strike or terrify either the beneficiaries or even third parties who take part in their publication or execution. According to the more probable opinion, excommunication is incurred even if these measures of opposition do not produce the intended results.

(9) "All falsifiers of Apostolic Letters, even in the form of a Brief, and of petitions concerning matters of grace or justice signed by the Roman pontiff, or by cardinal vice-chancellors or those who replace them, or simply by command of the pope; also those who falsely publish Apostolic Letters, even in the form of a Brief; and finally, those who falsely sign petitions of this kind with the name of the Roman pontiff, of the vice-chancellor, or of those who replace them." This excommunication punishes what is generally known as forgery, not in all its forms, but in so far as it affects such pontifical letters or grants as are issued through the tribunals known as the "Signatura Gratiæ" and the "Signatura Justitiæ", i. e. whence issue papal favours purely benevolent or connected with litigation. It does not therefore attain forgeries affecting the letters of grants of the Roman Congregations or of prelates. It may be somewhat of a surprise to know that this excommunication does not include those who fabricate an entire Apostolic Letter, the definition of falsification (*falsum*) meaning only a notable alteration of authentic Letters either by suppression, erasures, writing over, or substitution. Petitions addressed to the pope, when granted, are first signed by him, or by the vice-chancellor, or other officers. The grant does not thereby become official, but the petition thus signed serves as a basis for the wording of Apostolic Letters (Bulls or Briefs) that actually grant the favour requested. In this process three acts are punishable with excommunication: the false signing of a petition; the falsification of Apostolic Letters, and the publication of Letters thus falsified, in order to use them.

(10) "Those who absolve an accomplice in a sin against chastity, and that even at the moment of death, provided another priest, although he be not approved for confession, can hear the confession of the dying person without serious danger of infamy or scandal." This excommunication is not derived from the Bull "In Cœna Domini", but from the celebrated Constitution of Benedict XIV, "Sacramentum Pœnitentiæ" (1 June, 1741), completed by his Constitution "Apostolici muneris" (8 Feb., 1745). By these Bulls the pope, with a view to protecting the Sacrament of Penance from sacrilegious abuse, withdraws all jurisdiction from a confessor for absolving from sins against chastity which he may have committed with another person, whether man or woman; the absolution he might impart for such sin would be null, and the mere attempt to absolve would incur excommunication. The sin thus withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the confessor is any grievous exterior sin against the Sixth Commandment, but it must be such on both sides. The confessor accessary to it cannot pardon it, but,

this sin once pardoned, he incurs no penalty by again hearing the confession of his accomplice. This being the case, excommunication is incurred by the confessor if he pronounce the formula of absolution after his accomplice has accused himself or herself of this sin, even though he had not the intention of absolving, or even if he only feign to absolve (Holy Office, 5 Dec., 1883), thereby allowing the penitent to suppose that he has absolved him or her; or again if he be the cause of the penitent's refraining from accusing himself or herself of this sin (S. Peniten., 19 Feb., 1896). Neither gross (*crassa, supina*) nor affected ignorance excuses from the censure (Holy Office, 13 Jan., 1892). There are but two cases in which excommunication is not incurred: first, under absolutely exceptional circumstances where the penitent could not approach another confessor, as the human law does not bind at the cost of such serious disadvantage; again, at the moment of death. But even then Benedict XIV does not restore the power of absolving nor exempt from excommunication, unless it be morally impossible for the dying person, without grave danger of slander or scandal, to call in another confessor; this condition, however, should be interpreted broadly.

(11) "Those who usurp or sequester the jurisdiction, property, or revenues belonging to ecclesiastical persons by reason of their churches or benefices." To usurp is to take as if it legitimately belonged to oneself that which belongs to another; hence it is that this article does not apply to thieves of ecclesiastical property (Holy Office, 9 March, 1870). To sequester is formally and authoritatively to place in the custody of a third party property withdrawn from the possession of a previous owner. The rights and property protected by this article do not include all church property but only the rights and property of beneficed clergy as such; they are, as a matter of fact, the principal possessions of the Church. Other property, e. g. that belonging to pious establishments (*opera pia*) or confraternities and that intended for the maintenance or reparation of churches, is protected, indeed, by distinct censures, but its usurpation or sequestration does not incur the excommunication contemplated by this article, which was declared applicable to intruded parish priests in Switzerland (Pius IX, Encyclical of 21 Nov., 1873; S. Cong. of the Council, 23 May, 1874) and in Prussia (25 Feb., 1875). It applies quite certainly to governments that despoil the Church of her property.

(12) "Those who themselves or through others, invade, destroy, or detain cities, lands, places, or rights of the Roman Church, those who hold possession of, disturb, or detain its sovereign jurisdiction, and all who give aid, counsel, or countenance to these offences." This penalty applies to the authors and accomplices of the invasion and detention of the temporal domains of the Holy See.

(b) Excommunications Simply Reserved to the Pope.—Before enumerating those it intends to retain, the Constitution "Apostolicæ Sedis" pronounces a first excommunication of this kind against "those who presume to absolve, without the requisite faculties and under any pretext whatsoever, from excommunications that are specially reserved". This article is directed against those who dare to absolve in bad faith or rashly; a well-founded doubt, however, and even gross ignorance may be pleaded as excuses. Then follow seventeen excommunications simply reserved, declared against the following persons:—

(1) "Those who either publicly or privately teach or defend propositions condemned by the Holy See under pain of excommunication latæ sententiæ; likewise those who teach or maintain as lawful the practice of asking the penitent the name of his or her accomplice, a practice condemned by Benedict XIV in his Constitutions 'Suprema' (7 July, 1745), 'Ubi primum' (2 July, 1746), and 'Ad eradicandam' (28 Sept., 1746)." This article contains two distinct parts. In the first it is not question of all propositions condemned by popes or councils in terms less condemnatory (e. g. rash, offensive, etc.) than the specific stigma *heretical* (to defend heretical propositions being heresy itself and already declared a chief cause of excommunication, see above), but only those which the popes have specifically forbidden to be maintained under pain of excommunication latæ sententiæ. These propositions are: (a) the forty-one errors of Luther condemned by Leo X, 16 May, 1520; (b) the seventy-nine theses of Michael Baius condemned 1 Oct., 1567, 29 Jan., 1579, and 16 March, 1641; (c) the thesis on confession and absolution by letter or messenger, condemned by Clement VIII, 20 June, 1602; (d) the twenty-eight propositions condemned by Alexander VII, 24 Sept., 1665; (e) the seventeen propositions condemned by the same pope, 18 March, 1666; (f) the sixty-five propositions condemned by Innocent XI, 4 March, 1679; (g) the sixty-eight propositions of Miguel de Molinos condemned by the same pope, 20 November, 1687; (h) the second of two propositions condemned by Alexander VIII, 24 August, 1690; (i) the thirty-one propositions condemned by the same pope, 7 December, 1690; (k) the five propositions on duelling condemned by Benedict XIV, 10 November, 1752; (l) and finally the sixty-five Modernistic propositions condemned by decree of the Holy Office, 3 July, 1907, according to the Motu Proprio of Pius X, 19 November, 1907. The text of all these propositions will be found in Denzinger's "Enchiridion Symbolorum, definitionum et declarationum", etc. (10th ed., Freiburg, 1908), also, the last series excepted, in Pennachi's "Comment. in Const. Apost. Sedis", I, 168. The second part of the article aims at the abusive practice of requiring the penitent, under pain of being refused absolution, to divulge the name of his or her accomplice in any crime, a dangerous practice and opposed to the conditions of secrecy under which sacramental confession is made. Benedict XIV denounced it, notably in Portugal, by the aforementioned Constitutions. It is to be noted, however, that this excommunication is not incurred by the confessor who asks a penitent the name of his or her accomplice, but only by him who teaches or maintains that this practice is permitted. Moreover, the expression "to teach or maintain" implies more than merely to affirm or share the condemned opinions.

(2) "Those who, at the instigation of the devil, violently lay hands on ecclesiastics or religious of either sex, exception being made, as regards reservation, in behalf of cases and of persons that the law or privileges allow the bishop or others to absolve." This is the celebrated privilege or immunity "of the canon" (*privilegium canonis*), so called from the canon "Si quis, suadente diabolo" (Decretum of Gratian, C. xvii, q. iv, c. xxix), enacted by the Council of Lateran in 1139 and intended to protect the honour of the clergy from material violence and injury. The persons protected are all who belong to the clergy in the broad sense of the word, i. e. both minor and major clerics, tonsured persons, monks, nuns, novices, and even tertiaries living in community. This privilege is to be interpreted broadly. The acts punished are all injurious corporal violence, such as blows and wounds, a fortiori mutilation; also pursuit, imprisonment, and arrest, likewise insulting acts, such as a slap in the face, etc. The penalty is not imposed for acts that are not grievous, for verbal injuries, for excusable violence, e. g. in the case of legitimate defence, or finally when one is unaware that he is dealing with a cleric. Nowadays only the real perpetrators of these deeds are excommunicated, not accomplices nor those who are morally responsible. Once the fact is publicly known the culprits are vitandi even without being denounced by name. Absolution from this excommunication is regularly reserved to the pope, but the text of the

article maintains the faculties possessed by bishops and others, such as we have heretofore indicated.

(3) "Those who fight duels, those who challenge or accept challenge thereunto, all accomplices, all who help or countenance such combats, all who designedly assist thereat, finally all who permit duelling or who do not prevent it in so far as lies in their power, no matter what their rank or dignity, be it royal or imperial." This severe discipline against duelling dates from the Council of Trent (Sess. XXV, c. xix, De ref.); here, however, only the excommunication in question is considered. It aims at duelling, properly so called, by challenge and on accepted conditions, not at other single combats or altercations. University duels, so common in Germany, are included (S. Cong. of the Council, 29 Aug., 1890). The malice of the duel lies in the fact that it makes right depend upon the fate of arms; this penalty is extended to all who take any part whatever in these detestable combats. The excommunication is incurred, first, by the duellists themselves, not only when they actually fight, but as soon as they have proposed or accepted a challenge; next, by the official witnesses or seconds, also by physicians expressly brought upon the scene (Holy Office, 28 May, 1884), and by all spectators not accidentally present; likewise by those who permit these affairs, when such permission is necessary, e. g. in the army, and by those who, although able to prevent duelling, refrain from so doing.

(4) "Those who become members of the Masonic sect, of the Carbonari, or of other similar sects that plot either openly or secretly against the Church or legitimate authorities; all who countenance these sects in any way whatever, and finally, all who do not inform against the occult chiefs or leaders, i. e. until they have made such denunciations." Certain associations are prohibited because of their evil or dangerous object; this article deals only with those to which it is forbidden to belong under pain of excommunication latæ sententiæ. These are known by their aim, which is to plot against the Church or legitimate authorities, obviously by illicit or criminal means; this excludes at once purely political groups. It matters little whether or not these societies exact secrecy from their members, though the element of secrecy constitutes an unfavourable presumption. The article names two of these sects, the Freemasons and the Carbonari; to these we must add the Fenians (Holy Office, 12 Jan., 1870). There are four prohibited American societies: the Independent Order of Good Templars (Holy Office, 9 Aug., 1893), the Odd Fellows, the Sons of Temperance, and the Knights of Pythias (Holy Office, 20 June, 1894), but not under pain of excommunication. In regard to the sects of which our article treats, three distinct acts incur excommunication: the inscribing of one's name as a member, the positive favouring of the sect as such, and failure to denounce the occult leaders. For this last act censure is not incurred if the leaders be not occult, or if they be not known with sufficient certainty. The denunciation, if imperative, must be made within a month; once it is made the excommunication is no longer reserved, and one is in a condition to receive absolution from any confessor without further formality.

(5) "Those who command the violation of or who themselves rashly violate the immunity of ecclesiastical asylum." Immunity, or right of sanctuary, protected criminals who took refuge near the altar or within sacred edifices; it was forbidden to remove them from such places of refuge either by public or private force. This immunity, although formerly beneficial, has disappeared from modern life; the excommunication here retained has hardly more than the value of a principle; it may be noted that the article is cautiously worded. By its terms excommunication would be incurred only by those who rashly, and without being constrained thereto, violate the right of sanctuary as such (Holy Office, 1 Feb., 1871; 22 Dec., 1880).

(6) "Persons of any kind, condition, sex, or age who violate the *clausura* [i. e. canonical enclosure] of nuns by penetrating into their monasteries, those introducing or admitting them, also nuns who leave their clausura, except in the cases and in the manner provided for by the Constitution 'Decori' of St. Pius V." The reader will find in the article CLOISTER further details; here it suffices to add that the enclosure in question is that of the papal enclosure (*clausura papalis*), or that of religious women with solemn vows. The Constitution "Decori" (24 Jan., 1570) limits the reasons of egress to fire, leprosy, or an epidemic; even in the two latter cases it is necessary for such nuns to have the written authorization of the bishop.

(7) "Women who violate the enclosure [clausura] of male religious and the superiors and others who admit them." Here also it is question of religious with solemn vows; moreover, it has not seemed necessary to provide for exceptional cases nor for permission.

(8) "Those who are guilty of real simony [*simonia realis*] for the obtaining of any benefices whatever, and their accomplices." (For this article and the two that follow see SIMONY.)

(9) "Those who are guilty of confidential simony [*simonia confidentialis*] apropos of any benefice or any dignity whatever."

(10) "Those who are guilty of real simony for the purpose of entering a religious order."

(11) "All who traffic in Indulgences or other spiritual favours are excommunicated by the Constitution of St. Pius V, 'Quam plenum' (2 Jan., 1569)." This Constitution enumerates the abuses that the pope wished to remedy. Certain Spanish bishops were accustomed to issue public grants of Indulgences or various other spiritual favours, but in a manner for which they were unauthorized; the abuse consisted mainly in the pecuniary conditions they imposed for obtaining these favours (Indulgences, choice of a confessor for the absolution of reserved cases, Mass and burial in time of interdict, dispensation from abstinence, the right to present several sponsors at baptism, etc.). To overcome these abuses St. Pius V inflicted two kinds of penalties: bishops were punished by being forbidden entrance into church and by suspension of the "fruits", or revenues, of their benefices; culprits of inferior rank were excommunicated. The penalties against bishops have been suppressed; excommunication, however, is retained to punish those who would reap unlawful profit from the publication or granting of Indulgences or of the other spiritual favours enumerated.

(12) "Those who collect stipends for Masses and make profits out of them by having the Masses celebrated in places where the stipends are not so high." The object of the penalty is to remedy all shameful traffic in Mass-stipends; to incur it two things are necessary: not only must the stipends for Masses (called *missæ manuales*) be collected, but a portion of them must be withheld when remitting them to the priests who are to fulfil the obligation of saying the Masses. Despite the wording of the article, it is not necessary that both conditions, the quest of stipends and the celebration of the Masses, occur in different places (Holy Office, 19 Aug., 1891, ad 4).

(13) "All those excommunicated by the Constitutions of St. Pius V, 'Admonet nos' (29 March, 1567); Innocent IX, 'Quæ ab hâc Sede' (4 Nov., 1591); Clement VIII, 'Ad Romani Pontificis curam' (26 June, 1592); and Alexander VIII, 'Inter cæteras' (24 Oct., 1660), concerning the alienation and enfeoffment of cities and places belonging to the Holy Roman Church." This article deals with the temporal domains of the Church and calls here for no special comment.

(14) "Religious who, without permission of the parish priest, venture to administer extreme unction or the Eucharist as Viaticum, to ecclesiastics or laymen, except in cases of necessity." The penalty affects religious with solemn vows and professed, but is not incurred if they have at least the presumed permission of the parish priest, if they be in ignorance, finally if it be a case of necessity. Those to whom these religious must not administer the sacraments are seculars, ecclesiastics or laymen; they may, however, administer them to persons domiciled in their convents.

(15) "Those who without legitimate permission take relics from the cemeteries or catacombs of Rome or its territory, and those who give such persons aid or countenance." The permission is to be sought from the Roman Vicariate, and excommunication is incurred only by carrying away from the catacombs genuine relics, not other objects. Relics are the remains, not of anyone happening to be buried in the catacombs, but only of martyrs or of those regarded as such by reason of the "signs of martyrdom" that distinguish their tombs, notably the phial of blood, according to the Sacred Congregation of Rites, 10 April, 1668, and 27 Nov., 1863.

(16) "Those who hold communion in criminal crime with a person whom the pope has excommunicated by name, that is, those who give him assistance or countenance." The "criminal crime" (*crimen criminosum*) is the very one for which the culprit was excommunicated; the article, of course, does not contemplate participation in the offensive act itself, since excommunication by name is necessarily posterior to such an act. The penalty is inflicted for subsequently assisting or countenancing the excommunicated person. This is a survival [see above, II (5)] of the penalties incurred by intercourse with the excommunicated. It must be noted that this censure is not imposed for intercourse with all excommunicated persons, but only with vitandi, those whom the pope has excommunicated by name, not such as have been excommunicated by a Roman Congregation (Holy Office, 16 June, 1897) or by the bishop.

(17) "Clerics who knowingly and wilfully hold communion *in divinis* with persons whom the pope has excommunicated by name and receive them at Divine service." The excommunicated in question are the same as in the preceding article, and they cannot be admitted to Divine worship; however, the penalty incurred concerns ecclesiastics only, when acting freely and with full knowledge [see above, II (5)].

(c) Excommunications Reserved to the Bishop (Ordinary).—These are three in number and affect the following persons:—

(1) "Ecclesiastics in Holy orders and regulars or nuns who dare to contract marriage after having made a solemn vow of chastity, also those who dare to contract marriage with one of these persons." The ecclesiastics whose marriage is null in consequence of the impediment of Holy orders are subdeacons and those in still higher orders; the nuns and male religious whose marriage is null through the impediment of vow are members of the great orders. Nevertheless, the impediment does not exist from the time of their first profession that follows the novitiate, but only from the solemn profession made three years later. The penalty is incurred by an attempt at marriage, not by an act of betrothal; such an attempt is recognized in any contract having the *figura matrimonii*, i. e. which would constitute a marriage if there were no impediment; consequently the penalty is incurred for civil marriage (Holy Office, 22 Dec., 1880), even if there were other impediments, e. g. consanguinity (Holy Office, 16 Jan., 1892).

(2) "Those who efficaciously procure abortion." The fruitless attempt is not punished with excommunication; authors do not agree as to whether the woman guilty of self-abortion is excommunicated.

(3) "Those who knowingly make use of counterfeit Apostolic Letters or who co-operate in the crime." [See above, (a) (9).] This article is not directed against forgers but against those who endeavour to profit by falsified letters. Petitions signed by the pope or in his name are not mentioned. Accomplices are also punished; but the culprits must act knowingly, and be fully aware that they are using falsified papal letters.

(d) Excommunications That Are Not Reserved (*Nemini Reservatæ*).—These are four in number and are pronounced against the following persons:—

(1) "Those who command or oblige the giving of ecclesiastical burial to notorious heretics or to persons excommunicated by name or placed under interdict." The article does not consider funeral ceremonies, but only material interment in consecrated ground. Those who admit heretics or others to ecclesiastical burial are not punished, but only those who, by authority or force, compel such an interment, thereby violating the prohibition of the Church. Nor is it question here of all who, according to the Ritual, should be deprived of ecclesiastical burial, but merely of the two categories indicated.

(2) "Those who wound or terrorize the inquisitors, informers, witnesses, or other ministers of the Holy Office; those who lacerate or burn the writings of this tribunal and all who give to the aforesaid assistance, counsel, or countenance." This excommunication does not apply in countries where the Holy Office has no organized tribunal; the inquisitional functions devolve in such countries on the bishop, who is protected by the specially reserved excommunications described above, under (a) (5), (6), (8).

(3) "Those who alienate and those who have the audacity to receive church property without Apostolic authorization, according to the terms of the Constitution 'Ambitiosæ, de rebus eccl. non alienandis'." The author of this Constitution (Extravagantes, lib. III, tit. iv, inter comm.) was Paul II (1 March, 1467). It forbids under pain of reserved excommunication and of the nullity of the acts, not only alienations (properly so called) of ecclesiastical property, sales, donations, etc., but also all contracts savouring of alienation, such as mortgages, *emphyteusis* or perpetual lease, long-term leases, etc. For the manifest benefit of the Church these contracts must be authorized by the pope; only objects of small value are excepted (see Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, no. 20).

(4) "Those who, through their own fault, neglect or omit to denounce within a month the confessors or priests by whom they have been solicited to immodest acts, in all the cases set forth by our predecessors Gregory XV in the Constitution 'Universi' (20 Aug., 1622) and Benedict XIV in the Constitution 'Sacramentum pœnitentiæ' (1 June, 1741)." This excommunication is not intended to punish those solicited to sin (they are not therefore guilty), but to protect the administration of the Sacrament of Penance. Persons thus solicited are strictly obliged to make known to the inquisitor or the bishop those priests who have solicited them to the aforesaid acts; if, through their own fault, such denunciation is not made within a month they incur excommunication, which ceases only when they have made known in the aforesaid manner the guilty party. The solicitation here alluded to is not any provocation to evil, but to sins against chastity on the part of confessors or priests, and in connexion with the Sacrament of Penance, this being the abuse that the legislator especially seeks to punish. Said connexion exists when the solicitation takes place "during the very act of sacramental confession, immediately before or after, on the occasion or under the pretext of confession, or finally, in the confessional".

B. *Excommunications Pronounced by the Council of Trent.*—These are eight in number, the first being sim-

ply reserved to the pope and the other seven non-reserved:—

(1) Sess. XXII, c. ii, De ref.: against usurpers, whether ecclesiastics or laymen, of any kind of church property, until the time of restitution and absolution. This penalty protects all ecclesiastical property, properly so called, i. e. of which the administration belongs to ecclesiastical authority, such as real and personal property, revenues, etc. Excommunication is incurred by usurpers, namely by those who claim for themselves the ownership of this property, and passes on to the successive acquirers of such property until restitution or composition (agreement) is made. This penalty was applied at the time of the recent spoliations in Italy and France.

(2) Sess. IV, De editione et usu sacrorum librorum. —The excommunication pronounced by the council was restricted by the Constitution "Apostolicæ Sedis" to those who, without the approbation of the bishop, print, or have printed, books treating of sacred things; this must here be understood solely of the text of Holy Writ and of notes and commentaries on the same (Holy Office, 22 Dec., 1880).

(3) Sess. XXIV, c. vi, De ref. matr.: against those who are guilty of the crime of abduction, in regard to any woman, with a view to marriage, and all who lend them advice, aid, or countenance.

(4) Sess. XXIV, c. ix, De ref. matr.: against temporal rulers and magistrates who directly or indirectly oppose obstacles to the liberty of their subjects in the matter of contracting marriage.

(5) Sess. XXV, c. v, De regul.: against secular magistrates who at the request of the bishop, do not give the support of the secular arm in re-establishing the clausura or enclosure of nuns. This excommunication is abrogated in practice or at least is inapplicable.

(6) Sess. XXV, c. xviii, De regul.: against those who unjustly oblige a woman to enter a monastery unwillingly, or to take the habit, or make a profession, and those who thereunto give their counsel, aid, or countenance, as also against those who, without good reason, prevent a woman from taking the veil or making her profession.

(7) Sess. XXIV, c. i, De ref. matr.: against "those who deny that clandestine marriages [before the legislation of the council] are true and valid; as also those who falsely affirm that marriages contracted by the children of a family without the consent of their parents are invalid and that parents can make such marriages valid or invalid."

(8) Sess. XIII, can. xi: "This council ordains and declares that sacramental confession, when a confessor may be had, is of necessity to be made before Communion by those whose conscience is burdened by mortal sin, how contrite soever they may think themselves. But if anyone shall presume to teach, preach, or obstinately to assert, or even in public disputation to defend the contrary, he shall be thereupon excommunicated."

C. *Excommunications Pronounced or Renewed Since the Constitution "Apostolicæ Sedis"*.—These are four in number, the first two being specially reserved to the pope, the third to the ordinary; the fourth is non-reserved.

(1) The Constitution "Romanus Pontifex" (28 Aug., 1873), besides other penalties, declares specially reserved excommunication: first, against the dignitaries and canons of cathedral churches (or those having the administration of vacant cathedrals) who would dare to concede and transfer the administration of their church with the title of vicar to the person elected by the chapter, or named or presented to said church by lay power; second, against those so elected or presented; and third, against all who aid, advise, or countenance the aforesaid offenders.

(2) Excommunication specially reserved against the members of the "Catholic Italian Society for the restoration of the rights of the Christian and especially of the Roman people", and against its promoters, supporters, and adherents (S. Peniten., 4 Aug., 1876; Acta S. Sed., IX, 352). Amongst other rights this society proposed to restore popular participation in the election of the sovereign pontiff.

(3) Excommunication reserved to the ordinary against laymen (for ecclesiastics the penalty is suspension) who traffic in Mass-stipends and trade them with priests for books and other merchandise (S. Cong. of the Council, decree "Vigilanti studio", 25 May, 1893).

(4) Excommunication, non-reserved, against missionaries, both regulars and seculars, of the East Indies (Farther Orient) or the West Indies (America) who devote themselves to commerce or who participate in it, and their immediate superiors, provincial or general, who fail to punish the culprits, at least by removal, and even after a single offence. This excommunication comes down from the Constitutions of Urban VIII, "Ex delicto" (22 Feb., 1633), and Clement IX, "Sollicitudo" (17 July, 1669), but was suppressed by reason of non-mention in the Constitution "Apostolicæ Sedis"; it was re-established, however, at the request of the S. Cong. of the Inquisition, 4 Dec., 1872. This excommunication is non-reserved, but the culprit cannot be absolved prior to making restitution, unless he be at the point of death.

Canonists usually treat of excommunication in their commentaries on the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, at the title *De sententia excommunicationis* (lib. V, tit. xxxix). Moralists deal with it apropos of the treatise on censures (*De Censuris*). One of the best works is that of D'Annibale, *Summula Theologiæ moralis* (5th ed., Rome, 1908). For details consult the numerous commentaries on the Constitution *Apostolicæ Sedis*. Special works by ancient writers: Avila, *De censuris* (Lyons, 1608); Suarez, *De censuris* (Coimbra, 1603); Altieri, *De censuris ecclesiasticis* (Rome, 1618).—Cf. Kober, *Der Kirchenbann* (Tübingen, 1857); Idem in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Bann;* Hollweck, *Die kirchlichen Strafgesetze* (Mainz, 1899); Hilarius a Sexten, *De censuris* (Mainz, 1898); München, *Das kanonische Gerichtsverfahren und Strafrecht* (Cologne, 1874); Taunton, *The Law of the Church* (London, 1906), s. v. *Excommunication;* Smith, *Elements of Ecclesiastical Law* (New York, 1884); Santi-Leitner, *Prælect. Jur. Canonici* (New York, 1905), V, 210–15; Lega, *De Judiciis Eccl.* (Rome, 1900).

A. Boudinhon.

Exeat. See Incardination.

Execration, same as Desecration (q. v.).

Executor, Apostolic, a cleric who puts into execution a papal rescript, completing what is necessary in order that it be effective. The executor of a rescript may be discovered from the tenor of the document itself. In matters which regard the government of regulars, the executor of Apostolic Letters is the superior of the order, namely, the general, the procurator general, or the provincial. Rescripts containing favours are sometimes granted by the Holy See directly to the petitioners; in which case, the executor merely has the office of executing the favour asked for, without any obligation of judicial inquiry into the opportuneness of the grant, or the reasons alleged for seeking it. Nevertheless, if it is notorious that the favour has been surreptitiously obtained, he must abstain from executing the rescript. Rescripts, however, are not usually sent direct to the parties interested, but, in the external forum, to the ordinary, either of the petitioners or of the territory in question, and in the internal forum, to any approved confessor chosen by the persons concerned. In this latter case the grant is remitted entirely to the judgment and conscience of him who is to execute it. He enjoys delegated power, and must act within the limits of his mandate. The Apostolic Letters must first of all be in his hands before he may act; from them he determines whether he is the one delegated, and what are his powers. He must verify the force of the reasons alleged for granting the request, as well as the truth of other statements found in the petition. As a delegate of the Holy See he may, ordinarily, subdelegate another to execute the rescript, unless this is expressly

forbidden in the grant, or unless it is apparent that he is selected by reason of his knowledge or other personal qualities specially fitting him for the office. It is important to know whether an executor is chosen for his personal characteristics, or on account of his office: in the former case the delegation is personal, in the latter it is attached to the position, and passes on to the successor of the same office. A rescript given to the ordinary may likewise be executed by the vicar general. An executor must know the rules for interpreting rescripts, also, when they are rendered void, because surreptitiously obtained or for other cause. Rescripts emanating from the Sacred Penitentiaria are executed in the confessional, and are then destroyed by the confessor, as they treat of matters of conscience. When the rescript pertains to the external forum, a decree should be drawn up to the effect that all necessary formalities have been observed in its execution; these formalities should be specified. No fee is allowed for the execution of Apostolic Letters, lest the executor's judgment be influenced thereby.

HUMPHREY, *Urba et Orbis* (London, 1899), pp. 320–322; FERRARIS, *Prompta Bibliotheca*, s. v. *Executor*.

ANDREW B. MEEHAN.

Exedra.—A semicircular stone or marble seat; a rectangular or semicircular recess; the portico of the Grecian palæstra, or gymnasium, in which disputations of the learned were held among the ancients; also, in private houses, the parastas, or vestibule, used for conversation. The term is sometimes applied to a porch or chapel which projects from a larger building. Also used, as synonymous with *cathedra*, for a throne or seat of any kind; for a small private chamber; the space between an oriel window and the small chapels between the buttresses of a large church or cathedral.

ANDERSON AND SPIERS, *Architecture of Greece and Rome* (London), 21, 108, 262, 278; PARKER, *Glossary of Architecture*, (Oxford and London, 1845), I, 159; B. AND B. F. FLETCHER, *A History of Architecture* (London and New York, 1905), 691.

THOMAS H. POOLE.

Exegesis (BIBLICAL) is the branch of theology which investigates and expresses the true sense of Sacred Scripture. The exegete does not inquire which books constitute Sacred Scripture, nor does he investigate their genuineness, nor, again, does he study their double authorship. He accepts the books which, according to the concurrent testimony of history and ecclesiastical authority, belong to the Canon of Sacred Scripture. Obedient to the decree of the Council of Trent, he regards the Vulgate as the authentic Latin version, without neglecting the results of sober textual criticism, based on the readings found in the other versions approved by Christian antiquity, in the Scriptural citations of the Fathers, and in the more ancient manuscripts. With regard to the authorship of the Sacred Books, too, the exegete follows the authoritative teaching of the Church and the prevalent opinions of her theologians on the question of Biblical inspiration. Not that these three questions concerning the Canon, the genuine text, and the inspiration of Sacred Scriptures exert no influence on Biblical exegesis: unless a book forms part of the Canon, it will not be the subject of exegesis at all; only the best supported readings of its text will be made the basis of its theological explanation; and the doctrine of inspiration with its logical corollaries will be found to have a constant bearing on the results of exegesis. Still, exegesis, as such, does not deal with these three subjects; the reader will find them treated in the articles CANON OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES; CRITICISM, BIBLICAL, subtitle: *Criticism, Textual;* and INSPIRATION.

The early Reformers were wont to claim that the genuine text of the inspired and canonical books is self-sufficient and clear. This contention does not owe its origin to the sixteenth century. The words of Origen (De princip., IV), St. Augustine (De doctr. christ., I-III), and St. Jerome (ad Paulin., ep. liii, 6, 7) show that similar views existed among the sciolists in the early age of the Church. The exegetical results flowing from the supposed clearness of the Bible may be inferred from the fact that one century after the rise of the Reformation Bossuet could give to the world two volumes entitled, "A History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches". A Protestant theologian, S. Werenfels, sets forth the same truth in a telling epigram:—

Hic liber est in quo quærit sua dogmata quisque,
Invenit et pariter dogmata quisque sua,

which may be rendered in an English paraphrase:—

Men ope this book, their favourite creed in mind;
Each seeks his own, and each his own doth find.

Agreeing with the warning of the Fathers, Pope Leo XIII, in his Encyclical "Providentissimus Deus", insisted on the difficulty of rightly interpreting the Bible. "It must be observed", he wrote, "that in addition to the usual reasons which make ancient writings more or less difficult to understand, there are some which are peculiar to the Bible. For the language of the Bible is employed to express, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, many things which are beyond the power and scope of the reason of man—that is to say, Divine mysteries and all that is related to them. There is sometimes in such passages a fullness and a hidden depth of meaning which the letter hardly expresses and which the laws of grammatical interpretation hardly warrant. Moreover, the literal sense itself frequently admits other senses, adapted to illustrate dogma or to confirm morality. Wherefore, it must be recognized that the Sacred Writings are wrapt in a certain religious obscurity, and that no one can enter into their interior without a guide; God so disposing, as the Holy Fathers commonly teach, in order that men may investigate them with greater ardour and earnestness, and that what is attained with difficulty may sink more deeply into the mind and heart; and, most of all, that they may understand that God has delivered the Holy Scriptures to the Church, and that in reading and making use of His word, they must follow the Church as their guide and their teacher."

But it is not our purpose so much to prove the need of Biblical exegesis as to explain its aim, describe its methods, indicate the various forms of its results, and outline its history. Exegesis aims at investigating the sense of Sacred Scripture; its method is contained in the rules of interpretation; its results are expressed in the various ways in which the sense of the Bible is wont to be communicated; its history comprises the work done by Christian and Jewish interpreters, by Catholics and Protestants. We shall endeavour to consider these various elements under the four heads: I. Sense of Sacred Scripture; II. Hermeneutics; III. Sacred Rhetoric; IV. History of Exegesis.

I. SENSE OF SACRED SCRIPTURE.—In general, the sense of Sacred Scripture is the truth actually conveyed by it. We must well distinguish between the sense and the signification of a word. A good dictionary will give us, in the case of most words, a list of their various possible meanings or significations; but no reader will be tempted to believe that a word has all these meanings wherever it occurs. The context or some other restrictive element will determine the meaning in which each word is used in any given passage, and this meaning is the sense of the word. The signification of the word is its possible meaning; the sense of a word is its actual meaning in any given context. A sentence, like a word, may have several possible significations, but it has only one sense or meaning intended by the author. Here, again, the signification denotes the possible meaning of the sentence, while the sense is the meaning which the sentence here and now conveys. In the case of the Bible, it must be kept in mind that God is its author, and that God, the Sovereign Lord of all things, can manifest truth not

merely by the use of words, but also by disposing outward things in such a way that one is the figure of the other. In the former case we have the literal sense; in the latter, the typical (cf. St. Thomas, Quodl., vii, Q. vi, a. 14).

(1) *Literal Sense.*—(i) What is the Literal Sense?—The literal sense of Sacred Scripture is the truth really, actually, and immediately intended by its author. The fact that the literal sense must be *really* intended by the author distinguishes it from the truth conveyed by any mere accommodation. This latter applies a writer's language, on the ground of analogy, to something not originally meant by him. Again, since the literal sense is *actually* intended by the writer, it differs from the meaning conveyed only virtually by the text. Thus the reader may come to know the literary capacity of the author from the style of his writing; or he may draw a number of logical inferences from the writer's direct statements; the resultant information is in neither case actually intended by the writer, but it constitutes the so-called derivative or consequent sense. Finally, the literal sense is limited to the meaning *immediately* intended by the writer, so that the truth mediately expressed by him does not fall within the range of the literal sense. It is precisely in this point that the literal sense differs from the typical. To repeat briefly, the literal sense is not an accommodation based on similitude or analogy; it is not a mere inference drawn by the reader; it is not an antitype corresponding to the immediate contents of the text as its type; but it is the meaning which the author intends to convey *really*, not by a stretch of the imagination; *actually*, not as a syllogistic potency; and *immediately*, i. e., by means of the language, not by means of the truth conveyed by the language.

(ii) Division of the Literal Sense.—What has been said about the immediate character of the literal sense must not be misconstrued in such a way as to exclude figurative language from its range. Figurative language is really a single, not a double, sign of the truth it conveys. When we speak of "the arm of God", we do not imply that God really is endowed with such a bodily member, but we directly denote his power of action (St. Thomas, Summa, I, Q. i, a. 10, ad 3^{um}). This principle applies not merely in the metaphor, the synecdoche, the metonymy, or the irony, but also in those cases in which the figure extends through a whole sentence or even an entire chapter or book. The very name *allegory* implies that the real sense of the expression differs from its usual verbal meaning. In Matt., v, 13 sqq., e. g., the sentence, "You are the salt of the earth" etc., is not first to be understood in its non-figurative sense, and then in the figurative; it does not first class the Apostles among the mineral kingdom, and then among the social and religious reformers of the world, but the literal meaning of the passage coincides with the truth conveyed in the allegory. It follows, therefore, that the literal sense comprises both the proper and the figurative. The fable, the parable, and the example must also be classed among the allegorical expressions which signify the intended truth immediately. It is true that in the passage according to which the trees elect a king (Judges, ix, 6–21), in the parable of the prodigal son (Luke, xv, 11 sqq.), and in the history of the Good Samaritan (Luke, x, 25–37) a number of words and sentences are required in order to construct the fable, the parable, and the example respectively; but this does not interfere with the literal or immediate sense of the literary devices. As such they have no meaning independent of, or prior to, the moral lesson which the author intends to convey by their means. It is easily granted that the mechanical contrivance we call a watch immediately indicates the time in spite of the subordinate action of its spring and wheels; why, then, should we question the truth that the literary device called fable, or parable, or example, immediately points out its moral lesson, though the very existence of such a device presupposes the use of a number of words and even sentences?

(iii) Ubiquity of the Literal Sense.—The Fathers of the Church were not blind to the fact that the literal sense in some Scripture passages appears to imply great incongruities, not to say insuperable difficulties. On the other hand, they regarded the language of the Bible as truly human language, and therefore always endowed with a literal sense, whether proper or figurative. Moreover, St. Jerome (in Is., xiii, 19), St. Augustine (De tent. Abrah. serm. ii, 7), St. Gregory (Moral., i, 37) agree with St. Thomas (Quodl., vii, Q. vi, a. 14) in his conviction that the typical sense is always based on the literal and springs from it. Hence if these Fathers had denied the existence of a literal sense in any passage of Scripture, they would have left the passage meaningless. Where the patristic writers appear to reject the literal sense, they really exclude only the proper sense, leaving the figurative. Origen (De princ., IV, xi) may be regarded as the only exception to this rule; since he considers some of the Mosaic laws as either absurd or impossible to keep, he denies that they must be taken in their literal sense. But even in his case, attempts have been made to give to his words a more acceptable meaning (cf. Vincenzi, "In S. Gregorii Nysseni et Origenis scripta et doctrinam nova recensio", Rome, 1864, vol. II, cc. xxv-xxix). The great Alexandrian Doctor distinguishes between the body, the soul, and the spirit of Scripture. His defendants believe that he understands by these three elements its proper, its figurative, and its typical sense respectively. He may, therefore, with impunity deny the existence of any bodily sense in a passage of Scripture without injury to its literal sense. But it is more generally admitted that Origen went astray on this point, because he followed Philo's opinion too faithfully.

(iv) Is the Literal Sense One or Multiple?—There is more solid ground for a diversity of opinion concerning the unicity of the literal sense contained in each passage of Sacred Scripture. This brings us face to face with a double question: (a) Is it *possible* that a Scripture passage has more than one literal sense? (b) Is there any Biblical text which *actually* has more than one literal meaning? It must be kept in mind that the literal sense is taken here in the strict meaning of the word. It is agreed on all sides that a multiple consequent sense or a multiple accommodation may be regarded as the rule rather than the exception. Nor is there any difficulty about the multiple literal sense found in various readings or in different versions of the same text; we ask here whether one and the same genuine Scripture text may have more than one literal sense.

(a) Possibility of a Multiple Literal Sense.—Since a word, and a sentence too, may have more meanings than one, there is no a priori impossibility in the idea that a Scriptural text should have more than one literal sense. If the author of Scripture really intends to convey the truth contained in the various possible meanings of a text, the multiple literal sense will be the natural resultant. Some of the expressions found in the writings of the Fathers seem to emphasize the possibility of having a multiple literal sense in Sacred Scripture.

(b) Actual Occurrence of a Multiple Literal Sense.—The subject becomes more complicated if we ask whether a multiple literal sense is not merely possible, but is actually found anywhere in Scripture. There is no good authority for its frequent occurrence; but does it really exist even in the few Scriptural passages which seem to contain it, such as Ps. ii, 7; Is., liii, 4, 8; Dan., ix, 27; John, xi, 51; ii, 19? Did God wish in these texts to convey a multiple literal sense? Revelation, as coming down to us in Scripture and tradition, furnishes the only clue to the solution of the question.

(α) Arguments for the Multiple Literal Sense.—The advocates of a multiple literal sense advance the following arguments for their view: First, Sacred Scripture supposes its existence in several passages. Thus Heb., i, 5, understands Ps. ii, 7 (this day have I begotten thee), of the Divine generation of the Son; Acts, xiii, 33, understands the text of the Resurrection; Heb., v, 5, of the eternal priesthood of Christ. Again, the Latin Vulgate and the Septuagint, together with I Pet., ii, 24, understand Is. liii, 4 (he hath borne our infirmities), of our sins; Matt., viii, 17, understands the words of our bodily ailments. And again, I Mach., i, 57, applies some words of Dan., ix, 27, to his own subject, while Matt., xxiv, 15, represents them as a prophecy to be fulfilled in the destruction of the Holy City. Finally, John, ii, 19, was understood by the Jews in a sense different from that intended by Jesus Christ; and John, xi, 51, expresses two disparate meanings, one intended by Caiphas and the other by the Holy Ghost. The second argument is, that tradition too upholds the existence of a multiple sense in several passages of the Bible. Its witnesses are St. Augustine (Conf., XII, xxvi, xxx, xxxi; De doctr. christ., III, xxvii; etc.), St. Gregory the Great (in Ezech., iii, 13, Lib. I, hom. x, n. 30 sq.), St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, St. Bernard, and, among the Scholastics, St. Thomas (I, Q. i, a. 10; "De potent.", IV, 1; "in II sent.", dist. xii, Q. i, a. 2, ad 7^{um}), Card. Cajetan (ad I, Q. i, a. 10), Melchior Cano (Loc. theol., Lib. II, c. xi, ad 7 arg., ad 3 rat.), Bañez (ad I, Q. i, a. 10), Sylvius (ad id.), John of St. Thomas (I, Q. i, disp. ii, a. 12), Billuart (De reg. fidei, dissert. i, a. 8), Vasquez, Valentia, Molina, Serrarius, Cornelius a Lapide, and others.

(β) Reasons against the Multiple Literal Sense.—Patrizi, Beelen, Lamy, Cornely, Knabenbauer, Reitmayr, and the greater number of recent writers deny the actual existence of a multiple literal sense in the Bible; they urge the following reasons for their opinion: First, the Bible is written in human language; now, the language of other books usually presents only one literal sense. Second, the genuine sense of Sacred Scripture must be discovered by means of the rules of hermeneutics. A commentator would render these rules meaningless, if he were to look for a second literal sense of a passage after discovering one true meaning by their means. Third, commentators implicitly assume that any given text of Scripture has only one literal sense; for after finding out the various meanings which are philologically probable, they endeavour to ascertain which of them was intended by the Holy Ghost. Fourth, a multiple literal sense would create equivocation and confusion in the Bible. Finally, the multiple sense in Scripture would be a supernatural fact wholly depending on the free will of God. We cannot know it independently of revelation; its actual occurrence must be solidly proved from Scripture or tradition. The patrons of the multiple literal sense have not thus far advanced any such proof.

(1) Where Scripture appeals to disparate meanings of the same passage, it does not necessarily consider each of them as the literal sense. Thus Heb., i, 5, may represent Ps. ii, 7, as referring literally to the eternal generation, but Acts, xiii, 33, may consider the Resurrection, and Hebr., v, 5, the eternal priesthood of Christ as necessary consequences. Matt., viii, 17, applies the consequent sense of Is., liii, 4, to the cure of bodily ailments; I Mach., i, 57, merely accommodates some words of Dan., ix, 27, to the writer's own time; in John, ii, 19, and xi, 51, only the meaning intended by the Holy Ghost is the literal sense, though this may not have been understood when the words in question were spoken. (2) The testimony of the Fathers and the Scholastic theologians is not sufficient in our case to prove the existence of a dogmatic tradition as to the actual occurrence of the multiple literal sense in Scripture. There is no trace of it before the time of St. Augustine; this great Doctor proposes his view not as the teaching of tradition, but as a pious and probable opinion. The expressions of the other Fathers, excepting perhaps St. Gregory the Great, urge the depth and wealth of thought contained in Scripture, or they refer to meanings which we technically call its typical, derivative, or consequent sense, and perhaps even to mere accommodations of certain passages. Among the Scholastics, St. Thomas follows the opinion of St. Augustine, at least in one of the alleged passages (De potent., IV, 1), and a number of the later Scholastics follow the opinion of St. Thomas. The other early Scholastics maintain rather the opposite view, as may be seen in St. Bonaventure (IV Sent. dist. xxi, p. I, dub. 1) and Alexander of Hales (Summa, I, Q. i, m. 4, a. 2).

(γ) The Derivative or Consequent Sense.—The consequent or derivative sense of Scripture is the truth legitimately inferred from its genuine meaning. It would be wrong to identify the consequent sense with the more latent literal sense. This depth of the literal sense may spring from the fact that the predicate changes somewhat in its meaning if it be applied to totally different subjects. The word *wise* has one meaning if predicated of God, and quite another if predicated of created beings. Such a variety of meaning belongs to the literal meaning in the strict sense of the word. The consequent sense may be said to be the conclusion of a syllogism one of whose premises is a truth contained in the Bible. Such inferences can hardly be called the sense of a book written by a human author; but God has foreseen all the legitimate conclusions derived from Biblical truths, so that they may be said, in a certain way, to be His intended meaning. The Bible itself makes use of such inferences as if they were based on Divine authority. St. Paul (I Cor., i, 31) quotes such an inference based on Jer., ix, 23, 24, with the express addition, "as it is written"; in I Cor., ix, 10, 11, he derived the consequent sense of Deut., xxv, 4, indicating the second premise, while in I Tim., v, 18, he states the consequent sense of the same passage without adding the second premise. Theologians and ascetical writers have, therefore, a right to utilize dogmatic and moral inferences from the genuine sense of Sacred Scripture. The writings of the Fathers illustrate this principle most copiously.

(δ) Accommodation.—By accommodation the writer's words are applied, on the ground of analogy, to something not originally meant by him. If there be no analogy between the original and the imposed meaning, there is no accommodation of the passage, but rather a violent perversion of its true meaning; such a contorted meaning is not merely outside, but against, the genuine sense. Accommodation is usually divided into two classes: extensive and allusive. Extensive accommodation takes the words of the Bible in their genuine sense, but applies them to a new subject. Thus the words, he "was found perfect, just, and in the time of wrath he was made a reconciliation", which Ecclus., xliv, 17, predicates of Noe, are often applied to other saints. Allusive accommodation does not employ the words of Scripture in their genuine sense, but gives them an entirely different meaning; here the analogy does not exist between the objects, but between the verbal expressions. Ps. xvii, 26, 27, "With the holy, thou wilt be holy; and with the innocent man thou wilt be innocent; and with the elect thou wilt be elect: and with the perverse thou wilt be perverted", expresses originally the attitude of God to the good and the wicked; but by accommodation these words are often used to show the influence of companionship. That the use of accommodation is legitimate, may be inferred from its occurrence in Scripture, in the writings of the Fathers, and from its very nature. Examples of accommodation in Scripture may be found in Matt., vii, 23 (cf. Ps. vi, 9), Rom.,

x, 18 (cf. Ps. xviii, 5), II Cor., viii, 15 (cf. Ex., xvi, 18), Heb., xiii, 5 (cf. Jos., i, 5), Apoc., xi, 4 (cf. Zach., iv, 14). The liturgical books and the writings of the Fathers are so replete with the use of accommodation that it is needless to refer to any special instances. Finally, there is no good reason for interdicting the proper use of accommodation, seeing that it is not wrong in itself and that its use does not involve any inconvenience as far as faith and morals are concerned. But two excesses are to be avoided: first, it cannot be maintained, that all the citations from the Old Testament which are found in the New are mere accommodations. Similar contentions are found in the writings of those who endeavour to destroy the value of the Messianic prophecies; they are not confined to our days, but date back to Theodore of Mopsuestia and the Socinians. The Fifth Œcumenical Synod rejected the error of Theodore; besides, Christ Himself (Matt., xxii, 41 sq.; cf. Ps. cix, 1), St. Peter (Acts, iii, 25 sq.; cf. Gen., xii, 3; xviii, 18; xxii, 18), and St. Paul (Heb., i, 5; v, 5; Acts, xiii, 33; cf. Ps. ii, 7) base theological arguments on Old-Testament citations, so that these latter cannot be regarded as mere accommodations. Secondly, we must not exceed the proper limits in the use of accommodation. This we should do, if we were to present the meaning derived from accommodation as the genuine sense of Scripture, or if we were to use it as the premise in an argument, or again if we were to accommodate the words of Scripture to ridiculous, absurd, or wholly disparate subjects. The fourth session of the Council of Trent warns most earnestly against such an abuse of Sacred Scripture.

(2) *Typical Sense.*—The typical sense has its name from the fact that it is based on the figurative or typical relation of Biblical persons, or objects, or events, to a new truth. This latter is called the antitype, while its Biblica. correspondent is named the type. The typical sense is also called the spiritual, or mystical, sense: mystical, because of its more recondite nature; spiritual, because it is related to the literal, as the spirit is related to the body. What we call type is called shadow, allegory, parable, by St. Paul (cf. Rom., v, 14; I Cor., x, 6; Heb., viii, 5; Gal., iv, 24; Heb., ix, 9); once he refers to it as antitype (Heb., ix, 24), though St. Peter applies this term to the truth signified (I Pet., iii, 21). Various other designations for the typical sense have been used by the Fathers of the Church; but the following questions are of more vital importance.

(i) Nature of the Typical Sense.—The typical sense is the Scriptural truth which the Holy Ghost intends to convey really, actually, but not immediately. Inasmuch as its meaning is really conveyed, the typical sense differs from accommodation; inasmuch as its meaning is actually expressed, it differs from the consequent sense; inasmuch as its meaning is not immediately signified, it differs from the literal sense. While we arrive at the latter immediately by way of the literary expression, we come to know the typical sense only by way of the literal. The text is the sign conveying the literal sense, but the literal sense is the sign expressing the typical. The literal sense is the type which by a special design of God is directed to signify its antitype. Three conditions are necessary to constitute a type: (a) It must have its own true and historical existence independently of the antitype; e. g., the intended immolation of Isaac would be an historical fact, even if Jesus Christ had not died. (b) It must not be referred to the antitype by its very nature. This prohibits the similitude from serving as a type, on account of its antecedent likeness to its object. (c) God himself must have established the reference of the type to its antitype; this excludes objects which are only naturally related to others. The necessity of these three conditions explains why a type cannot be confounded with a parable, or an example, or a symbol, or a similitude, or a comparison, or a metaphor, or a symbolic prophecy—e. g., the statue seen in the dream of Nabuchodonosor. It should be added, however, that at times the type may be expressed by the Scriptural representation of a subject rather than by the strict literal sense of Scripture. Gen., xiv, 18, e. g., introduces Melchisedech without reference to his genealogy; hence Heb., vii, 3, represents him "without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life", and makes him as such a type of Jesus Christ. Thus far we have spoken about the typical sense in its strict sense. In a wider sense, all persons, events, or objects of the Old Testament are sometimes considered as types, provided they resemble persons, events, or objects in the New Testament, whether the Holy Ghost has intended such a relationship or not. The Egyptian Joseph is in this way frequently represented as a type of St. Joseph, the foster-father of Christ.

(ii) Division of the Typical Sense.—The division of the typical sense is based on the character of the type and the antitype. The antitype is either a truth to be believed, or a boon to be hoped for, or again a virtue to be practised. This gives us a triple sense—the allegorical, the anagogical, and the tropological, or moral. The objects of faith in the Old Testament centred mainly around the future Messias and his Church. The allegorical sense may, therefore, be said to refer to the future or to be prophetic. The allegory here is not to be sought in the literary expression, but in the persons or things expressed. This division of the typical sense was expressed by the Scholastics in two lines:—

Littera gesta docet; quid credas, allegoria;
Moralis quid agas; quo tendas, anagogia.

Jerusalem, e. g., according to its literal sense, is the Holy City; taken allegorically, it denotes the Church Militant; understood tropologically, it stands for the just soul; finally, in its anagogical sense, it stands for the Church Triumphant. If the division of the typical sense be based on the type rather than the antitype, we may distinguish personal, real, and legal types. They are personal if a person is chosen by the Holy Ghost as the sign of the truth to be conveyed. Adam, Noe, Melchisedech, Moses, Josue, David, Solomon, and Jonas are types of Jesus Christ; Agar with Ismael, and Sara with Isaac are respectively the types of the Old and the New Testament. The real types are certain historical events or objects mentioned in the Old Testament, such as the paschal lamb, the manna, the water flowing from the rock, the brazen serpent, Sion, and Jerusalem. Legal types are chosen from among the institutions of the Mosaic liturgy, e. g., the tabernacle, the sacred implements, the sacraments and sacrifices of the Old Law, its priests and Levites.

(iii) The Existence of the Typical Sense.—Scripture and tradition agree in their testimony for the occurrence of the typical sense in certain passages of the Old Testament. Among the Scriptural texts which establish the typical sense, we may appeal to Col., ii, 16–17; Heb., viii, 5; ix, 8–9; Rom., v, 14; Gal., iv, 24; Matt., ii, 15 (cf. Os., xi, 1); Heb., i, 5 (cf. II K., vii, 14). The testimony of tradition concerning this subject may be gathered from Barnabas (Ep., 7, 8, 9, 12, etc.), St. Clement of Rome (I Cor., xii), St. Justin (Dial. c. Tryph., civ, 42), St. Irenæus (Adv. hær., IV, xxv, 3; II, xxiv, 2 sqq.; IV, xxvi, 2), Tertullian (Adv. Marc., V, vii), St. Jerome (Ep. liii, ad Paulin., 8), St. Thomas (I, Q. i, a. 10), and a number of other patristic writers and Scholastic theologians. That the Jews agree with the Christian writers on this point, may be inferred from Josephus (Antiq., XVII, iii, 4; Procem. Antiq., n. 4; III, vi, 4, 77; De bello Jud., V, vi, 4), the Talmud (Berachot, c. v, ad fin.; Quiddus, fol. 41, col. 1), and the writings of Philo (de Abraham; de migrat. Abrahæ; de vitâ contempl.), though this latter writer goes to excess in the allegorical interpre-

tation. The foregoing tradition may be confirmed by the language of the liturgy and by the remains of Christian archæology (Kraus, "Roma sotterranea," pp. 242 sqq.). Striking instances of the liturgical proof may be seen in the Preface of the Mass for Easter, in the Blessing of the Paschal Candle, and in the Divine Office recited on the feast of Corpus Christi. All Catholic interpreters readily grant that in some passages of the Old Testament we have a typical sense besides the literal; but this does not appear to be granted with regard to the New Testament, at least not subsequently to the death of Jesus Christ. Distinguishing between the New Testament as it signifies a collection of books, and the New Testament as it denotes the Christian economy, they grant that there are types in the New-Testament books, but only as far as they refer to the pre-Christian economy. For the New Testament has brought us the reality in place of the figure, light in place of darkness, truth in place of shadow (cf. Patrizi, "De interpretatione Scripturarum Sacrarum", p. 199, Rome, 1844). On the other hand, it is urged that the New Testament is the figure of glory, as the Old Testament was the figure of the New (St. Thom., Summa, I, Q. i, a. 10). Again, in Scripture the literal sense applies to what precedes, the typical to what follows. Now, even in the New Testament Christ and His Body precedes the Church and its members; hence, what is said literally of Christ or His Body, may be interpreted allegorically of the Church, the mystical body of Christ, tropologically of the virtuous acts of the Church's members, anagogically of their future glory (St. Thom., Quodl., VII, a. 15, ad 5^{um}). Similar views are expressed by St. Ambrose (in Ps. xxx, n. 25), St. Chrysostom (in Matt., hom. lxvi), St. Augustine (in Joh., ix), St. Gregory the Great (Hom. ii, in evang. Luc., xviii), St. John Damascene (De fide orth., iv, 13); besides, the bark of Peter is usually regarded as a type of the Church, the destruction of Jersualem as a type of the final catastrophe.

(iv) Has Everything in the Old Testament a Typical Sense?—If such passages as Luke, xxiv, 44, I Cor., x, 11, be taken out of their context, they suggest the ubiquity of the typical sense in the Old Testament; the context limits these texts to their proper range. If some of the Fathers, e. g. St. Augustine (De doct. christ., III, xxii) and St. Jerome (Ad Dard., Ep. cxxix, 6; Ep. ad Eptes. iii, 6), appear to assert the ubiquity of the typical sense, their language refers rather to the figurative than the spiritual sense. On the other hand, Tertullian (De resurrect. carn., c. xx), St. Augustine (De civ. Dei., XVII, iii; C. Faust., XXII, xciv), St. Jerome (in Joann., c. i; cf. in Jer., xxvii, 3, 9; xxix, 14), and St. Thomas (Quodl., vii, a. 15, ad 5^{um}), explicitly reject the opinion which maintains that the whole of the Old Testament has a typical sense. The opposite opinion does not appeal to reason; what could be the typical sense, e. g., of the command to love the Lord our God (Deut., vi, 5)?

(v) How Can the Typical Sense be Known?—In the typical sense God does not merely select an existing person or object as the sign of a future person or object, but he directs the course of nature in such a way that the very existence of the type, however independent it may be in itself, refers to the antitype. Man, too, can, in one or another particular case, perform an action in order to typify what he will do in the future. But as the future is not under his complete control, such a way of acting would be ludicrous rather than instructive. The typical sense is, therefore, properly speaking, confined to God's own book. Hence the criteria which serve for the interpretation of profane literature will not be sufficient to detect the typical sense. The latter is a supernatural fact depending entirely on the free will of God; nothing but revelation can make it known to us, so that Scripture or tradition must be regarded as the source of any solid argument in favour of the existence of the typical sense in any particular passage. Where the typical sense really exists, it expresses the mind of God as truly as the literal sense; but we must be careful against excess in this regard. St. Augustine is guilty of this fault in his spiritual interpretation of the thirty-eight years in John, v, 5, and of the one hundred and fifty-three fishes in John, xxi, 11. Besides, it must be kept in mind that not all the minutiæ connected with the type have a definite and distinct meaning in the antitype. It would be useless labour to search for the spiritual meaning of every detail connected with the paschal lamb, e. g., or with the first Adam. The exegete ought to be especially careful in the admission of typical prophecies, and of anything that would resemble the method of the Jewish Cabbalists.

(vi) The Theological Value of the Typical Sense.—Father Perrone (Præl. theol. dogm., IX, 159) believes it is the common opinion of theologians and commentators that no theological argument can be based on the typical sense. But if we speak of the typical sense which has been revealed as such, or which has been proved as such from either Scripture or tradition, it conveys the meaning intended by God not less veraciously than the literal sense. Hence it furnishes solid and reliable premises for theological conclusions. The inspired writers themselves do not hesitate to argue from the typical sense, as may be seen in Matt., ii, 15 (cf. Os., xi, 1), and Heb., i, 5 (cf. II K., vii, 14). Texts whose typical sense is only probable yield only probable theological conclusions; such is the argument for the Immaculate Conception based on Est., xv, 13. If St. Thomas (Summa, I, Q. i, a. 10, ad 1^{um}; Quodlib., VII, a. 14, ad 4^{um}) and other theologians differ from our position on this question, their view is based on the fact that the existence of the types themselves must first be theologically proved, before they can serve as premises in a theological argument.

II. Hermeneutics.—The interpretation of a writing has for its object to find the ideas which the author intended to express. We do not consider here the so-called authentic interpretation or the writer's own statement as to the thought he intended to convey. In interpreting the Bible scientifically, its twofold character must always be kept in view: it is a Divine book, in as far as it has God for its author; it is a human book, in as far as it is written by men for men. In its human character, the Bible is subject to the same rules of interpretation as profane books; but in its Divine character, it is given into the custody of the Church to be kept and explained, so that it needs special rules of hermeneutics. Under the former aspect, it is subject to the laws of the grammatico-historical interpretation; under the latter, it is bound by the precepts of what we may call the Catholic explanation.

(1) *Historico-Grammatical Interpretation.* — The grammatico-historical interpretation implies three elements: first, a knowledge of the various significations of the literary expression to be interpreted; secondly, the determination of the precise sense in which the literary expression is employed in any given passage; thirdly, the historical description of the idea thus determined. What has been said in the preceding paragraphs sufficiently shows the difference between the signification and the sense of a word or a sentence. The importance of describing an idea historically may be exemplified by the successive shades of meaning attaching to the concept of *Messias*, or of *Kingdom of God*.

(i) Significations of the Literary Expression.—The signification of the literary expression of the Bible is best learned by a thorough knowledge of the so-called sacred languages in which the original text of Scripture was written, and by a familiar acquaintance with the Scriptural way of speaking.

(a) Sacred Languages.—St. Augustine (De doctr.

christ., II, xi; cf. xvi) warns us that "the knowledge of languages is the great remedy against unknown signs. Men of the Latin tongue need two others for a thorough knowledge of the Divine Scriptures, viz. the Hebrew and the Greek, so that recourse may be had to the older copies, if the infinite variety of the Latin translators occasions any doubt." Pope Leo XIII, in the Encyclical "Providentissimus Deus", agrees with the great African Doctor in urging the study of the sacred languages. "It is most proper", he writes, "that professors of Sacred Scripture and theologians should master those tongues in which the Sacred Books were originally written; and it would be well that church students also should cultivate them, more especially those who aspire to academic degrees. And endeavours should be made to establish in all academic institutions—as has already been laudably done in many—chairs of the other ancient languages, especially the Semitic, and of other subjects connected therewith, for the benefit principally of those who are intended to profess sacred literature." Nor can it be urged that for the Catholic interpreter the Vulgate is the authentic text, which can be understood by any Latin scholar. The pontiff considers this exception in the Encyclical already quoted: "Although the meaning of the Hebrew and Greek is substantially rendered by the Vulgate, nevertheless wherever there may be ambiguity or want of clearness, the 'examination of older tongues,' to quote St. Augustine, will be useful and advantageous." Recourse to the original text is considered the only scholarly approach to any great work of literature. A translation is never a perfect reproduction of the original; no language can fully express the thoughts conveyed in another tongue, no translator is capable of seizing the exact shades of all the truths contained in any work, and in case of Biblical versions, we have often good reason for doubt as to the genuineness of their readings.

(b) Scriptural Language.—The Scriptural language presents several difficulties peculiar to itself. First, the Bible is not written by one author, but presents in almost every book the style of a different writer. Secondly, the Bible was not written at a single period; the Old Testament covers the time between Moses and the last Old-Testament writer, i. e. more than one thousand years, so that many words must have changed their meaning during this interval. Thirdly, the Biblical Greek is not the classical language of the Greek authors with whom we are acquainted; up to about fifteen years ago, Biblical scholars used to speak about New-Testament Greek, they compiled New-Testament lexicons, and wrote New-Testament grammars. The discovery of the Egyptian papyri and other literary remains has broken down this wall of separation between the language of the New Testament and that of the time in which it was written; with regard to this point, our present time may be considered as a period of transition, leading up to the composition of lexicons and grammars that will rightly express the relation of the Biblical Greek to the Greek employed in profane writings. Fourthly, the Bible deals with the greatest variety of topics, requiring a corresponding variety of vocabulary; moreover, its expressions are often figurative, and therefore subject to more frequent changes of meaning than the language of profane writers. How are we to become acquainted with the Scriptural language in spite of the foregoing difficulties? St. Augustine (De doctr. christ., II, ix sqq.) suggests the continual reading of the Bible as the first remedy, so that we may acquire "a familiarity with the language of the Scriptures". He adds to this a careful comparing of the Bible text with the language of the ancient versions, a process calculated to remove some of the native ambiguities of the original text. A third help is found, according to the same great Doctor, in the diligent reading of the works of the Fathers, since many of them formed their style by a constant reading of Holy Scripture (loc. cit., II, xiii, xiv). Nor must we omit to study the writings of Philo and Josephus, the contemporaries of the Apostles and the historians of their nation. They are helpful illustrations of the cultured language of the Apostolic time. The study of the etymology of the sacred languages is another means of becoming acquainted with the languages themselves. For a proper understanding of the etymology of Hebrew words, the knowledge of the cognate languages is requisite; but here it must be kept in mind that many derivatives have a meaning quite different from the signification of their respective radicals, so that an argument based on etymology alone is open to suspicion.

(ii) Sense of the Literary Expression.—After the foregoing rules have aided the interpreter to know the various significations of the words of the sacred text, he must next endeavour to investigate in what precise sense the inspired writer employed his expressions. He will be assisted in this study by attending to the subject-matter of the book or chapter, to its occasion and purpose, to the grammatical and logical context, and to the parallel passages. Whatever meaning of the literary expressions is not in keeping with the subject-matter of the book, cannot be the sense in which the writer employed it. The same criterion directs us in the choice of any particular shade of meaning and in the limitation of its extent. The subject-matter of the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians, e. g., shows in what sense St. Paul used the expressions *law* and *works of the law;* the sense of the expressions *spirit of God, wisdom and understanding,* which occur in Ex., xxxi, 3, must be determined in the same way. The occasion and purpose of a book or of a passage will often determine whether certain expressions must be taken in their proper or figurative sense, whether in a limited or an unlimited extent. Attention to this point will aid us in explaining aright such passages as John, vi, 53 sqq.; Matt., x, 5; Heb., i, 5, 7; etc. Thus we shall understand the first of these passages of the real flesh and blood of Christ, not of their figure; we shall see the true import of Christ's command contained in the second passage, "Go ye not into the way of the Gentiles, and into the city of the Samaritans enter ye not"; again, we shall appreciate the full weight of the theological argument in favour of the eternal generation of the Son as stated in the third passage, contained in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The context is the third aid in determining the precise sense in which each single word is used by the writer. We need not insist on the necessity of explaining an expression in accordance with its grammatical environment. The commentator must make sure of the grammatical connexion of an expression, so as not to do violence to the rules of inflection or of syntax. The so-called poetical parallelism may be considered as constituting part of grammar taken in a wider sense. But the logical context, too, requires attention; a commentator must not explain any expression in such a sense as to make the author contradict himself, being careful to assign to each word a meaning that will best agree with the thought of the sentence, of the chapter, and even of the book. Still, it must not be overlooked that the context is sometimes psychological rather than logical; in lyric poetry, in the words of the Prophets, or in animated dialogues, thoughts and sentiments are at times brought into juxtaposition, the logical connexion of which is not apparent. Finally, there is a so-called optical context which is found in the visions of the Prophets. The inspired seer may perceive grouped together in the same vision events which are widely separated from each other in time and space.

The so-called real or verbal parallelisms will aid the commentator in determining the precise sense in which the inspired writer employed his words. In case of verbal parallelism, or in the recurrence of the same literary expressions in different parts of the in-

spired books, it is better to explain the language of Paul by that of Paul, the expressions of John by those of John, than to explain Paul by Matthew, and John by Luke. Again, it is more natural to explain an expression occurring in the Fourth Gospel by another found in the same book than by a parallel passage taken from the Apocalypse. Finally, it should be kept in mind that parallelism of thought, or real parallelism, is a more reliable aid in finding the exact sense of a passage than a mere material recurrence of a sentence or a phrase.

(iii) Historical Setting.—The inspired writers connected with their words the ideas which they themselves possessed, and which they knew to be intelligible to their contemporaries. When they spoke of a house, they expressed a habitation to which their contemporaries were accustomed, not a contrivance in use among the barbarians. In order to arrive at the precise sense of a passage, we must therefore bear in mind its historical setting, we must consult the testimony of history. The true sense of the Bible cannot be found in an idea or a thought historically untrue. The commentator must therefore be well acquainted with sacred history and sacred archæology, in order to know, to a certain extent at least, the various customs, laws, habits, national prejudices, etc. under the influence of which the inspired writers composed their respective books. Otherwise it will be impossible for him to understand the allusions, the metaphors, the language, and the style of the sacred writers. What has been said about the historico-grammatical interpretation of Scripture is synopsized, as it were, in the Encyclical already quoted: "The more our adversaries contend to the contrary, so much the more solicitously should we adhere to the received and approved canons of interpretation. Hence, while weighing the meanings of words, the connexion of ideas, the parallelism of passages, and the like, we should by all means make use of such illustrations as can be drawn from apposite erudition of an external sort."

(2) *Catholic Interpretation.*—Since the Church is the official custodian and interpreter of the Bible, her teaching concerning the Sacred Scriptures and their genuine sense must be the supreme guide of the commentator. The inferences which flow from this principle are partly negative, partly positive.

(i) Negative Directions.—The following directions are called negative not because they do not imply a positive attitude of mind or because they do not lead to positive results, but because they appear to emphasize at first sight the avoidance of certain methods of proceeding which would be legitimate in the exegesis of profane books. They are based on what the Church teaches concerning the sacred character of the Bible.

(a) Avoid Irreverence.—Since the Bible is God's own book, its study must be begun and prosecuted with a spirit of reverence and prayer. The Fathers insist on this need in many passages. St. Athanasius calls the Scriptures the fountain that quenches our thirst for justice and supplies us with the doctrine of piety (Ep. fest. xxxix); St. Augustine (C. Faust., XIII, xviii) wishes them to be read for a memorial of our faith, for the consolation of our hope, and for an exhortation to charity; Origen (Ep. ad Gregor. Neocæs., c. iii) considers pious prayer as the most essential means for the understanding of the Divine Scriptures; but he wishes to see humility joined with prayer; St. Jerome (In Mich., I, x) agrees with St. Augustine (De doctr. christ., III, xxxvii) in regarding prayer as the principal and most necessary aid for the understanding of the Scriptures. We might add the words of other patristic writers, if the alleged references were not clear and explicit enough to remove all doubt on the subject.

(b) No Error in Scripture.—Since God is the principal Author of Sacred Scripture, it can contain no error, no self-contradiction, nothing contrary to scientific or historical truth. The Encyclical "Providentissimus Deus" is most explicit in its statement of this prerogative of the Bible: "All the books which the Church receives as sacred and canonical, are written wholly and entirely, with all their parts, at the dictation of the Holy Ghost; and so far is it from being possible that any error can coexist with inspiration, that inspiration not only is essentially incompatible with error, but excludes and rejects it as absolutely and necessarily, as it is impossible that God Himself, the Supreme Truth, can utter that which is not true." The Fathers agree with this teaching almost unanimously; we may refer the reader to St. Jerome (In Nah., I, iv), St. Irenæus (C. hær., II, xxviii), Clement of Alexandria (Strom., VII, xvi), St. Augustine ("C. Faust.", II, ii; cf. "In Ps. cxviii", serm. xxxi, 5; "Ad Hier.", ep. lxxxii, 2, 22; "Ad Oros. c. Prisc.", xi), St. Gregory the Great (Præf. in Job, n. 2). The great African Doctor suggests a simple and radical remedy against apparent errors in the Bible: "Either my codex is wrong, or the translator has blundered, or I do not understand."

But inerrancy is not the prerogative of everything that happens to be found in the Bible; it is restricted to what the inspired writers state as their own, unless they quote the words of a speaker who is infallible in his utterances, the words of an Apostle, e. g., or of a Divinely authorized speaker, whether angel or man (cf. Luke, i, 42, 67; ii, 25; II Mach., vii, 21), or again words regarded as having Divine authority either by Scripture (cf. I Cor., iii, 19; Gal., iv, 30) or by the Church (e. g., the Magnificat). Biblical words that do not fall under any of these classes carry merely the authority of the speaker, the weight of which must be studied from other sources. Here is the place to take notice of a decision issued by the Biblical Commission, 13 Feb., 1905, according to which certain Scriptural statements may be treated as quotations, though they appear on the surface to be the utterances of the inspired writer. But this can be done only when there is certain and independent proof that the inspired writer really quotes the words of another without intending to make them his own. Recent writers call such passages "tacit" or "implicit" citations.

The inerrancy of Scripture does not allow us to admit contradictions in its statements. This is understood of the genuine or primitive text of the Bible. Owing to textual corruptions, we must be prepared to meet contradictions in details of minor importance; in weightier matters such discrepancies have been avoided even in our present text. Discrepancies which may appear to obtain in matters of faith or morals should put the commentator on his guard that the same Biblical expressions are not everywhere taken in the same sense, that various passages may differ from each other as the complete statement of a doctrine differs from its incomplete expression, as a clear presentation differs from its obscure delineation. Thus "works" has one meaning in James, ii, 24, another in Rom., iii, 28; "brothers" denotes one kind of relationship in Matt., xii, 46, quite a different kind in most other passages; John, xiv, 28, and x, 30, Acts, viii, 12, and Matt., xxviii, 19, are respectively opposed to each other as a clear statement is opposed to an obscure one, as an explicit one to a mere implication. In apparent Biblical discrepancies found in historical passages, the commentator must distinguish between statements made by the inspired writer and those merely quoted by him (cf. I Kings, xxxi, 9, and II Kings, i, 6 sqq.), between a double account of the same fact and the narrative of two similar incidents, between chronologies which begin with different starting-points, finally between a compendious and a detailed report of an event. Lastly, apparent discrepancies which occur in prophetical passages necessitate an investigation, whether the respective texts emanate from the Prophets as Prophets (cf. II Kings, vii, 3–17),

whether they refer to the same or to similar subjects (the destruction of Jerusalem, e. g., and the end of the world), whether they consider their subject from the same point of view (e. g. the suffering and the glorious Messias), whether they use proper or figurative language. Thus the Prophet Nathan in his *private* capacity encourages David to build the Temple (II Kings, vii, 3), but *as Prophet* he foretells that Solomon will build the house of God (ibid., 13).

The inerrancy of Scripture excludes also any contradiction between the Bible and the certain tenets of science. It cannot be supposed that the inspired writers should agree with all the various hypotheses which scientists assume to-day and reject to-morrow; but the commentator will be required to harmonize the teaching of the Bible with the scientific results which rest on solid proof. This rule is clearly laid down by the Encyclical in the words of St. Augustine: "Whatever they can really demonstrate to be true of physical nature, we must show to be capable of reconciliation with our Scriptures, and whatever they assert in their treatises which is contrary to these Scriptures of ours, that is to Catholic faith, we must either prove as well as we can to be entirely false, or at all events we must, without the smallest hesitation, believe it to be so" (De Gen. ad litt., I, xxi, xli). But the commentator must also be careful "not to make rash assertions, or to assert what is not known as known" (St. Aug., in Gen. op. imperf., ix, 30). The Encyclical appeals here again to the words of the great African Doctor (St. Aug., de Gen. ad litt., II, ix, xx): "[The Holy Ghost] who spoke by them [the inspired writers], did not intend to teach men these things [i. e., the essential nature of the things of the visible universe], things in no way profitable unto salvation." The pontiff continues: "Hence they . . . described and dealt with things in more or less figurative language, or in terms which were commonly used at the time, and which in many instances are in daily use at this day, even by the most eminent men of science. Ordinary speech primarily and properly describes what comes under the senses; and somewhat in the same way, the sacred writers—as the Angelic Doctor reminds us (Summa, I, Q. lxx, a. 1, ad 3^{um})—'went by what visibly appeared', or put down what God, speaking to men, signified in a way men could understand and were accustomed to." In Gen., i, 16, e. g., the sun and the moon are called two great lights; in Jos., x, 12, the sun is commanded to stand still; in Eccl., i, 5, the sun returns to its place; in Job, xxvi, 11, the heavens are upheld by columns; in other passages the firmament appears solid and brazen, and God rides on the clouds of heaven.

Finally, the commentator must be prepared to deal with the seeming discrepancies between Biblical and profane history. The considerations to be kept in mind here are similar to those laid down in the preceding paragraph. First, not all statements found in profane sources can be regarded a priori as Gospel truth; some of them refer to subjects with which the writers were imperfectly acquainted, others proceed from party-feeling and national vanity, others again are based on imperfectly or only partially translated ancient documents. Secondly, the Bible does not *ex professo* teach profane history or chronology. These topics are treated only incidentally, in as far as they are connected with sacred subjects. Hence it would be wrong to regard Scripture as containing a complete course of history and chronology, or to consider the text of its historical portions above suspicion of corruption. Thirdly, we must keep in mind the words of St. Jerome (in Jer., xxviii, 10): "Many things in Sacred Scripture are related according to the opinion of the time in which they are said to have happened, and not according to objective truth"; and again (in Matt., xiv, 8): "According to the custom of Scripture, the historian relates the opinion concerning many things in accordance with the general belief at that time." Father Delattre maintains (Le Criterium à l'usage de la Nouvelle Exégèse Biblique, Liège, 1907) that according to St. Jerome the inspired writers report the public opinion prevalent at the time of the events related, not the public opinion prevalent when the narrative was written. This distinction is of greater practical importance than it, at first, seems to be. For Father Delattre only grants that the inspired historian may write according to *sensible* appearances, while his opponents contend that he may follow also the so-called *historic* appearances. Finally, the first two decisions of the Biblical Commission must be mentioned in this connexion. Some Catholic writers had attempted to remove certain historical difficulties from the sacred text either by considering the respective passages as tacit or implied quotations from other authors, for which the inspired writers did not in any way vouch; or by denying that the sacred writers vouch, in any way, for the historical accuracy of the facts they narrate, since they use these apparent facts merely as pegs on which to hang some moral teaching. The Biblical Commission rejected these two methods by decrees issued respectively 13 Feb. and 23 June, 1905, adding, however, that either of them may be admitted in the case when, due regard being paid to the sense and judgment of the Church, it can be proved by solid argument that the sacred writer either really quoted the sayings or documents of another without speaking in his own name, or did not really intend to write history, but only to propose a parable, an allegory, or another non-historical literary concept.

(ii) Positive Directions.—St. Irenæus represents the teaching of the early Church, when he writes that the truth is to be learned where the charismata of God are, and that Holy Scripture is safely interpreted by those who have the Apostolic succession (Adv. hær., IV, xxvi, 5). Vincent of Lérins appears to sum up the teaching of the Fathers on this subject when he writes that on account of the great intricacies of various errors it is necessary that the line of Prophetic and Apostolic interpretation be directed according to the rule of ecclesiastical and Catholic teaching. The Vatican Council emphasizes the decree of the Council of Trent (Sess. IV, De edit. et usu sacr. libr.) when it teaches (Constit. de fide cathol., c. ii) that "in things of faith and morals belonging to the building up of Christian doctrine, that is to be considered the true sense of Holy Scripture which has been held and is held by our Holy Mother the Church, whose place it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures; and therefore that it is permitted to no one to interpret Holy Scripture against such sense or also against the unanimous agreement of the Fathers". Hence flow the following principles.

(a) Defined Texts.—The Catholic commentator is bound to adhere to the interpretation of texts which the Church has defined either expressly or implicitly. The number of these texts is small, so that the commentator can easily avoid any transgression of this principle. The Council of Trent teaches that Rom., v, 12, refers to original sin (Sess. V, cc. ii, iv), that John, iii, 5, teaches the absolute necessity of the baptism of water (Sess. V, c. iv; Sess. VII, De bapt., c. ii), that Matt., xxvi, 26 sq. is to be understood in the proper sense (Sess. XIII, cap. i); the Vatican Council gives a direct definition of the texts, Matt., xvi, 16 sqq. and John, xxi, 15 sqq. Many more Scripture texts are indirectly defined by the definition of certain doctrines and the condemnation of certain errors. The Council of Nicæa, e. g., showed how those passages ought to be interpreted on which the Arians relied in their contention that the Word was a creature; the Fifth Œcumenical Council (II Constantinople) teaches the right meaning of many prophecies by condemning the interpretation of Theodore of Mopsuestia.

(b) Patristic Interpretation.—Pope Leo XIII, in m

Encyclical "Providentissimus Deus", repeats the principles concerning the authority of the Fathers laid down by the Vatican and Tridentine Councils: "The Holy Fathers, 'to whom, after the Apostles, the Church owes its growth—who have planted, watered, built, governed, and cherished it' (Aug., C. Julian., II, x, 37)—the Holy Fathers, we say, are of supreme authority whenever they all interpret in one and the same manner any text of the Bible, as pertaining to the doctrine of faith or morals; for their unanimity clearly evinces that such interpretation has come down from the Apostles as a matter of Catholic faith." Three conditions are, therefore, required in order that the patristic authority may be absolutely decisive: first, they must interpret texts referring to matters of faith or morals; secondly, they must speak as witnesses of Catholic tradition, not merely as private theologians; thirdly, there must be a moral unanimity in their interpretation. This unanimity is not destroyed by the silence of some of the foremost Fathers, and is sufficiently guaranteed by the consentient voice of the principal patristic writers living at any critical period, or by the agreement of commentators living at various times; but the unanimity is destroyed if some of the Fathers openly deny the correctness of the interpretation given by the others, or if they explain the passage in such a way as to render impossible the explanation given by others. But the Encyclical warns us to treat the opinion of the Fathers with reverence, even if there is no unanimity: "The opinion of the Fathers", says the holy pontiff, "is also of very great weight when they treat of these matters in their capacity of doctors, unofficially; not only because they excel in their knowledge of revealed doctrine and in their acquaintance with many things which are useful in understanding the Apostolic books, but because they are men of eminent sanctity and of ardent zeal for the truth, on whom God has bestowed a more ample measure of his light."

(c) The Analogy of Faith.—Here again the Encyclical "Providentissimus Deus" is our guide: "In the other passages", it reads, "the analogy of faith should be followed, and Catholic doctrine, as authoritatively proposed by the Church, should be held as the supreme law; for, seeing that the same God is the author both of the Sacred Books and of the doctrine committed to the Church, it is clearly impossible that any teaching can by legitimate means be extracted from the former, which shall in any respect be at variance with the latter." This principle has a double influence on the interpretation of Scripture, a negative and a positive influence. First, the commentator cannot admit in Scripture a statement contrary to the teaching of the Church; on the other hand, the agreement of an explanation with the doctrine of the Church does not prove its correctness, since more than one explanation may agree with the ecclesiastical teaching. Secondly, the Catholic interpreter must explain the obscure and partial teaching of the Scriptures by the clear and complete teaching of the Church; the passages, e. g., which refer to the Divine and human nature of Christ, and to the power of binding and loosing, find their explanation and their complement in Catholic tradition and the conciliar definitions. And here we must keep in mind what the Encyclical adds concerning doctrine which comes down to us in a less authoritative channel: "The authority of other Catholic interpreters is not so great; but the study of Scripture has always continued to advance in the Church, and, therefore, these commentaries also have their own honourable place, and are serviceable in many ways for the refutation of assailants and the explanation of difficulties."

III. Sacred Rhetoric.—The genuine teaching of Sacred Scripture is useful to all, but few have the time necessary to investigate it. It is for this reason that Scripture students express their results in writing so as to share their light with as many as possible. Sixtus Senensis [Bibliotheca sancta (Venice, 1575), I, pp. 278 sqq.] enumerates twenty-four various forms in which such Scriptural explanations may be expressed. But some of these methods are no longer in use; others may be reduced to fewer and more general heads. According to the end which the writer has in view, they may be divided into theoretical and practical or historico-dogmatic and moral treatises; considering the persons for whom they were written, they are either popular or learned expositions; but if their literary form be made the basis of division, which is the common and more rational principle of division, there are five kinds of Biblical exegesis: the version, the paraphrase, the gloss and scholion, the dissertation, and the commentary.

(1) *The Version.*—The version is the translation of the Bible from one language into another, especially from its original into the vernacular language. A version made directly from the original text is called immediate, while it is mediate if it be based directly on another version. It is verbal if it renders the very words; in case it renders the meaning rather than the words, it is a free version. A good version must be faithful and clear, i. e. it must express the thought without any alteration; it must reproduce the literary form, whether it be prosaic or poetic, figurative or proper; and it must be easily intelligible, as far as the character of the two languages in question permits this. This shows the difficulty of making a good translation; for it implies not merely a thorough knowledge of the two languages, but also an accurate insight into the genuine meaning of Sacred Scripture.

(2) *The Paraphrase.*—The paraphrase expresses the genuine sense of Scripture in continuous and more expansive form. The version removes the difficulties which arise from the fact that the Bible is written in a foreign language; the paraphrase elucidates also the difficulties of thought. For it supplies the transitions and middle terms omitted by the author; it changes the foreign and involved phraseology of the original into idiomatic sentences; it amplifies the brief statements of the original by adding definitions, indicating causes and reasons, and illustrating the text by reference to parallel passages. A good paraphrase must render the thought of the original most accurately, and must at the same time be brief and clear; there is danger, in this form of exposition, of rendering obscure what has been clearly said in the original text.

(3) *The Gloss and Scholion.*—The version removes from the Scripture text the difficulties connected with the foreign language, the paraphrase elucidates the difficulties of thought; but there are still other difficulties connected with the Bible, which must be removed by means of notes. One kind of brief notes, called glosses, explains the difficulties connected with the words; another kind, called scholia, deals with variant readings, verbal difficulties, unknown persons, countries, and things, and with the connexion of thought. Two celebrated series of glosses deserve special mention: the *glossa ordinaria* by Walafrid Strabo, and the *glossa interlinearis* by Anselm of Laon.

(4) *The Dissertation.*—Origen, Eusebius, and St. Jerome were asked by their contemporaries concerning certain difficult texts of Scripture; a similar need of special elucidations of particular passages has been felt by the faithful of all ages. The answers to such questions we may call dissertations or treatises. It is understood that only really important texts ought to be made the subject of such scholarly explanations. In order to satisfy the inquisitive reader, the essayist should examine the text critically; he should state its various explanations given by other writers and weigh them in the light of the principles of hermeneutics; finally, he should give the true solution of the difficulty, prove it by solid arguments, and defend it against the principal exceptions.

(5) *The Commentary.*—The commentary is a contin-

uous, full, learned, well-reasoned, and complete explanation, touching upon not merely the more difficult passages, but everything that stands in need of elucidation. Hence the commentator must discuss all the variants, state and prove the genuine sense of the book he explains, add all the necessary personal, geographical, historical, ethnical information, and indicate the sources whence it is drawn, harmonize the single sentences with each other and with the scope of the entire book, consider its apparent contradictions, and explain the sense in which its quotations from the Old Testament must be understood. With a view of securing an orderly exposition, the author should premise the various historico-critical studies belonging to the whole book; he should divide and subdivide the book into its principal and subordinate parts, clearly stating the special subject of each; he should, finally, arrange the various opinions concerning disputed questions in a neatly distributed list, so as to lighten the work of the reader. What has been said sufficiently shows the qualities which a well-written commentary ought to possess; it must be faithful in presenting the genuine sense of Scripture; it must be clear, complete, and brief; and it ought to show the private work of the commentator by the light it throws on the more complicated questions. The commentaries which consist of mere lists of the patristic views on the successive texts of Scripture are called catenæ (q. v.).

Perhaps the homily may be added to the foregoing methods of Biblical exposition. It is written in a popular way, and is of a practical tendency. It is not concerned with the subtile and more difficult questions of Scripture, but explains the words of a Biblical section in the order in which they occur. A more elevated kind of homily seizes the fundamental idea of a Scriptural section, and considers the rest in relation to it. The Church has always encouraged such homiletic discourses, and the Fathers have left a great number of them in their writings.

IV. History of Exegesis.—The history of exegesis shows its first beginnings, its growth, its decay, and its restoration. It points out the methods which may be safely recommended, and warns against those which rather corrupt than explain the Sacred Scriptures. In general, we may distinguish between Jewish and Christian exegesis.

(1) *Jewish Exegesis.*—The Jewish interpretation of the Scriptures began almost at the time of Moses, as may be inferred from traces found both in the more recent canonical and the apocryphal books. But in their method of interpretation the Palestinian Jews differed from the Hellenistic.

(i) Palestinian Exegesis.—All Jewish interpreters agree in admitting a double sense of Scripture, a literal and a mystical, though we must not understand these terms in their strictly technical sense.

(a) The literal exposition is mainly represented by the so-called Chaldee paraphrases or Targumim, which came into use after the Captivity, because few of the returning exiles understood the reading of the Sacred Books in their original Hebrew. The first place among these paraphrases must be given to the Targum Onkelos, which appears to have been in use as early as the first century after Christ, though it attained its present form only about A. D. 300–400. It explains the Pentateuch, adhering in its historical and legal parts to a Hebrew text which is, at times, nearer to the original of the Septuagint than the Massoretic, but straying in the prophetic and poetical portions so far from the original as to leave it hardly recognizable. —Another paraphrase of the Pentateuch is the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, or the Jerusalem Targum. Written after the seventh century of our era, it is valueless both from a critical and an exegetical point of view, since its explanations are wholly arbitrary.—The Targum Jonathan, or the paraphrase of the Prophets, began to be written in the first century, at Jerusalem; but it owes its present form to the Jerusalem rabbis of the fourth century. The historical books are a fairly faithful translation from the original text; in the poetical portions and the later Prophets, the paraphrase often presents fiction rather than truth.—The paraphrase of the Hagiographa deals with the Book of Job, the Psalms, the Canticle of Canticles, Proverbs, Ruth, the Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, and Paralipomena. It was not written before the seventh century, and is so replete with rabbinic fiction that it hardly deserves the notice of the serious interpreter. The notes on Cant., Ruth, Lam., Eccles., and Esth. rest on public tradition; those on the other Hagiographa express the opinions of one or more private teachers; the paraphrase of Par. is the most recent and the least reliable.

(b) The method of arguing employed in the First Gospel and the Epistle to the Hebrews shows that the Jews before the coming of Christ admitted a mystical sense of Scripture; the same may be inferred from the letter of Pseudo-Aristeas and the fragment of Aristobulus. The Gospel narrative, e. g., Matt., xxiii, 16 sqq., testifies that the Pharisees endeavoured to derive their arbitrary traditions from the Law by way of the most extraordinary contortions of its real meaning. The mystic interpretation of Scripture practised by the Jewish scholars who lived after the time of Christ, may be reduced to the following systems.

(α) The Talmudists ascribed to every text several thousand legitimate meanings belonging either to the Halakhah or the Haggadah. The Halakhah contained the legal inferences derived from the Mosaic Law, all of which the Talmudists referred back to Moses himself; the Haggadah was the collection of all the material gathered by the Talmudists from history, archæology, geography, grammar, and other extra-Scriptural sources, not excluding the most fictitious ones. In their commentaries, these writers distinguished a twofold sense, the proper, or primitive, and the derivative. The former was subdivided into the plain and the recondite sense; the latter, into logical deductions, and inferences based on the way in which the Hebrew words were written or on association of ideas. As to the hermeneutical rules followed by the Talmudists, they were reduced to seven by Hillel, to thirteen by Ismael, and to thirty-two by R. Jose of Galilee. In substance, many of these principles do not differ from those prevalent in our day. The interpreter is to be guided by the relation of the genus to the species, of what is clear to what is obscure, of verbal and real parallelisms to their respective counterparts, of the example to the exemplified, of what is logically coherent to what appears to be contradictory, of the scope of the writer to his literary production. The commentaries written according to these principles are called Midrashim (plural of Midrash); the following must be mentioned: Mekhilta (measure, rule, law) explains Ex., xii, 1–23, 30; xxxi, 12–17; xxxv, 1–4, and is variously assigned to the second or third century, or even to more recent times; it gives the Halakhah of the ceremonial rites and laws, but contains also material belonging to the Haggadah.—Siphra explains the Book of Leviticus; Siphri, the Books of Numbers and Deuteronomy; Pesiqta, the Sabbatical sections.—Rabboth (plural of Rabba) is a series of Midrashim explaining the single books of the Pentateuch and the five Megilloth or the five Hagiographa which were read in the synagogues; the allegorical, anagogical, and moral sense is preferred to the literal, and the fables and sayings of the rabbis are highly valued.—Tanchuma is the first continuous commentary on the Pentateuch; it contains some valuable traditions, especially of Palestinian origin.—Yalqut Simoni contains annotations on all the books of the Old Testament.

(β) The Caraites are related to the Talmud-

ists, as the Sadducees were related to the Pharisees. They rejected the Talmudic traditions, just as the Sadducees refused to acknowledge the authority of the Pharisaic teaching (cf. Joseph., Ant., XVIII, x, 6). The Caraites derive their origin from Anan, born about A. D. 700, who founded this sect out of spite, because he had not obtained the headship of the Jews outside Palestine. From Bagdad, the place of its birth, the sect soon spread into Palestine and especially into the Crimea, so that about A. D. 750 it occasioned what is practically a schism among the Jews. The Caraites reject all tradition, and admit only the Mosaic Law. By means of Ismael's thirteen hermeneutical rules, they establish the literal sense of Scripture, and this they supplement by means of the syllogism and the consensus of the Synagogue. Owing to their rejection of authentic interpretation and their claim of private judgment, they have been called by some writers "Jewish Protestants".

(ii) Hellenistic Exegesis.—Generally speaking, the Alexandrian Jews were favourable to the allegorical explanation of Scripture, thus endeavouring to harmonize the inspired records with the principles of Greek philosophy. Eusebius has preserved specimens of this Hellenistic exegesis in the fragments of Aristobulus (Hist. Eccles., VII, xxxii; Præpar. evang., VIII, x) and in the letter of Pseudo-Aristeas (Præpar. evang., VIII, ix), both of whom wrote in the second century B. C. Philo attests that the Essenes adhered to the same exegetical principles (De vit. contempl., x); but Philo (died A. D. 39) himself is the principal representative of this manner of interpretation. According to Philo, Abraham symbolizes virtue acquired by doctrine; Isaac, inborn virtue; Jacob, virtue acquired by practice and meditation; Egypt denotes the body; Chanaan, piety; the dove, Divine wisdom, etc. (De Abraham, ii).

The Cabbalists exceeded the preceding interpreters in their allegorical explanation of Scripture. Traces of their system are found in the last pre-Christian centuries, but its full development did not take place till the end of the first millennium of the Christian Era. In accordance with their name, from a word meaning "to receive", the Cabbalists claimed to possess a secret doctrine received by way of tradition from Moses, to whom it had been revealed on Mount Sinai. They maintained that all earthly things had their heavenly prototypes or ideals; they believed that the literal sense of Scripture included the allegorical sense, as the body includes the soul, though only the initiated could reach this veiled meaning. Three methods helped to attain it: Gematria takes the numerical value of all the letters which make up a word or an expression and derives the hidden meaning from the resultant number; Notaricon forms new entire words out of the single letters of a word, or it forms a word out of the initial letters of the several words of a phrase; Temura consists in the transposition of the letters which make up a word, or in the systematic substitution of other letters. Thus they transpose the consonants of *mal'akhi* (my angel; Ex., xxiii, 23) into *Mikha'el* (Michael). There is a twofold system of substitution: the first, Athbash, substitutes the last letter of the alphabet for the first, the second last for the second, etc.; the second system substitutes the letters of the second half of the alphabet for the corresponding letters of the first half. The Cabbalistic doctrine has been gathered in two principal books, one of which is called "Yeçirah", the other "Zohar".

We may add the names of the more prominent Jewish commentators: Saadya Gaon (b. 892; d. 942), in the Fayûm, Egypt, translated the whole of the Old Testament into Arabic and wrote commentaries on the same.—Moses ben Samuel ibn Chiqitilla, of Cordova, explained the whole of the Old Testament in Arabic, between A. D. 1050 and 1080; only fragments of his work remain.—Rabbi Solomon ben Isaac, known also under the names Rashi and Yarchi (b. about 1040, at Troyes; d. 1105), explained the whole of the Old Testament, except Par. and Esd., according to its literal sense, though he did not neglect the allegorical; he shows an anti-Christian tendency.—Rabbi Abraham ibn Ezra, often called Aben Ezra (b. about 1093 at Toledo, Spain; d. 1167 on the Island of Rhodes). Among his many other works he left an incomplete commentary on the Pentateuch and other parts of the Old Testament; he renders the literal sense faithfully without excluding the allegorical, e. g. in Cant.—Rabbi David Kimchi, called also Radak (b. 1170 at Narbonne; d. 1230), explained nearly all the books of the Old Testament in the literal sense, without excluding the spiritual; his anti-Christian feeling shows itself in his treatment of the Messianic prophecies.—Rabbi Moyses ben Maimon, commonly called Maimonides or Rambam (b. 1135 at Cordova, Spain; d. 1204 in Egypt), became a convert to Mohammedanism in order to escape persecution, then fled to Egypt, where he lived as a Jew, and where, for the guidance of those who could not harmonize their philosophical principles with the teaching of Sacred Scripture, he wrote his celebrated "Guide of the Perplexed", a work in which he presents some of the Biblical stories as mere literary expressions of certain ideas.—Rabbi Isaac Abarbanel (d. 1508), explained the Pentateuch, the prophetical books, and Daniel, adding often irrelevant matter and arguments against Christian revelation.—Rabbi Elias Levita (d. after 1542), is known as one of the best Jewish grammarians, and as the author of the work "Tradition of Tradition", in which he gives the history of Massoretic criticism.—Among the Caraite interpreters we must mention: Rabbi Jacob ben Ruben (twelfth century), who wrote brief scholia on all the books of Scripture; Rabbi Aaron ben Joseph (d. 1294), author of a literal commentary on the Pentateuch, the earlier Prophets, Isaias, the Psalms, and the Book of Job; Rabbi Aaron ben Elia (fourteenth century), who explained the Pentateuch.—Among the Cabbalists, Rabbi Moyses Nachmanides, also known as Ramban (d. about 1280), deserves mention on account of his explanation of the Pentateuch, which is several times quoted by Paul of Burgos.—The principal Jewish commentaries have been reprinted in the so-called Rabbinic Bibles which appeared at Venice, 1517; Venice, 1525, 1548, 1568, 1617; Basle, 1618; Amsterdam, 1724.

(2) *Christian Exegesis.*—For the sake of clearness we may distinguish three great periods in Christian exegesis: the first ends about A. D. 604; the second brings us up to the Council of Trent; the third embraces the time after the Council of Trent.

(i) The Patristic Period.—The patristic period embraces three distinct classes of exegetes, the Apostolic and apologetical writers, the Greek Fathers, the Latin Fathers. The amount of exegetical literature produced by these three classes varies greatly; but its character is so distinctively proper to each of the three classes that we can hardly consider them under the same heading.

(a) The Apostolic Fathers and Apologists.—The early Christians made use of the Scriptures in their religious meetings as the Jews employed them in the synagogues, adding however the writings of the New Testament more or less completely to those of the Old. The Apostolic Fathers did not write any professional commentaries; their use of Scripture was incidental and casual rather than technical; but their citations and allusions show unmistakably their acceptance of some of the New-Testament writings. Neither do we find among the apologists' writings of the second century any professional treatises on Sacred Scripture. St. Justin and St. Irenæus are noted for their able defence of Christianity, and their arguments are often based on texts of Scripture. St. Hippolytus appears to have been the first Christian theologian who at-

tempted an explanation of the whole of Scripture; his method we learn from the remaining fragments of his writings, especially of his commentary on Daniel. It may be said in general that these earliest Christian writers admitted both the literal and the allegorical sense of Scripture. The latter sense appears to have been favoured by St. Clement of Rome, Barnabas, St. Justin, St. Irenæus, while the literal seems to prevail in the writings of St. Hippolytus, Tertullian, the Clementine Recognitions, and among the Gnostics.

(b) The Greek Fathers.—The Encyclical "Providentissimus Deus" refers mainly to the Greek Fathers when it says: "When there arose, in various sees, catechetical and theological schools, of which the most celebrated were those of Alexandria and of Antioch, there was little taught in those schools but what was contained in the reading, the interpretation, and the defence of the Divine written word. From them came forth numbers of Fathers and writers whose laborious studies and admirable writings have justly merited for the three following centuries the appellation of the golden age of Biblical exegesis."

(α) The School of Alexandria.—Tradition loves to trace the origin of the Alexandrian School back to the Evangelist St. Mark. Be that as it may, towards the end of the second century we find St. Pantænus president of the school; none of his writings are extant, but Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., V, x) and St. Jerome (De vir. ill., c. xxxvi) testify that he explained Sacred Scripture. Clement of Alexandria ranks him among those who did not write any book (Strom., I, i); he died before 200. His successor was Clement of Alexandria, who had first been his disciple, and after 190 his colleague. Of his writings are extant "Cohortatio ad Gentiles", "Pædagogus", and "Stromata"; also the Latin translation of part of his eight exegetical books (Migne, P. G., IX, 729–740). Clement was followed by Origen (b. 185; d. 254), the principal glory of the whole school. Among his works, the greater part of which is lost, his "Hexapla" and his threefold explanation of Scripture, by way of scholia, homilies, and commentaries, deserve special notice. It was Origen, too, who fully developed the hermeneutical principles which distinguish the Alexandrian School, though they are not applied in their entirety by any other Father. He applied Plato's distinction of body, soul, and spirit to the Scriptures, admitting in them a literal, a moral, and a mystical or spiritual sense. Not that the whole of Scripture has this triple sense. In some parts the literal sense may be neglected, in others the allegorical may be lacking, while in others again the three senses may be found. Origen believes that the apparent discrepancies of the Evangelists can be explained only by means of the spiritual sense, that the whole ceremonial and ritual law must be explained mystically, and that all the prophetic utterances about Judea, Jerusalem, Israel, etc., are to be referred to the Kingdom of Heaven and its citizens, to the good and bad angels, etc. Among the eminent writers of the Alexandrian School must be classed Julius Africanus (c. 215), St. Dionysius the Great (d. 265), St. Gregory Thaumaturgus (d. 270), Eusebius of Cæsarea (d. 340), St. Athanasius (d. 373), Didymus of Alexandria (d. 397), St. Epiphanius (d. 403), St. Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444), and finally also the celebrated Cappadocian Fathers, St. Basil the Great (d. 379), St. Gregory Nazianzen (d. 389), and St. Gregory of Nyssa (d. 394). The last three, however, have many points in common with the School of Antioch.

(β) The School of Antioch.—The Fathers of Antioch adhered to hermeneutical principles which insist more on the so-called grammatico-historical sense of the Sacred Books than on their moral and allegorical meaning. It is true that Theodore of Mopsuestia urged the literal sense to the detriment of the typical, believing that the New Testament applies some of the prophecies to the Messias only by way of accommodation, and that on account of their allegories the Canticle of Canticles, together with a few other books, should not be admitted into the Canon. But generally speaking, the Fathers of Antioch and Eastern Syria, the latter of whom formed the School of Nisibis or Edessa, steered a course midway between Origen and Theodore, avoiding the excesses of both, and thus laying the foundation of the hermeneutical principles which the Catholic exegete ought to follow. The principal representatives of the School of Antioch are St. John Chrysostom (d. 407); Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 429), condemned by the Fifth Œcumenical Synod on account of his explanation of Job and the Canticle of Canticles, and in certain respects the forerunner of Nestorius; St. Isidore of Pelusium, in Egypt (d. 434), numbered among the Antiochene commentators on account of his Biblical explanations inserted in about two thousand of his letters; Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus in Syria (d. 458), known for his Questions on the Octateuch, the Books of Kings and Par., and for his Commentaries on the Psalms, the Cant., the Prophets, and the Epistles of St. Paul. The School of Edessa glories in the names of Aphraates who flourished in the first half of the fourth century, St. Ephraem (d. 373), Cyrillonas, Balæus, Rabulas, Isaac the Great, etc.

(c) The Latin Fathers.—The Latin Fathers, too, admitted a twofold sense of Scripture, insisting variously now on the one, now on the other. We can only enumerate their names: Tertullian (b. 160), St. Cyprian (d. 258), St. Victorinus (d. 297), St. Hilary (d. 367), Marius Victorinus (d. 370), St. Ambrose (d. 397), Rufinus (d. 410), St. Jerome (d. 420), St. Augustine (d. 430), Primasius (d. 550), Cassiodorus (d. 562), St. Gregory the Great (d. 604). St. Hilary, Marius Victorinus, and St. Ambrose depend, to a certain extent, on Origen and the Alexandrian School; St. Jerome and St. Augustine are the two great lights of the Latin Church on whom depend most of the Latin writers of the Middle Ages; at the end of the works of St. Ambrose is inserted a commentary on the Pauline Epistles which is now ascribed to Ps.-Ambrose or Ambrosiaster.

(ii) Second Period of Exegesis, A. D. 604–1546.—We consider the following nine centuries as one period of exegesis, not on account of their uniform productiveness or barrenness in the field of Biblical study, nor on account of their uniform tendency of developing any particular branch of exegesis, but rather on account of their characteristic dependence on the work of the Fathers. Whether they synopsized or amplified, whether they analysed or derived new conclusions from old premises, they always started from the patristic results as their basis of operation. Though during this period the labours of the Greek writers can in no way compare with those of the Latin, still it will be found convenient to consider them apart.

(a) The Greek Writers.—The Greek writers who lived between the sixth and the thirteenth centuries composed partly commentaries, partly compilations. The Bishops of Cæsarea, Andreas and Arethas, who are variously assigned to the fifth and sixth, or to the eighth and ninth centuries, explained the Apocalypse; Procopius of Gaza (524) wrote on the Octateuch, Is., and Prov.; Hesychius of Jerusalem wrote probably about the end of the sixth century on Lev., Pss., Is., the Minor Prophets, and the concordance of the Gospels; Anastasius Sinaita (d. 599) left twelve books of allegorical comments on the hexaemeron; Olympiodorus (d. 620) and St. Maximus (d. 662) left more sober explanations than Anastasius, though they are not free from allegorism; St. John Damascene (d. 760) has many Scriptural explanations in his dogmatic and polemical works, besides writing a commentary on the Pauline Epistles, in which he follows Theodoret and St. Cyril of Alexandria, but especially St. Chrysostom. Photius (d. 891), Œcumenius (tenth century), Theophylactus (d. 1107), and Euthymius (d. 1118) were

adherents of the Greek Schism, but their exegetical works deserve attention.—The above-named compilations are technically called catenæ. They furnish continuous explanations of various books of Scripture in such a way that they give after each text the various patristic explanations either in full or by way of a synopsis, usually adding the name of the particular Father whose opinion they transcribed. Several of these catenæ have been printed, such as Nicephorus, on the Octateuch (Leipzig, 1772); B. Corderius, on the Pss. (Antwerp, 1643–1646); A. Schottius, on Prov. (Lyons, 1633); Angelo Mai, on Dan. (Rome, 1831); Cramer, on the New Testament (Oxford, 1638–1640).

(b) The Latin Writers.—The Latin writers of this epoch may be divided into two classes: the pre-Scholastic and the Scholastic. The two are not of equal importance, but they are too different to be treated under the same heading.

(α) The Pre-Scholastic Period.—Among the many writers of this age who were instrumental in spreading the Biblical expositions of the Fathers, the following are deserving of notice: St. Isidore of Seville (d. 636), the Venerable Bede (d. 735), Alcuin (d. 804), Haymo of Halberstadt (d. 855), Rhabanus Maurus (d. 856), Walafrid Strabo (d. 849), who compiled the *glossa ordinaria*, Anselm of Laon (d. 1117), author of the *glossa interlinearis*, Rupert of Deutz (d. 1135), Hugh of St. Victor (d. 1141), Peter Abelard (d. 1142), and St. Bernard (d. 1153). The particular writings of each of these great men will be found under their respective names.

(β) The Scholastics.—Without drawing a mathematical line of distinction between the writers of this period, we may say that the works which appeared in its beginning are remarkable for their logical and theological explanations; the subsequent works showed more philological erudition; and the final ones began to offer material for textual criticism. The first of these groups of writings coincides with the so-called golden age of scholastic theology which prevailed about the thirteenth century. Its principal representatives are so well known that we need only mention their names. Peter Lombard rightly heads the list (d. 1164), for he appears to be the first who fully introduced into his exegetical work the scholastic divisions, distinctions, definitions, and method of argumentation. Next follow Card. Stephen Langton (d. 1228), author of the chapter-divisions as they exist to-day in our Bibles; Card. Hugh of Saint-Cher (d. 1260), author of the so-called "Dominican Correctory", and of the first Biblical concordance; Blessed Albertus Magnus (d. 1280); St. Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274); St. Bonaventure (d. 1274); Raimondo Martini (d. 1290), who wrote the polemical work known as "Pugio Fidei" against the Moors and Jews; a number of other names might be added, but they are of less importance.—In 1311 Pope Clement V ordained, in the Council of Vienne, that chairs of the Oriental languages were to be erected in the principal universities, so that the Jews and Mohammedans might be refuted from their own sources. The philological results of this enactment may be seen in the celebrated "Postilla" of Nicholas of Lyra (d. 1340), a work which received notable additions by Paul of Burgos (d. 1435). Alphonsus Tostatus, called also Abulensis (d. 1455), and Denys the Carthusian (d. 1471), returned to the more scholastic method of interpretation; Laurentius Valla (d. 1457) applied the results of his Greek studies to the explanation of the New Testament, though he is unduly opposed to the Latin Vulgate.—Not to insist on the less illustrious exegetes of this period, we may pass on to those who applied to Scripture not merely their philological erudition, but also their acumen for textual criticism in its incipient state. Aug. Justiniani edited an Octapla of the Psalter (Genoa, 1516); Card. Ximenez finished his Complutensian Polyglot (1517); Erasmus published the first edition of his Greek New Testament (1517); Card. Cajetan (d. 1535) attempted an explanation of the Scriptures according to the original texts; Santes Pagninus (d. 1541) translated the Old and the New Testament anew from their original texts; a number of other scholars worked in the same field, publishing either new translations, or scholia, or again commentaries in which new light was shed on one or more books of the Sacred Scriptures.

(iii) Third Period of Exegesis.—A few decades before the Council of Trent, Protestantism began to make its inroads into various parts of the Church, and its results were felt not merely in the field of dogmatic theology, but also in Biblical literature. We shall, therefore, have to distinguish after this between Catholic and Protestant exegetes.

(a) Catholic Exegetes.—Catholic exegesis subsequent to the Council of Trent may be divided into three stages: the first may be regarded as the terminus of the Scholastic period; the second forms the transition from the old to the new exegesis; and the third comprises the exegetical work of recent times. The first stage begins about the time of the Council of Trent, and ends about 1660; the second reaches to the beginning of the nineteenth century; and the third deals with our own times.

(α) The Golden Age of Catholic Exegesis, 1546–1660.—We have spoken above of the golden age of Christian exegesis, as distinct from the exegesis of the Jews; the following period is by some writers called the golden age of Catholic exegesis, as distinct from the Biblical work done by Protestants. During this period more than 350 Catholic writers were engaged in Biblical study; we can only classify the work done, and indicate some of the principal writers engaged in it. The revised Clementine edition of the Vulgate appeared in 1592; the Antwerp Polyglot, in the years 1569–1572; the Paris Polyglot, in the years 1629–1645.—The introductory questions were treated by Sixtus Senensis (d. 1569), Christ. Adrichomius (d. 1585), Flaminius Nobilius (d. 1590), Ben. Arias Montanus (d. 1598), Petrus Morinus (d. 1608), Lucas Brugensis (d. 1619), de Tena (d. 1622), Joannes Morinus (d. 1659), and Franc. Quaresmius (d. 1660).—All or most of the books of Scripture were interpreted by Sa (d. 1596), Mariana (d. 1624), Tirinus (d. 1636), a Lapide (d. 1637), Gordon (d. 1641), Menochius (d. 1655), de la Haye (1661).—Select books of both the Old and the New Testament were commented upon by Jansenius Gandavensis (d. 1575), Maldonatus (d. 1583), Ribera (d. 1591), Serarius (d. 1609), and Lorinus (d. 1634).—Certain books of the Old Testament were explained by Andreas Masius (d. 1573), Forerius (d. 1581), Pradus (d. 1595), Villalpandus (d. 1608), Genebrardus (d. 1597), Agellius (d. 1608), Pererius (d. 1610), Card. Bellarmine (d. 1621), Sanctius (d. 1628), Malvenda (d. 1628), de Pineda (d. 1637), Bonfrerius (d. 1642), de Muis (d. 1644), Ghislerius (d. 1646), de Salazar (d. 1646), and Corderius (d. 1655).—Finally, all or part of the books of the New Testament found interpreters in Salmeron (d. 1585), Card. Toletus (d. 1596), Estius (d. 1613), de Alcasar (d. 1613), and Ben. Justiniani (d. 1622). It must be noted here that several of the foregoing writers admit a multiple literal sense; hence they represent various explanations of the same words as equally true.

(β) The Transition Period, 1660–1800.—During this period, historical studies were more cultivated than scholastic. It is here that we meet with the father of the historical and critical introduction, Richard Simon (d. 1712). Frassen (d. 1711) adopts more of the scholastic method, but there is a return to the historical in the case of Bern. Lamy (d. 1715), Daniel Huet (d. 1721), and Nat. Alexander (d. 1722). The bibliography of exegesis was treated by Bartolocci (d. 1687), Imbonatus (d. 1694), Dupin (d. 1719), Lelong (d. 1721), and Desmolets (d. 1760). Old documents belonging to Scriptural studies were edited by

B. de Montfaucon (d. 1741), P. Sabatier (d. 1742), and Jos. Blanchinus (d. 1764), while Calmet (d. 1757) and Bossuet (d. 1704) are noted for their exegetical work. Bukentop (d. 1710) has recourse to the original texts in order to explain doubtful or obscure readings in the Vulgate. If one compares this period with the preceding, one is struck with its poverty in great Biblical scholars; but textual criticism is fairly well represented by Houbigant (d. 1784) and de Rossi (d. 1831).

(γ) Recent Times.—The perturbed state of the Church at the beginning of the nineteenth century interfered with the peaceful pursuance of any kind of ecclesiastical study. After peace had returned, the study of Sacred Scripture flourished more lustily than ever. In three respects, the modern commentary surpasses that of any past age: First, the interpreter attends in our times not merely to the immediate context of a phrase or a verse, but to the whole literary form of the book, and to the purpose for which it was written; secondly, he is assisted by a most abundant wealth of historical information practically unknown in former days; thirdly, the philology of the sacred tongues has been highly cultivated during the last century, and its rich results are laid under contribution by the modern commentator. It would lead us too far here were we to rehearse the history of all the recent excavations and discoveries, the contents of the various tablets, papyri, and ostraka, the results of literary criticism, archæology, and history of religion; it must suffice to say that the modern commentator can leave none of these various sources of information unnoticed in so far as they bear on his special subject of investigation. It would be invidious to mention only some names of modern scholars, excluding others; still, they cannot all be enumerated. We may draw attention, however, to the French series of commentaries entitled "La Sainte Bible avec Commentaires"; the Latin "Cursus" published by Fathers Cornely, Knabenbauer, and von Hummelauer; the "Revue biblique" published by the Dominican Fathers; the "Biblische Zeitschrift"; the "Biblische Studien"; and the "Dictionnaire de la Bible". While the two series of commentaries offer the main points of information on each particular book of the Bible, as far as it could be ascertained at the time of their respective publication, the periodicals keep the reader informed concerning any new investigation or result worth knowing.

(b) Protestant Exegetes.—It will be found convenient to divide Protestant exegesis into three periods. The first embraces the age of the so-called Reformers, 1517–1600; the second reaches down to the beginning of rationalism, 1600–1750; the third embraces the subsequent time.

(α) Early Reformers.—The early Reformers did not introduce any new principles of interpretation. They may speak, at times, as if they admitted only the literal sense, but Melanchthon and Flacius Illyricus insist also on the importance of the allegorical. Their teaching concerning the multiplicity of the literal sense finds practical expression in their interpretation. The principle of free inquiry is claimed by the Reformers themselves, but neither theoretically nor practically granted to their followers. Both Luther's (d. 1546) and Calvin's (d. 1564) principles rest in the end on subjective considerations.

(β) From the Reformers to the Rationalists.—In order to secure some unity of interpretation, the first followers of the Reformers introduced the "analogy of faith" as the supreme hermeneutic rule. But since they claimed that Scripture was their rule of faith, they experienced difficulty in properly applying their canon of hermeneutics. Finally, they were forced to regard the contents of their symbols as first principles which needed no proof. But the writers of this period produced some noteworthy treatises on Biblical antiquities. Thus Lightfoot (d. 1675) and Schöttgen (d. 1751) illustrated New Testament questions from rabbinic sources; Reland (d. 1718) wrote on sacred geography; Bochart (d. 1667), on natural history; the two Buxtorfs, father (d. 1629) and son (d. 1664), Goodwin (d. 1665), and Spencer (d. 1695) investigated certain civil and religious questions of the Jews. Among those who explained the sacred text, the following are worthy of mention: Drusius (d. 1616), de Dieu (d. 1642), Grotius (d. 1645), Vitringa (d. 1722), Cocceius (Koch, d. 1669), and Clericus (d. 1736). Brian Walton (d. 1658) is celebrated for the edition of the London Polyglot, which easily surpasses all previous works of the same kind. The "Critici sacri" (London, 1660; Frankfort, 1696; Amsterdam, 1698), collected by John and Richard Pearsons, and the "Synopsis criticorum" (London, 1669; Frankfort, 1709), edited by Matt. Polus, may be regarded as fairly good summaries of the exegetical work of the seventeenth century.

(γ) After the Rise of Rationalism.—The Arminians, Socinians, the English Deists, and the French Encyclopedists refused to be bound by the "analogy of faith" as their supreme hermeneutic rule. They followed the principle of private judgment to its last consequences. The first to adhere to the principle of Biblical rationalism was Semler (d. 1791), who denied the Divine character of the Old Testament, and explained away the New by his "system of accommodation", according to which Christ and the Apostles only conformed to the views of the Jews. To discover the true teaching of Christ, we must first eliminate the Jewish doctrines, which may be learned from the books of Josephus, Philo, and other Jewish writers. —Kant (d. 1804) destroyed the small remnant of supernatural revelation by his system of "authentic interpretation"; we must not seek to find what the Biblical writers said, but what they should have said in order to remain within the range of the natural Kantian religion.—But this did violence to the historical character of the Biblical records; H. E. G. Paulus (d. 1851) apparently does justice to the historicity of the Bible, but removes from it all miracles by means of his "notiologico-philological" or "psychological" system of interpretation. He distinguishes between the fact or the occurrence to which the witnesses testify, and the judgment of the fact or the particular view which the witnesses took of the occurrence. In the New Testament, e. g., we have a record of the views of the Disciples concerning the events in Christ's life.—This explanation left too much of Christ's history and doctrine intact. Hence David F. Strauss (d. 1875) applied to the New Testament the system of Biblical mythicism, which Semler, Eichhorn, Vater, and de Wette had employed in their explanation of part of the Old Testament; about thirty years after its first appearance, Strauss's system was popularized by E. Renan. A great many Protestant commentators now began to grant the existence of myths in the Sacred Scriptures, though they might adhere to the general outlines of the Jewish and the Gospel history. The principles which are at least implicitly maintained by the mythicists, are the following: First, miracles and prophecies are impossible; secondly, our religious sources are not really historical; thirdly, the history and religion of all nations begin with myths, the Christian religion not excluded; fourthly, the Messianic idea of the New Testament was adopted from the Old, and all the traditional traits of the Messias were attributed to Jesus of Nazareth by a really myth-forming process.—But as it was hard to explain the growth of this whole Christian mythology within the narrow space of forty or fifty years, Ferd. Christ. Baur (d. 1860) reconstructed the origin of the Christian Church, making it a compromise between judaizing and universalistic Christians, or between the Petrine and the Pauline parties. Only Rom., I and II Cor., Gal. are

authentic; the other books of the New Testament were written during or after the amalgamation of the two parties, which occurred in the second century. The adherents of this opinion form the New Tübingen or the Critical School.—It is true that Baur's theory of the late origin of the New Testament has been abandoned by the great majority of Protestant commentators who have ranked themselves among the followers of Harnack; but the opinion that the Sacred Books of the New Testament lack historicity in its true sense, is more common than ever.

In the light of this fact, we have to distinguish between the various classes of exegetical works in order to give a true estimate of the value possessed by the numberless recent Protestant contributions to Biblical literature: their philological and historical studies are, as a general rule, of great assistance to the commentator; the same must be said of their work done in textual criticism; but their commentaries are not sound enough to elicit commendation. Some of them adhere professedly to the principles of the most advanced criticism; others belong to the ranks of the conservatives; others again are more concerned with grammatical and philological than theological questions; others, finally, try to do the impossible by combining the conservative with the advanced critical principles.

When we are asked what attitude the Catholic reader ought to maintain with regard to these numerous Protestant commentaries, we answer in the words of Leo XIII, found in the Encyclical "Providentissimus Deus": "Though the studies of non-Catholics, used with prudence, may sometimes be of use to the Catholic student, he should, nevertheless, bear well in mind—as the Fathers also teach in numerous passages—that the sense of Holy Scripture can nowhere be found incorrupt outside of the Church, and cannot be expected to be found in writers who, being without the true faith, only gnaw the bark of the Sacred Scripture, and never attain its pith."

MANGENOT in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v. *Herméneutique;* SCHANZ in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Exegese;* ZAPLETAL, *Hermeneutica Bibl.* (Freiburg, 1897); DÖLLER, *Compendium herm. bibl.* (Paderborn, 1898); CHAUVIN, *Leçons d' introduction générale, théologique, historique et critique aux divines Ecritures* (Paris, 1898); SENEPIN, *De divinis scripturis earumque interpretatione brevis institutio* (Lyons and Paris, 1893); LESAR, *Compendium hermeneuticum* (Laybach, 1891); CORNELY, *Introductio in Libros Sacros* (Paris, 1885 and 1894), I. Nearly every work on hermeneutics will give a more or less complete list of recent literature. As to the Latin Fathers and writers, the reader may consult MIGNE, *P. L.*, CCXIX, 79–84. See also: ORIGEN, *De principiis*, IV, viii-xxvii; TERTULLIAN, *De præscriptionibus;* TICHONIUS, *Liber de septem regulis;* AUGUSTINE, *De doctrinâ christ.;* JUNILIUS, *De partibus divinæ legis;* VINCENT OF LÉRINS, *Commonitorium;* EUCHERIUS, *Liber formularum spiritualis intelligentiæ;* CASSIODORUS, *De institutione divinarum literarum;* KIHN, *Theodor von Mopsuestia und Junilius Africanus* (Freiburg, 1880). For the Middle Ages consult: RHABANUS MAURUS, *De clericorum institutione*, III, viii-xv; HUGH OF ST. VICTOR, *Erudit. didascal.*, Lib. V; and somewhat later, JEAN GERSON, *Propositiones de sensu literali Scripturæ sacræ* in *Opera* (Paris, 1606), I, p. 515. After the rise of the Reformation: PAGNINO, *Isagoges seu introductionis ad sacras scripturas liber unus* (Lyons, 1528, 1536); SIXTUS SENENSIS, *Bibliotheca sancta* (Venice, 1566); the reader will find a number of works belonging to this period in MIGNE, *Scriptur. Sacr. Cursus Completus.* Among Protestant works we may notice: BRIGGS, *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scriptures* (New York, 1899); FAIRBAIRN, *Hermeneutical Manual* (Edinburgh, 1858); TERRY, *Biblical Hermeneutics* (New York, 1883); DAVIDSON, *Sacred Hermeneutics* (Edinburgh, 1844).

A. J. MAAS.

Exemption is the whole or partial release of an ecclesiastical person, corporation, or institution from the authority of the ecclesiastical superior next higher in rank, and the placing of the person or body thus released under the control of the authority next above the former superior, or under a still higher one, or under the highest authority of all, the pope. Originally, according to canon law, all the subjects of a diocese, and all diocesan institutions, were under the authority of the bishop. On account of the oppressive manner in which bishops at times treated the monasteries, these were soon taken under the protection of synods, princes, and popes. The papal protection often developed later into exemption from episcopal authority. The first privilege of this kind was given by Pope Honorius I, in 628, to the old Irish monastery of Bobbio, in Upper Italy (Jaffé, Regesta Pont. Rom., no. 2017). Since the eleventh century, papal activity in the matter of reforms has been a frequent source or occasion of exemptions; in this way the monks became more closely bound to the popes, as against the bishops, many of whom were often inimical to the papal power. It thus came to pass that not only individual monasteries, but also entire orders, obtained exemption from the authority of the local ordinary. Moreover, from the reign of Urban II, the broadly general "protection" of the Holy See (*libertas Romana*), which many monasteries enjoyed, came to be regarded as exemption from the authority of the bishop. From the twelfth century, it may be said the exemption of orders and monasteries became the rule. Exemptions were also granted to cathedral chapters, collegiate chapters, parishes, communities, ecclesiastical institutions, and single individuals. Under these circumstances the diocesan administration of the bishops was frequently crippled (Trent, Sess. XXIV, De ref. c. xi); consequently the bishops complained of such exemptions, while, on the other hand, the parties exempted were wont to accuse the bishops of violating acquired privileges. The Council of Trent sought to correct the abuses of exemption by placing the exempt, in many regards, under the ordinary jurisdiction of the bishops, or at least under the bishops as papal delegates. This provision of the council was never fully executed, owing to the frequent opposition of the monasteries. About the beginning of the nineteenth century, however, many monasteries were suppressed by the process known as secularization, in part accepted by the Holy See. In some countries more recent civil legislation does not permit exemption.

Exemption, as a rule, arises when the privilege is granted by competent authority (*exemptio dativa*). It can also rest on immemorial use (*exemptio præscriptiva*). Finally exemption can be original (*exemptio nativa*), when the respective church or monastery has always been free and distinct from the later diocesan organization. The claimant of exemption must prove the fact.

Exemption ceases by the complete or partial withdrawal of the privilege by the giver, by customary exercise of a contrary usage, or by extinction of the rightful subject of the privilege.

Another kind of exemption applies to bishops, when released from the authority of the metropolitan, either at their own request or as a gracious act on the part of the Apostolic See, under whose direct control they are then placed. However, to prevent injury to the Church, the bishops, thus made independent of their proper metropolitans, are obliged to attend the synods of the province for which they have opted. Bishops who had not connected themselves with any provincial synod were summoned, by Benedict XIII, to attend the Roman one of 1725. Exemption also frequently occurs in connexion with the system of military chaplaincies. In Austria, since 1720, the "Feldbischof" (army bishop), nominated by the emperor, is exempt. In Prussia, since 1868, the "Feldprovost" or army provost, is appointed by the pope after nomination by the German emperor. In France military chaplains who serve permanent garrisons remote from a parish church were exempt. In Spain and elsewhere *vicarii castrenses generales*, i. e. army vicars-general, are appointed.

As applied to monasteries and churches, exemption is known as *passiva* or *activa*. In the former case the jurisdiction of the monastic or ecclesiastical prelate is confined to the ecclesiastics and laity belonging to his monastery or church. On the other hand, prelates

having "active" exemption may exercise a more extensive jurisdiction. They are (1) those who have certain episcopal rights over a clearly defined territory otherwise belonging to the diocese, and are known, canonically, as *prælati nullius* (i. e. *diœceseos*) *cum territorio conjuncto*; (2) those who have episcopal jurisdiction over a definite territory entirely distinct from the diocese, and known as *prælati nullius cum territorio separato*. The latter are *prælati nullius* in the proper sense; such, e. g. are the abbots of Monte Cassino, in Italy, and of St. Moritz, and Einsiedeln, in Switzerland. Prelates actively exempted have almost the same rights and privileges as a bishop. They may sit and vote in a general council, make laws within their proper territory, exercise canonical jurisdiction in matrimonial, disciplinary, and criminal matters. They may also grant faculties to hear confessions, reserve to themselves the right of absolving from certain sins, inflict ecclesiastical punishments and censures, grant faculties for preaching, make visitations within their jurisdiction, found an ecclesiastical seminary for priests, and appoint a vicar-general. Correspondingly, such a prelate must reside in his district, offer the Holy Sacrifice for the people, every Sunday and feast day, go at stated times to visit the Apostolic See (*visitatio liminum Apostolorum*), and attend the synod of the province, for which option has been declared. He is not, however, obliged to attend the diocesan synod. As a rule, such prelates are not consecrated bishops. They must consequently apply to some bishop of their own choice for the confirmation of their subjects, and for the consecration of the holy oils; for the ordination of their subjects, however, they must apply to the nearest bishop. When such *prælati nullius* are also regular abbots they may confer on their subjects the ecclesiastical tonsure, and ordain to the lower orders, or to this effect grant dimissorial letters to the diocesan bishop. Without papal privilege, however, they cannot make use of the pontifical insignia (pontificalia), nor perform acts of consecration reserved to bishops. Nor can they, without papal privilege, convene a diocesan synod, appoint synodal examiners, or hold examinations for appointment to parishes.

Although regulars are, in all matters of substantial importance, exempted from jurisdiction, there remain a number of matters in which they are subject to episcopal control. Regulars living outside of their monastery are subject to the bishop as papal delegate (Conc. Trid. Sess. VI, De ref. ch. iii; Sess. XXV, De regul., ch. xiv). Besides the papal confirmation, the consent of the bishop is also necessary for the founding of a monastery (Conc. Trid. Sess. XXV, De regul. ch. iii). The bishop has the right to bless an abbot confirmed by the pope (Conc. Trid Sess. XXV, De regul. ch. vi). Monasteries of men are subject to episcopal visitation only in respect of parochial work (*cura animarum*) carried on by them outside of the monasteries (Conc. Trid. Sess. XXV, De regul., ch. xi). The bishop has the right to confer major orders on regulars, and to use the *pontificalia* in their churches. When the regulars have no special privilege the diocesan bishop consecrates their churches; and they must obtain episcopal permission for processions outside the immediate vicinity of such churches. They must also ask the episcopal blessing before they can preach (*coram episcopo*) in churches of the order, while, in order to preach in any other than their own churches, canonical authorization (*missio canonica*) must be obtained from the bishop (Conc. Trid. Sess. V, De ref. ch. ii). To hear the confessions of the laity, and to grant absolution in cases reserved to the bishop, regulars require episcopal approbation (Conc. Trid. Sess. XXIII, De ref. ch. xv). The writings and books of regulars must be submitted, before publication, to the diocesan censor for the place of issue (Leo XIII, "Officiorum ac munerum", 25 January, 1897, no 36). It is also obligatory, on members of orders, to observe the ordinances of the bishop respecting the Church feast days, church services, and processions (Conc. Trid. Sess. XXV, De regul., ch. xii, and ch. xiii).

The rights of the bishop in respect to exempt orders of women are still more extensive. The bishop, or his representative (commissarius), presides at the election of abbesses, prioresses, or superiors (Conc. Trid. Sess. XXV, De regul. ch. vii). The right to visit canonically religious houses of women belongs to the bishop; he is charged in particular, with the entire superintendence of the observance of the *clausura* or cloister (Conc. Trid. Sess. XXV, De regul. ch. v). The bishop appoints the confessors, ordinary and extraordinary, for religious houses of women; in cases where such appointment belongs to some one else the bishop must, at least, give his approbation (Conc. Trid. Sess. XXV, De regul. ch. x). It is the bishop who examines into, either personally, or by representative, the voluntary character of the entrance of candidates into orders for women, both when they put on the habit of the order, and when they make their profession (Conc. Trid. Sess. XXV, De regul. ch. xvii). It is the bishop, finally, who audits the management of the property of female orders and religious houses. For exemption of ecclesiastics from secular jurisdiction see IMMUNITY.

DE BUCK, *De exemptione regularium conservanda* (Brussels, 1869); SCHÄFLER, *Der Bischof und die Regularen seiner Diözese* (Augsburg, 1871); BLUMENSTOK, *Der päpstliche Schutz im Mittelalter* (Innsbruck, 1890); WEISS, *Die kirchlichen Exemtionen der Klöster von ihrer Entstehung bis zur gregorianisch-kluniacensischen Zeit* (Basle, 1893); HÜFNER, *Das Rechtsinstitut der klösterlichen Exemtion in der abendländischen Kirche* (Mainz, 1903); LAURENTIUS, *Institutiones Juris ecclesiastici* (Freiburg im Br., 1908), 2nd ed., 180 sqq., 619 sqq.

JOHANNES BAPTIST SÄGMÜLLER.

Exequatur (synonymous with REGIUM PLACET), as the Jansenist Van Espen defines it, is a faculty which civil rulers impart to a Bull, papal Brief, or other ecclesiastical enactment in order to give it binding force in their respective territories. This faculty is conceded after ecclesiastical laws have been examined and found not derogatory to any right of the civil power and, therefore, suitable for promulgation. Modern statesmen draw a distinction between the Exequatur and the Regium Placet. The latter, according to them, is given to episcopal acts or acts of any other ecclesiastical superior belonging to the nation for which they are approved; while the former is conceded to enactments of a foreign power, that is, to papal Constitutions; the pope, as head of the whole Church, being formally considered as an authority not belonging to any particular country. In both cases, however, state authorities have the power of examining church laws and giving permission for their promulgation, by which permission ecclesiastical decrees acquire legal value and binding force.

As to the origin of this supposed right of the State over the Church, it is now beyond doubt, contrary to the assertions of Gallicans and Jansenists, that no trace of it can be found in the early centuries of the Church, or even as late as the fourteenth century. It is true that during all that period of time General Councils, like those of Nicæa and Ephesus, requisitioned the sanction of State authorities for ecclesiastical laws; it was not, however, juridical, but only physical, force that was then invoked for ecclesiastical decrees, in order to enforce their execution by the secular arm. Moreover, had such a power in the State been at that time known, rulers of nations who were sometimes anxious to prevent the promulgation and execution of papal Constitutions in their domains would have readily appealed to it, instead of resorting to more difficult and troublesome means, in order to impede in every possible way papal letters from ever being introduced into their dominions, e. g. in the conflicts of Philip the Fair of France with Boniface VIII, and of Henry II of England with Alexander

III. The Regium Placet really dates from the great Western Schism, which lasted from the pontificate of Urban VI to the Council of Constance and the election of Martin V (1378–1417). In order to guard against spurious papal letters issued by antipopes during the schism, Urban VI granted to some ecclesiastical superiors the faculty of examining papal Constitutions and ascertaining their authenticity before promulgation and execution. Civil authorities felt bound to adopt the same precautionary measure, though they did not attribute such a power to themselves as a right attached to their office; apparently its use was discontinued when, after the schism, Martin V condemned the Regium Placet in his Constitution "Quod antidota" (1418). In the fifteenth century, however, it was revived in Portugal by King John II and claimed by him as a right inherent in the crown. In the sixteenth century the Viceroy of Naples, the Duke of Alcalá, made it obligatory by law, and in the seventeenth century it was introduced into France in order to preserve the so-called Gallican Liberties, and afterwards into Spain, Belgium, Sicily, Naples, and other countries.

In theory this supposed right of the State was first propounded and defended as a true doctrine by Luther, Pasquier Quesnel, and other heretics who denied the supreme jurisdiction of the pope; later on it was advocated by Gallicans and Jansenists, e. g. Van Espen, Febronius, De Marca, and Stockmans, who attributed this power to the State as a necessary means of self-defence against possible attempts of the Church to injure the rights of civil society. More recently it has been defended with particular vigour by Italian jurists and statesmen, e. g. Cavallari, Mancini, Piola, apropos particularly of the "Law of Guarantees" passed in 1871 by the Italian Government in favour of the Holy See. However, not only is it historically erroneous, as shown above, that such a right has been exercised from time immemorial, but it is also juridically false that such power naturally belongs to the State, particularly as a necessary means of self-defence. The injustice of that claim and the consequent usurpation of authority by the State appear manifest in the light of Catholic faith. If the binding force of church laws depended on the approval and consent of the State, it would no longer be true that the Church received legislative power directly from her Divine Founder, and that whatever is bound or loosed by the Church on earth, will be bound or loosed in heaven (Matt., xvi, 19). Again, the Church would, in that case, immediately cease to be a supreme, self-sufficient, and perfect society, and would be deprived of her characteristics of unity, sanctity, catholicity, and apostolicity. Moreover, the use of the Exequatur to prevent possible usurpation of rights is contrary not only to Divine law but also to natural social law and is, therefore, an abuse of power, even if exercised by a State not professing the Catholic religion. A possible conflict of rights of two societies and the fear of a consequent injury to their respective jurisdiction do not entitle one of them to impede the free exercise of its ordinary jurisdiction by the other. Differences, if they arise, may be settled by private mutual understanding or arbitration. It is needless to say that the fear of any usurpation or conflict on the part of the Church is unfounded, as appears from her doctrine and history.

The Church, as a matter of fact, never claimed the power of revising and approving civil laws before promulgation, although, indeed, past experience would justify her in fearing on the part of the State usurpation of her powers. She contents herself with condemning civil laws after promulgation, if they are injurious to Catholic interests. We need not wonder, then, that the Church has always condemned the doctrine and use of the Regium Placet. Boniface IX first condemned it in his Constitution "Intenta Salutis" and after him a great number of pontiffs, down to Pius IX in Propositions 28 and 29 of the Syllabus "Quanta Cura" and in the Allocution "Luctuosis Exagitati" (12 March, 1877), also the Vatican Council in the Constitution "De Ecclesiâ Christi". To avert animosities and persecution, the Church has made minor concessions in favour of the State as to the exercise of the Regium Placet. In some other instances she has tolerated its acknowledgment by ecclesiastics, particularly to enable them to take possession of benefices and other temporalities. At present the Exequatur, or Regium Placet, is seldom, if ever, used, at least in its fullness, by modern civil rulers. In the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies it was abolished by the Concordat of 1818, and in Austria by that of 1855. It must likewise be regarded as abolished in Spain, France, Portugal, and Hungary. According to Aichner, it exists still, but in a mitigated form, in Saxony, Bavaria, and some parts of Switzerland. In Italy the strict Exequatur, i. e. previous to promulgation of papal Constitutions, is not in use, but it is retained in a mild form for the possession of ecclesiastical benefices. According to the "Law of Guarantees" (13 July, 1871), ecclesiastics who have been provided with benefices must present the Bull of their appointment to the State authorities; after approval the latter concede the Exequatur and put the incumbents of benefices in possession of the temporalities hitherto controlled by the government. In this form the Exequatur is at present tolerated by the Church, though it is not devoid of inconveniences, as Leo XIII complained in a letter written to his Secretary of State Cardinal Nina (27 August, 1878).

Van Espen, *De promulgatione legum eccl.* (Louvain, 1729); Bouix, *De principiis juris* (Paris, 1788); Zaccaria, *Comandi chi può obbedisca chi deve* (Faenza, 1788); Cavagnis, *Jur. Publ. Eccl. Instit.* (Rome, 1906); Barba, *Il Diritto Publ. Eccl.* (Naples, 1900); Tarquini, *Dissert. de Regio Placet* (Rome, 1862); De Dominicis, *Il Regio Exequatur* (Naples, 1869).

S. Luzio.

Exercises, Spiritual. See Spiritual Exercises of Saint Ignatius.

Exeter (Exonia, Isca Damnoniorum, Caer Wise, Exanceaster), Ancient Diocese of (Exoniensis), in England, chosen by Leofric, Bishop of Crediton, as his cathedral city in 1050. Originally Devonshire formed part of the Diocese of Wessex. About 703 Devonshire and Cornwall became the separate Bishopric of Sherborne and in 900 this was divided into two, the Devonshire bishop having his cathedral at Crediton. The two dioceses were again united when Leofric became first Bishop of Exeter. The present cathedral was begun by Bishop William de Warelhurst in 1112; the abbey church of St. Mary and St. Peter, founded by Athelstan in 932 and rebuilt in 1019, serving till then as the cathedral church. The transept towers built by Warelhurst still remain, being the only part of the Norman cathedral existing. This Norman building was completed by Bishop Marshall at the close of the twelfth century. The cathedral as it now stands is in the decorated style, being begun by Bishop Quivil (1280–1291), continued by Bytton and Stapeldon, and completed by the great Bishop Grandisson during his long pontificate of forty-two years, who left it much as it now stands. In many respects it resembles the French cathedrals rather than those of England. The special features of the cathedral are the transeptal towers and the choir. The latter contains much early stained-glass and a magnificent episcopal throne, and is separated from the nave by a choir-screen of singular beauty (1324). The absence of a central tower and a general lack of elevation prevent the building from ranking among the greatest English cathedrals, though the stately west front is alone sufficient to render it remarkable.

The bishops of Exeter always enjoyed considerable independence and the see was one of the largest and richest in England. "The Bishop of Exeter," writes

EXETER CATHEDRAL

Professor Freeman, "like the Archbishop of York was the spiritual head of a separate people." The remoteness of the see from London prevented it from being bestowed on statesmen or courtiers, so that the roll of bishops is more distinguished for scholars and administrators than for men who played a large part in national affairs. This was fortunate for the diocese and gave it a long line of excellent bishops, one of whom, Edmund Lacy, died with a reputation for sanctity and the working of miracles (1455). The result of this was seen in the fidelity with which Devonshire and Cornwall adhered to the Catholic Faith at the time of the Reformation. The following are the bishops with the dates of their accession:—

Leofric, 1046	James Berkeley, 1326
Osbern, 1072	John Grandisson, 1327
William Warelwast, 1107	Thomas Brantyngham, 1370
Robert Chichester, 1138	Edmund Stafford, 1395
Robert Warelwast, 1155	John Ketterick, 1419
Bartholomew Iscanus, 1161	Edmund Lacy, 1420
John the Chaunter, 1186	George Neville, 1458
Vacancy, 1191	John Bothe, 1465.
Henry Marshall, 1194	Peter Courtenay, 1478
Vacancy, 1206	Richard Fox, 1487
Simon de Apulia, 1214.	Oliver King, 1492
William Bruere, 1224	Richard Redman, 1496
Richard Blondy, 1245	John Arundell, 1502
Walter Bronescombe, 1257	Hugh Oldham, 1504
Peter Quivil, 1280	John Vesey, 1519
Thomas de Bytton, 1292	Vacancy, 1551
Walter de Stapeldon, 1308	James Turberville, 1555–1559

The diocese, originally very wealthy, was plundered during the reign of Henry VIII, when Bishop Vesey was forced to surrender fourteen out of twenty-two manors, and the value of the bishopric was reduced to a third. Vesey, though a Catholic at heart, held the see until 1551, when he was made to resign, and the Reformer, Miles Coverdale, was intruded into the see, where he made himself most unpopular. On the accession of Mary, in 1553, Vesey was restored. He died in 1554 and was succeeded by James Turberville, beloved by Catholics and Protestants alike. He was deprived of the see by Elizabeth in 1559 and died in prison, probably in or about 1570, the last Catholic Bishop of Exeter. The diocese contained four archdeaconries, Cornwall, Barnstaple, Exeter, and Totton, and six hundred and four parishes. There were Benedictine, Augustinian, Franciscan, Dominican, and Norbertine houses, and four Cistercian abbeys. The cathedral was dedicated to St. Peter, and the arms of the see were: Gules, a sword in pale blade and hilt proper, two keys in saltire or.

LYTTLETON, *Some remarks on the original foundation of Exeter Cathedral* (1754); ENGLEFIELD, *Observations on Bishop Lyttleton's account of Exeter Cathedral* (London, 1796); ANON, *Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus Provincialis* (Exeter, 1782); BRITTON, *Historyand Antiquities of the Cathedral Church of Exeter* (London, 1836); BREWER, *Hist. and Antiq. of the Cath. Ch. of Exeter* (London, s. d.); BOGGIS, *Exeter Cathedral* (Exeter, s. d.); HEWETT, *History of the Cathedral Church of Exeter* (Exeter, 1848); OLIVER, *Lives of the bishops of Exeter and history of the Cathedral* (Exeter, 1861), also *Monasticon Dioecesis Exoniensis*, records illustrating the ancient conventual foundations (Exeter, 1846); CARTER, *Some account of the Cathedral Church of Exeter* (London, 1879); SHELLY, *History of the Chapter of Exeter* (Plymouth, 1881); HINGESTON-RANDOLPH, *Episcopal Registers: Diocese of Exeter, 1257–1419*, 6 vols. (London, 1889–1896); REYNOLDS, *Use of Exeter Cathedral according to John de Grandisson* (London, 1891); FREEMAN, *Architectural History of Exeter Cathedral* (Exeter, s. d.); REYNOLDS, *Short History of the Ancient Diocese of Exeter*, with calendar of Episcopal registers and of MSS. belonging to dean and chapter; (Exeter, 1895); EDWARDS, *Exeter Cathedral* (London, 1897); ADDLESHAW, *Exeter: the Cathedral and See* (London, 1898).

EDWIN BURTON.

Existence. See ESSENCE AND EXISTENCE.

Exodus, the second Book of the Pentateuch, second also of the whole Old Testament Canon (see PENTATEUCH).

Exomologesis. See PENANCE.

Exorcism is (1) the act of driving out, or warding off, demons, or evil spirits, from persons, places, or things, which are, or are believed to be, possessed or infested by them, or are liable to become victims or instruments of their malice; (2) the means employed for this purpose, especially the solemn and authoritative adjuration of the demon, in the name of God, or of any higher power to which he is subject. The word, which is not itself biblical, is derived from ἐξορκίζω, which is used in the Septuagint (Gen. xxiv, 3 = cause to swear; III (I) Kings xxii, 16 = adjure) and in Matt. xxvi, 63, by the high priest to Christ, "I adjure thee by the living God . . . " The non-intensive ὁρκίζω and the noun ἐξορκιστής (exorcist) occur in Acts xix, 13, where the latter (in the plural) is applied to certain strolling Jews who professed to be able to cast out demons. Expulsion by adjuration is, therefore, the primary meaning of exorcism, and when, as in Christian usage, this adjuration is in the name of God or of Christ, exoreism is a strictly religious act or rite. But in ethnic religions, and even among the Jews from the time when there is evidence of its being in vogue, exorcism as an act of religion is largely replaced by the use of mere magical and superstitious means, to which non-Catholic writers at the present day sometimes quite unfairly assimilate Christian exorcism. Superstition ought not to be confounded with religion, however much their history may be interwoven, nor magic, however white it may be, with a legitimate religious rite.

IN ETHNIC RELIGIONS: The use of protective means against the real, or supposed, molestations of evil spirits naturally follows from belief in their existence, and is, and has been always, a feature of ethnic religions, savage and civilized. In this connexion only two of the religions of antiquity, the Egyptian and the Babylonian, call for notice; but it is no easy task, even in the case of these two, to isolate what bears strictly on our subject, from the mass of mere magic in which it is embedded. The Egyptians ascribed certain diseases and various other evils to demons, and believed in the efficacy of magical charms and incantations for banishing or dispelling them. The dead more particularly needed to be well fortified with magic in order to be able to accomplish in safety their perilous journey to the underworld (see Budge, Egyptian Magic, London, 1899). But of exorcism, in the strict sense, there is hardly any trace in the Egyptian records.

In the famous case where a demon was expelled from the daughter of the Prince of Bekhten, human ministry was unavailing, and the god Khonsu himself had to be sent the whole way from Thebes for the purpose. The demon gracefully retired when confronted with the god, and was allowed by the latter to be treated to a grand banquet before departing "to his own place" (op. cit. p. 206 sq.). Babylonian magic was largely bound up with medicine, certain diseases being attributed to some kind of demoniacal possession, and exorcism being considered the easiest, if not the only, way of curing them (Sayce, Hibbert Lect. 1887, 310). For this purpose certain formulæ of adjuration were employed, in which some god or goddess, or some group of deities, was invoked to conjure away the evil one and repair the mischief he had caused. The following example (from Sayce, op. cit., 441 seq.) may be quoted: "The (possessing) demon which seizes a man, the demon (ekimmu) which seizes a man; The (seizing) demon which works mischief, the evil demon, Conjure, O spirit of heaven; conjure, O spirit of earth." For further examples see King, Babylonian Magic and Sorcery (London, 1896).

AMONG THE JEWS: There is no instance in the Old Testament of demons being expelled by men. In Tobias, viii, 3, it is the angel who "took the devil

and bound him in the desert of upper Egypt"; and the instruction previously given to young Tobias (VI, 18, and 19), to roast the fish's heart in the bridal chamber, would seem to have been merely part of the angel's plan for concealing his own identity. But in extra-canonical Jewish literature there are incantations for exorcising demons, examples of which may be seen in the Talmud (Schabbath, xiv, 3; Aboda Zara, xii, 2; Sanhedrin, x, 1). These were sometimes inscribed on the interior surface of earthen bowls, a collection of which (estimated to be from the seventh century A. D.) is preserved in the Royal Museum in Berlin; and inscriptions from the collection have been published, and translated, by Wohlstein in the "Zeitschrift für Assyriologie" (Dec., 1893; April, 1894).

The chief characteristic of these Jewish exorcisms is their naming of names believed to be efficacious, i. e. names of good angels, which are used either alone or in combination with El (=God); indeed reliance on mere names had long before become a superstition with the Jews, and it was considered most important that the appropriate names, which varied for different times and occasions, should be used. It was this superstitious belief, no doubt, that prompted the sons of Sceva, who had witnessed St. Paul's successful exorcisms in the name of Jesus, to try on their own account the formula, "I conjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth", with results disastrous to their credit (Acts, xix, 13). It was a popular Jewish belief, accepted even by a learned cosmopolitan like Josephus, that Solomon had received the power of expelling demons, and that he had composed and transmitted certain formulæ that were efficacious for that purpose. The Jewish historian records how a certain Eleazar, in the presence of the Emperor Vespasian and his officers, succeeded, by means of a magical ring applied to the nose of a possessed person, in drawing out the demon through the nostrils—the virtue of the ring being due to the fact that it enclosed a certain rare root indicated in the formulæ of Solomon, and which it was exceedingly difficult to obtain (Ant. Jud. VIII, ii, 5; cf. Bell. Jud. VII, vi, 3).

But superstition and magic apart, it is implied in Christ's answers to the Pharisees, who accused Him of casting out demons by the power of Beelzebub, that some Jews in His time successfully exorcised demons in God's name: "and if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out?" (Matt., xii, 27). It does not seem reasonable to understand this reply as mere irony, or as a mere *argumentum ad hominem* implying no admission of the fact; all the more so, as elsewhere (Mark, ix, 37–38) we have an account of a person who was not a disciple casting out demons in Christ's name, and whose action Christ refused to reprehend or forbid.

EXORCISM IN THE NEW TESTAMENT: Assuming the reality of demoniac possession, for which the authority of Christ is pledged (see OBSESSION, POSSESSION), it is to be observed that Jesus appealed to His power over demons as one of the recognised signs of Messiahship (Matt., xii, 23, 28; Luke, xi, 20). He cast out demons, He declared, by the finger or spirit of God, not, as His adversaries alleged, by collusion with the prince of demons (Matt., xii, 24, 27; Mark, iii, 22; Luke, xi, 15, 19); and that He exercised no mere delegated power, but a personal authority that was properly His own, is clear from the direct and imperative way in which He commands the demon to depart (Mark, ix, 24; cf. i, 25 etc.): "He cast out the spirits with his word, and he healed all that were sick" (Matt., viii, 16). Sometimes, as with the daughter of the Canaanean woman, the exorcism took place from a distance (Matt., xv, 22 sqq.; Mark, vii, 25). Sometimes again the spirits expelled were allowed to express their recognition of Jesus as "the Holy One of God" (Mark, i, 24) and to complain that He had come to torment them "before the time", i. e. the time of their final punishment (Matt., viii, 29 sqq.; Luke, viii, 28 sqq.). If demoniac possession was generally accompanied by some disease, yet the two were not confounded by Christ or the Evangelists. In Luke, xiii, 32, for example, the Master Himself expressly distinguishes between the expulsion of evil spirits and the curing of diseases.

Christ also empowered the Apostles and Disciples to cast out demons in His name while He Himself was still on earth (Matt., x, 1 and 8; Mark, vi, 7; Luke, ix, 1; x, 17), and to believers generally He promised the same power (Mark, xvi, 17). But the efficacy of this delegated power was conditional, as we see from the fact that the Apostles themselves were not always successful in their exorcisms: certain kinds of spirits, as Christ explained, could only be cast out by prayer and fasting (Matt., xvii, 15, 20; Mark, ix, 27, 28; Luke, ix, 40). In other words the success of exorcism by Christians, in Christ's name, is subject to the same general conditions on which both the efficacy of prayer and the use of charismatic power depend. Yet conspicuous success was promised (Mark, xvi, 17). St. Paul (Acts, xvi, 18; xix, 12), and, no doubt, the other Apostles and Disciples, made use regularly, as occasion arose, of their exorcising power, and the Church has continued to do so uninterruptedly to the present day.

ECCLESIASTICAL EXORCISMS: Besides exorcism in the strictest sense, i. e. for driving out demons from the possessed, Catholic ritual, following early traditions, has retained various other exorcisms, and these also call for notice here. (1) *Exorcism of the possessed.* We have it on the authority of all early writers who refer to the subject at all that in the first centuries not only the clergy, but lay Christians also were able by the power of Christ to deliver demoniacs or energumens, and their success was appealed to by the early Apologists as a strong argument for the Divinity of the Christian religion (Justin Martyr, Apol., 6; P. G., VI, 453; Dial., 30, 85; ibid., 537, 676 sq; Minutius Felix, Octav., 27, P. L., III; Origen, Contra Celsum., I, 25; VII, 4, 67; P. G., XI, 705, 1425, 1516; Tertullian, Apol., 22, 23; P. L., I, 404 sq; etc.). As is clear from the testimonies referred to, no magical or superstitious means were employed, but in those early centuries, as in later times, a simple and authoritative adjuration addressed to the demon in the name of God, and more especially in the name of Christ crucified, was the usual form of exorcism.

But sometimes in addition to words some symbolic action was employed, such as breathing (*insufflatio*), or laying of hands on the subject, or making the sign of the cross. St. Justin speaks of demons flying from "the touch and breathing of Christians" (II Apol., 6) as from a flame that burns them, adds St. Cyril of Jerusalem (Cat., xx, 3, P. G., XXXIII, 1080). Origen mentions the laying on of hands, and St. Ambrose (Paulinus, Vit. Ambr., n. 28, 43, P. L., XIV, 36, 42), St. Ephraem Syrus (Greg. Nyss., De Vit. Ephr., P. G., XLVI, 848) and others used this ceremony in exorcising. The sign of the cross, that briefest and simplest way of expressing one's faith in the Crucified and invoking His Divine power, is extolled by many Fathers for its efficacy against all kinds of demoniac molestation (Lactantius, Inst., IV, 27, P. L., VI, 531 sq.; Athanasius, De Incarn. Verbi., n. 47, P. G., XXV, 180; Basil, In Isai., XI, 249, P. G., XXX, 557; Cyril of Jerusalem, Cat., XIII, 3 col. 773; Gregory Nazianzen, Carm. adv. iram, v, 415 sq.; P. G., XXXVII, 842). The Fathers further recommend that the adjuration and accompanying prayers should be couched in the words of Holy Writ (Cyril of Jerus., Procat., n. 9, col. 350; Athanasius, Ad Marcell., n. 33, P. G., XXVII, 45). The present rite of exorcism as given in the Roman Ritual fully agrees with patristic teaching and is a proof of the continuity of Catholic tradition in this matter.

(2) *Baptismal exorcism.* At an early age the prac-

tice was introduced into the Church of exorcising catechumens as a preparation for the Sacrament of Baptism. This did not imply that they were considered to be obsessed, like demoniacs, but merely that they were, in consequence of original sin (and of personal sins in case of adults), subject more or less to the power of the devil, whose "works" or "pomps" they were called upon to renounce, and from whose dominion the grace of baptism was about to deliver them. Exorcism in this connexion is a symbolical anticipation of one of the chief effects of the sacrament of regeneration; and since it was used in the case of children who had no personal sins, St. Augustine could appeal to it against the Pelagians as implying clearly the doctrine of original sin (Ep. cxciv, n. 46, P. L., XXXIII, 890; C. Jul. III, 8; P. L., XXXIV, 705, and elsewhere). St. Cyril of Jerusalem (Procat., 14, col. 355) gives a detailed description of baptismal exorcism, from which it appears that anointing with exorcised oil formed a part of this exorcism in the East. The only early Western witness which treats unction as part of the baptismal exorcism is that of the Arabic Canons of Hippolytus (n. 19, 29). The *Exsufflatio*, or outbreathing of the demon by the candidate, which was sometimes part of the ceremony, symbolized the renunciation of his works and pomps, while the *Insufflatio*, or in-breathing of the Holy Ghost, by ministers and assistants, symbolised the infusion of sanctifying grace by the sacrament. Most of these ancient ceremonies have been retained by the Church to this day in her rite for solemn baptism.

(3) *Other Exorcisms.* According to Catholic belief demons or fallen angels retain their natural power, as intelligent beings, of acting on the material universe, and using material objects and directing material forces for their own wicked ends; and this power, which is in itself limited, and is subject, of course, to the control of Divine providence, is believed to have been allowed a wider scope for its activity in consequence of the sin of mankind. Hence places and things as well as persons are naturally liable to diabolical infestation, within limits permitted by God, and exorcism in regard to them is nothing more than a prayer to God, in the name of His Church, to restrain this diabolical power supernaturally, and a profession of faith in His willingness to do so on behalf of His servants on earth.

The chief things formally exorcised in blessing are water, salt, and oil, and these in turn are used in personal exorcisms, and in blessing or consecrating places (e. g. churches) and objects (e. g. altars, sacred vessels, church bells) connected with public worship, or intended for private devotion. Holy water, the sacramental with which the ordinary faithful are most familiar, is a mixture of exorcised water and exorcised salt; and in the prayer of blessing, God is besought to endow these material elements with a supernatural power of protecting those who use them with faith against all the attacks of the devil. This kind of indirect exorcism by means of exorcised objects is an extension of the original idea; but it introduces no new principle, and it has been in use in the Church from the earliest ages. (See also EXORCIST.)

P. J. TONER.

Exorcist, (1) in general, any one who exorcises or professes to exorcise demons (cf. Acts, XIX, 13); (2) in particular, one ordained by a bishop for this office, ordination to which is the second of the four minor orders of the Western Church. The practice of exorcism was not confined to clerics in the early ages, as is clear from Tertullian (Apologet., 23, P. L., I, 410; cf. De Idolat., 11) and Origen (C. Celsum, VII, 4, P. G. 1425). The latter expressly states that even the simplest and rudest of the faithful sometimes cast out demons, by a mere prayer or adjuration (Mark, xv, 17), and urges the fact as a proof of the power of Christ's grace, and the inability of demons to resist it. In the Eastern Church, a specially ordained order of exorcists (or of acolytes, or door-keepers) has never been established, but in the Western Church, these three minor orders (with that of lectors as a fourth) were instituted shortly before the middle of the third century. Pope Cornelius (251–252) mentions in his letter to Fabius that there were then in the Roman Church forty-two acolytes, and fifty-two exorcists, readers, and door-keepers (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., VI, xliii; P. G., XX, 621), and the institution of these orders, and the organization of their functions, seems to have been the work of Cornelius's predecessor, Pope Fabian (236–251).

The fourth Council of Carthage (398), in its seventh canon, prescribes the rite of ordination for exorcist; the bishop is to give him the book containing the formulæ of exorcism, saying, "Receive, and commit to memory, and possess the power of imposing hands on energumens, whether baptized or catechumens"; and the same rite has been retained, without change, in the Roman Pontifical down to the present day, except that instead of the ancient Book of Exorcisms, the Pontifical, or Missal, is put into the hands of the ordained. From this form it is clear that one of the chief duties of exorcists was to take part in baptismal exorcism. That catechumens were exorcised every day, for some time before baptism, may be inferred from canon xc of the same council, which prescribed the daily imposition of hands by the exorcists. A further duty is prescribed in canon xcii, viz.: to supply food to, and in a general way to care for, energumens who habitually frequented the Church. There is no mention of pagan energumens, for the obvious reason that the official ministrations of the Church were not intended for them. But even after the institution of this order, exorcism was not forbidden to the laity, much less to the higher clergy; nor did those who exorcised always use the forms contained in the Book of Exorcisms. Thus the Apostolic Constitutions (VIII, 26; P. G., I, 1122) say expressly that "the exorcist is not ordained", i. e. for the special office of exorcist, but that if anyone possess the charismatic power, he is to be recognized, and if need be, ordained deacon or subdeacon. This is the practice which has survived in the Eastern Orthodox Church.

As an example of the discretion allowed in the West, in the use of the means of exorcising, we may refer to what Sulpitius Severus relates of St. Martin of Tours (Dial., III (II), 6; P. L., XX, 215), that he was in the habit of casting out demons by prayer alone, without having recourse to the imposition of hands or the formulæ usually employed by the clergy. After a time, as conditions changed in the Church, the office of exorcist, as an independent office, ceased altogether, and was taken over by clerics in major orders, just as the original functions of deacons and subdeacons have with the lapse of time passed to a great extent into the hands of priests; and according to the present discipline of the Catholic Church, it is only priests who are authorized to use the exorcising power conferred by ordination. The change is due to the facts that the catechumenate, with which the office of exorcist was chiefly connected, has ceased, that infant baptism has become the rule, and that with the spread of Christianity and the disappearance of paganism, demonic power has been curtailed, and cases of obsession have become much rarer. It is only Catholic missionaries labouring in pagan lands, where Christianity is not yet dominant, who are likely to meet with fairly frequent cases of possession.

In Christian countries authentic cases of possession sometimes occur and every priest, especially if he be a parish priest, or pastor, is liable to be called upon to perform his duty as exorcist. In doing so, he is to be mindful of the prescriptions of the Roman Ritual and of the laws of provincial or diocesan synods, which for

the most part require that the bishop should be consulted, and his authorization obtained before exorcism is attempted. The chief points of importance in the instructions of the Roman Ritual, prefixed to the rite itself, are as follows:—

(1) Possession is not lightly to be taken for granted. Each case is to be carefully examined and great caution to be used in distinguishing genuine possession from certain forms of disease. (2) The priest who undertakes the office should be himself a holy man, of blameless life, intelligent, courageous, humble; and he should prepare for the work by special acts of devotion and mortification, particularly by prayer and fasting (Matt., xvii, 20). (3) He should avoid in the course of the rite everything that savours of superstition, and should leave the medical aspects of the case to qualified physicians. (4) He should admonish the possessed, in so far as the latter is capable, to dispose himself for the exorcism by prayer, fasting, confession, and communion, and while the rite is in progress to excite within himself a lively faith in God's goodness, and a patient resignation to His holy will. (5) The exorcism should take place in the Church or some other sacred place, if convenient; but if on account of sickness, or for other legitimate reasons, it takes place in a private house, witnesses (preferably members of the family) should be present: this is specially enjoined, as a measure of precaution, in case the subject is a woman. (6) All idle and curious questioning of the demon should be avoided, and the prayers and adjurations should be read with great faith, humility, and fervour, and with a consciousness of power and authority. (7) The Blessed Sacrament is not to be brought near the body of the obsessed during exorcism for fear of possible irreverence; but the crucifix, holy water, and, when available, relics of the saints are to be so employed. (8) If expulsion of the evil spirit is not obtained at once, the rite should be repeated, if need be, several times. (9) The exorcist should be vested in surplice, and violet stole.

Besides works referred to in article on EXORCISM, see PROBST, *Sacramente und Sacramentalien in den ersten Jahrhunderten*, 16–62; IDEM, in *Kirchenlexikon*, s. v., IV, 1141 sqq.; MARTÈNE, *De antiquiis Ecclesiæ ritibus*, I, i, 6 and viii, 8; MARTIGNY, *Dict. des antiquités chrétiennes* (Paris, 1877), 312; WHITEHOUSE in HASTINGS, *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v., I, 811 sqq.; BISCHOFBERGER, *Entwicklung der sog. ordines minores in den drei ersten Jahrh.*, in *Römische Quartalschrift* (Rome, 1907), suppl. 7.

P. J. TONER.

Expectation of the Blessed Virgin Mary (*Expectatio Partus B. V. M.*), FEAST OF THE, celebrated on 18 December by nearly the entire Latin Church. Owing to the ancient law of the Church prohibiting the celebration of feasts during Lent (a law still in vigour at Milan), the Spanish Church transferred the feast of the Annunciation from 25 March to the season of Advent, the Tenth Council of Toledo (656) assigning it definitely to 18 December. It was kept with a solemn octave. When the Latin Church ceased to observe the ancient custom regarding feasts in Lent, the Annunciation came to be celebrated twice in Spain, viz. 25 March and 18 December, in the calendars of both the Mozarabic and the Roman Rite (Missale Gothicum, ed. Migne, pp. 170, 734). The feast of 18 December was commonly called, even in the liturgical books, "S. Maria de la O", because on that day the clerics in the choir after Vespers used to utter a loud and protracted "O", to express the longing of the universe for the coming of the Redeemer (Tamayo, Mart. Hisp., VI, 485). The Roman "O" antiphons have nothing to do with this term, because they are unknown in the Mozarabic Rite. This feast and its octave were very popular in Spain, where the people still call it "Nuestra Señora de la O". It is not known at what time the term *Expectatio Partus* first appeared; it is not found in the Mozarabic liturgical books. St. Ildephonsus cannot, therefore, have invented it, as some have maintained. The feast was always kept in Spain and was approved for Toledo in 1573 by Gregory XIII as a double major, without an octave. The church of Toledo has the privilege (approved 29 April, 1634) of celebrating this feast even when it occurs on the fourth Sunday of Advent. The "Expectatio Partus" spread from Spain to other countries; in 1695 it was granted to Venice and Toulouse, in 1702 to the Cistercians, in 1713 to Tuscany, in 1725 to the Papal States. The Office in the Mozarabic Breviary is exceedingly beautiful; it assigns special antiphons for every day of the octave. At Milan the feast of the Annunciation is, even to the present, kept on the last Sunday before Christmas. The Mozarabic Liturgy also celebrates a feast called the Expectation (or Advent) of St. John the Baptist on the Sunday preceding 24 June.

HOLWECK, *Fasti Mariani* (Freiburg, 1892); DE LA FUENTE, *Vida de la Virgen Maria* (Mexico, 1883), 206; *Liturgica Gothica* in *P. L.*

F. G. HOLWECK.

Expectative (from Lat. *expectare*, to expect or wait for).—An expectative, or an expectative grace, is the anticipatory grant of an ecclesiastical benefice, not vacant at the moment but which will become so, regularly, on the death of its present incumbent. In 1179 the Third Lateran Council, renewing a prohibition already in existence for a long time, forbade such promises or gifts. This prohibition was further extended by Boniface VIII. Nevertheless, during the Middle Ages expectative graces were customarily conferred upon applicants to canonical prebends in the cathedral and collegiate chapters. This fact was due to toleration by the Holy See, which even accorded to the chapters the right of nominating four canons in the way of expectative graces (cc. ii, viii, De concessione prebendæ, X, III, viii; c. ii, De concessione prebendæ, in VI°, III, vii; Constitution of Alexander IV, "Execrabilis", 1254). Several chapters preferred to renounce this right; others continued to employ expectatives even contrary to the canonical enactments. The popes, especially, made use of this grace from the twelfth century. After having first asked, then ordered, the collators to dispose of certain benefices in favour of ecclesiastics whom they had previously named to them, the popes themselves directly granted, in the way of expectatives, benefices which were not at the moment vacant; they even charged another ecclesiastic with the future investiture of the appointee with the benefice. The privilege of granting expectatives was conceded also to the delegates of the Holy See, the universities, certain princes, etc., with more or less restriction. This practice aroused grave opposition and gave rise to many abuses, especially during the Western Schism. The Council of Trent suppressed all expectatives excepting the designation of a coadjutor with the right of succession in the case of bishops and abbots; to these we may add the prefects Apostolic. (Sess. XXIV, cap. xix, De ref.; Sess. XXIX, cap. vii, De ref.). Although the council intended to forbid also the collation of expectatives by privileges granted by the pope, still the latter is not bound by such a prohibition. However, the only expectatives now in use are those authorized by the Council of Trent.

SCHMITT, *De eo quod circa expectativas ad canonicatus ex statutis et observantiis Germaniæ justum est* in MAYER, *Thesaurus novus juris ecclesiastici* (Ratisbon, 1791), I, 249; DÜRR, *De capitulis clausis in Germaniâ* in SCHMIDT, *Thesaurus juris ecclesiastici* (Heidelberg, 1774), III, 122; HINSCHIUS, *System des katholischen Kirchenrechts* (Berlin, 1879–1895), II, 64, 474; III, 113 sqq.; WERNZ, *Jus Decretalium* (Rome, 1899), II, 450.

A. VAN HOVE.

Expeditors, APOSTOLIC.—(Lat. *Expeditionarius litterarum apostolicarum, Datariæ Apostolicæ sollicitator atque expeditor;* It. *Spedizionieri*). Officials who attend to the sending of Bulls, Briefs, and Rescripts, that emanate from the Apostolic Chancery, the Dataria, the Sacred Pœnitentiaria, and the Secretariate of

Briefs. In a restricted and specific sense expeditors or expeditioners are laymen approved by the Dataria, after an examination, to act as agents for bishops or others before the Dataria or Apostolic Chancery. They are members of the Roman Court. They differ from solicitors as well as from procurators or agents in general, who transact business with the Roman Congregations. A solicitor, strictly speaking, is an assistant to a procurator, doing the mechanical work of preparing documents. An expeditor is more concerned with matters of favour, privileges, dispensations and so on, than with cases in litigation. It has been the practice of the Dataria and Apostolic Chancery to carry on business only with authorized agents, or expeditors, whose office it is to draw up and sign the necessary documents, receive and forward the answer given. They receive a certain fixed fee for each transaction, while procurators and solicitors generally receive a monthly stipend. The number of expeditors has varied. Cardinal Pacca, pro-datarius, decided, in 1833, that the number, which was then one hundred, should be regulated by the amount of business to be transacted. In late years there were about thirty. In reorganizing the Roman Court, Pius X deprived these expeditors of their exclusive right to appear before the Dataria, and Apostolic Chancery.

HUMPHREY, *Urbs et Orbis* (London, 1899), 437–440; MORONI, *Dizionario*, s. v. *Spedizioniere*.

ANDREW B. MEEHAN.

Expiation, FEAST OF. See ATONEMENT, DAY OF.

Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament is a manner of honouring the Holy Eucharist, by exposing It, with proper solemnity, to the view of the faithful in order that they may pay their devotions before It. We will speak later of the conditions which constitute proper solemnity, but something must first be said of the history of the practice.

HISTORY.—There can be no reasonable doubt that the practice of exposition came in in the wake of that most epoch-making liturgical development, the Elevation of the Host in the Mass. The Elevation itself (q. v.), of which we first hear in its present sense about the year 1200, was probably adopted as a practical protest against the teaching of Peter Comestor and Peter the Chanter, who held that the bread was not consecrated in the Mass until the words of institution had been spoken over both bread and wine. Those who believed that when the words "*Hoc est enim corpus meum*" had been pronounced, the bread was at once changed into the flesh of our Lord, supported their opinion by adoring the Sacrament, and holding It up for the adoration of the people, without waiting for the words to be spoken over the chalice. At Paris, this elevation became a matter of synodal precept, probably before the year 1200. Before long it came to be regarded as a very meritorious act to look upon and salute the Body of the Lord. In this way, even before the middle of the thirteenth century, all kinds of fanciful promises were in circulation regarding the special privileges enjoyed by him, who, on any day, saw the Body of his Maker. He was believed to be protected from sudden death, or from loss of sight. Further, on that day he would be duly nourished by the food he took, and would grow no older, with many other extravagances. The development of these popular beliefs was also probably much assisted by a legendary element current in the romances of the Holy Grail, then at the height of their popularity. What is certain is, that among all classes the seeing the Host, at the moment It was lifted on high in the hands of the priest, became a primary object of devotion, and various devices—for example, the hanging of a black curtain at the back of the altar, or the lighting of torches held behind the priest by a deacon or server—were resorted to, to make the looking upon the Body of Christ more easy.

Whether the institution of the feast of Corpus Christi with its procession, an innovation due to the visions of the Flemish contemplative, St. Juliana Cornelion, is to be regarded as the cause, or rather the effect, of this great desire to behold the Body of Christ is somewhat doubtful. But the evidence points to it as an effect rather than as a cause, for, even before the close of the twelfth century, we find a well-authenticated story of the last moments of Maurice de Sully, Bishop of Paris, according to which, being unable on account of sickness to receive Holy Viaticum, he satisfied his devotion by having the Blessed Sacrament brought to him to gaze upon. An exactly similar incident is recorded of St. Juliana herself, when upon her death-bed. This also seems to show that the devout longing of the faithful to gaze upon the Sacred Host was not confined to the time of Mass. Moreover, we find it debated among scholastic theologians, as early as the thirteenth century, whether the looking upon the consecrated Host was permissible to those in the state of grievous sin, and it was commonly decided that far from being a new offence against God, such an act was praiseworthy, if it were done with a reverent intention, and was likely to obtain for the sinner the grace of true contrition.

In the fourteenth century, we find the practice of Exposition already established, especially in Germany. The "Septililium" of Blessed Dorothea of Prussia who died a recluse, at an advanced age, in 1394, not only bears witness to the saint's extraordinary desire to see the Blessed Sacrament, a desire which was sometimes gratified as often as a hundred times in one day, but also incidentally mentions that in certain churches near Dantzig, the Blessed Sacrament was reserved all day long in a transparent monstrance, so that pious persons like Dorothea could come to pray before It. The practice undoubtedly spread very widely, especially in Germany and the Netherlands. In the fifteenth century, we find numerous synodal decrees passed, prohibiting this continuous and informal Exposition, as wanting in proper reverence. The decree enacted at Cologne in 1452, under the presidency of Cardinal Nicholas de Cusa, altogether forbids the reserving, or carrying of the Blessed Sacrament in such monstrances, except during the octave of Corpus Christi. An earlier decree passed at Breslau, in 1416, speaks of permission having previously been given "for the Body of Jesus Christ, on some few days of the week, to be visibly exposed and shown to public view". But the bishop declares that he has perceived, that, "by this frequent exposition, the indevotion of the multitude only becomes greater, and reverence is lessened". It is clear that these prohibitions did not eradicate the custom, but they seem to have led to a curious compromise, by which the Blessed Sacrament, throughout a great part of central Europe, was reserved in "Sakramentshäuschen" (Sacrament houses), often beautifully carved of stone, and erected in the most conspicuous part of the church, near the sanctuary. There the Sacred Host was kept in a transparent vessel, or monstrance, behind a locked metal door of lattice work, in such a way that the Host could still be dimly seen by those who prayed outside. In the convent of Vadstena in Sweden, the motherhouse of the Brigittines, we have record of the erection of such a Sacrament House, in 1454, in the following terms: "Circa festum Epiphaniæ erectum est ciborium, sive columna, pro Corpore Christi, et monstrancia ibi posita cum lampade".

Another custom which seems to have been very prevalent in Germany and the Netherlands, before the close of the fifteenth century, was the practice of exposing the Blessed Sacrament during the time of Mass, apparently to add solemnity to the Holy Sacrifice thus offered. Numerous papal permissions for such Exposition will be found in the "Regesta" of Pope Leo X. (See e. g. 3 Nov., 1514; 20 Nov., 1514,

etc.) This practice is still a very favourite one in Belgium, though it seems directly to contravene the spirit of many directions in the official "Cæremoniale Episcoporum" prescribing that the Blessed Sacrament should, when possible, be removed from the altar at which High Mass is to be celebrated (Cær. Episc. I, XII, 8-9). Before the Council of Trent, the abuse of such frequent expositions, in Germany and elsewhere, seems to have been very much checked, if not entirely eliminated. In the sixteenth century and subsequently, the developments of popular devotion in this matter have been much more restrained, and they have always been subject to strict episcopal supervision. The practice of the Forty Hours' Devotion, and the service now known as Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, are treated separately, and the reader may be referred to the articles in question. But a good many other varieties of services, involving Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament for a longer or shorter period, began to prevail in the time of St. Philip Neri and St. Charles Borromeo. Of one such variety known as the *Oratio sine intermissione*, and dating at least from 1574, a full account will be found in the "Acta Mediolanensis Ecclesiæ". Not very long after this, we begin to come across various religious institutes founded, with the permission of the Holy See, for the express purpose of maintaining the perpetual adoration of the Blessed Sacrament. See the article ADORATION, PERPETUAL, where details are given. In most of these cases we may assume that the Blessed Sacrament is exposed upon the altar, though in some religious institutes of this kind the exposition is only continued by day.

CONDITIONS REGULATING EXPOSITION.—The Church distinguishes between private and public Expositions of the Blessed Sacrament; and though the former practice is hardly known in northern Europe, or in America, it is clearly within the competence of a parish priest to permit such private exposition for any good reason of devotion, by opening the tabernacle door and allowing the ciborium containing the Blessed Sacrament to be seen by the worshippers. There is, however, in this case no enthroning of the Blessed Sacrament or use of a monstrance. Public Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament may not take place without the permission, express or implied, of the ordinary. In English-speaking countries, a monstrance is almost always used when the Blessed Sacrament is set upon Its throne, but in Germany, one frequently sees simply the ciborium, covered of course with its veil. A certain solemnity and decorum in the matter of lights upon the altar, incense, music, and attendance of worshippers is also required, and bishops are directed to refuse permission for public Exposition where these cannot be provided for.

When Mass is celebrated, or the Divine Office recited, at the altar upon which the Blessed Sacrament is exposed, a new set of rubrics comes into force, birettas are not worn, genuflexions on both knees are made before the altar, the incense and water are not blessed, the celebrant's hand is not kissed, etc. The "Cæremoniale" seems only to contemplate the case of Mass before the Blessed Sacrament exposed during the octave of Corpus Christi, and at the Mass of Deposition of the *Quarant' Ore*, but, as already noticed, in many parts of Europe, local custom has made these Masses before the Blessed Sacrament of very common occurrence. For the candles that ought to burn upon the altar, and for the ritual to be followed the reader may be referred to the articles BENEDICTION, and FORTY HOURS' DEVOTION. Other rubrical directions dealing with such matters as the use of electric light, the arrangement of the throne, etc., are given in detail in manuals like that of Hartmann, or works upon Pastoral Theology such as that of Schulze.

GIHR, in *Kirchenlexikon* (1713–1716), I; THURSTON in *The Month*, June to September, 1901, and May, 1902, p. 539; CORBLET, *Histoire de la Sainte Eucharistie* (Paris, 1886); LUPUS, *De SS. Sacramenti Publica Expositione* (Liège, 1681); THIERS, *De l'Exposition du S. Sacrement de l'Autel* (Paris, 1677); RAIBLE, *Der Tabernakel einst und jetzt* (Freiburg, 1908), which gives some good illustrations of German "Sacrament-houses". For rubrical details see, for example, SCHULZE, *Manual of Pastoral Theology* (Milwaukee, 1906), 56–62); VAN DER STAPPEN, *Sacra Liturgia* (Mechlin, 1903), V, *Cæremoniale;* SCHÜCK, *Pastoral Theologie* (Innsbruck, 1905), p. 628.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Expulsion. See ANATHEMA; DEGRADATION; EXCOMMUNICATION; RELIGIOUS ORDERS; VOW.

Extension (from Lat. *ex-tendere*, to spread out).—That material substance is not perfectly continuous in its structure, as it appears to our gross senses, the physical sciences demonstrate. The microscope reveals pores in the most compact matter, while the permeation of gases and even of liquids through solids indicates that the densest bodies would probably present to a sufficiently penetrating eye a sponge-like structure throughout. This fact, together with the difficulty of explaining how the senses can perceive extension, has led many theorists to deny its objectivity, although, on the other hand, the first of modern philosophers, Descartes, was so impressed by the universality of extension that he held it to be the very essence of matter. Kant makes extension a subjective form, an original condition of sensuous faculty which when stimulated by the sense-object stamps the impression accordingly. Others, with Leibniz, resolve matter into simple unextended points (monads), which by their agitation are supposed to produce in us the impression of continuous extension. Others, with Boscovich (d. 1787), subtilize matter into simple forces which some hold to be "virtually" extended. The Atomists (physical and chemical) dissolve bodies into minute particles or atoms (which some consider to be absolutely, others only physically, indivisible) of certain elementary substances, which hitherto have defied further analysis but which may eventually turn out to be merely varying arrangements of some primordial homogeneous material, the radical constituent of the universe. The present teaching of Catholic philosophy on the subject may be summarized as follows: Extension is either successive (fluent, as that of a stream and of time), or permanent. The latter may be viewed as either (a) continuous (mathematical, i. e. abstract, as a line; or physical), when the entitative or integrant parts into which its immediate subject, material substance, is divisible are united (perfectly or imperfectly) throughout, e.g. a homogeneous wire; (b) contiguous, when the said parts are conjoined only by contact, e. g. a brick wall; (c) interrupted, when those parts are in some degree disjoined, though connected by an intermediate, e. g. a string of beads. We are here occupied with continuous extension only.

Continuous extension may be described as that property in virtue whereof the parts into which material substance is divisible are situally arranged in orderly relation one beyond the other (internal and potentially local extension) and hence are naturally commensurate with the corresponding parts of the immediately environing surfaces (external and actual local extension). Consequent attributes of extension are divisibility, measurability, and impenetrability. Wherein precisely the essence of extension consists, is a controverted question. Probably the more general opinion is that extension radically and essentially consists in the internal distribution of the parts into which matter is divisible, and that external extension, or the correspondence of those parts to the parts of the locating surfaces, is a sequent property of essential or internal extension. Of course this does not explain extension. Some nearer approach to an explanation may be found in the opinion of a recent writer (Pecsi) who makes extension consist in the expansive and cohesive forces of matter—the former causing the said parts to spread out, the latter keeping them united.

Continuous extension is an objective property of matter, not a mere mental form moulding the sensuous impression produced in the sensory organs by some sort of physical motion. What it is that extension immediately affects—whether the ultimate atoms, the constituent molecules, or the gross mass of matter—we are unable in the present stage of physical science to decide. Even should it turn out, however, as many conjecture, that the densest solid—to say nothing of a liquid or a gas—is but what might be called an "infinitely" complex arrangement of infinitesimal corpuscles—atoms or electrons—gyrating in a matrix of ether, continuous extension would still remain real (objective), though it would then be the immediate property of the constituent corpuscles and the ether instead of a property of the gross mass. It is experimentally demonstrable that sensuous impressions are aroused in us by bodies as extended and resistent. Now if bodies were constituted of simple, unextended points—monads or forces—these could not stimulate the sensory organs, since such elements, apart from the fact that they would all coalesce and copenetrate, could not be the subjects of material activity (etherial or aerial vibrations, chemical reactions, i. e. the immediate sense-stimuli). Nor could the organs evoke the sensation, since in the hypothesis they, too, being made up of unextended elements, would be incapable of material action. Neither will it do to say that the motion of the supposed "points" might evoke sensation, since being unextended they would be imperceptible whether in motion or at rest.

Extension is an "absolute accident", that is not a mere mode in which substance exists, as, for instance, are motion and rest. It seems to have a certain distinct entity of its own. This, of course, would most probably never have been suspected by the human mind unaided by Revelation. But given the doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, wherein the extensional dimensions and sensible qualities of bread and wine persist after the conversion of the substance of the bread and wine into His Body and Blood, reason, speculating on the doctrine, discerns some grounds for the possibility of the real distinction and even severance between substance and local extension. In the first place there are motives for inferring a real distinction between substance and extension (actual and local), or, in other words, that extension does not constitute the essence of material substance (as Descartes maintained that it does): (a) substance is the root principle of action; extension as such is either inactive or at most a proximate principle; (b) substance is the ground of specification; extension as such is indifferent to any species, since shape or figure which is the dimensional termination of extension depends upon the specific form; (c) substance is identical in the entire mass and in each of its parts (e. g. in gold), while extension is not the same in the whole and in each of its parts; (d) substance is the principle of unity; extension is the formal principle of plurality; (e) substance essentially demands three dimensions; extension may be realized in one or two; (f) substance remaining the same, extension may increase or decrease.

Given a real distinction between extension and substance, no intrinsic impossibility can be proven to exist in the separation of one from the other, for although internal extension naturally demands external, there is no evidence that the demand is so essentially imperative that Omnipotence cannot supernaturally suspend its realization and by other means afford the accidents—extension and the rest—the support which the substance naturally supplies. Since material substance owes the distribution of its integral parts to extension, the question arises whether, independently of extension, it possesses any such parts (it, of course, possesses parts essential to corporeal substance, matter and form), or is simple, indivisible. St. Thomas and many others maintain that substance as such is indivisible. Suarez and others hold that it is divisible. For this and the other questions concerning the divisibility of extension, and the psychology of the subject, the reader is referred to the works mentioned below.

BALMES, *Fundamental Philosophy* (New York, 1864); FARGES, *L'Idée du Continu* (Paris, 1894); NYS, *Cosmologie* (Louvain, 1906); LADD, *Psychology Descriptive and Explanatory* (New York, 1895); IDEM, *Theory of Reality* (New York, 1899); GUTBERLET, *Naturphilosophie* (Münster, 1894); MAHER, *Psychology* (New York, 1903); WILLEMS, *Institutiones Philosophiæ* (Trier, 1906); HUGON, *Philosophia Naturalis* (Paris, 1907); PECSI, *Cursus brevis Philosophiæ* (Esztergom, Hungary, 1906).

F. P. SIEGFRIED.

Extravagantes (*extra*, outside; *vagari*, to wander).—This word is employed to designate some papal decretals not contained in certain canonical collections which possess a special authority, i. e. they are not found in the Decree of Gratian or the three official collections of the "Corpus Juris" (the Decretals of Gregory IX, the Sixth Book of the Decretals, and the Clementines). The term was first applied to those papal documents which Gratian had not inserted in his "Decree" (about 1140), but which, however, were obligatory upon the whole Church, also to other decretals of a later date, and possessed of the same authority. Bernard of Pavia designated under the name of "Breviarium Extravagantium", or Digest of the "Extravagantes", the collection of papal documents which he compiled between 1187 and 1191. Even the Decretals of Gregory IX (published 1234) were long known as the "Liber" or "Collectio Extra", i. e. the collection of the canonical laws not contained in the "Decree" of Gratian. This term is now applied to the collections known as the "Extravagantes Joannis XXII" and the "Extravagantes communes", both of which are found in all editions of the "Corpus Juris Canonici". When John XXII (1316–1334) published the decretals known as the Clementines, there already existed some pontifical documents, obligatory upon the whole Church but not included in the "Corpus Juris". This is why these Decretals were called "Extravagantes". Their number was increased by the inclusion of all the pontifical laws of later date, added to the manuscripts of the "Corpus Juris", or gathered into separate collections. In 1325 Zenselinus de Cassanis added a gloss to twenty constitutions of Pope John XXII, and named this collection "Viginti Extravagantes papæ Joannis XXII". The others were known as "Extravagantes communes", a title given to the collection by Jean Chappuis in the Paris edition of the "Corpus Juris" (1499–1505). He adopted the systematic order of the official collections of canon law, and classified in a similar way the "Extravagantes" commonly met with (hence "Extravagantes communes") in the manuscripts and editions of the "Corpus Juris". This collection contains decretals of the following popes: Martin IV, Boniface VIII (notably the celebrated Bull "Unam Sanctam"), Benedict XI, Clement V, John XXII, Benedict XII, Clement VI, Urban V, Martin V, Eugene IV, Callistus III, Paul II, Sixtus IV (1281–1484). Chappuis also classified the "Extravagantes" of John XXII under fourteen titles, containing in all twenty chapters. These two collections are of lesser value than the three others which form the "Corpus Juris Canonici"; they possess no official value, nor has custom bestowed such on them. On the other hand, many of the decretals comprised in them contain legislation obligatory upon the whole Church, e. g. the Constitution of Paul II, "Ambitiosæ", which forbade the alienation of ecclesiastical goods. This, however, is not true of all of them; some had even been formally abrogated at the time when Chappuis made his collection; three decretals of John XXII, are reproduced in both collections. Both the collections were printed in the official (1852.

edition of the "Corpus Juris Canonici". This explains the favour they enjoyed among canonists. For a critical text of these collections see Friedberg, "Corpus Juris Canonici" (Leipzig, 1879–1881), II.

(See CORPUS JURIS CANONICI; DECRETALS, PAPAL.)

General introductions to the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, by LAURIN, SCHNEIDER, SCHULTE, etc.; the manuals of canon law, especially those of VON SCHERER, WERNZ, SÄGMÜLLER, etc.; BICKELL, *Ueber die Entstehung und den heutigen Gebrauch der beiden Extravagantensammlungen des Corpus juris canonici* (Marburg, 1825).

A. VAN HOVE.

Extreme Unction is a sacrament of the New Law instituted by Christ to give spiritual aid and comfort and perfect spiritual health, including, if need be, the remission of sins, and also, conditionally, to restore bodily health, to Christians who are seriously ill; it consists essentially in the unction by a priest of the body of the sick person, accompanied by a suitable form of words. The several points embodied in this descriptive definition will be more fully explained in the following sections into which this article is divided: I. Actual Rite of Administration; II. Name; III. Sacramental Efficacy of the Rite; IV. Matter and Form; V. Minister; VI. Subject; VII. Effects; VIII. Necessity; IX. Repetition; X. Reviviscence of the Sacrament.

I. ACTUAL RITE OF ADMINISTRATION.—As administered in the Western Church to-day according to the rite of the Roman Ritual, the sacrament consists (apart from certain non-essential prayers) in the unction with oil, specially blessed by the bishop, of the organs of the five external senses (eyes, ears, nostrils, lips, hands), of the feet, and, for men (where the custom exists and the condition of the patient permits of his being moved), of the loins or reins; and in the following form repeated at each unction with mention of the corresponding sense or faculty: "Through this holy unction and His own most tender mercy may the Lord pardon thee whatever sins or faults thou hast committed [*quidquid deliquisti*] by sight [by hearing, smell, taste, touch, walking, carnal delectation]". The unction of the loins is generally, if not universally, omitted in English-speaking countries, and it is of course everywhere forbidden in case of women. To perform this rite fully takes an appreciable time, but in cases of urgent necessity, when death is likely to occur before it can be completed, it is sufficient to employ a single unction (on the forehead, for instance) with the general form: "Through this holy unction may the Lord pardon thee whatever sins or faults thou hast committed." By the decree of 25 April, 1906, the Holy Office has expressly approved of this form for cases of urgent necessity.

In the Eastern Orthodox (schismatical) Church this sacrament is normally administered by a number of priests (seven, five, three; but in case of necessity even one is enough); and it is the priests themselves who bless the oil on each occasion before use. The parts usually anointed are the forehead, chin, cheeks, hands, nostrils, and breast, and the form used is the following: "Holy Father, physician of souls and of bodies, Who didst send Thy Only-Begotten Son as the healer of every disease and our deliverer from death, heal also Thy servant N. from the bodily infirmity that holds him, and make him live through the grace of Christ, by the intercessions of [certain saints who are named], and of all the saints." (Goar, Euchologion, p. 417.) Each of the priests who are present repeats the whole rite.

II. NAME.—The name *Extreme Unction* did not become technical in the West till towards the end of the twelfth century, and has never become current in the East. Some theologians would explain its origin on the ground that this unction was regarded as the last in order of the sacramental or quasi-sacramental unctions, being preceded by those of baptism, confirmation, and Holy orders; but, having regard to the conditions prevailing at the time when the name was introduced (see below, VI), it is much more probable that it was intended originally to mean "the unction of those *in extremis*", i. e. of the dying, especially as the corresponding name, *sacramentum exeuntium*, came into common use during the same period. In previous ages the sacrament was known by a variety of names, e. g., the holy oil, or unction, of the sick; the unction or blessing of consecrated oil; the unction of God; the office of the unction; etc. In the Eastern Church the later technical name is εὐχέλαιον (i. e. prayer-oil); but other names have been and still are in use, e. g. ἔλαιον ἅγιον (holy), or ἡγιασμένον (consecrated), ἔλαιον, ἐλαίου Χρῖσις, χρῖσμα, etc.

III. SACRAMENTAL EFFICACY OF THE RITE.—(A) *Catholic Doctrine.*—The Council of Trent (Sess. XIV, cap. i, De Extr. Unct.) teaches that "this sacred unction of the sick was instituted by Christ Our Lord as a sacrament of the New Testament, truly and properly so called, being insinuated indeed in Mark [vi, 13] but commended to the faithful and promulgated" by James [Ep., v, 14, 15]; and the corresponding canon (can. i, De Extr. Unct.) anathematizes anyone who would say "that extreme unction is not truly and properly a sacrament instituted by Christ Our Lord, and promulgated by the blessed Apostle James, but merely a rite received from the fathers, or a human invention". Already at the Council of Florence, in the Instruction of Eugene IV for the Armenians (Bull "Exultate Deo", 22 Nov., 1439), extreme unction is named as the fifth of the Seven Sacraments, and its matter and form, subject, minister, and effects described (Denzinger, "Enchiridion", 10th ed., Freiburg, 1908, no. 700—old no. 595). Again, it was one of the three sacraments (the others being confirmation and matrimony) which Wycliffites and Hussites were under suspicion of contemning, and about which they were to be specially interrogated at the Council of Constance by order of Martin V (Bull "Inter cunctas", 22 Feb., 1418.—Denzinger, op. cit., no. 669—old no. 563). Going back farther we find extreme unction enumerated among the sacraments in the profession of faith subscribed for the Greeks by Michael Palæologus at the Council of Lyons in 1274 (Denzinger, no. 465—old no. 388), and in the still earlier profession prescribed for converted Waldenses by Innocent III in 1208 (Denzinger, no. 424—old no. 370). Thus, long before Trent—in fact from the time when the definition of a sacrament in the strict sense had been elaborated by the early Scholastics—extreme unction had been recognized and authoritatively proclaimed as a sacrament; but in Trent for the first time its institution by Christ Himself was defined. Among the older Schoolmen there had been a difference of opinion on this point, some—as Hugh of St. Victor (De Sacram., Bk. II, pt. XV, c. ii), Peter Lombard (Sent., IV, dist. xxiii), St. Bonaventure (Comm. in Sent., loc. cit., art. i, Q. ii), and others—holding against the more common view that this sacrament had been instituted by the Apostles after the Descent of the Holy Ghost and under His inspiration. But since Trent it must be held as a doctrine of Catholic faith that Christ is at least the mediate author of extreme unction, i. e., that it is by His proper authority as God-Man that the prayer-unction has become an efficacious sign of grace; and theologians almost unanimously maintain that we must hold it to be at least certain that Christ was in some sense the immediate author of this sacrament, i. e., that He Himself while on earth commissioned the Apostles to employ some such sign for conferring special graces, without, however, necessarily specifying the matter and form to be used. In other words, immediate institution by Christ is compatible with a mere generic determination by Him of the physical elements of the sacrament.

The teaching of the Council of Trent is directed chiefly against the Reformers of the sixteenth century.

Luther denied the sacramentality of extreme unction and classed it among rites that are of human or ecclesiastical institution (De Captivit. Babylonicâ, cap. de extr. unct.). Calvin had nothing but contempt and ridicule for this sacrament, which he described as a piece of "histrionic hypocrisy" (Instit., IV, xix, 18). He did not deny that the Jacobean rite may have been a sacrament in the Early Church, but held that it was a mere temporary institution which had lost all its efficacy since the charisma of healing had ceased (Comm. in Ep. Jacobi, v, 14, 15). The same position is taken up in the confessions of the Lutheran and Calvinistic bodies. In the first edition (1551) of the Edwardine Prayer Book for the reformed Anglican Church the rite of unction for the sick, with prayers that are clearly Catholic in tone, was retained; but in the second edition (1552) this rite was omitted, and the general teaching on the sacraments shows clearly enough the intention of denying that extreme unction is a sacrament. The same is to be said of the other Protestant bodies, and down to our day the denial of the Tridentine doctrine on extreme unction has been one of the facts that go to make up the negative unanimity of Protestantism. At the present time, however, there has been a revival more or less among Anglicans of Catholic teaching and practice. "Some of our clergy", writes Mr. Puller (Anointing of the Sick in Scripture and Tradition, London, 1904), "seeing the plain injunction about Unction in the pages of the New Testament, jump hastily to the conclusion that the Roman teaching and practice in regard to Unction is right, and seek to revive the use of Unction as a channel of sanctifying grace, believing that grace is imparted sacramentally through the oil as a preparation for death" (p. 307). Mr. Puller himself is not prepared to go so far, though he pleads for the revival of the Jacobean unction, which he regards as a mere sacramental instituted for the supernatural healing of bodily sickness only. His more advanced friends can appeal to the authority of one of their classical writers, Bishop Forbes of Brechin, who admits (Exposition of the XXXIX Articles, vol. II, p. 463) that "the unction of the sick is the Lost Pleiad of the Anglican firmament. . . . There has been practically lost an apostolic practice, whereby, in case of grievous sickness, the faithful were anointed and prayed over, for the forgiveness of their sins, and to restore them, if God so willed, or to give them spiritual support in their maladies".

Previous to the Reformation there appears to have been no definite heresy relating to this sacrament in particular. The Albigenses are said to have rejected it, the meaning probably being that its rejection, like that of other sacraments, was logically implied in their principles. The abuses connected with its administration which prevailed in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and which tended to make it accessible only to the rich, gave the Waldenses a pretext for denouncing it as the *ultima superbia* (cf. Preger, Beiträge zur Gesch. der Waldenser im M. A., pp. 66 sqq.). That the Wycliffites and Hussites were suspected of contemning extreme unction is clear from the interrogatory already referred to, but the present writer has failed to discover any evidence of its specific rejection by these heretics.

(B) *Proof of Catholic Doctrine from Holy Scripture.*—In this connexion there are only two texts to be discussed—Mark, vi, 13, and James, v, 14, 15—and the first of these may be disposed of briefly. Some ancient writers (Victor of Antioch, Theophylactus, Euthymius, St. Bede, and others) and not a few Scholastics saw a reference to this sacrament in this text of St. Mark, and some of them took it to be a record of its institution by Christ or at least a proof of His promise or intention to institute it. Some post-Tridentine theologians also (Maldonatus, de Sainte-Beuve, Berti, Mariana, and among recent writers, but in a modified form, Schell) have maintained that the unction here mentioned was sacramental. But the great majority of theologians and commentators have denied the sacramentality of this unction on the grounds: (1) that there is mention only of bodily healing as its effect (cf. Matt., x, 1; Luke, ix, 1, 2); (2) that many of those anointed had probably not received Christian baptism; (3) that the Apostles had not yet been ordained priests; and (4) that penance, of which extreme unction is the complement, had not yet been instituted as a sacrament. Hence the guarded statement of the Council of Trent that extreme unction as a sacrament is merely "insinuated" in St. Mark, i. e. hinted at or prefigured in the miraculous unction which the Apostles employed, just as Christian baptism had been prefigured by the baptism of John.

The text of St. James reads: "Is any man sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save [σώσει] the sick man: and the Lord shall raise him up [ἐγερεῖ]: and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him." It is not seriously disputed that there is question here of those who are physically ill, and of them alone; and that the sickness is supposed to be grave is conveyed by the word κάμνοντα and by the injunction to have the priests called in; presumably the sick person cannot go to them. That by "the priests of the church" are meant the hierarchical clergy, and not merely elders in the sense of those of mature age, is also abundantly clear. The expression τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους, even if used alone, would naturally admit no other meaning, in accordance with the usage of the Acts, Pastoral Epistles, and I Peter (v); but the addition of τῆς ἐκκλησίας excludes the possibility of doubt (cf. Acts, xx, 17). The priests are to pray over the sick man, anointing him with oil. Here we have the physical elements necessary to constitute a sacrament in the strict sense: oil as remote matter, like water in baptism; the anointing as proximate matter, like immersion or infusion in baptism; and the accompanying prayer as form. This rite will therefore be a true sacrament if it has the sanction of Christ's authority, and is intended by its own operation to confer grace on the sick person, to work for his spiritual benefit. But the words "in the name of the Lord" here mean "by the power and authority of Christ", which is the same as to say that St. James clearly implies the Divine institution of the rite he enjoins. To take these words as referring to a mere invocation of Christ's name—which is the only alternative interpretation—would be to see in them a needless and confusing repetition of the injunction "let them pray over him". But is this rite recommended by St. James as an operative sign of grace? It may be admitted that the words "the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up", taken by themselves and apart from the context, might possibly be applied to mere bodily healing; but the words that follow, "and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him", speak expressly of a spiritual effect involving the bestowal of grace. This being so, and it being further assumed that the remission of sins is given by St. James as an effect of the prayer-unction, nothing is more reasonable than to hold that St. James is thinking of spiritual as well as of bodily effects when he speaks of the sick man being "saved" and "raised up".

It cannot be denied that in accordance with New-Testament usage the words in question (especially the first) are capable of conveying this twofold meaning, and it is much more natural in the present context to suppose that they do convey it. A few verses further on the predominating spiritual and eschatological connotation of "saving" in St. James's mind emerges clearly in the expression, "shall save his soul from death" (v, 20), and without necessarily excluding a reference to deliverance from bodily death in verse 15,

we are certainly justified in including in that verse a reference to the saving of the soul. Moreover, the Apostle could not, surely, have meant to teach or imply that every sick Christian who was anointed would be cured of his sickness and saved from bodily death; yet the unction is clearly enjoined as a permanent institution in the Church for all the sick faithful, and the saving and raising up are represented absolutely as being the normal, if not infallible, effect of its use. We know from experience (and the same has been known and noted in the Church from the beginning) that restoration of bodily health does not as a matter of fact normally result from the unction, though it does result with sufficient frequency and without being counted miraculous to justify us in regarding it as one of the Divinely (but conditionally) intended effects of the rite. Are we to suppose, therefore, that St. James thus solemnly recommends universal recourse to a rite which, after all, will be efficacious for the purpose intended only by way of a comparatively rare exception? Yet this is what would follow if it be held that there is reference exclusively to bodily healing in the clauses which speak of the sick man being saved and raised up, and if further it be denied that the remission of sins spoken of in the following clause, and which is undeniably a spiritual effect, is attributed to the unction by St. James. This is the position taken by Mr. Puller; but, apart from the arbitrary and violent breaking up of the Jacobean text which it postulates, such a view utterly fails to furnish an adequate rationale for the universal and permanent character of the Apostolic prescription. Mr. Puller vainly seeks an analogy (op. cit., pp. 289 sqq.) in the absolute and universal expressions in which Christ assures us that our prayers will be heard. We admit that our rightly disposed prayers are always and infallibly efficacious for our ultimate spiritual good, but not by any means necessarily so for the specific temporal objects or even the proximate spiritual ends which we ourselves intend. Christ's promises regarding the efficacy of prayer are fully justified on this ground; but would they be justified if we were compelled to verify them by reference merely to the particular temporal boons we ask for? Yet this is how, on his own hypothesis, Mr. Puller is obliged to justify St. James's assurance that the prayer-unction shall be efficacious. But in the Catholic view, which considers the temporal boon of bodily healing as being only a conditional and subordinate end of the unction, while its paramount spiritual purpose—to confer on the sick and dying graces which they specially need—may be, and is normally, obtained, not only is an adequate rationale of the Jacobean injunction provided, but a true instead of a false analogy with the efficacy of prayer is established.

But in defence of his thesis Mr. Puller is further obliged to maintain that all reference to the effects of the unction ceases with the words, "the Lord shall raise him up", and that in the clause immediately following, "and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him", St. James passes on to a totally different subject, namely, the Sacrament of Penance. But unless we agree to disregard the rules of grammar and the logical sequence of thought, it is impossible to allow this separation of the clauses and this sudden transition in the third clause to a new and altogether unexpected subject-matter. All three clauses are connected in the very same way with the unction, "*and* the prayer of faith . . . *and* the Lord . . . *and* if he be in sins . . .", so that the remission of sins is just as clearly stated to be an effect of the unction as the saving and raising up. Had St. James meant to speak of the effect of priestly *absolution* in the third clause he could not have written in such a way as inevitably to mislead the reader into believing that he was still dealing with an effect of the priestly *unction*. In the nature of things there is no reason why unction as well as absolution by a priest might not be Divinely ordained for the sacramental remission of sin, and that it was so ordained is what every reader naturally concludes from St. James. Nor is there anything in the context to suggest a reference to the Sacrament of Penance in this third clause. The admonition in the following verse (16), "Confess, therefore, your sins one to another", may refer to a mere liturgical confession like that expressed in the "Confiteor"; but even if we take the reference to be to sacramental confession and admit the genuineness of the connecting "therefore" (its genuineness is not beyond doubt), there is no compelling reason for connecting this admonition closely with the clause which immediately precedes. The "therefore" may very well be taken as referring vaguely to the whole preceding Epistle and introducing a sort of epilogue.

Mr. Puller's is the latest and most elaborate attempt to evade the plain meaning of the Jacobean text that we have met with; hence our reason for dealing with it so fully. It would be an endless task to notice the many other similarly arbitrary devices of interpretation to which Protestant theologians and commentators have recurred in attempting to justify their denial of the Tridentine teaching so clearly supported by St. James (see examples in Kern, "De Sacramento Extremæ Unctionis", Ratisbon, 1907, pp. 60 sq.). It is enough to remark that the number of mutually contradictory interpretations they have offered is a strong confirmation of the Catholic interpretation, which is indeed the only plain and natural one, but which they are bound to reject at the outset. In contrast with their disregard of St. James's injunction and their hopeless disagreement as to what the Apostle really meant, we have the practice of the whole Christian world down to the time of the Reformation in maintaining the use of the Jacobean rite, and the agreement of East and West in holding this rite to be a sacrament in the strict sense, an agreement which became explicit and formal as soon as the definition of a sacrament in the strict sense was formulated, but which was already implicitly and informally contained in the common practice and belief of preceding ages. We proceed, therefore, to study the witness of Tradition.

(C) *Proof from Tradition.*—(1) State of the Argument.—Owing to the comparative paucity of extant testimonies from the early centuries relating to this sacrament, Catholic theologians habitually recur to the general argument from prescription, which in this case may be stated briefly thus: The uninterrupted use of the Jacobean rite and its recognition as a sacrament in the Eastern and Western Churches, notwithstanding their separation since 869, proves that both must have been in possession of a common tradition on the subject prior to the schism. Further, the fact that the Nestorian and Monophysite bodies, who separated from the Church in the fifth century, retained the use of the unction of the sick, carries back the undivided tradition to the beginning of that century, while no evidence from that or any earlier period can be adduced to weaken the legitimate presumption that the tradition is Apostolic, having its origin in St. James's injunction. Both of these broad facts will be established by the evidence to be given below, while the presumption referred to will be confirmed by the witness of the first four centuries.

As to the actual paucity of early testimonies, various explanations have been offered. It is not sufficient to appeal with Binterim (Die Vorzüglichsten Denkwürdigkeiten der christkathol. Kirche, vol. VI, pt. III, p. 241) to the Discipline of the Secret, which, so far as it existed, applied equally to other sacraments, yet did not prevent frequent reference to them by writers and preachers of those ages. Nor is Launoi's contention (Opera, vol. I, pt. I, pp. 544 sq.) well founded, that recourse to this sacrament was much rarer in early ages than later. It is more to the point in the first place to recall the loss, except for a few fragments, of

several early commentaries on St. James's Epistle (by Clement of Alexandria, Didymus, St. Augustine, St. Cyril of Alexandria, and others) in which chiefly we should look for reference to the unction. The earliest accurately preserved commentary is that of St. Bede (d. 735), who, as we shall see, is a witness for this sacrament, as is also Victor of Antioch (fifth century), the earliest commentator on St. Mark. Second, it is clear, at the period when testimonies become abundant, that the unction was allied to penance as a supplementary sacrament, and as such was administered regularly before the Viaticum. We may presume that this order of administration had come down from remote antiquity, and this close connexion with penance, about which, as privately administered to the sick, the Fathers rarely speak, helps to explain their silence on extreme unction. Third, it should be remembered that there was no systematic sacramental theology before the Scholastic period, and, in the absence of the interests of system, the interests of public instruction would call far less frequently for the treatment of this sacrament and of the other offices privately administered to the sick than would subjects of such practical public concern as the preparation of catechumens and the administration and reception of those sacraments which were solemnly conferred in the church. If these, and similar considerations which might be added, are duly weighed, it will be seen that the comparative fewness of early testimonies is not after all so strange. It should be observed, moreover, that charismatic and other unctions of the sick, even with consecrated oil, distinct from the Jacobean unction, were practised in the early ages, and that the vagueness of not a few testimonies which speak of the anointing of the sick makes it doubtful whether the reference is to the Apostolic rite or to some of these other usages.

It should finally be premised that in stating the argument from tradition a larger place must be allowed for the principle of development than theologians of the past were in the habit of allowing. Protestant controversialists were wont virtually to demand that the early centuries should speak in the language of Trent—even Mr. Puller is considerably under the influence of this standpoint—and Catholic theologians have been prone to accommodate their defence to the terms of their adversaries' demand. Hence they have undertaken in many cases to prove much more than they were strictly bound to prove, as for instance that extreme unction was clearly recognized as a sacrament in the strict sense long before the definition of a sacrament in this sense was drawn up. It is a perfectly valid defence of the Tridentine doctrine on extreme unction to show that St. James permanently prescribed the rite of unction in terms that imply its strictly sacramental efficacy; that the Church for several centuries simply went on practising the rite and believing in its efficacy as taught by the Apostle, without feeling the need of a more definitely formulated doctrine than is expressed in the text of his Epistle; and that finally, when this need had arisen, the Church, in the exercise of her infallible authority, did define for all time the true meaning and proper efficacy of the Jacobean prayer-unction. It is well to keep this principle in mind in discussing the witness of the early ages, though as a matter of fact the evidence, as will be seen, proves more than we are under any obligation to prove.

(2) The Evidence.—(a) Ante-Nicene Period.—The earliest extant witness is Origen (d. 254), who, in enumerating the several ways of obtaining remission of sins, comes (seventhly) to "the hard and laborious" way of (public) penance, which involves the confession of one's sins to the priest and the acceptance at his hands of "the salutary medicine". And having quoted the Psalmist in support of confession, Origen adds: "And in this [*in quo*] is fulfilled also what St. James the Apostle says: if any one is sick, let him call in the priests of the Church, and let them *lay hands on him*, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and if he be in sins they shall be remitted to him" (Hom. ii, in Levit., in P. G., XII, 419). We might be content to quote this as a proof merely of the fact that the injunction of St. James was well known and observed in Origen's time, and that the rite itself was commonly spoken of at Alexandria as "a laying on of hands". But when it is urged that he here attributes the remission of sins of which the Apostle speaks, not to the rite of unction but to the Sacrament of Penance, it is worth while inquiring into the reasons alleged for this interpretation of the passage. Some would have it that Origen is allegorizing, and that he takes the sick man in St. James to mean the spiritually sick or the sinner, thus changing the Apostolic injunction to the following: If anyone be in sins, let him call in the priests . . . and *if* he be in sins, they shall be remitted to him. But we cannot suppose the great Alexandrian capable of such illogicalness on his own account, or capable of attributing it to the Apostle. According to Mr. Puller (op. cit., pp. 42 sqq.), Origen, while quoting the whole text of St. James, means in reality to refer only to the fulfilment of the concluding words, "and if he be in sins", etc. But if that be so, why quote the preceding part at all, which, in Mr. Puller's, and *ex hypothesi* in Origen's, view, has nothing to do with the subject and can only lead to confusion; and why, above all, omit the words of St. James immediately following, "Confess your sins one to another", which would have been very much to the point and could not have caused any confusion? The truth is that the relation of the Jacobean rite to penance is very obscurely stated by Origen; but, whatever may have been his views of that relation, he evidently means to speak of the whole rite, unction and all, and to assert that it is performed as a means of remitting sin for the sick. If it be held on the obscurity of the connexion that he absolutely identifies the Jacobean rite with penance, the only logical conclusion would be that he considered the unction to be a necessary part of penance for the sick. But it is much more reasonable and more in keeping with what we know of the penitential discipline of the period—Christian sinners were admitted to canonical penance only once—to suppose that Origen looked upon the rite of unction as a supplement to penance, intended for the sick or dying who either had never undergone canonical penance, or after penance might have contracted new sins, or who, owing to their "hard and laborious" course of satisfaction being cut short by sickness, might be considered to need just such a complement to absolution, this complement itself being independently efficacious to remit sins or complete their remission by removal of their effects. This would fairly account for the confused grouping together of both ways of remission in the text, and it is a Catholic interpretation in keeping with the conditions of that age and with later and clearer teaching. It is interesting to observe that John Cassian, writing nearly two centuries later, and probably with this very text of Origen before him, gives similar enumeration of means for obtaining remission of sins, and in this enumeration the Jacobean rite is given an independent place (Collat., XX, in P. L., XLIX, 1161).

Origen's contemporary, Tertullian, in upbraiding heretics for neglecting the distinction between clergy and laity and allowing even women "to teach, to dispute, to perform exorcisms, to *undertake cures* [*curationes repromittere*], perhaps even to baptize" (De Præscript., c. xli, in P. L., II, 262), probably refers in the italicized clause to the use of the Jacobean rite; for he did not consider charismatic healing, even with oil, to be the proper or exclusive function of the clergy (see "Ad Scapulam", c. iv, in P. L., I, 703). If this be so, Tertullian is a witness to the general use of the rite and

to the belief that its administration was reserved to the priests.

St. Aphraates, "the Persian Sage", though he wrote (336–345) after Nicæa, may be counted as an Ante-Nicene witness, since he lived outside the limits of the empire and remained in ignorance of the Arian strife. Writing of the various uses of holy oil, this Father says that it contains the sign "of the sacrament of life by which Christians [in baptism], priests [in ordination], kings, and prophets are made perfect; [it] illuminates darkness [in confirmation], *anoints the sick*, and by its secret sacrament restores penitents" (Demonstratio xxiii, 3, in Graffin, "Patrol. Syriaca", vol. I, p. lv). It is hardly possible to question the allusion here to the Jacobean rite, which was therefore in regular use in the remote Persian Church at the beginning of the fourth century. Its mention side by side with other unctions that are not sacramental in the strict sense is characteristic of the period, and merely shows that the strict definition of a sacrament had not been formulated. As being virtually Ante-Nicene we may give also the witness of the collection of liturgical prayers known as the "Sacramentary of Serapion". (Serapion was Bishop of Thmuis in the Nile Delta and the friend of St. Athanasius.) The seventeenth prayer is a lengthy form for consecrating the oil of the sick, in the course of which God is besought to bestow upon the oil a supernatural efficacy "for good grace and remission of sins, for a medicine of life and salvation, for health and soundness of soul, body, spirit, for perfect strengthening". Here we have not only the recognition in plain terms of spiritual effects from the unction but the special mention of grace and the remission of sins. Mr. Puller tries to explain away several of these expressions, but he has no refuge from the force of the words "for good grace and remission of sins" but to hold that they must be a later addition to the original text.

(b) The Great Patristic Age: Fourth to Seventh Century.—References to extreme unction in this period are much more abundant and prove beyond doubt the universal use of the Jacobean unction in every part of the Church. Some testimonies, moreover, refer specifically to one or more of the several ends and effects of the sacrament, as the cure or alleviation of bodily sickness and the remission of sins, while some may be said to anticipate pretty clearly the definition of extreme unction as a sacrament in the strict sense. As illustrating the universal use of the Jacobean unction, we may cite in the first place St. Ephraem Syrus (d. 373), who in his forty-sixth polemical sermon (Opera, Rome, 1740, vol. II, p. 541), addressing the sick person to whom the priests minister, says: "They pray over thee; one blows on thee; another seals thee." The "sealing" here undoubtedly means "anointing with the sign of the cross", and the reference to St. James is clear [see Bickell, Carmina Nisibena, Leipzig, 1866, pp. 223, 4, note, and the other passage (seventy-third *carmen*) there discussed]. Next we would call attention to the witness of an ancient Ordo compiled, it is believed, in Greek before the middle of the fourth century, but which is preserved only in a fragmentary Latin version made before the end of the fifth century and recently discovered at Verona ("Didascaliæ Apostolorum" in "Fragmenta Veronensia", ed. Hauler, Leipzig, 1900), and in an Ethiopic version. This Ordo in both versions contains a form for consecrating the oil for the Jacobean rite, the Latin praying for "the strengthening and healing" of those who use it, and the Ethiopic for their "strengthening and sanctification". Mr. Puller, who gives and discusses both versions (op. cit., p. 104 sq.), is once more obliged to postulate a corruption of the Ethiopic version because of the reference to sanctification. But may not the "strengthening" spoken of as distinct from "healing" be spiritual rather than corporal? Likewise the "Testamentum Domini", compiled in Greek about the year 400 or earlier, and preserved in Syriac (published by Rahmani), and in Ethiopic and Arabic versions (still in MSS.) contains a form for consecrating the oil of the sick, in which, besides bodily healing, the sanctifying power of the oil as applied to penitents is referred to (see "The Testament of Our Lord", tr. Cooper and Maclean, 1902, pp. 77, 78). From these instances it appears that Serapion's Sacramentary was not without parallels during this period.

In St. Augustine's "Speculum de Scripturâ" (an. 427; in P. L., XXXIV, 887–1040), which is made up almost entirely of Scriptural texts, without comment by the compiler, and is intended as a handy manual of Christian piety, doctrinal and practical, the injunction of St. James regarding the prayer-unction of the sick is quoted. This shows that the rite was a commonplace in the Christian practice of that age; and we are told by Possidius, in his "Life of Augustine" (c. xxvii, in P. L., XXXII, 56), that the saint himself "followed the rule laid down by the Apostle that he should visit only orphans and widows in their tribulation (James, i, 27), and that if he happened to be asked by the sick to pray to the Lord for them and *impose hands on them*, he did so without delay". We have seen Origen refer to the Jacobean rite as an "imposition of hands", and this title survived to a very late period in the Church of St. Ambrose, who was himself an ardent student of Origen and from whom St. Augustine very likely borrowed it (see Magistretti, "Manuale Ambrosianum ex Codice sæc. XI", etc., 1905, vol. I, p. 79 sq., 94 sq., 147 sq., where three different Ordines of the eleventh and thirteenth centuries have as title for the office of extreme unction, *impositio manuum super infirmum*). It is fair, then, to conclude from the biographer's statement that, when called upon to do so, St. Augustine himself used to administer the Jacobean unction to the sick. This would be exactly on the lines laid down by Augustine's contemporary, Pope Innocent I (see below). St. Ambrose himself, writing against the Novatians (De Pœnit., VIII, in P. L., XVI, 477), asks: "Why therefore do you *lay on hands* and believe it to be an effect of the blessing [*benedictionis opus*] if any of the sick happen to recover? . . . Why do you baptize, if sins cannot be remitted by men?" The coupling of this laying-on of hands with baptism and the use of both as arguments in favour of penance, shows that there is question not of mere charismatic healing by a simple blessing, but of a rite which, like baptism, was in regular use among the Novatians, and which can only have been the unction of St. James. St. Athanasius, in his encyclical letter of 341 (P. G., XXV, 234), complaining of the evils to religion caused by the intrusion of the Arian Bishop Gregory, mentions among other abuses that many catechumens were left to die without baptism and that many sick and dying Christians had to choose the hard alternative of being deprived of priestly ministrations —"which they considered a more terrible calamity than the disease itself"—rather than allow "the hands of the Arians to be laid on their heads". Here again we are justified in seeing a reference to extreme unction as an ordinary Christian practice, and a proof of the value which the faithful attached to the rite. Cassiodorus (d. about 570) thus paraphrases the injunction of St. James (Complexiones in Epp. Apostolorum, in P. L., LXX, 1380): "a priest is to be called in, who by the prayer of faith [*oratione fidei*] and the unction of the holy oil which he imparts will save him who is afflicted [by a serious injury or by sickness]."

To these testimonies may be added many instances of the use of extreme unction recorded in the lives of the saints. See, e. g., the lives of St. Leobinus (d. about 550; Acta SS., 14 March, p. 348), St. Tresanus (ibid., 7 Feb., p. 55), St. Eugene (Eoghan), Bishop of Ardsrath (modern Ardstraw, in the Diocese of Derry; d. about 618; ibid., 23 Aug., p. 627). One instance

from the life of an Eastern saint, Hypatius (d. about 446), is worthy of particular notice. While still a young monk and before his elevation to the priesthood, he was appointed infirmarian in his monastery (in Bithynia), and while occupying this office he showed a splendid example of charity in his care of the sick, whom he sought out and brought to the monastery. "But if the necessity arose", says his disciple and biographer, "of anointing the sick person, he reported to the abbot, who was a priest (ἦν γὰρ πρεσβύτερος), and had the unction with the blessed oil performed by him. And it often happened that in a few days, God co-operating with his efforts, he sent the man home restored to health" (Acta SS., 17 June, p. 251). It appears from this testimony that the Jacobean unction was administered only to those who were seriously ill, that only a priest could administer it, that consecrated oil was used, that it was distinct from charismatic unction (which the saint himself used to perform, while still a layman, using consecrated oil), and finally that bodily healing did not always follow and was not apparently expected to follow, and that when it did take place it was not regarded as miraculous. It is, therefore, implied that other effects besides bodily healing were believed to be produced by the Jacobean unction, and these must be understood to be spiritual.

As evidence of the use of the unction by the Nestorians we may refer to the nineteenth canon of the synod held at Seleucia in 554 under the presidency of the Patriarch Joseph, and which, speaking of those who have been addicted to various diabolical and superstitious practices, prescribes that any such person on being converted shall have applied to him, "*as to one who is corporally sick*, the oil of prayer blessed by the priests" (Chabot, Synodicon Orientale, 1902, p. 363). Here, besides the legitimate use of the Jacobean unction, we have an early instance of an abuse, which prevails in the modern Orthodox (schismatical) church, of permitting the *euchelaion* to be administered, on certain days of the year, to people who are in perfect health, as a complement of penance and a preparation for Holy Communion [see below VI, (3)]. That the Monophysites also retained the Jacobean unction after their separation from the Catholic Church (451) is clear from the fact that their liturgies (Armenian, Syrian, and Coptic) contain the rite for blessing the oil. There is reason to suppose that this portion of their liturgies in its present form has been borrowed from, or modelled upon, the Byzantine rite of a later period (see Brightman in "Journal of Theological Studies", I, p. 261), but this borrowing supposes that they already possessed the unction itself. It has nowadays fallen into disuse among the Nestorians and Armenians, though not among the Copts.

Many testimonies might be quoted in which the Jacobean unction is recommended specifically as a means of restoring bodily health, and the faithful are urged to receive it instead of recurring, as they were prone to do, to various superstitious remedies. This is the burden of certain passages in Procopius of Gaza [c. 465–525; "In Levit.", xix, 31, in P. G., LXXXVII (1), 762 sq.], Isaac of Antioch (b. about 350; Opp., ed. Bickell, Pt. I, pp. 187 sq.), St. Cyril of Alexandria (De Adorat. in Spiritu et Veritate, VI, in P. G., LXVIII, 470 sq.), St. Cæsarius of Arles (Serm. cclxxix, 5, "Append ad sermm. Augustini" in P. L., XXXIX, 2273), and John Mandakuni (Montagouni), Catholicos of the Armenians from 480 to 487 (Schmid, Reden des Joannes Mandakuni, pp. 222 sq.). This particular effect of the prayer-unction is the one specially emphasized in the form used to this day in the Orthodox Eastern Church (see above, I).

Mention of the remission of sins as an effect of the Jacobean rite is also fairly frequent. It is coupled with bodily healing by St. Cæsarius in the passage just referred to: the sick person will "receive both health of body and remission of sins, for the Holy Ghost has given this promise through James". We have mentioned the witness of John Cassian, and the witness of his master, St. Chrysostom, may be given here. In his work "On the Priesthood" (III, vi, in P. G., XLVIII, 644) St. Chrysostom proves the dignity of the priesthood by showing, among other arguments, that the priests by their spiritual ministry do more for us than our own parents can do. Whereas our parents only beget our bodies, which they cannot save from death and disease, the priests regenerate our souls in baptism and have power, moreover, to remit post-baptismal sins; a power which St. Chrysostom proves by quoting the text of St. James. This passage, like that of Origen discussed above, has given rise to no little controversy, and it is claimed by Mr. Puller (op. cit., pp. 45 sqq.) as a proof that St. Chrysostom, like Origen, understood St. James as he (Mr. Puller) does. But if this were so it would still be true that only clinical penance is referred to, for it is only of the sick that St. James can be understood to speak; and the main point of Mr. Puller's argument, viz., that it is inconceivable that St. Chrysostom should pass over the Sacrament of Penance in such a context, would have lost hardly any of its force. We know very little, except by way of inference and assumption, about the practice of clinical penance in that age; but we are well acquainted with canonical penance as administered to those in good health, and it is to this obviously we should expect the saint to refer, if he were bound to speak of that sacrament at all. Mr. Puller is probably aware how very difficult it would be to prove that St. Chrysostom anywhere in his voluminous writings teaches clearly and indisputably the necessity of confessing to a priest: in other words, that he recognizes the Sacrament of Penance as Mr. Puller recognizes it; and in view of this general obscurity on a point of fundamental importance it is not at all so strange that penance should be passed over here. We do not pretend to be able to enter into St. Chrysostom's mind, but assuming that he recognized both penance and unction to be efficacious for the remission of post-baptismal sins—and the text before us plainly states this in regard to the unction—we may perhaps find in the greater affinity of unction with baptism, and in the particular points of contrast he is developing, a reason why unction rather than penance is appealed to. Regeneration by water in baptism is opposed to parental generation, and saving by oil from spiritual disease and eternal death to the inability of parents to save their children from bodily disease and death. St. Chrysostom might have added several other points of contrast, but he confines himself in this context to these two; and supposing, as one ought in all candour to suppose, that he understood the text of St. James as we do, in its obvious and natural sense, it is evident that the prayer-unction, so much more akin to baptism in the simplicity of its ritual character and so naturally suggested by the mention of sickness and death, supplied a much apter illustration of the priestly power of remitting post-baptismal sins than the judicial process of penance. And a single illustrative example was all that the context required.

Victor of Antioch (fifth century) is one of the ancient witnesses who, in the general terms they employ in speaking of the Jacobean unction, anticipate more or less clearly the definition of a sacrament in the strict sense. Commenting on St. Mark, vi, 13, Victor quotes the text of St. James and adds: "Oil both cures pains and is a source of light and refreshment. The oil, then, used in anointing *signifies* both the mercy of God, and the cure of the disease, and the enlightening of the heart. For it is manifest to all that the prayer *effected* all this; but the oil, as I think, was the *symbol* of these things" (Cramer, Caten. Græc. Patrum, I, p. 324). Here we have the distinction, so well known in later theology, between the *signification*

and *causality* of a sacrament; only Victor attributes the signification entirely to the matter and the causality to the form (the prayer). This was to be corrected in the fully developed sacramental theory of later times, but the attribution of sacramental effects to the form (the prayer, the word, etc.) is characteristic of patristic suggestions of a theory. Victor clearly attributes both spiritual and corporal effects to the prayer-unction; nor can the fact that he uses the imperfect tense (ἐνήργει, "effected"; ὑπῆρχε, "was") be taken to imply that the use of the unction had ceased at Antioch in his day. The use of the present tense in describing the signification of the rite implies the contrary, and independent evidence is clearly against the supposition. In the passage from John Mandakuni, referred to above, the prayer-unction is repeatedly described as "the gift of grace", "the grace of God", Divinely instituted and prescribed, and which cannot be neglected and despised without incurring "the curse of the Apostles"; language which it is difficult to understand unless we suppose the Armenian patriarch to have reckoned the unction among the most sacred of Christian rites, or, in other words, regarded it as being what we describe as a sacrament in the strict sense (cf. Kern, op. cit., pp. 46, 47).

There remains to be noticed under this head the most celebrated of all patristic testimonies on extreme unction, the well-known passage in the Letter of Pope Innocent I (402–417), written in 416, to Decentius, Bishop of Eugubium, in reply to certain questions submitted by the latter for solution. In answer to the question as to who were entitled to the unction, the pope, having quoted the text of St. James, says: "There is no doubt that this text must be received or understood of the sick faithful, who may be [lawfully] anointed with the holy oil of chrism; which, having been blessed by the bishop, it is permitted not only to priests but to all Christians to use for anointing in their own need or that of their families." Then he diverges to point out the superfluous character of a further doubt expressed by Decentius: "We notice the superfluous addition of a doubt whether a bishop may do what is undoubtedly permitted to priests. For priests are expressly mentioned [by St. James] for the reason that bishops, hindered by other occupations, cannot go to all the sick. But if the bishop is able to do so or thinks anyone specially worthy of being visited, he, whose office it is to consecrate the chrism, need not hesitate to bless and anoint the sick person." Then, reverting to the original question, he explains the qualification he had added in speaking of "the sick faithful": "For this unction may not be given to penitents [i. e. to those undergoing canonical penance], seeing that it is a sacrament [*quia genus sacramenti est*]. For how is it imagined that one sacrament [*unum genus*] may be given to those to whom the other sacraments are denied?" The pope adds that he has answered all his correspondent's questions in order that the latter's Church may be in a position to follow "the Roman custom" (P. L., XX, 559 sq., Denzinger, no. 99—old no. 61). We do not, of course, suggest that Pope Innocent had before his mind the definition of a sacrament in the strict sense when he calls the Jacobean unction a sacrament, but since "the other sacraments" from which penitents were excluded were the Holy Eucharist and certain sacred offices, we are justified in maintaining that this association of the unction with the Eucharist most naturally suggests an implicit faith on the part of Pope Innocent in what has been explicitly taught by Scholastic theologians and defined by the Council of Trent. It is interesting to observe that Mr. Puller, in discussing this text (op. cit., pp. 53 sqq.), omits all reference to the Holy Eucharist, though it is by far the most obvious and important of "the other sacraments" of which Innocent is speaking, and diverts his reader's attention to the *eulogia*, or blessed bread (*pain bénit*), a sacramental which was in use in many churches at that time and in later ages, but to which there is not the least reason for believing that the pope meant specially to refer. In any case the reference is certainly not exclusive, as Mr. Puller leaves his reader to infer. What Pope Innocent, following the "Roman custom", explicitly teaches is that the "sacrament" enjoined by St. James was to be administered to the sick faithful who were not doing canonical penance; that priests, and a fortiori bishops, can administer it; but that the oil must be blessed by the bishop. The exclusion of sick penitents from this "sacrament" must be understood, of course, as being subject to the same exception as their exclusion from "the other sacraments", and the latter are directed to be given before the annual Easter reconciliation when danger of death is imminent: "Quando usque ad desperandum venerit, ante tempus paschæ relaxandum [est] ne de sæculo [ægrotus] absque communione discedat." If the words of Innocent—and the same observation applies to other ancient testimonies, e. g. to that of Cæsarius of Arles referred to above—seem to imply that the laity were permitted to anoint themselves or members of their household with the oil consecrated by the bishop, yet it is clear enough from the text of St. James and from the way in which Pope Innocent explains the mention of priests in the text, that this could not have been considered by him to be identical with the Jacobean rite, but to be at most a pious use of the oil allowable for devotional, and possibly for charismatic, purposes. But it would not be impossible nor altogether unreasonable to understand the language used by Innocent and others in a causative sense, i. e. as meaning not that the laity were permitted to anoint themselves, but that they were to have the blessed oil at hand to secure their being anointed by the priests according to the prescription of St. James. We believe, however, that this is a forced and unnatural way of understanding such testimonies, all the more so as there is demonstrative evidence of the devotional and charismatic use of sacred oil by the laity during the early centuries.

It is worth adding, as a conclusion to our survey of this period, that Innocent's reply to Decentius was incorporated in various early collections of canon law, some of which, as for instance that of Dionysius Exiguus (P. L., LXVII, 240), were made towards the end of the fifth or the beginning of the sixth century. In this way Innocent's teaching became known and was received as law in most parts of the Western Church.

(c) The Seventh Century and Later.—One of the most important witnesses for this period is St. Bede (d. 735), who, in his commentary on the Epistle of St. James, tells us (P. L., XCIII, 39) that, as in Apostolic times, so "now the custom of the Church is that the sick should be anointed by the priests with consecrated oil and through the accompanying prayer restored to health". He adds that, according to Pope Innocent, even the laity may use the oil provided it has been consecrated by the bishop; and commenting on the clause, "if he be in sins they shall be remitted to him", after quoting I Cor., xi, 30, to prove that "many because of sins committed in the soul are stricken with bodily sickness or death", he goes on to speak of the necessity of confession: "If, therefore, the sick be in sins and shall have confessed these to the priests of the Church and shall have sincerely undertaken to relinquish and amend them, they shall be remitted to them. For sins cannot be remitted without the confession of amendment. Hence the injunction is rightly added [by St. James], 'Confess, therefore, your sins one to another.'" St. Bede thus appears to connect the remission of sins in St. James's text with penance rather than the unction, and is therefore claimed by Mr. Puller as supporting his own interpretation of the text. But it should be observed that in asserting the necessity of confessing post-

baptismal sins, a necessity recognized in Catholic teaching, Bede *does not deny* that the unction *also* may be efficacious in remitting them, or at least in completing their remission, or in remitting the lighter daily sins which need not be confessed. The bodily sickness which the unction is intended to heal is regarded by St. Bede as being, often at any rate, the effect of sin; and it is interesting to notice that Amalarius of Metz, writing a century later (De Eccles. Offic., I, xii, in P. L., CV, 1011 sq.), with this passage of Bede before him, expressly attributes to the unction not only the healing of sickness due to the unworthy reception of the Eucharist, but the remission of daily sins: "What saves the sick is manifestly the prayer of faith, of which the sign is the unction of oil. If those whom the unction of oil, i. e. the grace of God through the prayer of the priest, assists are sick for the reason that they eat the Body of the Lord unworthily, it is right that the consecration [of the oil] of which there is question should be associated with the consecration of the Body and Blood of the Lord, which takes place in commemoration of the Passion of Christ, by Whom the author of sin has been eternally vanquished. The Passion of Christ destroyed the author of death; His grace, which is signified by the unction of oil, has destroyed his arms, which are daily sins."

The confusing way in which St. Bede introduces penance in connexion with the text of St. James is intelligible enough when we remember that the unction was regarded and administered as a complement of the Sacrament of Penance, and that no formal question had yet been raised about their respective independent effects. In the circumstances of the age it was more important to insist on the necessity of confession than to discuss with critical minuteness the effects of the unction, and one had to be careful not to allow the text of St. James to be misunderstood as if it dispensed with this necessity for the sick sinner. The passage in St. Bede merely proves that he was preoccupied with some such idea in approaching the text of St. James. Paschasius Radbertus (writing about 831) says from the same standpoint that "*according to the Apostle* when anyone is sick, recourse is to be had in the first place to confession of sins, then to the prayer of many, then to the sanctification of the unction [or, the unction of sanctification]" (De Corp. et Sang. Domini, c. viii, in P. L., CXX, 1292); and the same writer, in what he tells us of the death of his abbot, St. Adelhard of Corbie, testifies to the prevalence of an opinion that it was only those in sins who had need of the unction. The assembled monks, who regarded the holy abbot as "free from the burdens of sins", doubted whether they should procure the Apostolic unction for him. But the saint, overhearing the debate, demanded that it should be given at once, and with his dying breath exclaimed: "Now dismiss thy servant in peace, because I have received all the sacraments of Thy mystery" (P. L., CXX, 1547).

As proving the uninterrupted universality during this period of the practice of the Jacobean rite, with a clear indication in some instances of its strictly sacramental efficacy, we shall add some further testimonies from writers, synods, and the precepts of particular bishops. As doubts may be raised regarding the age of any particular expression in the early medieval liturgies, we shall omit all reference to them. There is all the less need to be exhaustive as the adversaries of Catholic teaching are compelled to admit that from the eighth century onwards the strictly sacramental conception of the Jacobean rite emerges clearly in the writings and legislation of both the Eastern and the Western Churches. Haymo, Bishop of Halberstadt (841–853), in his Homily on Luke, ix, 6 (P. L., CXVIII, 573), and Amulo, Bishop of Lyons (about 841), in his letter to Theobald (P. L., CXVI, 82), speak of the unction of the sick as an Apostolic practice. Prudentius, Bishop of Treves (about 843–861), tells how the holy virgin Maura asked to receive from his own hands "the Sacraments of the Eucharist and of Extreme Unction" (P. L., CXV, 1374; cf. Acta SS., 21 Sept., p. 272); and Jonas, Bishop of Orléans, in his "Institutio Laicalis" (about 829), after reprobating the popular practice of recurring in sickness to magical remedies, says: "It is obligatory on anyone who is sick to demand, not from wizards and witches, but from the Church and her priests, the unction of sanctified oil, a remedy which [as coming] from Our Lord Jesus Christ will benefit him not only in body but in soul" (III, xiv, in P. L., CVI, 122 sq.). Already the Second Council of Châlon-sur-Saône (813), in its forty-eighth canon, had prescribed as obligatory the unction enjoined by St. James, "since a medicine of this kind which heals the sicknesses of soul and of body is not to be lightly esteemed" (Hardouin, IV, 1040). The Council of Aachen in 836 warns the priest not to neglect giving penance and unction to the sick person (once his illness becomes serious), and when the end is seen to be imminent the soul is to be commended to God "more sacerdotali cum acceptione sacræ communionis" (cap. ii, can. v, ibid., 1397). The First Council of Mainz (847), held under the presidency of Rhabanus Maurus (cap. xxvi), prescribed in the same order the administration of penance, unction, and the Viaticum (Hardouin, V, 13); while the Council of Pavia (850), legislating, as seems clear from the wording of the capitulary (viii), according to the traditional interpretation of Pope Innocent's letter to Decentius (see above), directs preachers to be sedulous in instructing the faithful regarding "that salutary sacrament which James the Apostle commends . . . a truly great and very much to be desired mystery, by which, if asked for with faith, both sins are remitted and as a consequence corporal health restored" (ibid., III, 27; Denzinger, Freiburg, 1908, no. 315).

The statutes attributed to St. Sonnatius, Archbishop of Reims (about 600–631), and which are certainly anterior to the ninth century, direct (no. 15) that "extreme unction is to be brought to the sick person who asks for it", and "that the pastor himself is to visit him often, animating and duly preparing him for future glory" (P. L., LXXX, 445; cf. Hefele, Conciliengesch., III, 77). The fourth of the canons promulgated (about 745) by St. Boniface, the Apostle of Germany (see Hefele, III, 580 sq.), forbids priests to go on a journey "without the chrism, and the blessed oil, and the Eucharist", so that in any emergency they may be ready to offer their ministrations; and the twenty-ninth orders all priests to have the oil of the sick always with them and to warn the sick faithful to apply for the unction (P. L., LXXXIX, 821 sq.). In the "Excerptiones" of Egbert, Archbishop of York (732–766), the unction is mentioned between penance and the Eucharist, and ordered to be diligently administered (P. L., LXXXIX, 382). But no writer of this period treats of the unction so fully as, and none more undeniably regards it as a true sacrament in the strict sense than, Theodulf, Bishop of Orleans, and with him we will conclude our list of witnesses. A long section of his second *Capitulare*, published in 789, is taken up with the subject (P. L., CV, 220 sq.): "Priests are also to be admonished regarding the unction of the sick, and penance, and the Viaticum, lest anyone should die without the Viaticum." Penance is to be given first, and then, "if the sickness allow it," the patient is to be carried to the church, where the unction and Holy Communion are to be given. Theodulf describes the unction in detail, ordering fifteen, or three times five, crosses to be made with the oil to symbolize the Trinity and the five senses, but noting at the same time that the practice varies as to the number of anointings and the parts anointed. He quotes with approval the form used by the Greeks while anointing, in which remission of sins is expressly mentioned; and so clearly is the unction in his view intended as a preparation for

death that he directs the sick person after receiving it to commend his soul into the hands of God and bid farewell to the living. He enjoins the unction of sick children also on the ground that it sometimes cures them, and that penance is (often) necessary for them. Theodulf's teaching is so clear and definite that some Protestant controversialists recognize him as the originator in the West of the teaching which, as they claim, transformed the Jacobean rite into a sacrament. But from all that precedes it is abundantly clear that no such transformation occurred. Some previous writers, as we have seen, had explicitly taught and many had implied the substance of Theodulf's doctrine, to which a still more definite expression was later to be given. The Scholastic and Tridentine doctrine is the only goal to which patristic and medieval teaching could logically have led.

IV. Matter and Form.—(For the technical meaning of these terms in sacramental theology see Sacraments.)—(1) The *remote* matter of extreme unction is consecrated oil. No one has ever doubted that the oil meant by St. James is the oil of olives, and in the Western Church pure olive oil without mixture of any other substance seems to have been almost always used. But in the Eastern Church the custom was introduced pretty early of adding in some places a little water, as a symbol of baptism, in others a little wine, in memory of the good Samaritan, and, among the Nestorians, a little ashes or dust from the sepulchre of some saint. But that the oil must be blessed or consecrated before use is the unanimous testimony of all the ages. Some theologians, however, have held consecration to be necessary merely as a matter of precept, not essential for the validity of the sacrament, e. g. Victoria (Summ. Sacramentorum, no. 219), Juénin (Comm. hist. et dogm. de Sacram., D. vii, q. iii, c. i), de Sainte-Beuve (De Extr. Unct., D. iii, a. l), Drouven (De Re Sacramentariâ, Lib. VII, q. ii, c. i, 2); indeed Berti, while holding the opposite himself, admitted the wide prevalence of this view among the recent theologians of his day. But considering the unanimity of tradition in insisting on the oil being blessed, and the teaching of the Council of Trent (Sess. XIV) that "the Church has understood the matter [of this sacrament] to be oil blessed by the bishop", it is not surprising that by a decree of the Holy Office, issued 13 Jan., 1611, the proposition asserting the validity of extreme unction with the use of oil not consecrated by the bishop should have been proscribed as "rash and near to error" (Denzinger, no. 1628—old no. 1494), and that, to the question whether a parish priest could in case of necessity validly use for this sacrament oil blessed by himself, the same Holy Office, reaffirming the previous decree, should have replied in the negative (14 Sept., 1842; ibid., no. 1629—old no. 1495). These decisions only settle the dogmatic question provisionally and, so far as they affirm the necessity of *episcopal* consecration of the oil, are applicable only to the Western Church. As is well known, it is the officiating priest or priests who ordinarily bless the oil in the Eastern Orthodox Church, and there is no lack of evidence to prove the antiquity of this practice (see Benedict XIV, De Synod. Diœc., VIII, i, 4). For Italo-Greeks in communion with the Holy See the practice was sanctioned by Clement VIII in 1595 and by Benedict XIV (see ibid.) in 1742; and it has likewise been sanctioned for various bodies of Eastern Uniats down to our own day (see "Collect. Lacensis", II, pp. 35, 150, 582, 479 sq.; cf. Letter of Leo XIII, "De Discipl. Orient. conservandâ" in "Acta S. Sedis", XXVII, pp. 257 sq.). There is no doubt, therefore, that priests can be delegated to bless the oil validly, though there is no instance on record of such delegation being given to Western priests. But it is only the supreme authority in the Church that can grant delegation, or at least it may reserve to itself the power of granting it (in case one should wish to maintain that in the absence of reservation the ordinary bishop would have this power). The Eastern Uniats have the express approbation of the Holy See for their discipline, and, as regards the schismatical Orthodox, one may say either that they have the tacit approbation of the pope or that the reservation of episcopal power does not extend to them. In spite of the schism the pope has never wished or intended to abrogate the ancient privileges of the Orthodox in matters of this kind.

The prayers for blessing the oil that have come down to us differ very widely, but all of them contain some reference to the purpose of anointing the sick. Hence, at least in the case of a bishop, whose power is ordinary and not delegated, no special form would seem to be necessary for validity, provided this purpose is expressed. But where it is not at all expressed or intended, as in the forms at present used for blessing the chrism and the oil of catechumens, it appears doubtful whether either of these oils would be valid matter for extreme unction (cf. Kern, op. cit., p. 131). But in the nature of things there does not seem to be any reason why a composite form of blessing might not suffice to make the same oil valid matter for more than one sacrament.

(2) The *proximate* matter of extreme unction is the unction with consecrated oil. The parts anointed according to present usage in the Western and Eastern Churches have been mentioned above (I), but it is to be observed that even to-day there are differences of practice in various branches of the Orthodox Church (see Echos d'Orient, 1899, p. 194). The question is whether several unctions are necessary for a valid sacrament, and if so, which are the essential ones. Arguing from the practice with which they were acquainted and which they assumed to have existed always, the Scholastics not unnaturally concluded that the unctions of the five organs of sense were essential. This was the teaching of St. Thomas (Suppl., Q. xxxii, a. 6), who has been followed pretty unanimously by the School and by many later theologians down to our own day (e. g. Billot, De Sacramentis, II, p. 231) who set the method and tradition of the School above positive and historical theology. But a wider knowledge of past and present facts has made it increasingly difficult to defend this view, and the best theologians of recent times have denied that the unction of the five senses, any more than that of the feet or loins, is essential for the validity of the sacrament. The facts, broadly speaking, are these: that no ancient testimony mentions the five unctions at all, much less prescribes them as necessary, but most of them speak simply of unction in a way that suggests the sufficiency of a single unction; that the unction of the five senses has never been extensively practised in the East, and is not practised at the present time in the Orthodox Church, while those Uniats who practise it have simply borrowed it in modern times from Rome; and that even in the Western Church down to the eleventh century the practice was not very widespread, and did not become universal till the seventeenth century, as is proved by a number of sixteenth-century Rituals that have been preserved (for details and sources see Kern, op. cit., p. 133 sq.). In face of these facts it is impossible any longer to defend the Scholastic view except by maintaining that the Church has frequently changed the essential matter of the sacrament, or that she has allowed it to be invalidly administered during the greater part of her history, as she still allows without protest in the East. The only conclusion, therefore, is that as far as the matter is concerned nothing more is required for a valid sacrament than a true unction with duly consecrated oil, and this conclusion may henceforth be regarded as certain by reason of the recent decree of the Holy Office already referred to (I), which, though it speaks only of the form, evidently supposes that form to be used with a single

unction. Besides the authority of the Scholastic tradition, which was based on ignorance of the facts, the only dogmatic argument for the view we have rejected is to be found in the instruction of Eugene IV to the Armenians [see above, III (A)]. But in reply to this argument it is enough to remark that this decree is not a dogmatic definition but a disciplinary instruction, and that, if it were a definition, those who appeal to it ought in consistency to hold the unction of the feet and loins to be essential. It is hardly necessary to add that, while denying the necessity of the unctions prescribed in the Roman Ritual for the validity of the sacrament, there is no intention of denying the grave obligation of adhering strictly to the Ritual except, as the Holy Office allows, in cases of urgent necessity.

(3) The forms of extreme unction from the Roman Ritual and the Euchologion have been given above (I). However ancient may be either form in its substance, it is certain that many other forms substantially different from the present have been in use both in the East and the West (see Martène, "De Antiquis Eccl. Rit.", I, vii, 4; and Kern, op. cit., pp. 142–152); and the controversy among theologians as to what precise form or kind of form is necessary for the validity of the sacrament has followed pretty much the same lines as that about the proximate matter. That some form is essential, and that what is essential is contained in both the Eastern and Western forms now in use, is admitted by all. The problem is to decide not merely what words in either form may be omitted without invalidating the sacrament, but whether the words retained as essential must necessarily express a prayer—"the prayer of faith" spoken of by St. James. Both forms as now used are deprecatory, and for the West the Holy Office has decided what words may be omitted in case of necessity from the form of the Roman Ritual. That the form, whether short or long, must be a prayer-form, and that a mere indicative form, such as "I anoint thee" etc., would not be sufficient for validity, has been the opinion of most of the great Scholastics and of many later theologians. But not a few Scholastics of eminence, and nearly all later theologians who have made due allowance for the facts of history, have upheld the opposite view. For the fact is that the indicative form has been widely used in the East and still more widely in the West; it is the form we meet with in the very earliest Church Orders preserved, viz., those of the Celtic Church (see Warren, "Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church", e. g. p. 168: "I anoint thee with sanctified oil in the name of the Trinity that thou mayst be saved for ever and ever"; cf. p. 223). Among contemporary theologians Kern (op. cit., pp. 154 sq.), who is followed by Pohle (Lehrbuch der Dogmatik, 3d ed., Paderborn, 1908, III, 534), suggests a compromise by holding, on the one hand, that at least a virtual prayer-form is required by the text of St. James and, on the other hand, that the indicative forms that have been used are virtually deprecatory. But this seems to be only a subtle way of denying the *raison d'être* of the controversy; one might argue on the same principle that the forms of baptism, penance, and confirmation are virtually prayer-forms. Some of the so-called indicative forms may be reasonably construed in this way, but in regard to others we may say, with Benedict XIV, that "we do not know how a prayer can be discovered in certain other forms published from very many ancient Rituals by Ménard and Martène, in which there is used merely the words 'I anoint thee' without any thing else being added from which a prayer can be deduced or fashioned" (De Synod. Diœc., VIII, ii, 2). If it be insisted that prayer as such must be in some way an element in the sacrament, one may say that the prayer used in blessing the oil satisfies this requirement. What has been said in regard to the matter is to be repeated here, viz., that the dogmatic controversy about the form does not affect the disciplinary obligation of adhering strictly to the prescriptions of the Ritual, or, for cases of urgent necessity, to the decree of the Holy Office.

V. Minister.—(1) The Council of Trent has defined in accordance with the words of St. James that the proper ministers (*proprios ministros*) of this sacrament are the priests of the Church alone, that is bishops or priests ordained by them (Sess. XIV, cap. iii, and can. iv, De Extr. Unct.). And this has been the constant teaching of tradition, as is clear from the testimonies given above. Yet Launoi (Opp., I, 569 sq.) has maintained that deacons can be validly delegated by the bishop to administer extreme unction, appealing in support of his view to certain cases in which they were authorized in the absence of a priest to reconcile dying penitents and give them the Viaticum. But in none of these cases is extreme unction once mentioned or referred to, and one may not gratuitously assume that the permission given extended to this sacrament, all the more so as there is not a particle of evidence from any other source to support the assumption. The Carmelite Thomas Waldensis (d. 1430) inferred from the passage of Innocent I [see above, under III (C), (2), (b)] that, in case of necessity when no priest could be got, a layman or woman might validly anoint (Doctrinale Antiq. Fidei, II, clxiii, 3), and quite recently Boudinhon (Revue Cath. des Eglises, July, 1905, p. 401 sq.) has defended the same view and improved upon it by allowing the sick person to administer the sacrament to himself or herself. This opinion, however, seems to be clearly excluded by the definition of the Council of Trent that the priest alone is the "proper" minister of extreme unction. The word *proper* cannot be taken as equivalent merely to *ordinary*, and can only mean "Divinely authorized". And as to the unction of themselves or others by lay persons with the consecrated oil, it is clear that Pope Innocent, while sanctioning the pious practice, could not have supposed it to be efficacious in the same way as the unction by a priest or bishop, to whom alone in his view the administration of the Jacobean rite belonged. This lay unction was merely what we call today a sacramental. Clericatus (Decisiones de Extr. Unct., decis. lxxv) has held that a sick priest in case of necessity can validly administer extreme unction to himself; but he has no argument of any weight to offer for this opinion, which is opposed to all sacramental analogy (outside the case of the Eucharist) and to a decision of the Congregation of Propaganda issued 23 March, 1844. These several singular opinions are rejected with practical unanimity by theologians, and the doctrine is maintained that the priests of the Church, and they alone, can validly confer extreme unction.

(2) The use of the plural in St. James—"the priests of the Church"—does not imply that several priests are required for the valid administration of the sacrament. Writing, as we may suppose, to Christian communities in each of which there was a number of priests, and where several, if it seemed well, could easily be summoned, it was natural for the Apostle to use the plural without intending to lay down as a matter of necessity that several should actually be called in. The expression used is merely a popular and familiar way of saying: "Let the sick man call for priestly ministrations", just as one might say, "Let him call in the doctors", meaning, "Let him procure medical aid". The plural in either case suggests at the very most the desirability, if the circumstances permit, of calling in more than one priest or doctor, but does not exclude, as is obvious, the services of only one, if only one is available, or if for a variety of possible reasons it is better that only one should be summoned. As is evident from several of the witnesses quoted above (III), not only in the West but in the East the unction was often administered in the early

centuries by a single priest; this has been indeed at all times the almost universal practice in the West (for exceptions cf. Martène, op. cit., I, vii, 3; Kern, op. cit., p. 259). In the East, however, it has been more generally the custom for several priests to take part in the administration of the sacrament. Although the number seven, chosen for mystical reasons, was the ordinary number in many parts of the East from an earlier period, it does not seem to have been prescribed by law for the Orthodox Church before the thirteenth century (cf. Kern, op. cit., p. 260). But even those Oriental theologians who with Symeon of Thessalonica (fifteenth century) seem to deny the validity of unction by a single priest, do not insist on more than three as necessary, while most Easterns admit that one is enough in case of necessity (cf. Kern, op. cit., p. 261). The Catholic position is that either one or several priests may validly administer extreme unction; but when several officiate it is forbidden by Benedict XIV for the Italo-Greeks (Const. "Etsi Pastoralis", 1742) for one priest merely to anoint and another merely to pronounce the form, and most theologians deny the validity of the unction conferred in this way. The actual practice, however, of the schismatical churches is for each priest in turn to repeat the whole rite, both matter and form, with variations only in the non-essential prayers. This gives rise to an interesting question which will best be discussed in connexion with the repetition of the sacrament (below, IX).

VI. Subject.—(1) Extreme Unction may be validly administered only to Christians who have had the use of reason and who are in danger of death from sickness. That the subject must be baptized is obvious, since all the sacraments, besides baptism itself, are subject to this condition. This is implied in the text of St. James: "Is any man sick *among you?*" i. e. any member of the Christian community; and tradition is so clear on the subject that it is unnecessary to delay in giving proof. It is not so easy to explain on internal grounds why extreme unction must be denied to baptized infants who are sick or dying, while confirmation, for instance, may be validly administered to them; but such is undoubtedly the traditional teaching and practice. Except to those who were capable of penance extreme unction has never been given. If we assume, however, that the principal effect of extreme unction is to give, with sanctifying grace or its increase, the right to certain actual graces for strengthening and comforting and alleviating the sick person in the needs and temptations which specially beset him in a state of dangerous illness, and that the other effects are dependent on the principal, it will be seen that for those who have not attained, and will not attain, the use of reason till the sickness has ended in death or recovery, the right in question would be meaningless, whereas the similar right bestowed with the *character* in confirmation may, and normally does, realize its object in later life. It is to be observed in regard to children, that no age can be specified at which they cease to be incapable of receiving extreme unction. If they have attained sufficient use of reason to be capable of sinning even venially, they may certainly be admitted to this sacrament, even though considered too young according to modern practice to receive their First Communion; and in cases of doubt the unction should be administered conditionally. Those who have always been insane or idiotic are to be treated in the same way as children; but anyone who has ever had the use of reason, though temporarily delirious by reason of the disease or even incurably insane, is to be given the benefit of the sacrament in case of serious illness.

(2) Grave or serious bodily illness is required for the valid reception of extreme unction. This is implied in the text of St. James and in Catholic tradition (see above, III), and is formally stated in the decree of Eugene IV for the Armenians: "This sacrament is not to be given except to the sick person, of whose death fears are entertained" (Denzinger, no. 700—old no. 595), and in the teaching of the Council of Trent that "this unction is to be administered to the sick, but *especially* to those who seem to be at the point of death [*in exitu vitæ*]" (Sess. XIV, cap. iii, De Extr. Unct.). It is clear from these words of Trent that extreme unction is not for the dying alone, but for all the faithful who are seriously ill with any such sickness as involves danger of death (*discrimen vitæ*, ibid.), i. e. as may probably terminate fatally. How grave must be the illness or how proximate the danger of death is not determined by the council, but is left to be decided by the speculations of theologians and the practical judgment of priests directly charged with the duty of administering the sacrament. And there have been, and perhaps still are, differences of opinion and of practice in this matter.

(3) Down to the twelfth century in the Western Church the practice was to give the unction freely to all (except public penitents) who were suffering from any serious illness, without waiting to decide whether danger of death was imminent. This is clear from many testimonies quoted above (III). But during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries a change of practice took place, and the sacrament came to be regarded by many as intended only for the dying. The causes contributing to this change were: (a) the extortionate demands of the clergy on the occasion of administering the unction which prevented the poor or even those of moderate means from asking for it except as a last resource; (b) the influence of certain popular superstitions, as, for instance, that the person anointed could not, in case of recovery, use the rights of marriage, eat flesh meat, make a will, walk with bare feet, etc.; and (c) the teaching of the Scotist School and of other theologians that, as the principal effect of the sacrament was the final remission of venial sins, it should not be given except to those who could not recover, and were no longer able or at least likely to fall again into venial sin (St. Bonaventure, "Breviloquium", P. VI, c. xi; Scotus, "Report. Parisien.", dist. xxiii, Q. unica). It was doubtless under the influence of this teaching that one or two provincial synods of the sixteenth century described the subject of extreme unction as "the dangerously sick and almost dying" (Hardouin, X, 1848, 1535); and the neglect of the sacrament induced by these several causes resulted, during the disturbances of the sixteenth century, in its total abandonment in many parts of Germany and especially of Bavaria (Knöpfler, "Die Kelchbewegung in Bayern unter Herzog Albrecht V.", pp. 61 sq.; and on this whole matter see Kern, op. cit., pp. 282 sq.). In view of these facts, the oft-repeated accusation of the Eastern schismatics, that the Latins gave the sacrament only to the dying and withheld it from the seriously ill who were capable of receiving it, is not without foundation (Kern, op. cit., p. 274); but they were wrong in assuming that the Western Church as a whole or the Holy See is responsible for abuses of this kind. Church authority earnestly tried to correct the avarice of the clergy and the superstitions of the people, while the Scotist teaching, regarding the chief effect of the unction, was never generally admitted in the schools, and its post-Tridentine adherents have felt compelled to modify the practical conclusion which St. Bonaventure and Scotus had logically drawn from it. There still linger in the popular mind traces of the erroneous opinion that extreme unction is to be postponed till a sickness otherwise serious has taken a critical turn for the worse, and the danger of death become imminent; and priests do not always combat this idea as strongly as they ought to, with the result that possibly in many cases the Divinely ordained effect of corporal healing is rendered impossible except by a miracle. The best and most recent theological teaching is in favour of a lenient, rather than of

a severe, view of the gravity of the sickness, or the proximity of the danger of death, required to qualify for the valid reception of extreme unction; and this is clearly compatible with the teaching of the Council of Trent and is supported by the traditional practice of the first twelve centuries.

But if the Easterns have had some justification for their charge against the Westerns of unduly restricting the administration of this sacrament, the Orthodox Church is officially responsible for a widespread abuse of the opposite kind which allows the euchelaion to be given to persons in perfect health as a complement of penance and a preparation for Holy Communion. Many Western theologians, following Goar (Euchologion, pp. 349 sq.), have denied that this rite was understood and intended to be sacramental, though the matter and form were employed precisely as in the case of the sick; but, whatever may have been the intention in the past, it is quite certain at the present time that at least in the Constantinopolitan and Hellenic branches of the Orthodox Church the intention is to give the sacrament itself and no mere sacramental to those in sound health who are anointed (Kern, op. cit., 281). On the other hand, in the Russian Church, except in the metropolitan churches of Moscow and Novgorod on Maundy Thursday each year, this practice is reprobated, and priests are expressly forbidden in their faculties to give the euchelaion to people who are not sick (Kern, pp. 279 sq.; Fortescue, The Orthodox Eastern Church, London, 1907, p. 425). We have already noticed (III) among Nestorians what appears to have been a similar abuse, but in the Orthodox Church till long after the schism there is no evidence of its existence, and the teaching of Eastern theologians down to modern times, to which the Russians still adhere, has been at one with the Western tradition in insisting that the subject of this sacrament must be labouring under a serious sickness.

(4) Nor will danger, or even certainty, of death from any other cause than sickness qualify a person for extreme unction. Hence criminals or martyrs about to suffer death and others similarly circumstanced may not be validly anointed unless they should happen to be seriously ill. But illness caused by violence, as by a dangerous or fatal wound, is sufficient; and old age itself without any specific disease is held by all Western theologians to qualify for extreme unction, i. e. when senile decay has advanced so far that death already seems probable. In cases of lingering diseases, like phthisis or cancer, once the danger has become really serious, extreme unction may be validly administered even though in all human probability the patient will live for a considerable time, say several months; and the lawfulness of administering it in such cases is to be decided by the rules of pastoral theology. If in the opinion of doctors the sickness will certainly be cured, and all probable danger of death removed by a surgical operation, theologians are not agreed whether the person who consents to undergo the operation ceases thereby to be a valid subject for the sacrament. Kern holds that he does (op. cit., p. 299), but his argument is by no means convincing.

VII. Effects.—The decree of Eugene IV for the Armenians describes the effects of extreme unction briefly as "the healing of the mind and, so far as it is expedient, of the body also" (Denzinger, no. 700—old no. 595). In Sess. XIV, can. ii, De Extr. Unct., the Council of Trent mentions the conferring of grace, the remission of sins, and the alleviation of the sick, and in the corresponding chapter explains as follows the effects of the unction: "This effect is the grace of the Holy Ghost, whose unction blots out sins, if any remain to be expiated, and the consequences [*reliquias*] of sin, and alleviates and strengthens the soul of the sick person, by exciting in him a great confidence in the Divine mercy, sustained by which [confidence] he bears more lightly the troubles and sufferings of disease, and more easily resists the temptations of the demon lying in wait for his heel, and sometimes, when it is expedient for his soul's salvation, recovers bodily health." The remission of sins, as we have seen, is explicitly mentioned by St. James, and the other spiritual effects specified by the Council of Trent are implicitly contained, side by side with bodily healing, in what the Apostle describes as the saving and raising up of the sick man (see above, II).

(1) It is therefore a doctrine of Catholic faith that sins are remitted by extreme unction, and, since neither St. James nor Catholic tradition nor the Council of Trent limits this effect to venial sins, it is quite certain that it applies to mortal sins also. But according to Catholic teaching there is *per se* a grave obligation imposed by Divine law of confessing all mortal sins committed after baptism and obtaining absolution from them; from which it follows that one guilty of mortal sin is bound *per se* to receive the Sacrament of Penance before receiving extreme unction. Whether he is further bound, in case penance cannot be received, to prepare himself for extreme unction by an act of perfect contrition is not so clear; but the affirmative opinion is more commonly held by the theologians, on the ground that extreme unction is primarily a sacrament of the living, i. e. intended for those in the state of grace, and that every effort should be made by the subject to possess this primary disposition. That the remission at least of mortal sins is not the primary end of extreme unction is evident from the conditional way in which St. James speaks of this effect; "and *if* he be in sins" etc.; but, on the other hand, this effect is attributed, if conditionally and secondarily, yet directly and *per se* to the unction—not indirectly and *per accidens* as we attribute it to other sacraments of the living—which means that extreme unction has been instituted secondarily as a sacrament of the dead, i. e. for the purpose not merely of increasing but of conferring sanctifying grace sacramentally. Hence, if for any reason the subject in mortal sin is excused from the obligation of confessing or of eliciting an act of perfect contrition, extreme unction will remit his sin and confer sanctifying grace, provided he has actual, or at least habitual, attrition, or provided (say on recovering the use of reason) he elicits an act of attrition so that the sacrament may take effect by way of reviviscence (see below, X). By habitual attrition in this connexion is meant an act of sorrow or detestation for sins committed, elicited since their commission and not retracted in the interval before the sacrament is received. The ordinary example occurs when the act of attrition has been elicited before the sick person lapses into unconsciousness or loses the use of reason. That such attrition is necessary, follows from the teaching of Trent (Sess. XIV, cap. i, De Pœnit.) regarding the absolute and universal necessity of repentance for the remission, even in baptism, of personal mortal sins. Schell has maintained (Kathol. Dogmatik, III, pp. 629 sq.) that such attrition is not required for the validity of extreme unction, but that the general purpose and intention, which a Christian sinner may retain even when he is sinning, of afterwards formally repenting and dying in the friendship of God, is sufficient; but this view seems irreconcilable with the teaching of Trent, and has the whole weight of theological tradition against it.

Extreme unction likewise remits venial sins provided the subject has at least habitual attrition for them; and, following the analogy of penance, which with attrition remits mortal sins, for the remission of which outside the sacrament perfect contrition would be required, theologians hold that with extreme unction a less perfect attrition suffices for the remission of venial sins than would suffice without the sacrament. But besides thus directly remitting venial sins, extreme unction also excites dispositions which procure their remission *ex opere operantis*.

The relics or effects of sin mentioned by the Council of Trent are variously understood by theologians to mean one, or more, or all of the following: spiritual debility and depression caused by the consciousness of having sinned; the influence of evil habits induced by sin; temporal penalties remaining after the guilt of sin has been forgiven; and venial, or even mortal, sins themselves. Of these only the remission of temporal punishment is distinct from the other effects of which the council speaks; and though some theologians have been loath to admit this effect at all, lest they might seem to do away with the *raison d'être* of purgatory and of prayers and indulgences for the dying and dead, there is really no solid ground for objecting to it, if passing controversial interests are subordinated to Catholic theory. It is not suggested that extreme unction, like baptism, sacramentally remits *all* temporal punishment due to sin, and the extent to which it actually does so in any particular case may, as with baptism, fall short of what was Divinely intended, owing to obstacles or defective dispositions in the recipient. Hence there is still room and need for Indulgences for the dying, and if the Church offers her prayers and applies Indulgences for adults who die immediately after baptism, she ought, a fortiori, to offer them for those who have died after extreme unction. And if temporal punishment be, as it certainly is, one of the *reliquiæ* of sin, and if extreme unction be truly what the Council of Trent describes (Sess. XIV, De Extr. Unct., introduct.) as "the consummation not merely of [the Sacrament of] Penance, but of the whole Christian life, which ought to be a perpetual penance", it is impossible to deny that the remission of temporal punishment is one of the effects of this sacrament.

(2) The second effect of extreme unction mentioned by the Council of Trent is the alleviation and strengthening of the soul by inspiring the sick person with such confidence in the Divine mercy as will enable him patiently and even cheerfully to bear the pains and worries of sickness, and with resolute courage to repel the assaults of the tempter in what is likely to be the last and decisive conflict in the warfare of eternal salvation. The outlook on eternity is brought vividly before the Christian by the probability of death inseparable from serious sickness, and this sacrament has been instituted for the purpose of conferring the graces specially needed to fortify him in facing this tremendous issue. It is unnecessary to explain in detail the appropriateness of such an institution, which, were other reasons wanting, would justify itself to the Christian mind by the observed results of its use.

(3) Finally, as a conditional and occasional effect of extreme unction, comes the restoration of bodily health, an effect which is vouched for by the witness of experience in past ages and in our own day. Theologians, however, have failed to agree in stating the condition on which this effect depends or in explaining the manner in which it is produced. "When it is expedient for the soul's salvation", is how Trent expresses the condition, and not a few theologians have understood this to mean that health will not be restored by the sacrament unless it is foreseen by God that a longer life will lead to a greater degree of glory —recovery being thus a sign or proof of predestination. But other theologians rightly reject this opinion, and of several explanations that are offered (cf. Kern, op. cit., pp. 195 sq.) the simplest and most reasonable is that which understands the condition mentioned not of the future and perhaps remote event of actual salvation, but of present spiritual advantage which, independently of the ultimate result, recovery may bring to the sick person; and holds, subject to this condition, that this physical effect, which is in itself natural, is obtained mediately through and dependently upon the spiritual effects already mentioned. The fortifying of the soul by manifold graces, by which over-anxious fears are banished, and a general feeling of comfort and courage, and of humble confidence in God's mercy and peaceful resignation to His Will inspired, reacts as a natural consequence on the physical condition of the patient, and this reaction is sometimes the factor that decides the issue of certain diseases. This mediate and dependent way of effecting restoration of health is the way indicated by the Council of Trent in the passage quoted above, and the view proposed is in conformity with the best and most ancient theoretical teaching on the subject and avoids the seemingly unanswerable difficulties involved in opposing views. Nor does it reduce this effect of extreme unction to the level of those perfectly natural phenomena known to modern science as "faith cures". For it is not maintained, in the first place, that recovery will follow in any particular case unless this result is spiritually profitable to the patient—and of this God alone is the judge—and it is admitted, in the second place, that the spiritual effect, from which the physical connaturally results, is itself strictly supernatural (cf. Kern, loc. cit.).

(4) There remains the question, on which no little controversy has been expended, as to which of these several effects is the principal one. Bearing in mind the general theory that sacramental grace as such is sanctifying grace as imparted or increased by the sacrament, with the right or title to special actual graces corresponding to the special end of each sacrament, the meaning of the question is: Which of these effects is the sacramental grace imparted in extreme unction primarily and immediately intended to produce, so that the others are produced for the sake of, or by means of, it? Or, more ultimately, what, according to Christ's intention in instituting it, is the primary and distinctive purpose of this sacrament, its particular *raison d'être* as a sacrament? Now, clearly this cannot be either the remission of mortal sin or the restoration of physical health, since, as we have seen, extreme unction is primarily a sacrament of the living; and restoration of bodily health is not a normal effect, but only brought about, when at all, indirectly. There remain the remission of venial sins and of the temporal punishment due for sins already forgiven, and the invigoration of the soul in face of the probability of death. Reference has already been made to the Scotist view (VI) which singles out the final and complete remission of venial sin as the chief end or effect of extreme unction, and which logically leads to the practical conclusion, adopted by St. Bonaventure and Duns Scotus, that only the dying should receive the sacrament; and the same conclusion, which must in any case be rejected, would also follow from holding in a similarly exclusive sense that the principal effect is the remission of temporal punishment. Thus we are left in possession of the theory, held by many of the best theologians, that the supernatural invigoration of the soul in view of impending death is the chief end and effect of extreme unction. This effect, of course, is actually realized only when the subject is *sui compos* and capable of co-operating with grace; but the same is true of the principal effect of several other sacraments. It is no argument, therefore, against this view to point to the fact that sins are sometimes remitted by extreme unction while the recipient is unconscious and incapable of using the invigorating graces referred to. The infusion or increase of sanctifying grace is an effect common to all the sacraments; yet it is not by this of itself that they are distinguished from one another, but by reference to the special actual graces to which sanctifying grace as infused or increased gives a title; and if the realization of this title is sometimes suspended or frustrated, this is merely by way of an accidental exception to which, in general, sacramental efficacy is liable. It does not seem, however, that this theory should be urged in an exclusive sense, as implying, that is, that the remission of venial sin or of temporal punishment is not also a primary

effect which may be obtained independently; rather should the theory be enlarged and modified, and the primary and essential end of the sacrament so described as to comprehend these effects.

This is the solution of the whole question proposed by Kern (op. cit., pp. 81 sq., 215 sq.), who, with no little learning and ability, defends the thesis that the end of extreme unction is the perfect healing of the soul with a view to its immediate entry into glory, unless it should happen that the restoration of bodily health is more expedient. This view is quite in conformity with, and may even be said to be suggested by, the teaching of the Council of Trent to the effect that extreme unction is "the consummation of the whole Christian life"; and Kern has collected an imposing weight of evidence in favour of his thesis from ancient and medieval and modern writers of authority. Dr. Pohle (op. cit., pp. 535, 536) reviews Kern's suggestion sympathetically. Besides being self-consistent and free from any serious difficulty, it is recommended by many positive arguments, and in connexion with the controverted point we have been discussing it has the advantage of combining and co-ordinating as parts of the principal effect—i. e. perfect spiritual health—not only the remission of venial sins and the invigoration of the soul, for which respectively Scotists and their opponents have contended too exclusively, but also the remission of temporal punishment, which not a few theologians have neglected.

VIII. Necessity.—Theologians are agreed that extreme unction may in certain circumstances be the only, and therefore the necessary, means of salvation for a dying person. This happens when there is question of a person who is dying without the use of reason, and whose soul is burdened with the guilt of mortal sin for which he has only habitual attrition; and for this and similar cases in which other means of obtaining justification are certainly or even probably unavailing, there is no doubt as to the grave obligation of procuring extreme unction for the dying. But theologians are not agreed as to whether or not a sick person in the state of grace is *per se* under a grave obligation of seeking this sacrament before death. It is evident *ex hypothesi* that there is no obligation arising from the need of salvation (*necessitate medii*), and the great majority of theologians deny that a grave obligation *per se* has been imposed by Divine or ecclesiastical law. The injunction of St. James, it is said, may be understood as being merely a counsel or exhortation, not a command, and there is no convincing evidence from tradition that the Church has understood a Divine command to have been given, or has ever imposed one of her own. Yet it is recognized that, in the words of Trent, "contempt of so great a sacrament cannot take place without an enormous crime and an injury to the Holy Ghost Himself" (Sess. XIV, cap. iii); and it is held to depend on circumstances whether mere neglect or express refusal of the sacrament would amount to contempt of it. The soundness, however, of the reasons alleged for this common teaching is open to doubt, and the strength of the arguments advanced by so recent a theologian as Kern (pp. 364 sq.) to prove the existence of the obligation which so many have denied is calculated to weaken one's confidence in the received opinion.

IX. Repetition.—The Council of Trent teaches that "if the sick recover after receiving this unction, they can again receive the aid of this sacrament, when they fall anew into a similar danger of death" (Sess. XIV, cap. iii, De Extr. Unct.). In the Middle Ages doubts were entertained by some ecclesiastics on this subject, as we learn from the correspondence between Abbot (later Cardinal) Godfried and St. Yves, Bishop of Chartres (d. 1117). Godfried considered the custom in vogue in the Benedictine monasteries, of repeating extreme unction, reprehensible on the ground that "no sacrament ought to be repeated" (P. L., CLVII, 87 sq.); but he wished to have St. Yves's opinion, and the latter quite agreed with his friend (ibid., 88). Not long afterwards Peter the Venerable, Abbot of Cluny, was asked by Abbot Theobald to explain "why it was that the unction of the sick was the only unction [out of many] repeated, and why this took place only at Cluny", and Peter in reply gave a convincing explanation of the Benedictine practice, his main contention being that the person anointed may on recovery have sinned again and be in need of the remission of sins promised by St. James, and that the Apostle himself not only does not suggest that the unction may be given only once, but clearly implies the contrary—"ut *quoties* quis infirmatus fuerit, *toties* inungatur" (P. L., CLXXXIX, 392 sq.). After this all opposition to the repetition of the sacrament disappears, and subsequent writers unanimously teach, what has been defined by the Council of Trent, that it may under certain conditions be validly and lawfully repeated. It should be noted, moreover, that the practice of repeating it at this period was not confined to the Benedictines or to Cluny. The Cistercians of Clairvaux, for example, were also in the habit of repeating it, but subject to the restriction that it was not to be given more than once within a year; and several Ordines of particular Churches dating from the ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries, have a rubric prescribing the repetition of the unction for seven successive days (cf. Kern, op. cit., pp. 334, 338 sq.).

Coming to the more accurate determination of the circumstances or conditions which justify the repetition of extreme unction, theologians, following the authority of Trent, are agreed that it may be validly and lawfully repeated as often as the sick person, after recovery, becomes seriously ill again, or, in cases of lingering illness where no complete recovery takes place, as often as the probable danger of death, after disappearing, returns. For verification of this latter condition some theologians would require the lapse of a certain interval, say a month, during which the danger would seem to have passed; but there is really no reason for insisting on this any more than on the year which medieval custom in some places was wont to require. St. Bonaventure's remark, that "it is absurd for a sacrament to be regulated by the motion of the stars" (in IV Semt., dist. xxiii, a. 2, q. iv, ad 2), applies to a month as well as to a year. Not a few theologians (among recent ones De Augustinis, "De Re Sacramentariâ", II, 408) understand, by the new danger of death, proximate or imminent danger, so that, once imminent danger has passed and returned, the sacrament may be repeated without waiting for any definite interval to elapse. The majority of theologians, however, deny the validity of extreme unction repeated while the danger of death remains the same, and they assume that this is the implicit teaching of the Council of Trent. But among contemporary authors, Kern, following the lead of several positive theologians eminent for their knowledge of sacramental history (Ménard, Launoi, Martène, Juénin, Drouven, Pouget, Pellicia, Binterim, Heinrich.—See references in Kern, op. cit., pp. 357, 538), maintains the *probable* validity of extreme unction repeated, no matter how often, during the same danger of death; and it will be found easier to ignore, than to meet and answer, the argument by which he supports his view. He furnishes, in the first place, abundant evidence of the widespread practice in the Western Church from the ninth to the twelfth, and even, in some places, to the thirteenth century, of repeating the unction for seven days, or indefinitely while the sickness lasted; and he is able to claim the authority of Oriental theologians for explaining the modern practice in the Eastern Church of a sevenfold anointing by seven priests as being due to a more ancient practice of repeating the unction for seven days—a practice to which the Coptic Liturgy bears witness. By admit-

ting the validity of each repeated unction we are able to give a much more reasonable explanation of the medieval Western and modern Eastern practice than can possibly be given by those who deny its validity. The latter are bound to maintain either that the repeated rite is merely a sacramental—though clearly intended to be a sacrament—or that the repeated unctions coalesce to form one sacrament—an explanation which is open to several serious objections. In the next place, since extreme unction does not imprint a permanent "character", there is no reason why its proper sacramental effect may not be increased by repetition, as happens in Penance and Holy Communion—that is, with an increase of sanctifying grace, the right to spiritual invigoration may be increased, and more abundant actual graces become due. And this, on internal grounds, would suffice to justify repetition, although the effect of the previous administration remains. Finally, in reply to the principal dogmatic reason urged against his view—viz., the teaching of the Council of Trent—Kern fairly maintains that the intention of the council was merely *positive*, and *not exclusive*, i. e., it wished to define, in opposition to more restrictive views that had beeen held, the validity of extreme unction repeated in the circumstances it mentions, but without meaning to deny its validity if repeated in other circumstances not mentioned. The exhaustive examination of tradition which is supposed to precede a definition had not, so far as this particular point is concerned, been carried out at the time of Trent; and the point itself was not ripe for definition. Modern discipline in the Western Church can be explained on other than dogmatic grounds; and if it be urged as dogmatically decisive, this will imply a very sweeping condemnation of medieval Western and modern Eastern practice, which the prudent theologian will be slow to pronounce.

X. Reviviscence.—The question of reviviscence arises when any sacrament is validly administered, but is hindered at the time from producing its effect, owing to the want of due dispositions in the recipient. Thus, in regard to extreme unction, the subject may be unconscious and incapable of spiritual invigoration in so far as this requires co-operation with actual grace. Or he may, for want of the necessary attrition, be indisposed to receive remission of sins, or indisposed in case of mortal sin for the infusion of sanctifying grace. And the want of disposition—the obstacle to the efficacy of the sacrament—may be inculpable or gravely culpable; in the latter case the reception of the sacrament will be sacrilegious. Now the question is, does extreme unction revive, that is, does it afterwards (during the same serious illness) produce such effects as are hindered at the time of reception, if the obstacle is afterwards removed or the requisite disposition excited? And theologians all teach that it certainly does revive in this way; that for its reviviscence, if no sacrilege has been committed in its reception, nor any grave sin in the interval, all that is needed is that the impeding defect should be removed, that consciousness, for instance, should be recovered, or habitual attrition excited; but that, when a grave sin has been committed at or since the reception, this sin must be remitted, and sanctifying grace obtained by other means (e. g. penance or perfect contrition) before extreme unction can take effect. From this doctrine of reviviscence—which is not, however, defined as a dogma—there follows an important practical rule in regard to the administration of extreme unction, viz., that, notwithstanding doubts about the dispositions of a certainly valid subject, the sacrament should always be conferred absolutely, never conditionally, since a condition making its validity dependent on the actual dispositions of the recipient would exclude the possibility of reviviscence. The conditional form (*si capax es*) should be used only when it is doubtful whether the person is a valid subject for the sacrament, e. g., whether he is not already dead, whether he has been baptized, has attained the use of reason, or has the implicit habitual intention of dying in a Christian manner.

From among, and in addition to, sources mentioned in the course of this article see Kern, *De Sacramento Extremæ Unctionis Tractatus Dogmaticus* (Ratisbon, 1907)—the best recent treatise on the subject; Schmitz, *De Effectibus Extremæ Unctionis Dissert. Hist.-Dogmatica* (Freiburg, 1893); Launoi, *De Sacr. Unctionis Infirmorum* (Paris, 1673), in *Opp.*, vol. I, pt. I; de Sainte-Beuve, *Tractatus de Sacr. Unctionis Infirmorum Extr.* (1686), in Migne, *Theol. Cursus*, XXIV; the respective sections in Perrone, Pesch, Tanquerey, and other standard courses of dogma, and in Gury, Lehmkuhl, and other standard moralists; among writers in German: Pohle, *Lehrbuch der Dogmatik* (3d ed., Paderborn, 1908), III, pp. 523–548; among Eastern Orthodox theologians: Maltzew, *Die Sakramente der Orthodox-katholischen Kirche* (Berlin, 1892), and others mentioned by Kern, *op. cit.*, 379; among non-Catholics: Blunt, *The Sacraments* (London, 1868); Morgan Dix, *The Sacramental System* (New York, 1893); Puller, *The Anointing of the Sick in Scripture and Tradition* (London, 1904).

P. J. Toner.

Exucontians. See Arianism.

Exul Hibernicus, the name given to an Irish stranger on the Continent of Europe in the time of Charles the Great, who wrote poems in Latin, several of which are addressed to the emperor. He is sometimes identified with Dungal (see Dungal). The designation *exul* is one which the Irish wanderers on the Continent frequently adopted. The poems of this exile show that he was not only a poet but a grammarian and dialectician as well. They also reveal his status as that of a teacher, probably in the palace school. Of more than ordinary interest are the verses which describe the attitude of the ninth-century teacher towards his pupils. His metrical poem on the seven liberal arts devotes twelve lines to each of the branches, grammar, rhetoric, dialectic, etc., showing the origin, scope, and utility of each in succession. Like the lines on the same subject by Theodulf of Orléans, they may have been intended to accompany a set of pictures in which the seven liberal arts were represented. The style of these poems, while much inferior to that of the classical period, is free from many of the artificialities which characterize much of the versification of the early Middle Ages.

Dümmler, *Poetæ Ævi Carolini* (Berlin, 1881), I, 408 sqq.; *Neues Archiv der Gesellsch. f. deutsche Geschichtskunde*, IV, 142, 254, 56; Traube, *O Roma Nobilis* in *Publications of Academy of Munich*, I class, xix (2),332–37.

William Turner.

Exultet, the hymn in praise of the paschal candle sung by the deacon, in the liturgy of Holy Saturday. In the missal the title of the hymn is "Præconium", as appears from the formula used at the blessing of the deacon: "ut digne et competenter annunties suum Paschale præconium". Outside Rome, the use of the paschal candle appears to have been very ancient in Italy, Gaul, Spain, and perhaps, from the reference by St. Augustine (De Civ. Dei, XV, xxii), in Africa. The "Liber Pontificalis" attributes its introduction in the local Roman Church to Pope Zosimus. The formula used for the "Præconium" was not always the "Exultet", though it is perhaps true to say that this formula has survived, where other contemporary formulæ have disappeared. In the "Liber Ordinum", for instance, the formula is of the nature of a benediction, and the Gelasian Sacramentary has the prayer "Deus mundi conditor", not found elsewhere, but containing the remarkable "praise of the bee"—possibly a Vergilian reminiscence—which is found with more or less modification in all the texts of the "Præconium" down to the present day. The regularity of the metrical *cursus* of the "Exultet" would lead us to place the date of its composition perhaps as early as the fifth century, and not later than the seventh. The earliest MSS. in which it appears are those of the three Gallican Sacramentaries:—the Bobbio Missal (seventh

century), the Missale Gothicum and the Missale Gallicanum Vetus (both of the eighth century). The earliest MS. of the Gregorian Sacramentary (Vat. Reg. 337) does not contain the "Exultet", but it was added in the supplement to what has been loosely called the Sacramentary of Adrian, and probably drawn up under the direction of Alcuin.

As it stands in the liturgy, it may be compared with two other forms, the Blessing of Palms, and the Blessing of the Baptismal Font. The order is, briefly:—(1) An invitation to those present to join with the deacon in the invocation of the blessing of God, that the praises of the candle may be worthily celebrated. This invitation, wanting in the two blessings just mentioned, may be likened to an amplified "Orate fratres", and its antiquity is attested by its presence in the Ambrosian form, which otherwise differs from the Roman. This section closes with the "Per omnia sæcula sæculorum", leading into:—(2) "Dominus vobiscum" etc., "Sursum corda" etc., "Gratias agamus" etc. This section serves as the introduction to the body of the "Præconium", cast in the Eucharistic form to emphasize its solemnity. (3) The "Præconium" proper, which is of the nature of a Preface, or, as it is called in the Missale Gallicanum Vetus, a *contestatio*. First, a parallel is drawn between the Passover of the Old and the New Covenants, the candle being here a type of the Pillar of Fire. And here the language of the liturgy rises into heights to which it is hard to find a parallel in Christian literature. We are drawn out of cold dogmatic statement into the warmth of the deepest mysticism, to the region where, in the light of paradise, even the sin of Adam may be regarded as "truly necessary" and "a happy fault". Secondly, the candle itself is offered as a burnt-sacrifice, a type of Christ, marked by the grains of incense as with the five glorious wounds of His Passion. And, lastly, the "Præconium" ends with a general intercession for those present, for the clergy, for the pope, and for the Christian rulers. For these last the text as it stands cannot now be used. The head of the Holy Roman Empire alone could be prayed for in this formula, and the resignation (1804) of the prerogatives of that august position, by the Emperor Francis II of Austria, has left that position unfilled to the present day.

It remains to notice three accessaries of the "Exultet": the ceremonial carried on during its performance; the music to which it has been sung; and the so-called "Exultet-rolls" on which it was sometimes written. The deacon is vested in a white dalmatic, the rest of the sacred ministers are vested in purple. The affixing of five grains of incense at the words *incensi hujus sacrificium* has probably arisen from a misconception of the meaning of the text. The lighting of the candle is followed by the lighting of all the lamps and candles of the church, extinguished since the close of Matins. The chant is usually an elaborate form of the well-known recitative of the Preface. In some uses a long bravura was introduced upon the word *accendit*, to fill in the pause, which must otherwise occur during the lighting of the candle. An elaborate analysis of the chant, as found in early MSS., has been published in "Paléographie Musicale", IV, viii, 171. Dom Latil has published the text, and part of the highly ornate chant, of an "Exultet" at Salerno. The text is almost identical with one previously published by Duchesne from a roll at Bari. In Italy the "Præconium" was sung from long strips of parchment, gradually unrolled as the deacon proceeded. These "Exultet-rolls" were decorated with illuminations and with portraits of contemporary reigning sovereigns, whose names were mentioned in the course of the "Præconium". The use of these rolls, as far as is known at present, was confined to Italy. The best examples date from the tenth and eleventh centuries.

DUCHESNE, *Christian Worship*, 2d ed. (London, 1904); GUÉRANGER, *Liturgical Year*, tr. (Stanbrook, 1901), VI; FEASEY, *Holy Week Ceremonial* (London, 1897); *Paléographie Musicale* (Solesmes, 1894), IV; GAVANTI-MERATI, *Thesaurus Sacr. Rit.* (Venice, 1823), IV; LATIL, *Rassegna Gregoriana* (Rome, 1908); PÉRATÉ in the *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, 2 pér., 1888, XXXIV, 346.

For the texts, see MIGNE, *P. L.*, LXXII, LXXVIII; MURATORI, *Lit. Rom. Vet.* (ed. 1772); PAMELIUS (Cologne, 1571); *Codex Bergomensis* (Solesmes, 1900); and the reprints of Missals of English uses by HENDERSON and the HENRY BRADSHAW SOCIETY.

CHARLTON BENEDICT WALKER.

Exuperius (EXSUPERIUS), SAINT, Bishop of Toulouse in the beginning of the fifth century; place and date of birth unascertained; d. after 410. Succeeding St. Silvius as bishop, he completed the basilica of St. Saturninus, begun by his predecessor. St. Jerome praises him for his munificence towards the monks of Palestine, Egypt, and Libya, and for his charity to the people of his own diocese, who were then suffering from the depredations of the Vandals, Alans, and Suevi. Of great austerity and simplicity of life, he sought not his own, but gave what he had to the poor. For their sake he even sold the altar vessels and was compelled in consequence to carry the Sacred Host in an osier basket and the Precious Blood in a vessel of glass. In esteem for his virtues and in gratitude for his gifts, St. Jerome dedicated to him his "Commentary on Zacharias". Exuperius is best known in connexion with the Canon of the Sacred Scriptures. He had written to Innocent I for instructions concerning the Canon and several points of ecclesiastical discipline. In reply, the pope honoured him with the letter "Consulenti tibi", dated February, 405, which contained a list of the canonical Scriptures as we have them to-day, including the deuterocanonical books of the Catholic Canon. The assertion of non-Catholic writers that the Canon of Innocent I excluded the Apocrypha is not true, if they mean to extend the term *Apocrypha* to the deuterocanonical books.

The opinion of Baronius, that the bishop Exuperius was identical with the rhetor of the same name, is quite generally rejected, as the rhetor was a teacher of Hannibalianus and Dalmatius, nephews of Constantine the Great, over half a century before the period of the bishop. From St. Jerome's letter to Furia of Rome, in 394, and from the epistle of St. Paulinus to Amandus of Bordeaux, in 397, it seems probable that Exuperius was a priest at Rome, and later at Bordeaux, before he was raised to the episcopate, though it is possible that in both of these letters reference is made to a different person. Just when he became bishop is unknown. That he occupied the See of Toulouse in February, 405, is evident from the letter of Innocent I mentioned above; and from a statement of St. Jerome in a letter to Rusticus it is certain that he was still living in 411. It is sometimes said that St. Jerome reproved him, in a letter to Riparius, a priest of Spain, for tolerating the heretic Vigilantius; but, as Vigilantius did not belong to the Diocese of Toulouse, St. Jerome was probably speaking of another bishop.

Exuperius was early venerated as a saint. Even in the time of St. Gregory of Tours he was held in equal veneration with St. Saturninus. His feast occurs on 28 September. The first martyrologist to assign it to this date was Usuard, who wrote towards the end of the ninth century.

Acta SS., Sept., VII, 623–30; ST. JEROME, *Epp.* iv, x, xi, liv, xcv, cxxv; IDEM, *Comm. in Zachariam*, preface to Books I and II; GREGORY OF TOURS, *Hist. Francorum*, II, xiii; BARONIUS, *Ann. Eccl.*, ad. an. 406; DENZINGER, *Enchiridion* (Freiburg, 1908), no. 96 (old no. 59).

LEO A. KELLY.

Eyb, ALBRECHT VON, one of the earliest German humanists, b. in 1420 near Ansbach in Franconia; d. in 1475. After preliminary studies at Erfurt he went to Italy and devoted himself to humanistic study at the Universities of Pavia and Bologna. He returned to Germany in 1451, having in the meantime been appointed canon at Eichstätt and Bamberg. From 1452 to 1459 he was again a student at Bologna, win-

ning the degree of doctor of canon and civil law. He was also honoured by an appointment as chamberlain to Pius II. After his return to Germany he resided chiefly at Eichstätt. In 1462 he became archdeacon of Würzburg, not, however, without encountering violent opposition from the Bishop of Würzburg, who hated Eyb as a partisan of the Hohenzollern Margrave, Albrecht Achilles. Little is known of his last years.

Eyb's best known and most important work is his "Ehebüchlein" (Book on Marriage), in which he discusses the question whether a man should take a lawful wife or not. It was published in 1472. In 1460 he had written on the same theme in Latin "An viro sapienti uxor sit ducenda". The German work treats of the joys and sorrows of married life and general maxims of a moral or philosophical character are added. A decision is finally rendered in favour of the married state. The popularity of the book is attested by the fact that between 1472 and 1540 no less than twelve reprints were issued. Another work of Eyb is the "Margarita poetica" (Nuremberg, 1472), a textbook of humanistic rhetoric, consisting of a collection of passages in prose and verse from Latin authors, to which are added specimens of humanistic eloquence. In 1474 Eyb finished his "Spiegel der Sitten" (Mirror of Morals), a lengthy work of ethical and moral content, probably based on some Latin original. The book did not meet with the favour shown to the "Ehebüchlein" and was not printed until 1511. Appended to it are German translations of two of Plautus's comedies, the "Menæchmi" and the "Bacchides" as well as of Ugolini's "Philogenia". Eyb's writings have been edited by K. Müller (Sondershausen, 1879); the best edition is that of M. Herrmann, "Deutsche Schriften des Albrecht von Eyb" (Berlin, 1895).

HERRMANN, *Albrecht von Eyb und die Frühzeit des deutschen Humanismus* (Berlin, 1893).

ARTHUR F. J. REMY.

Eyck, HUBERT and JAN VAN, brothers, Flemish illuminators and painters, founders of the school of Bruges and consequently of all the schools of painting in the North of Europe. Hubert was born at Maeseyck (i. e. Eyck on the Meuse)in the Diocese of Liège, about 1366, and his brother Jan about twenty years later, 1385. They had a sister named Margaret who won fame as a miniaturist.

A document of 1413 makes the earliest mention we have of a painting by "Master Hubert". In 1424 he was living at Ghent, and he died there on the 18th of September, 1426. We have no further definite knowledge concerning the elder of the brothers. Of the younger we know that in 1420 he presented a Madonna's head to the Guild of Antwerp, that in 1422 he decorated a paschal candle for the cathedral of Cambrai, and that in 1425 he was at The Hague in the service of Jean Sans Merci. Afterwards he went to Bruges and to Lille to the court of Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy, as *peintre et varlet de chambre*. He was already a man of some influence at court, and he travelled in the embassy charged to ask the hand of Isabella of Portugal for Philip, and it was his privilege to paint her portrait "true to life", thereby fixing Philip's choice. This journey lasted from the 18th of October, 1428, to the end of December, 1429. In 1431 he went to Hesdin to superintend, for the Duke, the work going on at the castle there; and afterwards he returned to Bruges, which he seldom left again. He married, and a child of his was baptized in 1434. In 1436 we learn once more that he received 720 *livres* on account of "certain secret matter", doubtless in connexion with some new mission or journey. He died towards the end of June, 1441.

The most important work of the brothers Van Eyck, and the one that places their names among the great masters of painting for ever, is the famous altarpiece, "The Adoration of the Lamb", of which the central portion is preserved in St-Bavons at Ghent, while the wings have found their way to the Museums of Berlin and of Brussels. It is one of the enigmas of art. All the questions bearing on it may, however, be reduced to two: Who was its author? and, What was its origin? As to its authorship, all we know depends on an inscription obscure enough, which is to be read on the edge of its frame:—

Pictor Hubertus e Eyck major quo nemo repertus
Incepit pondus: quod Johannes arte secundus
Suscepit letus, Judoci Vyd prece fretus
Vers-V seXta Ma-I: Vos CoLLoCat a-Cta tVerI.

The faulty Latin of this cryptic inscription means: "Hubert van Eyck, the greatest painter that ever lived, began this work [*pondus*], which John, his brother, second only to him in skill, had the happiness to continue at the request of Jodocus (Josse) Vydt. By this line, on the 6th of May, you learn when the work was completed, i. e., MCCCCXXXII." That it is their joint work is certain, but it is impossible to distinguish which portion belongs to each brother. Very soon Jan began to get all the credit for it. Dürer mentions only Jan in his "Journal" of 1521. But the inscription clearly states that Hubert began the work and asserts that he was the greater artist, his brother being called in only at his death, and in order to complete it. But how far had Hubert progressed with it? How far back had he been commissioned to paint it? In 1426 were portions of it finished, or was it merely a sketch, a general outline when Jan took charge? Who suggested the subject? Who planned its treatment? Can we believe that a painter of any school living in a fifteenth century atmosphere could have elaborated by himself from a few texts of the Apocalypse (v, 6–14) such a wealth of detail, such symphony of symbolism and imagery? Who was the theologian who inspired this mighty poem as others had inspired the learned allegories of the Chapel of the Spaniards, and of the Hall of the Segnatura? And again, in the history of painting from the miniatures of the Irish Apocalypses (eleventh century) to the Angers tapestries, what were the artistic sources of this great work?

This moral encyclopedia of the Middle Ages, if we may call it such, treats of all things in heaven and on earth (there was a predella to it depicting hell, but it disappeared in the sixteenth century); it portrays God and man in all their historical and mystical relations; it tells us of the heavenly and the earthly paradise, of the ages that have followed one another in the flight of time, of the Dogma of the Fall, and that of the Redemption, of Adam and Eve, and of the first sacrifices; of the death of Abel (type of Christ); of the years of expectation of the patriarchs and just men of the Old Law; of the mystery of the Incarnation; of the Trinity; of the world subject to the law of Christ; of the life of the Church in her saints, her hermits, her virgins, her martyrs, her pontiffs, her confessors, her warrior princes; of all Christendom in a landscape filled with cathedral spires (Rome, Jerusalem, Utrecht, etc.). And can we in reason be asked to believe that this wonderful pictorial epic reaching out from the beginning to the consummation of the world and ending in a glimpse of the eternal life to come as full in conception and as orderly in arrangement as the "Divina Commedia" itself; summing up the Old as well as the New Testament, drawing its inspiration from St. Augustine's "Civitas Dei", and Vincent of Beauvais' "Speculum Majus", as well as Jacobus de Voragine's "Legenda Aurea", and Dante's "De Monarchiâ"; a compendium of politics, history, and theology, and which crowns the representation of man's life on earth by a glimpse of the Infinite, can we in reason be asked to believe that this lofty expression of the ideals of Christendom in the Europe of the Middle Ages sprang Minerva-like, fully formed from the brain of a single artist?

No one can adopt this supposition except for the

purpose of ascribing all the honour of having conceived this painting to the elder of the brothers. As an assumption, however, it is altogether gratuitous. There is not one of the scenes that can be attributed to Hubert with any degree of certainty; and no work the brothers Van Eyck have left us (with the exception of the "Fount of Salvation" in the Prado Museum, Madrid, and this is the work of a school) shows a similar dogmatic and theological character, a like power of design and richness of thought that this "Lamb" does. Taken as a whole the work of the Van Eycks has a totally different tendency. It is frankly naturalistic in fact, as well as in intention. So that when Hubert is labelled a thinker, it is for no other reason than the wish to differentiate him, and to separate him from Jan. How futile this distinction is, is made clear if we look into the results obtained by applying it as a criterion to the work of the two brothers. On not a single disputed painting has agreement been reached; and every painting that has been attributed to Hubert by one connoisseur, has been adjudged by others for equally good reasons to Jan.

The catalogue of their work has been reconstructed more than twenty times. The altar-piece of the "Lamb" has been divided in a hundred different ways, and each in turn has been given to first one brother and then to the other over and over again. Each year sees a new theory proposed. After Waagen came James Weale; after Hymans, Dvorak, and after Stoerck, Wurzbach; and we are as far from the solution as ever. The masterpiece keeps its secret, and will probably never give it up. In any case, seeing that the whole painting was retouched at least twice during the sixteenth century, all evidence of individual technic must have been buried beneath these restorations; and in all likelihood the little points and peculiarities attributed to Hubert or to Jan, are really the work of Michael Coxie. But there is a larger and a wider question at issue than such idle wranglings that can never be settled, the question as to the effect and the nature of the artistic revolution to which the brothers Van Eyck have given their name.

What constitutes the altar-piece of the "Lamb" a unique monument in the history of art, and gives it its supreme interest in our eyes, is the fact that it unites in itself the styles and the genius of two opposing epochs. Whereas its general plan belongs to the Middle Ages, its execution, its manner of seeing things and putting them on canvas, are truly modern. The masterpiece has a double nature, so to speak. The genius of the Renaissance for what was concrete and realistic is wedded to the majesty of the Gothic and its love of the abstract. It shows us the wondrous blending of two principles that would seem necessarily to exclude each other, like the past and the future, and that we never meet with again save in opposition. It is this that constitutes the supreme interest of the work, that it contains the noblest expression of the old mystical genius together with the most powerful example of modern naturalism. In the sincerity, breadth, and daring of their naturalism, no one at any time nor of any school has excelled the Van Eycks. Nature, which, prior to their day, men had looked at as through a veil of formulæ and symbols, they seem suddenly to have unveiled. They invented, so to speak, the world of realities. The happenings of all sorts in the world of nature, the *sylva rerum*, with which they have endowed the art of painting, are always true to life. Landscapes, atmosphere, types, physiognomies, a wealth of studies and sketches of all sorts, rich materials, cloths, cimars (robes), copes, brilliancy of precious stones and works of the goldsmith's art; all are copied to perfection, and the deftness of the work is beyond compare. The masterpiece inaugurates a new era in painting. If the object of the painter's art is to depict the visible world, if his aim ought to be not so much the expression of a thought as to hold up the mirror to life, then for the first time in its history painting entered into its birthright in this altar-piece, and gave proof of its legitimacy in this first attempt. Life under all its sensible forms and aspects sweeps through this mighty scene like a motif, life with all its myriad changes and variety of moods, brushing aside the dry as dust ideograms and crumbling hieroglyphics of the Middle Ages.

The absolute is abandoned, and the relative brought into fashion. The eye is turned away from the vision of the ideal, but the feet are more firmly planted on the real. The word *nature* undergoes a change of meaning. Once it had been a vague Platonic idea, a something like the nominals and universals of the schools, which are understood by the intelligence rather than perceived by the senses. In that lofty plane of thought in which art in the thirteenth century loved to move, the universe existed really in the intellect. Henceforth, however, nature changes her aspect for the painter; he refrains from expressing any opinion as to the essence of things, but delights in all their accidental qualities. The actual, the fact, whether it be positive, complex, capricious, or odd, becomes of more importance than the abstract and immutable law. The absolute cause of all things is neglected in favour of the rich and glowing vegetation of nature; principles have less value than their consequences, less importance is given to types than individuals. The vast harvest of phenomena from the ever teeming field of reality and experience is henceforth open to art. A painting becomes what the painter has actually seen; what he has found in nature; the story of his feelings in the midst of things. In this a new kind of idealism replaces the old. And art, thus freed from the academism of the Gothic tradition, was not to slavishly copy nature, but to serve as a vehicle for the expression of the painter's personality, and to act as the safest confidante of his emotional experiences.

The altar-piece at Ghent marks the triumph of this basic artistic revolution from which all modern art has sprung. Never was a richer shrine of nature and of life got together by a painter. In two hundred figures of every size, sex, race, and costume we behold a résumé of the human race. We see before us all the beauty of the physical world, the woods, the fields, the rocks, the desert places, a geography of earth with its climates and its flora, palms, cacti, and aloes (which foolishly has led some to believe that Hubert must have travelled in the East). And the world of art is not forgotten; styles of architecture, towers, cupolas, statues, bas-reliefs, are all brought in. In a word, life out-of-doors and within doors, with all its social activities and moral colouring, is portrayed. There are interiors, such as the room of the Blessed Virgin, a young Flemish maiden, with its *prie-Dieu*, its nicely tiled floor, its washstand and basin, and its open window looking out on to the pointed roofs of a row of brick houses. There are portraits of a marvellous realism, such as those of the donor and his wife; epic figures, such as God the Father under the guise of Charlemagne crowned with a triple tiara, type of the pontiff-king; and there are figures full of charm and poetry, such as the singing angels (Berlin museum), symbolizing the harmonies of paradise, under the form of entrancing minstrelsy, or of the chanting of choir boys. Other figures are fearful in their naturalism, such as the figures of our first parents (Brussels museum) which would suffice alone to immortalize their creator, because of their audacious nudity, their stiff and awkward manner, and their eloquent ugliness.

Such a transformation, of course, exceeds the powers of any one man, or even of two brothers. And like all great works, the altar-piece of Ghent is but the result of the labours of more than one generation. It was not a local movement; its influences were at work up and down throughout Christendom.

In Italy the work of Jacopo della Quercia, of Ghiberti, the frescoes of Masolino and of Masaccio (1428), are contemporary with the labours of the Van Eycks, and bear traces of similar tendencies. But the birthplace of the movement was not on Italian soil. It is in France we find the earliest evidences of it, about the beginning of the fourteenth century. A few statues, like the Visitation group in the great doorway at Reims (1310), the tombs of St. Denis, the portraits of King Charles V and his wife Eleanor (in the Louvre), mark the last stages in the victorious progress. The same school which a century earlier had developed the Gothic ideal, was about to produce by a natural evolution the new principles and the new methods. An important factor in this evolution was the creation of the Duchies of Berry and of Burgundy, and the alliance of Flanders and Burgundy by marriage (1384). At the Court of the Valois, the most brilliant in the world, famous for its voluptuousness, its elegance, and its worship of all the arts of life, and under the patronage of its princes, no less famous for their dissolute lives than for their artistic taste and love of luxury, there rapidly grew up a school of painters, sculptors, goldsmiths, and miniaturists, cosmopolitans by birth, but Parisian by education, who were the nucleus of the Renaissance.

The larger part of the paintings, frescoes, and stained glass of this epoch have perished; but the miniatures supply all the proof we need. Especially in the manuscripts made at the time for the Duc de Berry do we find the links of this glorious history. Many of the books collected by this incomparable Mæcenas have come down to us; some of them illustrated by André Beauneveu, Jacquemart of Hesdin, or Jacques Cohn of Antwerp. But the most important of all is the seignorial MS.—one of the treasures of Chantilly—known as the "Book of Hours of the Duc de Berry". This wonderful book was adorned from 1413 to 1416 by three artists; "the three illuminator-brothers" spoken of by Guillebert of Metz, the brothers de Limbourg or simply the Limbourgs. Nearly all the poetic fancy of the Van Eycks is already outlined in this "Book of Hours", especially on their landscape side; and whereas the Limbourgs kept to the country around Liège, the Van Eycks followed the same route, and doubtless experienced the same influences. But there is something more. Another MS., "The Hours of Turin", which was unfortunately destroyed in the fire at the library of that town, 20 January, 1904, belonged successively to the Duc de Berry (d. 1416) and to Duke William IV of Bavaria-Hainault. And it has been proved that Hubert van Eyck spent some time in the latter's service. Paul Durrieu has given very weighty reasons for attributing the MS. to him, and for believing that he began it for the Duc de Berry. Thus the art of the Van Eycks would be but the culminating point of the great Renaissance movement inaugurated at the Court of the Valois in France, and which reached its apogee in 1400. Perhaps this was what the Italian Bishop Facius meant to imply when in 1456 he spoke of Jan van Eyck as Johannes Gallicus.

This is a partial solution of the enigma of the altar-piece. Hubert and Jan van Eyck are but continuators, masters indeed, of an art that began before them and without them. But what was it they added that caused the new style in art to date only from their work? If we are to credit Vasari, Van Mander, and all the historical writers, their great discovery was the art of painting with oils. Painting with oil had been discovered long before; the monk Theophilus gives a recipe for it in the eleventh century. And as we have seen, the new æstheticism had been already formulated in the miniatures of the Limbourgs and of the Van Eycks themselves. Whatever importance in art its material and mechanical methods may have, it would be too humiliating to make it depend entirely on the particular fluid, water, gum, or albumen used in mixing the colours. Moreover, on canvases 500 years old from which all moisture has long since dried up he would be a daring critic who would venture to assert the proportion of oil or distemper used by the artist. To build one's criticism on such a doubtful principle is like seeking the scent of the "Roses of Sadi". The real merit of the Van Eycks is elsewhere. By a chain of circumstances (The Battle of Agincourt, the madness of Charles VI, and the minority of Charles VII), France was brought to the edge of ruin, and suddenly lost control of the movement that it had begun.

Comfort, art, luxury began to cluster around the new fortunes of the Duchy of Burgundy, as the home of wealth in the North. Ghent, Bruges, Brussels, Antwerp became the centres of the new school. In these new towns of little culture and traditional refinement, and lacking in reserve (Taine, "Philosophie de l'Art aux Pays-Bas"—description of the festivals known as the *Vœu du faisan*), Naturalism, freed from the restraints French taste would have imposed on it, was enabled to grow at its ease and spread without restriction. The Germanic element which had already shown itself in such men as Beauneveu, Malouel, the Limbourgs, burst out, and carried everything before it in the work of the Van Eycks. For the first time the genius of the North shook off all those cosmopolitan influences which had hitherto refined it, and gave itself free scope.

It paused not to think of what had gone before, and it was not concerned with such things as taste, nobility, or beauty. Such preoccupations as these, as the antique began to have an influence, became more and more the distinguishing characteristics and limitation of Italian naturalism. It is enough to compare the ugly yet touching figures of Adam and Eve by Jan van Eyck, with those by Masaccio in the Brancacci Chapel to be convinced of this. On the one side there is realism, but the painter has scruples, reserves, a sense of modesty; on the other there is absolute crudity, what we might call naturalism pure and simple. What does this mean, but that painting, which had hitherto been a universal, international art, is beginning to localize itself; and that what had hitherto been a European, or better still, Western, colour-language is about to split up into many dialects and national modes of speech? It is the real glory of the Van Eycks, that they emancipated the genius of the races of the North and gave it its first full expression. During a whole century (1430–1530) the school they founded at Bruges was always producing new works and renewing its own strength. During a century, painters from Flanders, from Holland, and Germany—Petrus Cristus, Gérard de St-Jean, Ouwater, Hugo van der Goes, Roger van der Weyden, Memlinck, Gérard David, Martin Schöngauer, Dürer, Lucas of Leyden—never ceased to draw their inspiration more or less directly from their work. In 1445 the Catalonian Luis Dalmau made a copy of the altar-piece of Ghent. In France, Jean Fouquet, Nicolas Froment, on the banks of the Loire and of the Rhone, were disciples of Jan van Eyck. Even Italy did not escape their sovereign influence. As early as the middle of the fifteenth century paintings by Jan van Eyck were being treasured at Naples and at Urbino.

Antonello of Messina went to study art in Flanders. Ghirlandajo imitated the famous Portinari altar-piece by H. van der Goes, and whenever an Italian painter relaxed a moment his straining after art to snatch a breath of gayety or a lesson in realism, it was always to the Flemish school he turned; always, until the triumph of the antique was assured, and Raphael and Michelangelo, by the constraining revelation of its beauty, had restored for a time the reign of the ideal. Their triumph was, however, short-lived; the pagan and aristocratic ideal of art and life, with all its loftiness and rigidity, began to give way from the

beginning of the seventeenth century, with its new schools at Antwerp and Amsterdam, before the naturalism of the North, before the more homely, hearty, and winning genius of the Van Eycks. It is therefore impossible to exaggerate the importance of their work, which, besides occupying a unique position throughout the fifteenth century, led the way in the evolution which two centuries later produced such painters as Rubens and Rembrandt.

The following is a list of the signed and dated works of Jan van Eyck: The "Consecration of St. Thomas Becket" (1421—Chatsworth); "The Madonna" (1432—Ince Hall); portraits of two men (1432–1433—National Gallery); "Arnolfini and his Wife" (1434—National Gallery); "Portrait of Jan de Leewe" (1436—Vienna); "The Virgin", with kneeling figure of Canon van der Paele (1436—Bruges); "St. Barbara" (1437—Antwerp); "Head of Christ" (1438—Berlin); "The Artist's Wife" (1439—Bruges); "The Virgin" (1439—Antwerp). The principal works without date or signature that can be certainly attributed to the brothers Van Eyck are "Portrait of an Old Man" (Vienna); "The Man with the Pinks" (Berlin); "The Madonna of Lucca" (Frankfort); "The Madonna" executed for Chancellor Rolin (Louvre); "The Virgin" (Burleigh House, Exeter); "The Virgin" (Paris, Rothschild); triptych, not completed (Van Hellenpute collection, Mechlin).

FACIUS, *De viris illustribus* (1456, published at Florence, 1745); MORELLI, *Anonimo* in the *Notizie d'opere di disegno* (Bassano, 1800); VASARI, *Le Vite* (Florence, 1550) (preface and life of Antonello of Messina); VAN MANDER, *Het Schilder Boek* (Amsterdam, 1604); WAAGEN, *H. und J. Van Eyck* (Breslau, 1862); WEALE, *Notes on Jan van Eyck* (Bruges, 1864); IDEM, *The date of Jan van Eyck's Death* in *The Burlington Magazine* (London, 1904); DE LABORDE, *Les ducs de Bourgogne* (Paris, 1849); V. LECLERC AND ERNEST RENAN, *Discours sur l'état des arts au XIV^e siècle* (Paris, 1865); CROWE AND CAVALCASELLE, *The Early Flemish Painters* (London, 1857); TAINE, *Philosophie de l'art* (Paris, 1872); FROMENTIN, *Les maîtres d'autrefois* (Paris, 1876); KNACKFUSS, *Hubert und Jan van Eyck* (Bielefeld, 1897); COURAJOD, *Leçons professées à l'école du Louvre* (Paris, 1899–1903); DURRIEU, *Les débuts des Van Eyck* (*Gazette des Beaux Arts* (1902); *Les Heures de Turin*, phototype reproduction (Paris, 1903); HULIN, *L'exposition des Primitifs Flamands*, an arranged catalogue (Bruges, 1902); DVORAK, *Das Rätsel der Brüder Van Eyck* (Berlin, 1906); WURZBACH, *Niederländisches Künstlerlexikon* (Leipzig, 1906).

LOUIS GILLET.

Eycken, JEAN BAPTISTE VAN, painter, b. at Brussels, Belgium, 16 September, 1809; d. at Schaerbeek, 19 December, 1853. He was the son of Corneille van Eycken and Elise Cordemans, and as a boy was employed in commercial pursuits, but from 1829, when his father died, he gave himself over entirely to the study of art. In 1830 he became a member of the Academy of Belgium, in 1835 gained an important prize with high distinctions, and four years afterwards was appointed professor of drawing and painting. In 1838 he went to Italy, returning in 1839 and resuming his professorship. In that year he exhibited his great picture of "Divine Pity", which was warmly received and brought him a gold medal and a high position in the Société des Beaux Arts de France. He married in 1840 Julie Noël, who died 11 February, 1843. Two of his most important pictures were those representing "Captive Christians" and "St. Boniface", for the church of La Chapelle; but for the same building he carried out no less than fourteen pictures representing the Passion of Christ and these were exhibited in 1847 and gained for him the Order of Leopold. His best-known picture perhaps is entitled "L'Abondance", a replica of which the artist was employed to make for the Prince Consort of England, according to the instructions of Louise Marie, Queen of the Belgians. He was intensely interested in the subject of mural decoration, and studied every variety of it very closely, preparing a long essay on the subject and a series of paintings representing the Beatitudes, in order to exemplify his ideas in this direction. He also gave some attention to sculpture and to designing medallions. He was a very devout man, true to his faith and to his friends, and very much respected by all who knew him. His pictures are marked by considerable religious feeling, grace, tenderness, and delicacy. (For further details, see a life of the artist published privately in Brussels by Emile van Arenbergh, no date.)

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Eymard, PIERRE-JULIEN, VENERABLE, founder of the Society of the Blessed Sacrament, and of the Servants of the Blessed Sacrament, b. at La Mure d'Isère, Diocese of Grenoble, France, 4 Feb., 1811; d. there 1 Aug., 1868. From early childhood he gave evidence of great holiness and most tender devotion to the Blessed Sacrament. In 1829, he entered the novitiate of the Oblates of Mary, but illness compelled him to return home. At the age of twenty he entered the grand seminary of Grenoble, and was ordained priest 20 July, 1834. He returned to the Marist novitiate in 1839. In 1845 he was appointed Provincial of the Oblates of Mary. His entire spiritual life was centred round the Eucharist. It was the subject of his sermons and exhortations, the object of his worship and prayers. Those who fell under his spiritual direction were taught by his counsel to fix their attention on the Blessed Sacrament.

In January of 1851 Père Eymard made a pilgrimage to the shrine of Our Lady of Fourvières, and there promised Mary to devote his life to founding a congregation of priests whose principal duty should be to honour the Blessed Sacrament. Having obtained the necessary ecclesiastical permission, he procured a small house in Paris, in which he and his single companion took up their abode. Here, on 6 Jan., 1857, the Blessed Sacrament was exposed, and the nascent community of two members commenced the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament as prescribed by their rule. Their founder received his first encouragement for the work in a laudatory Brief, blessing the work and its author, and signed by Pius IX, in 1857. Five years after, in 1862, Père Eymard had enough spiritual sons to open a regular novitiate. From this date the congregation spread rapidly, until now its houses may be found in Rome, Belgium, Holland, Spain, Canada, the United States, and South America. The Servants of the Blessed Sacrament, a congregation of cloistered women who carry on perpetual adoration in their convents, were also founded by him in 1858. The Priests' Eucharistic League and the Archconfraternity of the Blessed Sacrament are evidences of his zeal among priests and the faithful. Père Eymard's writings have been collected, and form four volumes: "The Real Presence", which has been translated into English; "Retreat at the Feet of Jesus Eucharistic", "La Sainte Communion", and "L'Eucharistie et la Perfection Chrétienne". These writings have received the approbation of the Holy See. The author was declared Venerable, 11 August, 1908, and the process for Père Eymard's beatification is now in progress.

HERBERT, *The Priest of the Eucharist* (London, 1898); TERAILLON, *Le Révérend Père Pierre Julien Eymard: Documents sur sa vie et ses vertus* (Rome, 1899); TESNIÈRE, *Le Prêtre de l'Eucharistie.*

A. LETELLIER.

Eymeric, NICOLAS, theologian and inquisitor, b. at Gerona, in Catalonia, Spain, c. 1320; d. there 4 Jan., 1399. He entered the Dominican Order at an early age, receiving the habit 4 Aug., 1334, from the hands of Prior Petrus Carpi, and soon won a reputation for theological knowledge. His earliest writings, which date from 1351, were of a philosophical character. Nicola Roselli, the grand inquisitor of Aragon, having been raised to the rank of a cardinal (1356), Eymeric was appointed his successor in the Inquisition early in 1357. The zeal he displayed in his new office roused much opposition and even open enmity. In spite of

the support of Cardinal Legate Guido, Eymeric, in the interest of peace, was removed from office at the general chapter of the Dominican Order held at Perpignan in 1360. Two years later, at the general chapter held at Ferrara, he was chosen vicar of the Dominican province of Aragon. Shortly afterwards, when a provincial was to be elected for the same province, there was a hopeless division among the Dominicans, one party supporting Eymeric, the other Father Bernardo Ermengaudi. Pope Urban V confirmed neither, but appointed a third, Jacopo Dominici.

Meanwhile Eymeric showed great activity as a preacher, as well as a writer on theological subjects. Some years later he was again made inquisitor general of Aragon; we find him in this office in 1366, and several tractates on dogmatic subjects date from the years immediately following. He combated in particular Raymond Lully, in whose writings he found numerous errors. He influenced Gregory XI to forbid the faithful to read certain writings of Lully's and to condemn by a special decree (26 Jan., 1376) several theses extracted from his works. Eymeric was in high esteem with King Pedro IV of Aragon, as well as with Gregory XI. In 1376 he visited the papal court at Avignon, and accompanied the pope on his return to Rome. He was still there at the election of Urban VI and the nomination of the antipope Clement VII, whose claims he vigorously championed against those of the Roman pope. Towards the end of 1378 he returned to Aragon, but in the interests of his office as grand inquisitor often went to the court of Clement VII at Avignon. Eymeric continued his campaign against the Lullists by word as well as by pen. In his "Tractatus contra doctrinam Raymundi Lulli", dedicated to Clement VII, he indicates 135 heresies, 38 errors, and many misleading statements of Lully. He also composed a "Dialogus contra Lullistas" and other treatises. Lully's partisans, however, won over to their side, soon after his accession, King John I of Aragon. Eymeric was banished and went to the papal court of Avignon, where he was welcomed both by Clement VII and later by Benedict XIII. He wrote numerous theological works and also special tractates defending the legitimacy of the Avignon popes, e.g. his "Tractatus de potestate papali" (1383), which he composed for Clement VII, and two tractates for Benedict XIII. Notwithstanding his sentence of banishment, he still retained his post of grand inquisitor of Aragon. As early as 1376 he had compiled, as a guide for inquisitors, his "Directorium inquisitorum", the only one of his more extensive works that was afterwards printed (Barcelona, 1503; Rome, 1578, ed. Francesco Pegna, with a copious commentary; reissued several times). Towards the end of 1397 Eymeric returned to his native land and his monastery of Gerona, where he died. His epitaph describes him as *prædicator veridicus, inquisitor intrepidus, doctor egregius.*

QUÉTIF AND ECHARD, *Script. ord. præd.* (Paris, 1719), I, 709–17, with the titles of thirty-five of Eymeric's works, contained in eleven MSS. volumes; HURTER, *Nomenclator* (Innsbruck, 1906), 710–12; EHRLE in *Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengesch. des M. A.*, I, 43 sqq.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Eyre, THOMAS, first president of Ushaw College; b. at Glossop, Derbyshire, in 1748; d. at Ushaw, 8 May, 1810. He was the fourth son of Nathaniel Eyre and Jane Broomhead. On 24 June, 1758, he, with his brothers Edward and John, arrived at Esquerchin, near Douai, the preparatory school for the English college. Having passed through school and college alike with credit, he remained after his ordination as general prefect and master of the classes known as rhetoric and poetry. In 1775 Mr. Eyre returned to England to take charge of the Stella mission near Newcastle, on the invitation of his kinsman, Thomas Eyre. While here he brought out a new edition of the works of Gother and also made a collection of materials (now in the Ushaw archives) with the intention of continuing Dodd's "Church History". His scheme for a new edition of Bishop Challoner's Bible was given up at the request of Bishop Thomas Talbot. In 1792 he removed from Stella Hall to Wooler and thence to Pontop Hall in Durham. In 1794 Bishop Gibson desired him to take charge of the Northern students who had been expelled from Douai, and who were then temporarily at Tudhoe under Lingard, the famous historian, who had not yet been ordained priest. Mr. Eyre removed these students first to Pontop Hall and in October, 1794, to Crook Hall, where he became president of the new college. Though he was willing to resign this post in favour of Mr. Daniel, president of Douai, this suggested arrangement came to nothing and Mr. Eyre remained president. In 1803 an estate called Ushaw was bought by the bishop, and here, early in 1804, the new college was begun, and in July, 1808, Mr. Eyre began to remove his community thither. On 2 August he himself entered and the transfer of St. Cuthbert's College from Crook Hall to Ushaw was complete. Mr. Eyre died at Ushaw, leaving a considerable sum to the college for professorships and burses. Besides the edition of Gother's works he brought out, in separate form, Gother's "Instructions for Confirmation" (Newcastle, 1783), and Gobinet's "Instruction of Youth in Christian Piety".

KIRK, *Memoirs of Eighteenth Century Catholics* (London, 1908); GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.* (London, 1886), II, 199–202; COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (London, 1889), XVIII, 102; LAING, *Ushaw College Centenary Memorial* (Newcastle, 1895), with portrait.

EDWIN BURTON.

Eyston, CHARLES, antiquary, b. 1667; d. 5 Nov., 1721; he was a member of the ancient family of Eyston, then and still of East Hendred, their house being one of the few places in England where the Blessed Sacrament has always been preserved. He was eldest son of George Eyston and of Ann, daughter of Robert Dormer of Peterley. On the death of his father in 1691 he succeeded to the family estates, and in 1692 married Winefrid Dorothy, daughter of Basil Fitzherbert of Swinnerton, Staffordshire, by whom he had a large family. He was a good scholar and it was in his antiquarian researches that he became a friend of Thomas Hearne, who wrote of him: "He was a Roman Catholick and so charitable to the poor that he is lamented by all who knew anything of him. . . . He was a man of a sweet temper and was an excellent scholar and so modest that he did not care to have it at any time mentioned." (Reliq. Hearnianæ, cit. inf.) On his death he was succeeded by his son, Charles. It is generally stated that another of his sons joined the Jesuits, but though his son, William George, entered the Society in 1736, he left it almost at once. Several of his daughters became nuns. He wrote: "A little Monument to The Once Famous Abbey and Borough of Glastonbury", published by Hearne in his "History and Antiquities of Glastonbury" (Oxford, 1722); reprinted by the Rev. R. Warner in his "History of the Abbey of Glaston and the town of Glastonbury" (Bath, 1826). There is in the library at Hendred an unpublished MS. entitled "A Poor Little Monument to All the Old Pious Dissolved Foundations of England: or a Short History of Abbeys, all sorts of Monasteries, Colleges, Chapels, Chantries, etc." Another MS. mentioned under his name by Gillow was merely his property and not his work; and the same writer corrects Charles Butler's error in ascribing to Eyston a "History of the Reformation", published in 1685.

HEARNE, *Reliquiæ Hearnianæ* (London, 1869), II, III; KIRK, *Memoirs of Eighteenth Century Catholics* (London, 1908); BURKE, *History of the Commoners of Great Britain and Ireland* (London, 1834), I, 12; IDEM, *Landed Gentry* (London, 1886), I, 601; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.* (London, 1886), II, 204; COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, XVIII, 105.

EDWIN BURTON.

Ezechias (Heb. חזקיהו, or יחזקיהו="The Lord strengtheneth"; Sept. Ἐζεκίας; in the cuneiform inscriptions *Ha-za-qi-ya-hu*), King of Juda, son and successor of Achaz. We learn from IV Kings, xviii, that he began his reign in the third year of Osee, King of Israel, that he was then twenty-five years of age, that his reign lasted twenty-nine years, and that his mother was Abi, daughter of Zacharias. The account of his reign is beset with unsolved chronological difficulties, and there exists a difference of opinion among scholars as to the year in which he ascended the throne. The commonly received computation reckons his reign from 726 to 697 B. C. In character and policy, Ezechias was pious and agreeable to God. He was a strenuous civil and religious reformer, and on this account the sacred writer compares him to King David. The events of his reign are related in the Fourth Book of Kings, and also in the parallel account in the Second Book of Paralipomenon, but in the latter, as might be expected, stress is laid chiefly on the religious reforms which he carried out, whereas the earlier account mentions these briefly, and dwells at greater length on the civil and political aspects of his reign.

Among the religious reforms are mentioned the purification of the Temple, which had been closed by Achaz, the irreligious predecessor of Ezechias (II Par., xxviii–xxix), the resumption and proper celebration of the feast of the Passover which had been neglected (II Par., xxx), and in general the extirpation of idolatry, and the reorganization of the Hebrew worship (IV K., xviii, II Par., xxxi). In a title prefixed to the twenty-fifth chapter of Proverbs, it is stated that the sayings contained in the following collection (xxv-xxix) were copied out by the "men of Ezechias". This would seem to indicate, on the part of the king, some literary interest and activity, and in the Talmudic tradition these "men of Ezechias" are credited with the composition of several books of the Old Testament. Soon after his accession to the throne Ezechias threw off the yoke of the Assyrians, to whom his father had become a vassal (IV K., xviii). Other notable events of his reign are his sickness and miraculous cure, the embassy of Berodach Baladan, and the invasion of Sennacherib. The story of the sickness of Ezechias is narrated in IV K., xx, and in Is., xxxviii.

The king having been stricken with some mortal disease, the prophet Isaias comes in the name of Yahweh to warn him to put his affairs in order, for he is about to die. But Ezechias prays to the Lord, Who sends the prophet back to announce to him that he will recover, and that fifteen years are to be added to his life. As a sign of the fulfilment of this promise, Isaias causes the shadow to recede a distance of ten lines on the sundial. Connected with this event is the sending of an embassy by Berodach Baladan, King of Babylon, who having heard of the illness of Ezechias, sent messengers to him with presents. The motive of this action on the part of the Babylonian king was probably to enlist the services of Ezechias in a league against Sennacherib, King of Assyria. Ezechias received the envoys with great honour, and exhibited to them his various treasures and armaments of war. This spirit of ostentation was displeasing to the Lord, and Isaias was sent to announce that the treasures, in which the king seemed to place his confidence, would be all carried off as plunder to Babylon. Not long after (according to the cuneiform inscriptions, in the year 701), Sennacherib undertook a great campaign against Syria and Egypt. The story of this expedition is told, from the Assyrian standpoint, in the official cuneiform inscription known as the Taylor prism. The plan of Sennacherib was, first, to vanquish the kings of Ascalon, Sidon and Juda who had formed a coalition against him, and then to turn his attention to the land of the Pharaohs.

After subduing Ascalon and Accaron, the Assyrian invader captured and plundered all the fortified towns of Juda, and carried their inhabitants into exile. Then he besieged Jerusalem, and Ezechias, finding himself shut up "like a bird in a cage", resolved to come to terms with his enemy. Sennacherib demanded thirty talents of gold and three hundred talents of silver, and, in order to supply it, Ezechias was obliged to yield up not only the contents of the royal treasury, but also the silver belonging to the Temple, and the plates of gold which were on the doors thereof (IV K. xviii). But when in addition to this, the Assyrian demanded the surrender of Jerusalem with a view to carrying its inhabitants into exile, the courage of Ezechias was revived, and he prepared himself for a vigorous resistance. Haughty demands of surrender were repulsed, and the king taking counsel with the prophet Isaias turned in supplication to Yahweh; he received the assurance that the enemy would soon abandon the siege without doing any harm to the city. This prophecy was shortly verified when the angel of the Lord having slain in the night 185,000 of the besieging forces, the remainder fled with Sennacherib, and returned to Assyria. Ezechias survived this deliverance only a few years, and he was buried with great pomp in the tomb of the sons of David (IV K. xx, 21; II Par. xxxii, 33).

MANGENOT in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v.; *La Bible et les Découvertes Modernes*, 6th ed. (1896), t. IV, pp. 12, 14–28; HASTINGS, *Dictionary of the Bible*, s. v. *Hezekiah*.

JAMES F. DRISCOLL

Ezechiel, whose name, Yehézq'êl (יחזקאל) signifies "strong is God", or "whom God makes strong" (Ezech., i, 3; iii, 8), was the son of Buzi, and was one of the priests who, in the year 598 B. C., had been deported together with Joachim as prisoners from Jerusalem (IV Kings, xxiv, 12-16; cf. Ezech., xxxiii, 21, xl, 1). With the other exiles he settled in Tell-Abib near the Chobar (Ezech., i, 1; iii, 15) in Babylonia, and seems to have spent the rest of his life there. In the fifth year after the captivity of Joachim, and according to some, the thirtieth year of his life, Ezechiel received his call as a prophet (Ezech. i, 2, 4 etc.) in the vision which he describes in the beginning of his prophecy (Ezech. i, 4; iii, 15). From Ezech. xxix, 17 it appears that he prophesied during at least twenty-two years.

Ezechiel was called to foretell God's faithfulness in the midst of trials, as well as in the fulfilment of His promises. During the first period of his career, he foretold the complete destruction of the kingdom of Juda, and the annihilation of the city and temple. After the fulfilment of these predictions, he was commanded to announce the future return from exile, the re-establishment of the people in their own country and, especially, the redemption within the Kingdom of the Messiah, the second David, so that the people would not abandon themselves to despair and perish as a nation, through contact with the Gentiles, whose gods had apparently triumphed over the God of Israel. This is the principal burden of Ezechiel's prophecy, which is divided into three parts. After the introduction, the vision of the calling of the prophet (Ezech., i-iii, 21), the first part contains the prophecies against Juda before the fall of Jerusalem (Ezech., iii, 22-xxiv). In this part the prophet declares the hope of saving the city, the kingdom, and the temple to be vain, and announces the approaching judgment of God upon Juda. This part may be subdivided into five group of prophecies.

(1) After a second revelation, in which God discloses to the prophet His course of action (iii, 22-27), the prophet foretells by symbolic acts (iv, v) and in words (vi-vii), the siege and capture of Jerusalem, and the banishment of Juda. (2) In a prophetic vision, in the presence of the elders of Israel, God reveals to him the cause of these punishments. In spirit he witnesses

the idolatry practised in and near the temple (viii); God commands that the guilty be punished and the faithful be spared (ix); God's majesty departs from the temple (x), and also, after the announcement of guilt and punishment, from the city. With this the judgment which the prophet communicates to the exiles ends (xi).

(3) In the third group (xii-xix) many different prophecies are brought together, whose sole connexion is the relation they bear to the guilt and punishment of Jerusalem and Juda. Ezechiel prophesies by symbolic actions the exile of the people, the flight of Sedecias, and the devastation of the land (xii, 1-20). Then follow Divine revelations regarding belief in false prophecies, and disbelief in the very presence of

EZECHIEL
Michelangelo Buonarotti, Sistine Chapel, Vatican

true prophecy. This was one of the causes of the horrors (xii, 21-xiv, 11), to be visited upon the remnant of the inhabitants of Jerusalem (xiv, 12-23). The prophet likens Jerusalem to the dead wood of the vine, which is destined for the fire (xv); in an elaborate denunciation he represents Juda as a shameless harlot, who surpasses Samaria and Sodom in malice (xvi), and in a new simile, he condemns King Sedecias (xvii). After a discourse on the justice of God (xviii), there follows a further lamentation over the princes and the people of Juda (xix). (4) In the presence of the elders the prophet denounces the whole people of Israel for the abominations they practised in Egypt, in the Wilderness, and in Canaan (xx). For these Juda shall be consumed by fire, and Jerusalem shall be exterminated by the sword (xxi). Abominable is the immorality of Jerusalem (xxii), but Juda is more guilty than Israel has ever been (xxiii). (5) On the day on which the siege of Jerusalem began, the prophet represents, under the figure of the rusty pot, what was to befall the inhabitants of the city. On the occasion of the death of his wife, God forbids him to mourn openly, in order to teach the exiles that they should be willing to lose that which is dearest to them without grieving over it (xxiv).

In the second part (xxv-xxxii), are gathered together the prophecies concerning the Gentiles. He takes, first of all, the neighbouring peoples who had been exalted through the downfall of Juda, and who had humiliated Israel. The fate of four of these, the Ammonites, the Moabites, the Edomites, and the Philistines, is condensed in chapter xxv. He treats more at length of Tyre and its king (xxvi-xxviii, 19), after which he casts a glance at Sidon (xxviii, 20-26). Six prophecies against Egypt follow, dating from different years (xxix-xxxii). The third part (xxxiii-xlviii), is occupied with the Divine utterances on the subject of Israel's restoration. As introduction, we have a dissertation from the prophet, in his capacity of authorized champion of the mercy and justice of God, after which he addresses himself to those remaining in Juda, and to the perverse exiles (xxxiii). The manner in which God will restore His people is only indicated in a general way. The Lord will cause the evil shepherds to perish; He will gather in, guide, and feed the sheep by means of the second David, the Messiah (xxxiv).

Though Mount Seir shall remain a waste, Israel shall return unto its own. There God will purify His people, animate the nation with a new spirit, and re-establish it in its former splendour for the glory of His name (xxxv–xxxvi). Israel, though dead, shall rise again, and the dry bones shall be covered with flesh and endowed with life before the eyes of the prophet. Ephraim and Juda shall, under the second David, be united into one kingdom, and the Lord shall dwell in their midst (xxxvii). The invincibleness and indestructibility of the restored kingdom are then symbolically presented in the war upon Gog, his inglorious defeat, and the annihilation of his armies (xxxviii-xxxix). In the last prophetic vision, God shows the new temple (xl-xlii), the new worship (xliii-xlvi), the return to their own land, and the new division thereof among the twelve tribes (xlvii-xlviii), as a figure of His foundation of a kingdom where He shall dwell among His people, and where He shall be served in His tabernacle according to strict rules, by priests of His choice, and by the prince of the house of David.

From this review of the contents of the prophecy, it is evident that the prophetic vision, the symbolic actions and examples, comprise a considerable portion of the book. The completeness of the description of the vision, actions and similes, is one of the many causes of the obscurity of the book of Ezechiel. It is often difficult to distinguish between what is essential to the matter represented, and what serves merely to make the image more vivid. On this account it happens that, in the circumstantial descriptions, words are used, the meaning of which, inasmuch as they occur in Ezechiel only, is not determined. Because of this obscurity, a number of copyist mistakes have crept into the text, and that at an early date, since the Septuagint has some of them in common with the earliest Hebrew text we have. The Greek version, however, includes several readings which help to fix the meaning. The genuineness of the book of Ezechiel is generally conceded. Some few consider chapters xl-xlviii to be apocryphal, because the plan there described in the building of the temple was not followed, but they overlook the fact that Ezechiel here gives a symbolic representation of the temple, that was to find spiritual realization in God's new kingdom. The Divine character of the prophecies was recognized as early as the time of Jesus the son of Sirach (Eccles. xlix, 10, 11). In the New Testament, there are no verbatim references, but allusions to the prophecy and figures taken from it are frequent. Compare St. John, x, 10 etc. with Ezech., xxxiv, 11 etc.; St. Matthew, xiii, 32, with Ezech., xvii, 23. In particular St. John, in the Apocalypse, has often followed Ezechiel. Compare Apoc., xviii–xxi with Ezech., xxvii, xxxviii etc., xlvii etc.

CURREY, *Ezekiel* (London, 1882); COBERN, *Ezekiel and Daniel* (New York, 1903); REDPATH, *The Book of Ezekiel* (London, 1907); SPOER, *Emendations in the Text of Ezekiel* in *Am. Jour-*

nal of Sem. Languages, XIX–); DOUGLAS, *Ezekiel's Vision of the Temple* in *Expository Times*, XIV; LEWIS, *By the River Chebar* (London, 1903); BARCLAY, *The New Jerusalem* (London, 1905); BEVAN, *Ezekiel xxviii* in *Journal of Theol. Studies*, iv; PILCHER, *Ez. i* in *Proceedings of Soc. of Bibl. Arch.*, XXX, 45; KNABENBAUER, *Comment. in Ez.* (Paris, 1890); MEIGNAN, *Quatre siècles de lutte contre l'idolâtrie* (Paris, 1892); CORNILL, *Das Buch Ez.* (Leipzig, 1886); TROCHON, *Ezéchiel* (Paris, 1897); BERTHOLET, *Das Buch Hes.* (Freiburg, 1897); KRAETZSCHMAR, *Das Buch Ez.* (Göttingen, 1900); SCHMALZL, *Das Buch Ez.* (Vienna, 1901); MÜLLER, *Ezechiel Studien* in *Bibl. Studien* (Vienna, 1904); JAHN, *Das Buch Ez. auf Grund der Septuag. hergestellt* (Leipzig, 1905); JOÜON, *Ez. Verfasser des B. Job* in *Zeitschrift f. Kath. Theol.* (1903), 583; BEGRICH, *Messias des Ez.* in *Zeitschr. f. wis. Theol.*, XLVII, 433.

JOS. SCHETS.

Eziongeber. See ASIONGABER.

Eznik, a writer of the fifth century, b. at Golp, in the province of Taikh, a tributary valley of the Chorokh, in Northern Armenia. He was a pupil of Isaac, the catholicos, and of Mesrop. At their request he went first to Edessa, then to Constantinople to perfect himself in the various sciences and to collect or copy Syriac and Greek manuscripts of the Bible, and the writings of the Fathers of the Church. He returned to Armenia after the Council of Ephesus (431), and is probably identical with Eznik, Bishop of Bagrevand, who took part in the Synod of Artashat in 449. In addition to his labours in connexion with the new version of the Bible (see VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE) and various translations, he composed several works, the principal of which is his remarkable treatise "Against the Sects". It was written between 441 and 449, and contains four books or chapters. In the first, against the heathens, Eznik combats the eternity of matter and the substantial existence of evil. In the second he refutes the chief doctrines of Parseeism. The third is directed against the Greek philosophers (Pythagoreans, Platonists, Peripatetics, Stoics, and Epicureans), the writer taking his arguments from the Bible rather than from reason. The fourth book is an exposition and refutation of Marcionism. In the work Eznik displays much acumen and an extensive erudition. He was evidently as familiar with Persian as with Greek literature. His Armenian diction is of the choicest classical type, although the nature of his subject-matter forced him to use quite a number of Greek words. The work "Against the Sects" was first published at Smyrna in 1762; again, much more correctly and from several manuscripts, by the Mechitarists at Venice in 1826 and in 1865. An indifferent French translation was made by LeVaillant de Florival, "Réfutation des différentes sectes", etc. (Paris, 1853). A good German translation is that by J. M. Schmid, "Eznik von Kolb, Wider die Sekten" (Leipzig, 1900). Langlois published a general introduction to the whole treatise and a translation of part of book II (section 5, 1-11, containing Magism) in his "Collection des historiens anciens et modernes de l'Arménie", II, pp. 371 sq. Eznik is also the author of a short collection of moral precepts, printed with his more important treatise.

NEUMANN, *Versuch einer Geschichte der armenischen Literatur, nach den Werken der Mekhitaristen frei gearbeitet* (Leipzig, 1836), 42 sqq.; FINCK, *Geschichte der armenischen Litteratur* in *Geschichte der christlichen Litteraturen des Orients* (Leipzig, 1907), 85 sqq.; BARDENHEWER, *Patrology*, tr. SHAHAN (Freiburg im Br., St. Louis, 1908), 593; WEBER, *Die Katholische Kirche* in Armenian (Freiburg im Br., 1903), 50.

H. HYVERNAT.

Ezzo, a priest of Bamberg in the eleventh century, author of a famous poem known as the "Song of the Miracles of Christ" (*Cantilena de miraculis Christi*), or the "Anegenge" or "Beginning". The poem was found by Barack in a Strasburg MS. of the eleventh century, but only a few strophes are given. The whole song, thirty-four strophes, is preserved, though in a later version, in the Vorau MS. The "Vita Altmanni" relates that in 1065, when rumours of the approaching end of the world were rife, many people started on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem under the leadership of Bishop Gunther of Bamberg, and that Ezzo composed the poem on this occasion. The opening strophe of the Vorau MS. does not mention the pilgrimage, but simply states that the bishop ordered Ezzo to write the song. The effect, we are told, was such that everybody hastened to take monastic vows. The poem is written in the East Franconian dialect; it relates in earnest language the Creation, Fall, and Redemption of mankind. It was edited by P. Piper (*op. cit. infra*) and Steinmayer (in Müllenhoff and Scherer "Denkmäler deutscher Poesie und Prosa aus dem VIII–XII Jahrhundert", Berlin, 1892).

PIPER, *Die geistliche Dichtung des M. A.* in KÜRSCHNER, *Deutsche Nat.-Lit.*, I, 37 seq.; KELLE, *Die Quelle von Ezzos Gesang von den Wundern Christi* (Vienna, 1893).

ARTHUR F. J. REMY.

F

Faa di Bruno, Francesco, an Italian mathematician and priest, b. at Alessandria, 7 March, 1825; d. at Turin, 26 March, 1888. He was of noble birth, and held, at one time, the rank of captain-of-staff in the Sardinian Army. Coming to Paris, he resigned his commission, studied under Cauchy, an admirable type of the true Catholic savant, and Leverrier, who shared in the discovery of the planet Neptune, and he became intimate with Abbé Moigno and Hermite. On his return to Turin, he was ordained, but the remainder of his life was spent as Professor of Mathematics at the University. In recognition of his achievements as a mathematician, the degree of Doctor of Science was conferred on him by the Universities of Paris and Turin. In addition to some ascetical writings, the composition of some sacred melodies, and the invention of some scientific apparatus, Faa di Bruno made numerous and important contributions to mathematics. These include about forty original articles published in the "Journal de Mathématiques" (Liouville), Crelle's "Journal", "American Journal of Mathematics" (Johns Hopkins University), "Annali di Tortolini", "Les Mondes", "Comptes rendus de l'Académie des sciences", etc; the first half of an exhaustive treatise on the theory and applications of elliptic functions which he planned to complete in three volumes; "Théorie générale de l'élimination" (Paris, 1859); "Calcolo degli errori" (Turin, 1867), translated into French under the title of "Traité élémentaire du calcul des erreurs" (Paris, 1869); and most important of all, "Théorie des formes binaires" (Paris, 1876), translated into German (Leipzig, 1881). For a list of the memoirs of Faa di Bruno, see the "Catalogue of Scientific Papers of the Royal Society" (London, 1868, 1877, 1891), t. II, vii, and ix.

Paul H. Linehan.

Faa di Bruno, Joseph. See Pious Society of Missions.

Faber, Felix, German writer, b. about 1441 at Zurich, of a famous family commonly known as Schmid; d. in 1502 at Ulm, Germany. He made his early studies under the Dominicans at Basle and Ulm, where he spent the greater part of his life. He became a master of sacred theology, was head preacher at Ulm during 1477–78, became provincial of the German province in 1486, attended two general chapters of his order in 1480, and made a pilgrimage to Palestine and Syria in 1483–4. He wrote two accounts of his travels, one in German (Ulm, 1556); the other in Latin. The former is rather brief; the other is very complete and accurate in its descriptions of the places visited, and is of great value to students of Palestinian topography, who recognize Faber as the most distinguished and learned writer of the fifteenth century. This work was republished by the Stuttgart Literary Society in three octavo volumes (1843–49) under the title, "Fr. Felicis Fabri Evagatorium in Terræ Sanctæ, Arabiæ et Ægypti peregrinationem". He was also the author of a versified pilgrim's book, edited by Birlinger (Munich, 1864). In 1489 Faber completed a history of the Swiss (Historia Suevorum) down to that year. Goldast, in his preface to the Frankfort edition of 1604 (later ed., Ulm, 1727), says of him that he was praised by few but copied by many. Faber translated a life of Blessed Henry Suso from the Latin. Some of his manuscripts are still unpublished.

Quétif and Echard, *Scriptores Ord. Præd.*, I, 871; Haeberlin, *Dissert. sistens vitam, itinera et scripta Fr. F. Fabri* (Göttingen, 1742); cf. also preface to the Stuttgart ed. of the *Evagatorium.*

Arthur L. McMahon.

Faber, Frederick William, Oratorian and devotional writer; b. 28 June, 1814, at Calverley, Yorkshire, England; d. in London, 26 Sept., 1863. After five years at Harrow School he matriculated at Balliol in 1832, became a scholar at University College in 1834, and a fellow of that College in 1837. Of Huguenot descent Faber was divided in his university days between a tendency to Calvinism, in the form of individual pietism, and the Church theory then being advocated by Newman. Eventually the latter triumphed, and Faber threw himself unreservedly into the Tractarian movement and cooperated in the translation of the works of the Fathers then in progress. He received Anglican ordination in 1839, and took work as a tutor, till, in 1843, he was appointed Rector of Elton, Northamptonshire. During the years 1839–1843 Faber made two continental tours, and his letters give strikingly poetic descriptions of the scenes he visited; they glow with enthusiasm for Catholic rites and devotion. On his return to Elton in 1844, he established the practice of confession, preached Catholic doctrine, and wrote the life of St. Wilfrid, openly advocating the claims and supremacy of Rome.

Frederick William Faber

In October 1845, Newman was received into the Church at Littlemore; in November, Faber was also received by Bishop Waring, at Northampton. In 1846, Faber established a religious community, the "Brothers of the Will of God" or "Wilfridians," as they were called from St. Wilfrid, their patron, at Cotton Hall, near Cheadle, Staffordshire, the gift of the Earl of Shrewsbury. In 1847 Faber was ordained priest and with his zealous community, now forty in number, converted the whole parish, except "the parson, the pew-opener, and two drunken men." In 1848, Newman arrived from Rome with his new congregation of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri, and established himself at Old Oscott, Birmingham, then renamed Maryvale. With singular disinterestedness, Faber placed himself under Newman as a simple novice, taking with him all his community who were willing to follow his example. In 1849 he was sent by Newman to found the Oratory at King William Street, London, and was appointed its superior. In the poor chapel there, once a tavern, Faber laid the foundation of his future works. Poor schools, nightly services, and sermons with hymns and processions of the Blessed Sacrament, till then unknown, formed its chief

characteristics. Faber's hymns, composed especially for these services, display a combination of accurate theological doctrine, fervent devotion, musical rhythm, and true poetic talent. As a preacher he was remarkable for his delivery, choice of expression, absence of gesticulation, and personal exhortations of surprising force.

In 1847 Faber began the publication of "Lives of Modern Saints," not as biographies, but as showing the growth of sanctity under the operation of grace and the supernatural perfection attained. The series of forty-nine Lives supplied a great want of the time and, after some opposition, met with full approbation. His knowledge of the spiritual life and the extent of his theological and ascetic reading were seen in the eight works that now came from his pen: "All for Jesus", 1853; "Growth in Holiness", 1854; "The Blessed Sacrament", 1855; "The Creator and the Creature", 1858; "The Foot of the Cross", 1858; "Spiritual Conferences", 1859; "The Precious Blood", 1860; "Bethlehem", 1860. The many foreign translations of these works, their circulation now maintained for more than fifty years, their constant quotation by spiritual writers, have raised their author to the rank of a master in mystical theology. He wrote also two volumes of "Notes on Doctrinal Subjects" (1866), giving the skeleton of various sermons and of two projected works, "Calvary" and "The Holy Ghost." A volume of poems, various essays, and other minor works are also from his pen. The fascination and grace of his presence rendered him personally attractive, while as confessor his sympathy with souls in trouble, his spiritual insight, and his supernatural unworldliness, gave to his counsel a lifelong point and force.

The Oratory removed to South Kensington in 1854, and there Faber spent the remaining nine years of his life, occupied primarily in establishing his community on the strict observance of St. Philip's Institute, being convinced that fidelity to its Roman model was its one vital principle. The sacraments, prayer, including the reverent performance of the ecclesiastical functions, and the daily Word of God were St. Philip's weapons, and Faber would never engage in other external works, however good. Unswerving loyalty to the Holy See was his watchword, and devotion to the Mother of God was for him the safeguard of faith and the source and support of true piety.

BOWDEN, *The Life and Letters of Frederick William Faber*, 2nd ed. (London, 1888); FABER, *A Brief Sketch of the Early Life of F. W. Faber* (London, 1869); *Civiltà Cattolica* (Rome, 3 and 13 Aug., 1872), tr. (London, 1872); *Catholic World*, X, 145; III, 287; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. of Eng. Cath.*, II, 207–219.

HENRY S. BOWDEN.

Faber, JOHANN, theologian, b. at Leutkirch, in Swabia, 1478; d. in Vienna, 21 May, 1541. He studied theology and canon law at Tübingen and Freiburg in the Breisgau; was made doctor of sacred theology in Freiburg; became in succession minister of Lindau, Leutkirch; Vicar-General of Constance, 1518; chaplain and confessor to King Ferdinand I of Austria, 1524; was appointed Bishop of Vienna, 1530. While a canon of the cathedral of Basle he formed a friendship with Erasmus that lasted throughout their lives; Erasmus persuaded Faber to take up the study of the Fathers. Like others of his time Faber was at first friendly with the Reformers, Melanchthon, Zwingli, and Œcolampadius, sympathizing with their efforts at reform and opposing certain abuses himself; but when he realized that neither dogma nor the Church herself was spared by the Reformers, he broke with them and became their most consistent opponent. He wrote his first polemic against Luther, "Opus adversus nova quædam dogmata Martini Lutheri" (1552). This was soon followed by his "Malleus Hæreticorum, sex libris ad Hadrianum VI summum Pontificem" (Cologne, 1524; Rome, 1569). From this latter work he is sometimes called the "hammer of heretics". He entered into public debate with Zwingli at Zurich; was prominent in all the diets held to restore peace to the Church; and was one of the committee appointed to draw up a refutation of the Confession of Augsburg. On some points, e. g. the celibacy of the clergy, he was willing to recognize certain unfortunate conditions if an agreement could be reached to prevent similar conditions in the future, but no agreement was possible. He was sent by Ferdinand to Spain and then to Henry VIII in England to seek aid against the invading Turks; Ferdinand also had him enlist the services of the University of Vienna to combat the spread of the doctrines of Luther in Austria. As bishop his zeal was unbounded; he protected his flock by frequent preaching and numerous writings, and he held regular conferences with his clergy. He founded twelve scholarships for boys who wished to become priests but did not have the means to realize their ambition.

His works (German and Latin) are homiletical and polemical in character. Besides those already mentioned he wrote treatises on faith and good works, on the Sacrifice of the Mass; an instruction and answer to Luther's work against the King of England; a treatise against the more recent tenets of Luther; a comparison of the writings of Hus and Luther; the power of the pope in the case of Luther; an answer to six articles of Zwingli; defence of Catholic belief against the chief Anabaptist, Balthasar of Friedberg; a book on the religion of the Russians; sermons on the misery of life, and on the Blessed Sacrament; sermons of consolation and courage while the Turks were besieging Vienna. His works in three folio volumes (Cologne, 1537–40) do not contain his polemical writings; these are found in "Opuscula quædam Joannis Fabri, Episcopi Viennensis" (Leipzig, 1539).

QUÉTIF AND ECHARD, *Scriptores Ord. Præd.* (Paris, 1721), tom. II; DOLEN, *Scriptores Universitatis Viennensis*, pars II (Vienne, 1741); KETTNER, *De Joannis Fabri vitâ et scriptis* (Leipzig, 1735); JANSSEN, *History of the German People* (Freiburg, 1903), V; ROTH in *Kirchenl.* IV, 172–175.

M. SCHUMACHER.

Faber, JOHANN, of Heilbronn, controversialist and preacher; b. 1504, at Heilbronn in Wittenberg; d. at Augsburg, 27 Feb., 1558. At the age of sixteen he entered the Dominican Order and made his ecclesiastical studies in the convent at Wimpfen. Of his earliest missionary labours little is known. In 1534 he was charged with the duty of preaching in the cathedral of Augsburg, but owing to the Lutheran heresies and the bitter attitude of the heretics towards the Church, in consequence of which the Catholic clergy were forbidden to preach, his usefulness there was of short duration. Thence he went to the University of Cologne, where he devoted himself for several years to the higher clerical studies. Here he published in 1535 and 1536 several unedited works of the English mystic, Richard Rolle. Returning to Wimpfen he engaged in the work of preaching and refuting the errors of the Reformers, which had already taken deep root among a large portion of the people. His unwearied zeal, however, in upholding the ancient Faith and the marvellous results attending it, caused his enemies to turn against him with such bitterness that he was forced to leave the city. In 1539, at the solicitation of the citizens of Colmar, he proceeded to that city, where the new doctrines had by this time gained considerable ground. On 2 Sept. of the same year he matriculated at the University of Freiburg as "Concionator Colmarensis", and it was at this time, in all probability, that he received the baccalaureate. In 1545 he was elected prior of the convent in Schlettstadt, but he had served only two years in this capacity when he was again appointed to take charge of the pulpit in the cathedral of Augsburg. Being compelled to abandon it once more in 1552, he proceeded to the University of Ingolstadt, where he received the degree of Doctor of Theology

under the presidency of Peter Canisius, who succeeded him later in the pulpit of Augsburg. In the following year he returned again to Augsburg, where he died. Faber was a man of vast theological erudition. His zeal to stem the tide of heresy and the invincible courage he evinced in exposing the prevailing errors brought him into conflict with many heretical leaders. He is the author of a number of excellent works, including the following: (1) "Quod fides esse possit sine caritate, expositio pia et catholica" (Augsburg, 1548); (2) "Testimonium Scripturæ et Patrum B. Petrum apostolum Romæ fuisse" (Antwerp, 1553); (3) "Gründliche und christliche Anzeigungen aus der heiligen Schrift und heiligen Kirchenlehrern was die evangelische Messe sei" (Dillingen, 1558); (4) "Enchiridion Bibliorum concionatori in popularibus declamationibus utile" (Cologne, 1568); (5) "Precationes Christianæ ex sacris litteris et D. Augustino singulario studio concinnatæ et selectæ" (Cologne, 1586).

QUÉTIF AND ECHARD, *Scriptores Ord. Præd.*, II, 161; HURTER, *Nomenclator*, 3d ed., II, 1431; PAULUS, *Die deutschen Dominikaner im Kampfegegen Luther* (Freiburg, 1903), 232–266.

JOSEPH SCHROEDER.

Faber, JOHANN AUGUSTANUS, theologian, b. at Fribourg, Switzerland, c. 1470; d. about 1531. He entered the Dominican Order, probably at Augsburg, Germany, where he passed the greater part of his religious life, whence his name Augustanus. He obtained the degrees of Master and Doctor of Divinity, was made (1511) Vicar General of the Dominican Congregation of Upper Germany, and for twenty years filled the office of prior in the Augsburg Convent. He rebuilt (1512-1515) the Dominican church in that city, for which some of the funds were obtained through the preaching of a jubilee permitted by Leo X and also, after a prohibition, by the Emperor Maximilian I. Maximilian made him court preacher and royal counsellor. On the recommendation of Erasmus, with whom he was very friendly, he was again appointed to these offices by Maximilian's successor, Charles V. Sympathizing with the Lutherans in their revival of classical learning, he advocated a plan for the treatment of Luther and his followers that the ecclesiastical superiors could not accept. When he withdrew this, and broke away from the humanists, he received the abuse of Luther, and also of his former supporter Erasmus, who had already been provoked by his censure, published anonymously, for adhering to the new errors. The accusation made by Erasmus, that Faber had calumniated him to Cardinal Cajetan has not been proved.

QUÉTIF AND ECHARD, *Script. Ord. Præd.*, II, 80; PAULUS, *Die deutschen Dominikaner in Kampfegegen Luther* (Freiburg, 1903), 292–313.

ARTHUR L. MCMAHON.

Faber, MATTHIAS, writer and preacher, b. at Altomünster, Germany, 24 Feb., 1586; d. at Tyrnau, 26 April, 1653. He embraced the ecclesiastical state, became curé of the parish of St. Maurice at Ingoldstadt, and was a professor at the University of that city. His sermons had already won for him a reputation as a sacred orator when he entered the Society of Jesus at Vienna. He was then fifty years old. The sermons which he has left are remarkable for soundness of doctrine, and learning. He is even more a controversialist than an orator in the ordinary sense of the word. His object in preaching was, before everything, either to convert heretics, or to safeguard Catholics from the false doctrines of the Reformation. According to the custom of the times he made excessive use of Scriptural texts, which crowd his instructive sermons and render the reading of them difficult. They are all written in Latin, and have been published in many editions.

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la c. de J.* (Brussels, 1891), III; FABER, *Concionum Opus*, preface.

LOUIS LALANDE.

Faber, PETER. See PETER FABER, SAINT.

Faber (FABRI), PHILIP, theologian, philosopher, and noted commentator of Duns Scotus; b. in 1564, at Spinata di Brisighella, district of Faenza, Italy, and d. at Padua, 28 Aug., 1630. In 1582 he entered the Order of St. Francis (Conventuals), at Cremona. After completing his studies, he taught in various monastic schools till he was appointed professor of philosophy in 1603, and in 1606 professor of theology, at the University of Padua, where he was highly successful as a lecturer. In 1625 he was elected provincial of the order, and he again took up his work as professor, expounding the teachings of Duns Scotus with ability and judgment, and abandoning the superlative style of other commentators. His most important works are: "Philosophia naturalis Scoti in theoremata distributa" (Parma, 1601, revised at Venice, 1606, 1616, 1622, and at Paris, 1622). "Commentaria in quatuor libros sententiarum Duns Scoti" (Venice, 1613; 3rd ed. Paris, 1622); "De Prædestinatione" (Venice, 1623), a complement to the first book of the "Sentences"; "De restitutione, et extremâ unctione" (Venice, 1624), an addition to the fourth book of the Sentences; "A treatise 'de Sacramento Ordinis, pœnis et censuris ecclesiasticis'" (Venice, 1628). His work, "De Primatu Petri et Romani Pontificis" and his "Commentaries on the Metaphysics of Aristotle" were published, after Faber's death, by his friend Matthew Ferchius, O.F.M., who prefaced the "Commentaries", with a biography of the author.

FRANCHINI, *Bibliosofia e memorie letterarie di Scrittori Francescani Conventuali* (Modena, 1698), 204–218; WADDING, *Scrip. Ord. Min.* (Rome, 1906), 196; SBARALEA, *Supplementum ad Scriptores* (Rome, 1806), p. 617.

MICHAEL BIHL.

Faber Stapulensis. See LEFEBVRE D'ETAPLES, JACQUES.

Fabian (FABIANUS), SAINT, POPE, 236–250, the extraordinary circumstances of whose election is related by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., VI, 29). After the death of Anterus he had come to Rome, with some others, from his farm and was in the city when the new election began. While the names of several illustrious and noble persons were being considered, a dove suddenly descended upon the head of Fabian, of whom no one had even thought. To the assembled brethren the sight recalled the Gospel scene of the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the Saviour of mankind, and so, divinely inspired, as it were, they chose Fabian with joyous unanimity and placed him in the Chair of Peter. During his reign of fourteen years there was a lull in the storm of persecution. Little is known of his pontificate. The "Liber Pontificalis" says that he divided Rome into seven districts, each supervised by a deacon, and appointed seven subdeacons, to collect, in conjunction with other notaries, the "acta" of the martyrs, i. e. the reports of the court-proceedings on the occasion of their trials (cf. Eus., VI, 43). There is a tradition that he instituted the four minor orders. Under him considerable work was done in the catacombs. He caused the body of Pope St. Pontianus to be exhumed, in Sardinia, and transferred to the catacomb of St. Callistus at Rome. Later accounts, more or less trustworthy, attribute to him the consecration (245) of seven bishops as missionaries to Gaul, among them St. Denys of Paris (Greg. of Tours, Hist. Francor., I, 28, 31). St. Cyprian mentions (Ep., 59) the condemnation by Fabian for heresy of a certain Privatus (Bishop of Lambæsa) in Africa. The famous Origen did not hesitate to defend, before Fabian, the orthodoxy of his teaching (Eus. Hist. Eccl., VI, 34). Fabian died a martyr (20 Jan., 250) at the beginning of the Decian persecution, and was buried in the Crypt of the Popes in the catacomb of St. Callistus, where in recent times (1850) De Rossi discovered his Greek epitaph (Roma Sotterranea II, 59): "Fabian,

bishop and martyr." The decretals ascribed to him in Pseudo-Isidore are apocryphal.

DUCHESNE (ed.), *Liber Pontificalis* (Paris, 1886) I, 148–49; *Acta SS. Jan.* II, 252–56; BARMBY, in *Dict. of Christian Biogr.* s. v.; TILLEMONT, *Mémoires*, III, 362–66, 719–20; JAFFÉ, *Reg. RR. Pont.* I, 15–17; II, 690.

P. GABRIEL MEIER.

Fabiola, SAINT, a Roman matron of rank, d. 27 December, 399 or 400. She was one of the company of noble Roman women who, under the influence of St. Jerome, gave up all earthly pleasures and devoted themselves to the practice of Christian asceticism and to charitable work At the time of St. Jerome's stay at Rome (382–84), Fabiola was not one of the ascetic circle which gathered around him. It was not until a later date that, upon the death of her second consort, she took the decisive step of entering upon a life of renunciation and labour for others. Fabiola belonged to the patrician Roman family of the Fabia. She had been married to a man who led so vicious a life that to live with him was impossible. She obtained a divorce from him according to Roman law, and, contrary to the ordinances of the Church, she entered upon a second union before the death of her first husband. On the day before Easter, following the death of her second consort, she appeared before the gates of the Lateran basilica, dressed in penitential garb, and did penance in public for her sin, an act which made a great impression upon the Christian population of Rome. The pope received her formally again into full communion with the Church.

Fabiola now renounced all that the world had to offer her, and devoted her immense wealth to the needs of the poor and the sick. She erected a fine hospital at Rome, and waited on the inmates herself, not even shunning those afflicted with repulsive wounds and sores. Besides this she gave large sums to the churches and religious communities at Rome, and at other places in Italy. All her interests were centred on the needs of the Church and the care of the poor and suffering. In 395, she went to Bethlehem, where she lived in the hospice of the convent directed by Paula and applied herself, under the direction of St. Jerome, with the greatest zeal to the study and contemplation of the Scriptures, and to ascetic exercises. An incursion of the Huns into the eastern provinces of the empire, and the quarrel which broke out between Jerome and Bishop John of Jerusalem respecting the teachings of Origen, made residence in Bethlehem unpleasant for her, and she returned to Rome. She remained, however, in correspondence with St. Jerome, who at her request wrote a treatise on the priesthood of Aaron and the priestly dress. At Rome, Fabiola united with the former senator Pammachius in carrying out a great charitable undertaking; together they erected at Porto a large hospice for pilgrims coming to Rome. Fabiola also continued her usual personal labours in aid of the poor and sick until her death. Her funeral was a wonderful manifestation of the gratitude and veneration with which she was regarded by the Roman populace. St. Jerome wrote a eulogistic memoir of Fabiola in a letter to her relative Oceanus.

ST. JEROME, *Ep. lxxvii*, cf. *Epp. lv. lxiv, lxxviii*, in *P. L.* XXII; IDEM, *Contra Rufinum*, III, 14; FREMANTLE in *Dict. of Christ. Biog.*, s. v. *Fabiola;* GRÜTZMACHER, *Hieronymus* (Berlin, 1906), II, 183 sqq.; THIERRY, *St. Jérôme, la société chrétienne à Rome et l'émigration romaine en Terre Sainte* (Paris, 1876), II.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Fabre, JOSEPH, second Superior General of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, b. 14 November, 1824, at Cuges, Bouches-du-Rhône, France; d. at Royaumont near Paris, 26 October, 1892. He first studied at the Lycée of Marseilles, then entered the Grand Séminaire of the same city, and made his novitiate in the Congregation of the Oblates, pronouncing his final vows 17 February, 1845. After teaching philosophy for some time, he was ordained priest, 29 May, 1847. He was Director of the Grand Séminaire of Marseilles when, in 1850, a general chapter elected him procurator of the whole Institute. The Bishop of Marseilles, who was also the superior and founder of the Oblates, made him his trusted confidant; and when that prelate died Father Fabre was unanimously chosen to succeed him (5 Dec., 1861) as Superior General of his congregation, in which capacity he from time to time addressed to the members of his congregation, encyclical letters which have remained models of spiritual direction. He instituted collective retreats for the superiors, and others for the simple religious, and insisted on the observance of charity and humility, which Bishop De Mazenod had made the cardinal virtues of his Institute.

He introduced his missionaries into Italy, Spain, and Holland; established new houses in France, Great Britain, and Canada, and, in 1883, canonically erected into a separate province the houses already existing in the United States. Their activities in the missions of Ceylon, South Africa, and the extreme North, as well as the far West, of America, were no less remarkable during his tenure of office.

At the time of his death, when he had been superior for thirty-one years, the roll of members had more than doubled in numbers, and the Oblates counted in their ranks ten bishops who were at the head of as many vicariates Apostolic. If Bishop De Mazenod had founded and consolidated the congregation, the last touches to the good work were given by his immediate successor. In addition to being their superior general, Father Fabre was the Director-General of the Association of the Holy Family, a religious institute composed of seven congregations of nuns founded at Bordeaux in the first half of the nineteenth century.

Notices nécrologiques des Oblats de Marie Immaculée (Bar-le-Duc, 1899); BENOIT, *Vie de Mgr. Taché* (Montreal, 1904).

A. G. MORICE.

Fabri (LEFÈVRE), HONORÉ, Jesuit, theologian, b. about 1607 in the Department of Ain, France; d. at Rome, 8 March, 1688. He entered the Society of Jesus at Avignon, in 1626, and distinguished himself by a life of continuous mental work. He excelled especially in mathematics and physics, but he was also a formidable controversialist. For eight years he taught philosophy and for six years mathematics in the Jesuit college at Lyons, attracting many pupils by the fame of his learning. Called to Rome, he became the theologian of the court of the papal penitentiary in the Vatican Basilica, a position he held for thirty years. His duties did not prevent him from writing a number of learned works on various subjects in keeping with the needs of his time. Sommervogel mentions thirty-one titles of published works in connexion with Fabri's name; besides, there are fourteen of his productions in MS., now kept in the Library of Lyons.

The following are the more important of his publications: "Pithanophilus, seu dialogus vel opusculum de opinione probabili," etc. (Rome, 1659). This work was attacked by Stephanus Gradius, Prefect of the Vatican Library, in his "Disputatio de opinione probabili" (Rome, 1678; Mechlin, 1679). "Honorati Fabri, Societatis Jesu, apologeticus doctrinæ moralis ejusdem Societatis" (Lyons, 1670; Cologne, 1672). This treats, in eleven dialogues, of probabilism, explaining its true nature, and refuting the charges of its opponents. The Cologne edition was considerably enlarged but did not meet with ecclesiastical approbation; it was placed on the Index of forbidden books soon after its appearance. "Una fides unius Ecclesiæ Romanæ contra indifferentes hujus sæculi tribus libris facili methodo asserta" (Dillingen, 1657). "Summula theologica in quâ quæstiones omnes alicujus momenti, quæ a Scholasticis agitari

solent, breviter discutiuntur ac definiuntur" (Lyons, 1669). The principles on which this work constructs its theological conclusions are far different from those of Aristotle. "Euphiander seu vir ingeniosus", a little book, which may be useful to the student of literature (Lyons, 1669; Vienna, 1731; Budapest, 1749; Ofen, 1763). Most of Fabri's other works deal with philosophy, mathematics, physics, astronomy, and even zoology. In his treatise on man he claims to have discovered the circulation of the blood, prior to Harvey; but, after investigating this question, Father Bellynk arrives at the conclusion that, at best, Father Fabri may have made the discovery independently of Harvey (cf. Bellynk, Cours de Zoologie, 1864, p. 23).

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la C. de J.* (Brussels and Paris, 1892), III, 511–521; HURTER, *Nomenclator Literarius* (Innsbruck, 1893), tom. II, 598–600.

A. J. MAAS.

Fabriano and Matelica, DIOCESE OF (Fabrianensis et Mathelicensis). Fabriano, a city in the province of Macerata, Central Italy, is noted for its paper manufactories and its trade in salted fish. It is said to have been founded in the ninth century B. C. by refugees from the ancient Attidium (the modern Attigio); even as late as 1254 the baptismal font of Fabriano was in the church of San Giovanni Battista in Attigio. The history of Fabriano is closely connected with that of the Marches. In the church of San Benedetto, of the Silvestrine monks, is the tomb of Blessed Giovanni Bonelli, a Silvestrine (d. 1290). St. Silvestro Guzzoli, the founder of this order, is buried at Monte Fano, not far from Fabriano, where Blessed Giuseppe dei Conti Atti and Blessed Ugo Laico, both Silvestrines, are also buried. The relics of St. Romuald were transferred to the church of SS. Biagio and Romoaldo in 1480. The city was under the jurisdiction of Camerino until 1785, when Pius II re-established the see of Matelica and united it *æque principaliter* with Fabriano.

The town of Matelica possesses some ancient inscriptions. A Roman colony was established there in 89 B. C. In 487, Bishop Equitius of Matelica was at Rome; and in 551, Bishop Florentius accompanied Pope Vigilius to Constantinople. No other bishops of the ancient see are known. Until 1785 Matelica was under the jurisdiction of Camerino. Mention may be made of Blessed Gentile da Matelica, a Franciscan, martyred in Egypt in 1351, and buried in Venice (ai Frari), and of Blessed Mattea Lazano, a Benedictine nun, also of Matelica, buried in the church of Santa Maria Maddalena. The diocese is immediately subject to the Holy See, and has 32,000 inhabitants, 42 parishes, 1 male and 2 female educational institutions, 6 religious houses of men and 4 of women. The painter, Gentile da Fabriano (q. v.), is one of the most famous of the natives of Fabriano. He worked at Foggia and Bari, and later in the palace of the doges at Venice, in the Strozzi chapel at Florence, and finally at Rome.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), VII; CAMILLO ACQUACOTTA, *Memorie di Matelica* (Ancona, 1838).

U. BENIGNI.

Fabrica Ecclesiæ, a Latin term, meaning, etymologically, the construction of a church, but in a broader sense the funds necessary for such construction. This expression may also be used to designate the repairing and maintenance of churches, the daily expenses of worship, and to the amount requisite for covering these expenses. In this particular connexion, the expression is first met with in the letter of Pope Simplicius to Gaudentius, Bishop of Aufina (19 Nov., 475); however, even then it was not new, being borrowed from profane usage.

During the first Christian centuries the temporalities intended to meet the expenses incurred by the religious services carried on throughout a diocese belonged entirely to the cathedral church, and constituted a common fund which the bishop used, at his option, in defraying the expenses of religion, supporting its ministers, and caring for the poor. But in the fifth century, particularly in Italy, this common fund was divided into four parts, one of which was set aside for the *fabrica ecclesiæ*. In Sicily, however, in 494, no portion was especially reserved for the fabric, and in Gaul, such an allotment seems to have been unknown. In Spain, a third of the ecclesiastical revenues was assigned to the *luminare* (lights), a term synonymous with *fabrica*. The increase of Christianity in the rural districts brought with it a change of discipline, according to which each church obtained a separate patrimony. In fact, benefactors no longer bestowed their gifts on the entire diocese, but on one particular church, frequently in honour of some saint specially venerated there. The common fund itself was divided among the churches of the diocese. Some writers maintain this division was owing to the establishment of ecclesiastical benefices; others claim that it followed the canonical recognition of the private ownership of churches. After vainly endeavouring to restrict the exercise of public worship to churches whose ownership had been completely renounced by the founders, the canon law eventually permitted public worship in churches that remained the private property of an individual, a monastery or even the episcopal *mensa*, or estate. The owner, however, was obliged to set apart a special fund for the needs of the church (*pro sartis tectis*, or for the *luminare*). Henceforth, when a bishop established a new parish, he was bound to provide for its needs by a specified income to be deducted from the common diocesan estate or fund—of course, if no benefactor had otherwise endowed the parish. Some hold that in consequence of the principles governing feudal society all medieval churches and their revenues became private property, and that the conflict of Gregory VII and his successors against lay investitures was in reality an effort to restore its lost possessions to the ecclesiastical domain. The result of so much strife was the transformation of former proprietary rights into the right of patronage (*Jus patronatus*).

While ecclesiastical ownership was going through these phases, the canon law decided who must contribute to the maintenance of a particular church, i. e. its owner, and all recipients of its revenues (Synod of Frankfort, 794); under pain, therefore, of forfeiting his right of patronage, the patron of a church must share the burden of its maintenance; so too the incumbent of the ecclesiastical benefice and those to whom the tithes have been granted (*decimatores*). Finally, when the resources of the church were insufficient, the faithful themselves were bound to contribute to the expenses of Divine worship. These provisions were sanctioned by the Decretals of Gregory IX (cc. i and iv *de ecclesiis ædificandis*, III, 48), and by the Council of Trent (Sess. XXI, *de ref.* c. vii); they represent in this matter the common ecclesiastical law (see BUILDINGS, ECCLESIASTICAL). The *fabrica ecclesiæ* means also the persons charged with the administration of church property, usually laymen. The origin and historical development of this institution have not yet been studied very closely. Their organization, moreover, has differed from one country to another, nor have they been uniformly organized in the same country. Churches subject to the right of patronage and those incorporated, even for temporal administration, with monasteries, were more closely affected than other churches by this condition of dependency. In such churches the patron occasionally appointed an officer to administer the temporalities. It is commonly believed, however, that "church fabrics" do not antedate the thirteenth century. In the first ages of the Church the bishop administered church property with the aid of deacons and priests, but during the

fourth century there appeared in the Orient and in certain countries of the West, bursars (*œconomi*), who, subject to the direction of the bishop, managed the temporal affairs of churches; in other countries the bishop continued to administer the church property with the assistance of some trustworthy man of his choice. When each church came to have its own particular patrimony, the bishop was naturally obliged to turn over the administration of such property to the local clergy, reserving nevertheless a right of control. During the long Investitures conflict this right, it may be, was completely annihilated; when peace was restored the clergy were often obliged to appeal to the inhabitants of the parish to defray the expenses of religion. In France and England especially, the assembled parishoners established the portion of expenses that ought to be borne by the community; naturally, therefore, this assembly was henceforth consulted in regard to the most important acts connected with the administration of the parish temporalities. For that purpose it selected lay delegates who participated in the ordinary administration of the ecclesiastical property set aside for parochial uses. They were called vestrymen, churchwardens, procurators (*procuratores*), mambours (*mamburni*), *luminiers*, gagers, *provisores*, *vitrici*, *operarii*, *altirmanni*, etc.

In the councils of the thirteenth century frequent mention is made of laymen, chosen by their fellow laymen to participate in the administration of temporal affairs; at the same time the rights of the parish priest and of ecclesiastical authority were maintained. A reaction is visible in the councils of the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries which undertake to check the tendency towards an exclusively lay administration of the parochial property. Eventually the Council of Trent (Sess. XXII *de ref.* c. ix) admitted participation in the administration of ecclesiastical property, but demanded that at all times and in all places the lay administrators render an annual account to the bishop or to his delegate. As no general law has determined either the competency or the composition of fabric committees (*conseils de fabrique*) there has been in this respect very great variations. In modern times secular power has frequently interfered in the administration of ecclesiastical property set apart for purposes of worship, and in the organization of church fabrics. Even now, in most European countries, the State regulates the administration of ecclesiastical property, and the proceedings of church fabrics. (See under BUILDINGS, ECCLESIASTICAL, an outline of the regulations actually in force.)

THOMASSINUS, *Vetus et nova Ecclesiæ disciplina circa beneficia* (Paris, 1691), Pars III, lib. I, II; SŒNENS, *Des fabriques d'église* (Louvain, 1862); STUTZ, *Geschichte des kirchlichen Beneficialwesens* (Berlin, 1895), I; IDEM, *Die Eigenkirche als Element des mittelalterlich-germanischen Kirchenrechts* (Berlin, 1895); BONDROIT, *De capacitate possidendi Ecclesiæ* (Louvain, 1900), I; ROTH, *Geschichte des Beneficialwesens* (Erlangen, 1850); GROSS, *Das Recht an der Pfründe* (Gratz, 1887); IMBART DE LA TOUR, *Les paroisses rurales du IV^e au XI^e siècle* (Paris, 1900); KÜNSTLE, *Die deutsche Pfarrei und ihr Recht zu Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Stuttgart, 1905); VON POSCHINGER, *Das Eigenthum am Kirchenvermögen* (Munich, 1871); LESÊTRE, *La paroisse* (Paris, 1906); CLÉMENT, *Recherches sur les paroisses et les fabriques au commencement du XIII^e siècle* in *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'Ecole française de Rome* (Paris, 1895), XV, 387; FROGER, *De l'organisation et de l'administration des fabriques avant 1789, au diocèse du Mans* in *Revue des questions historiques* (Paris, 1890), LXIII, 406–436, and VACANT-MANGENOT, *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, s. v. *Biens ecclésiastiques* (Paris, 1905), II, 844–878.

A. VAN HOVE.

Fabricius, ANDREW. See LEFÈVRE, FAMILY OF.

Fabricius, HIERONYMUS (surnamed AB AQUAPENDENTE), a distinguished Italian anatomist and surgeon, b. in the little town of Acquapendente (Aquæ-Taurinæ), twelve miles from Orvieto, in 1537; d. at Padua, 21 May, 1619. He is known by the name of his birthplace to distinguish him from his contemporary, the great German surgeon, Fabricius Hildanus. In English medical literature Fabricius is best known as the teacher of Harvey, who gives him the entire credit for the discovery of the valves in the veins which meant so much for Harvey's own discovery of the circulation of the blood. Some valves in the veins, however, had been seen and described by investigators before this, probably even by Erasistratus in ancient times. It was Fabricius' merit that he recognized the existence of a system of valves.

Sent by his parents to the University of Padua, Fabricius succeeded admirably in Greek, Latin, and philosophy. When he took up medicine he became the favourite pupil of Fallopius, being his demonstrator in anatomy at Padua when scarcely twenty. Though he was only twenty-five when Fallopius died, Fabricius was chosen his successor and a little later became professor of surgery, occupying both chairs for nearly half a century (1562–1609). His abilities were properly appreciated by the Senate of Venice, which built for him at Padua a spacious anatomical theatre bearing his name. He was created a Knight of St. Mark, and his annual salary was a thousand crowns, which was continued for ten years after his resignation. A statue was erected to his memory in Padua after his death. Fabricius was indifferent to money, refused regular fees, and accepted only such presents as wealthy patients forced on him. His work on anatomy (500 fol. pp.) is illustrated by hundreds of figures on sixty-one full-page plates, some of the best ever made. A monograph on the speech of brutes and a study of the comparative anatomy of the appendix are suggestive even for modern readers. His work on surgery is scarcely less valuable than that on anatomy and has gone through twenty editions in many languages. His principal works are: "De visione, voce, auditu" (Venice, 1600); "De brutorum loquelâ" (Padua, 1603); "De formato fœtu" (Venice, 1600); "De locutione" (Venice, 1627); "Tractatus anatomicus triplex" (Frankfort, 1614). All his other works were reprinted at Frankfort shortly after this time, and all his works at Leipzig in 1687.

FISHER in *Annals of Anatomy and Surgery* (Brooklyn, 1880); FOSTER, *History of Physiology* (New York, 1901); THULIUS, *Funus Hieronymi Fabricii* (Padua, 1619); ROMITI, *Il merito anatomico di Fabrizi* in *Lo Sperimentale* (1883), April; DE RENZI, *Storia della Medicina in Italia* (Naples, 1845–49).

JAMES J. WALSH.

Fabyan, ROBERT, English chronicler, d. 28 Feb., 1513. He was a London clothier, a member of the Drapers' Company, and an alderman. He held several responsible positions, but resigned his aldermanship in 1502, probably to escape the financial burdens of the mayoralty. Fabyan belongs to the class of City chroniclers, men interested mainly in municipal life, but he is the first to take a wider view and to attempt to combine his London history with that of the country. He was not very successful. His "Concordance of Histories" begins with Brutus and goes down to the death of Richard III, but his effort to harmonize different chroniclers is made without art or historical judgment. The work is of value mainly for its reference to London. The second edition (1533) contains a number of pithy scattered notes on municipal history under Henry VII. Dr. Busch considers that these must be an abridgment of a lost chronicle of that reign. The best edition of Fabyan is that published by Ellis in 1811.

CREIGHTON in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, XVIII, 113; BUSCH, *England under the Tudors* tr. (London, 1895), I, 402–415.

F. F. URQUHART.

Façade, the face or front of any building. In ecclesiastical architecture the term is generally used to designate the west front; sometimes the transept fronts. For ritualistic reasons, the church architect was everywhere compelled to treat the end wall of the nave as the grand façade.

EARLY CHRISTIAN PERIOD. The façades of the

churches of the early period were generally built on the model of the old Roman basilicas, and were constructed according to Roman methods, and largely formed of columns and other features taken from Pagan buildings. Their interest is principally from an archæological point of view. The façades of the early Roman basilicas were exceedingly simple in their upper surfaces. There were but two types; the central gable, following usually the outline of the structure behind it, and the screen façade, usually made to overhang for purposes of protection, and formed by a gradual projection of the courses of brick both forward and sideways. In the more important churches the entire surface was concealed by a mosaic composition extending from summit to portico. Such were St. John Lateran's, St. Peter's, St. Paul's, St. Mary Major's, etc. This converted the façade above the porch into a blaze of colour. Toward the close of the Middle Ages more windows were sometimes opened in the façade. At St. Peter's, in the thirteenth century, beside the wheel window in the gable, there were two rows of three tall mullioned windows, the lower row being flanked by two more. The lower part of the façade was always covered by a projecting portico, consisting either of one side of the quadrangular atrium, or of an independent arcade or colonnade. The wall space underneath was usually broken by as many doors as there were aisles to the church, normally three, sometimes five. In the minor basilicas there was but a single door, and in exceptional cases, as at St. Peter's, there was a supplementary door for special occasions.

Byzantine façades as a rule were left comparatively plain, partly, no doubt, on account of their location and surroundings. A Byzantine church usually stood apart in a close, and when possible trees were planted about to give shade. In towns, the church, its grounds, etc., were generally surrounded with walls. It was entered through a cloistered forecourt or atrium, in the centre of which stood the phiale, or fountain, where the required ablutions were made. Across the lower portion of the front of the church stretched the narthex or vestibule, which sometimes had a porch or portico in front of it. Many churches had a double vestibule, the outer one being called the eso-narthex, generally appointed for women. The narthex communicated with the church by means of three doors; that in the centre being large and often richly ornamented. The two others, situated one on each side, were small and not remarkable. The central door was called the Beautiful Gate, sometimes the royal or basilican gate.

In the larger churches, above the narthex there was often an enclosed upper gallery for the accommodation of women, called the gynæconitis. This gallery was enclosed partly by the outside wall or walls and partly by grilles, and was reached by a staircase for the use of women only. From the outside it was lighted by a series of narrow windows, generally covered by round arches, or one or more double windows were formed by the interposition of a pillar. As a rule the windows are small and grouped together, or else they are of considerable width, and divided into three lights by columns or by thin strips of unmoulded marble. The lower portion of the windows was often filled with thin slabs of translucent marble, sculptured on the outside, which allowed the light to shine through to a certain extent. Especially in the Neo-Byzantine style, there are occasionally porches, balconies and machicolations, which give relief to the general flatness. These features are well marked with the grace peculiar to the East. Examples at Constantinople, Sts. Sergius and Bacchus (527–532), and Sancta Sophia (532–537). The church of the Virgin at Misitra and the Catholicon, at Athens (both uncertain, 11th to 13th century), and St. Mark's, Venice (1100–1350). Examples of Italian Byzantine are the cathedrals at Palermo and Cefalu. The present façade of St. Mark's, Venice, is a later casing upon the original Byzantine façade, and stands alone as regards its style, although generally classed as Byzantine. The first appearance of the Byzantine in Italy was the church of San Vitale, at Ravenna. In Russia, the cathedrals of Moscow, Kiev, and Novgorod, are among the best known examples.

Lombardic (sometimes called Lombard Romanesque) façades were the most unfortunate part of Lombard churches. The designing of façades to the basilican plan and section gave much trouble to many different schools of architecture, but by none was it treated with such signal failure as by the Lombards. In declining to attach the campaniles to the church, the Italians rejected what apparently was the only possible solution. The continuous shape of the gable was used by the Pavians, even in churches where the aisle roofs were much lower than those of the nave. "False" façades, like that of San Michele Maggiore, resulted in designs that obviously belied the basilican section. Even before this, it had been the custom, where the three aisles had been expressed, to raise the walls of the façade much above the actual roof of the church, perhaps with a view to make the church appear externally larger than it really was. This fraud continued to be practised in the churches of Verona, and indeed throughout all Italy, so that it finally became characteristic of Italian church architecture. On the false façade thus obtained, ornament, utterly irrelevant for the most part, was spread with a more or less lavish hand. The façade of S. Ambrogio, Milan, with its great open arches is, perhaps, the most successful one the Lombards ever erected.

Romanesque façades. Their characteristics, as a whole, may be summed up as follows: Buttresses formed as pilaster strips of slight projection, connected at the top by horizontal mouldings, or by a row of semicircular arches resting on a corbel-table projecting from the wall. Semicircular arches, resting on rudely formed capitals, also occur. Door and window openings are very characteristic. The principal, upon which the jambs were formed, was in receding planes, or rectangular recesses, known as "orders", in which were placed circular columns or shafts. The arches followed the same method, being built in concentric rings. A continuous abacus often occurs over these columns, and the profile of the jamb is carried round the semicircular portion of the arch. The characteristic rose (or wheel) window occurs over the principal doorway of the façade. Mouldings were often elaborately carved. The carving and ornaments are derived from many types of the vegetable and animal kingdom, and treated in a conventional way. Local influences were instrumental in producing different local characteristics.

In Central Italian Romanesque, beauty in detail was more sought after than completeness of style. Byzantine influence was strong, especially in Venice, Ravenna, and Pisa, the latter possessing a distinct style of its own, sometimes called Tuscan. San Miniato's, in Florence, is interesting as marking the period of transition, in the eleventh century, from the Basilican to the Romanesque type. In Northern Italian Romanesque, arcades are restricted to the tops of gables. The general character is less refined, owing to the use of stone and brick instead of marble. Details show a breaking away from Classic precedent. In sculpture, hunting and other scenes reflecting the life of the northern invaders are frequent, and in these a grotesque element is prevalent. S. Antonio's, in Piacenza, is an example.

Southern Italian Romanesque shows Byzantine and Mohammedan influence, as instanced in Monreale Cathedral, and the Martorana Church, in Palermo. The detail of these buildings is always refined and graceful, which may be due to some extent to the Greek descent

FAÇADES

1. ST. PAUL'S, LONDON
2. THE CATHEDRAL, AMIENS
3. THE CATHEDRAL, SPEYER
4. S. MARIA IN COSMEDIN, ROME

of the inhabitants of this part of Italy. Southern French Romanesque is remarkable for its rich decorative façades. Buttresses are generally mere strips, of slight projection, and the façades were arranged in stories, with window lights in pairs or groups. Imposing western entrances are characteristic of this period. The west fronts of the churches of the Charente District, in Aquitania, were elaborately treated with carved ornament representing foliage or figures of men and animals. On the ground story the capitals so treated were often continued as a rich, broad frieze. German Romanesque bears a strong resemblance to that of North Italy. In the façades the most richly ornamented parts are the doorways and capitals; there is also a wealth of circular and octagonal turrets and arcaded galleries. Examples: The church of the Apostles, at Cologne, the cathedrals of Worms, Mainz, Trier, and Spires.

Gothic façades.—The first in point of dignity is undoubtedly that of Notre-Dame de Paris; in richness, those of Amiens and Reims. The façade of Amiens, of which only the three lower stories are of the thirteenth century, would doubtless have been the noblest of all Gothic façades, had it been finished according to the original design. The great French Gothic façades are often criticized on the ground that they somewhat disguise the true character of the edifice which they enclose; and it is, perhaps, true that an entirely satisfactory design for a western façade was hardly ever realized in a large Gothic church. As a rule, the façade rarely wholly expresses the form of the building which it encloses, except in buildings of a very simple character. In the façades of smaller churches where the towers are omitted, as at Nesle, Auvers, Heronville, and Champagne, the whole structural form of the building is expressed as fully as it can be. The west fronts of Senlis, Paris, Amiens, and Reims sufficiently illustrate the development and the characteristics of the French Gothic western façade.

In England, the Anglo-Norman western façade was, as a rule, both inappropriate as a termination to the building, and ill-composed as an independent architectural design. Very few early façades remain. The most important extant fronts of the thirteenth century are those of Lincoln, Salisbury, Wells, and Peterborough. The façade of Lincoln exhibits four different styles of architecture—the work of as many different periods of construction. The portals of English churches are in general insignificant and diminutive, and those of Wells are especially so. The façade of Peterborough is entirely unrelated to the building which it encloses. As a rule, the west front in England is devoid of Gothic character; but among exceptions is the western façade of Ripon cathedral. In the early pointed architecture of England, western towers, when they occur, are less imposing than those of the Gothic churches of France.

The western Gothic façades in Germany call for no extended remarks. The façade of the Lorenzkirche of Nuremberg, dating probably from the second half of the thirteenth century, exhibits a strange combination of Romanesque and Gothic features. Towards the close of the thirteenth century, in Germany, the west front began to receive more elaborate and peculiar treatment. Acute open gables over the portals, free-standing mullions and tracery over the face of the wall above, and tall open gallery in front of the openings of the second stories of the towers, are among the new features. Entrances are often north or south, instead of being at the west end. Towers with spires were much used, open-work tracery in the spires is very characteristic. The typical examples of German Gothic are Strasburg, Freiburg, Ratisbon, Cologne, and Vienna cathedrals.

Italian Gothic façades show the influence of Roman tradition in their classic forms of construction and decoration, which was so great that the verticality which marks the Gothic architecture in the north of Europe does not pervade the Italian examples, to anything like the same extent. From the absence of vertical features and shadows in the façade, flatness is the predominating characteristic. There was a general absence of pinnacles. Stone or marble of different colours, carried in systematic band-courses or patterns throughout the design, gives a special character, as at Siena, Orvieto, Verona, etc. A large central circular window was a general feature. Windows are often semicircular-headed, and have shafts with square capitals of Corinthian type, often twisted and inlaid with mosaic known as "cosmatesque".

Spanish Gothic façades exhibit a variety of treatment; but in very few cases is the French form closely followed. The front of the early church of San Pedro of Avila is an entirely logical design of simple character. The façade of Burgos is composed in the French manner. Toledo is a mixture of Gothic and Renaissance, and the west front of Leon dates from the thirteenth century, the later work being characterized by extreme, and even wild, ornamentation. Traceried open-work spires, as in Germany, were favoured, those at Burgos being worthy of attention.

Renaissance façades agree essentially in architectural treatment, growing out of a close contact with ancient monuments, though with no strict conformity to them. Examples in Italy: S. Lorenzo and Santo Spirito, in Florence; Santa Maria della Pace, S. Andrea's, The Gesu, S. Peter's, St. John Lateran's, in Rome; S. Maria dei Miracoli, S. Zaccaria and S. Maria della Salute, in Venice; Milan cathedral; and the Certosa of Pavia. French Renaissance: St. Eustache, St. Etienne du Mont, the church of the Sorbonne, the Pantheon and the Madeleine, at Paris. German Renaissance: St. Michael's at Munich and the Frauenkirche at Dresden. Spanish Renaissance: Santo Domingo at Salamanca; the cathedrals of Granada, Valladolid, Santiago, Malaga, and Carmona. English Renaissance: St. Paul's, London.

THOMAS H. POOLE.

Facciolati, JACOPO, lexicographer and philologist, b. at Torreglia, near Padua, Italy, 4 Jan., 1682; d. at Padua, 26 Aug., 1769. He was educated in the seminary at Padua, and later was made professor of logic and regent of the schools in the university of that city, continuing in this position for forty-five years. In 1719 he brought out a revised edition of the "Lexicon Septem Linguarum", a Latin dictionary in seven languages, called the "Calepinus", from the name of its author, the monk Ambrogio Calepino. In this work Facciolati was assisted by his pupil, Forcellini. Their labours on the "Calepinus" convinced them of the need of a totally new Latin lexicon. Therefore, putting aside all other works, they undertook the compilation of a lexicon which should be the most comprehensive vocabulary of the Latin language that had ever been made. For forty years, under the supervision of Facciolati, Forcellini laboured, reading through the entire body of Latin literature, as well as the whole collection of Latin inscriptions, including those on coins and medals. Their great lexicon, which bore the title, "Totius Latinitatis Lexicon", was published in four volumes, at Padua in 1771, after the death of both the editors. This monumental work, on which all Latin lexicons now in use are based, gives every Latin word, with its Italian and Greek equivalents and copious citations illustrating the various meanings. Subsequent editions are the English one of Bailey in two volumes (London, 1828), and that of De Vit (Prato, 1858–87). Facciolati also published a new edition of the "Thesaurus Ciceronianus" of Nizolius. He left a number of letters, remarkable for their elegant Latinity, which were afterwards published. (See FORCELLINI.)

FERRARI, *Vita Jacobi Facciolati* (Padua, 1799); GENNARI, *Vita di Jacopo Facciolati* (Padua, 1818).

EDMUND BURKE.

Faculties, CANONICAL (Lat. *Facultates*).—In law, a faculty is the authority, privilege, or permission, to perform an act or function. In a broad sense, a faculty is a certain power, whether based on one's own right, or received as a favour from another, of validly or lawfully doing some action. In a more restricted sense, it means the conferring on a subordinate, by a superior who enjoys jurisdiction in the external forum, of certain ecclesiastical rights which are denied him by common law; to act, namely, in the external or internal forum validly or lawfully, or at least safely. Faculties, then, will be classified, first of all, by reason of the object to which they relate, inasmuch as (1) jurisdiction is granted to absolve from sins and ecclesiastical censures, to dispense in vows, in irregularities relating to the reception of orders, in matrimonial impediments; (2) permission or licence is given to do something which would be otherwise forbidden, as the reading of prohibited books, saying two Masses on the same day; ordaining clerics under the prescribed age; (3) to avoid worry and qualms of conscience a precautionary dispensation or permission is granted to proceed in certain cases in relation to which the opinions of theologians may not appear sufficiently well founded, as for instance, a matrimonial dispensation may be conceded as a precaution, when it is not certain that an impediment exists, or permission to anticipate at 2 p. m. the recitation of the Divine Office is granted to a person who is unwilling to accept the opinion that anticipation at that hour is lawful.

Secondly, faculties, by reason of their source, are Apostolic, episcopal, or regular. Faculties are styled Apostolic or papal when they proceed from the pope directly, or through the ordinary channels of the Sacred Roman Congregations. They are episcopal, if the power or privilege conferred proceeds from a diocesan bishop, by virtue of his own power or ordinary jurisdiction, as for instance, the faculties of the diocese, to hear confessions, say Mass, preach, etc., granted to priests who labour in the diocese for the salvation of souls. Faculties are regular when they proceed from superiors of the regular clergy by reason of their ordinary jurisdiction, or by virtue of extraordinary powers or privileges conceded to them by the Holy See. Lastly, faculties are general or particular: general, when granted for indeterminate persons, though they may be limited by time; particular, when granted to designated persons or for particular cases. General faculties conceded to bishops and other ordinaries are also called indults.

The distance of dioceses from Rome, together with peculiar local conditions, render the granting of these general faculties a matter of necessity, and in 1637 certain new grants or lists of faculties were drawn up by the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, and since then have been communicated by the Holy See, through the Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith, to bishops, vicars and prefects Apostolic throughout the world, according to their various needs. These indults are given for a definite period, e. g. five years (*facultates quinquennales*), or for a definite number of cases, and are ordinary and extraordinary; the former being issued in forms or grants under Roman numerals (Formula I, II, III . . . . X), some of the latter under capital letters (Formula A, B, C, etc.), others under small letters (Formula a, b, c,), while others, finally, without special designation, begin: "In an audience with His Holiness". Formulæ V, VII, VIII, IX are no longer in use. It has been the practice to communicate to the United States grants I, C, D, and E. Of late, however, C, D, and E, with certain modifications, are combined in form T. Favours and privileges are granted likewise by the congregations in keeping with the Constitution "Sapienti Consilio" (1908), and are classified consequently in accordance with the Congregation from which they proceed. The authority of the Propaganda is not so ample in this matter as formerly, and this too in relation to countries still subject to it. Questions pertaining to the Pauline Privilege fall in every case under the sole competency of the Holy Office, while in matrimonial dispensations, for the portions of the Western Church under its jurisdiction, the Propaganda is obliged to confer with the Congregation of the Sacraments (Cong. of the Consistory, 7 Jan., 1909). Especially through the Sacred Pœnitentiaria does the pope communicate faculties for the internal forum to bishops and others, including certain confessors, in definite forms or leaflets (*pagellæ*).

Graces thus received from the Holy See do not restrict the prerogatives which the one favoured may already enjoy by virtue of ordinary jurisdiction or other title (*gratia non nocet gratiæ*). The purpose of the Holy See is to make a concession, not to lessen one's authority. Hence, for example, a bishop is authorized by the Council of Trent to dispense his subjects from the observance of the intervals prescribed in the reception of orders; consequently he is not obliged to observe the condition laid down in Form I, art. xxix, which forbids him to use this faculty in favour of a cleric actually outside the bishop's territory. While the recent legislation of the Church has sought to prevent conflict of authority between the various Roman Congregations, tribunals and offices, yet it will happen at times that two or more of these bodies will have jurisdiction in the same case.

A petition which has been rejected by one of the congregations may not be presented lawfully to another; a favour granted by another congregation, the previous refusal of the grant being concealed, is null and void. A petition in writing is not required for validity, but is usually exacted; the same may be said of application by telegraph or telephone. The form of the supplication is not prescribed except in so far as requisite data must be expressed. Petitions addressed to the Propaganda (the same is true of most of the congregations, at least to expedite matters), should be in Latin, Italian, or French. The Sacred Pœnitentiaria will accept communications in any modern tongue. The supplication is made out in the name of the petitioner, but the rescript is sent to the ordinary. The diocesan chancery office usually deals directly with the rector of the parties concerned.

Faculties can only be used in favour of members of the Church who are not disqualified by ecclesiastical penalties or censures. Hence in marriage cases where one of the contracting parties is a non-Catholic, the dispensation is given directly to the Catholic. Hence also in Apostolic rescripts absolution from penalties and censures, as far as necessary for the rescript to be effective, is first given. Apostolic faculties granted to a bishop, which imply an act of jurisdiction in using them, can be communicated and applied only to the subjects of the bishop, and to such determinate persons as are capable of receiving the favour given by means of this faculty. Ordinarily faculties may be exercised in behalf of a subject, while both he and the bishop, or other person making the concession, are outside their own territory. When the use of faculties is restricted to the diocese, as in Forms I and C, it means that the subject, not the bishop, must be in the diocese when the indult is made use of in his behalf. In the United States any matrimonial dispensation may be conceded to one actually outside his own diocese, if he has not acquired at least a quasi-domicile elsewhere (Holy Office per Propaganda, 20 Dec., 1894). To dispense validly and lawfully by virtue of an indult, a just cause existing at the time of the dispensation is required. He who possesses general delegated power may apply it to himself, e. g. dispensing himself from fasting. There is an obligation, especially in dispensations, to be measured by the greater or less urgency of the case,

of using faculties possessed. It might be noted that the Apostolic Delegate at Washington, in common with the bishops of the United States, has possessed the Propaganda Forms I, C, D, and E, together with some others, applicable of course throughout the United States. His Excellency, aside from territorial extension, possesses no greater powers in regard to matrimonial dispensations than these diocesan bishops.

A bishop cannot dispense without a special faculty, when two or more matrimonial impediments, diriment or otherwise, exist in the same case, or affect the same persons, though by reason of indults he can dispense separately in each of the impediments involved. This restriction, however, holds good only when the impediments in question are generically different, e. g. consanguinity and affinity, or where the power to dispense is given in different indults. The special faculty covering the cumulation of matrimonial impediments is usually granted with the renewal of faculties and is effective during the duration of the same. The form of this special faculty is not always identical, greater or more restricted powers being contained therein. Moreover, a bishop cannot employ this faculty when he is granting by virtue of an indult a retroactive dispensation to render a marriage valid (*sanatio in radice*). This question of cumulation affects dispensations only, not absolutions: a dispensation inflicts a wound on the law, not so an absolution. It is necessary for validity that the concession of a favour be made known to the one benefited; and it ought to be applied in such manner that its execution may be established. As faculties depend upon the will of the grantor, the terms of the indult must be carefully studied, and obscure passages rightly interpreted. In this matter the general rules for the interpretation of law are to be observed with some additional ones. Hence in the use of faculties it must be noted whether power to dispense is granted for matrimonial alliances already contracted, or not yet contracted, or for both. A faculty granted for the internal forum only, particularly if jurisdictional, cannot be used in the external forum, and vice versa. Faculties are not to be extended to persons or cases not included in the same. The existing practice, especially of the Roman Curia (*stylus curiæ Romanæ*), will serve as a guide in this matter.

Faculties expire by the death of the grantor, his removal from office or loss of jurisdiction (certain distinctions, however, are to be borne in mind, as below); by the death of the privileged one; by lapse of time, when they are granted for a definite period; when they have been used for the number of cases specified in the grant; by revocation; by renunciation duly accepted; by the completion of the business for which one has received special authorization; by cessation of the formal cause on which the favour was based. Faculties granted absolutely (not revocable at will) by one possessing ordinary jurisdiction, and *gratiæ factæ* (i. e., the delegate is a *necessary* executor), do not expire at the death of the grantor; *gratiæ faciendæ* (i. e. the delegate is a *voluntary* executor, viz. commissioned to act, if he judge it expedient) cease at the death of the grantor, when no steps have as yet been taken leading to the concession requested (*re adhuc integrâ*); otherwise they do not cease. Faculties granted by one enjoying delegated power cease at the death of the one delegating, unless the Holy See expressly provides for their continuance, or unless the matter in question has already been begun (*re non integrâ*). The power given personally to a delegate, or subdelegate, expires at his death, which is not the case if he is chosen by reason of his dignity or office. When it is stated that faculties are "revocable at our will or judgment", they expire with the death of the grantor; when given in the name of the Holy See, a diocese, etc., they continue in force after the death of the pope, bishop, etc. Indults consequently found in the Propaganda forms or other general grants as above, since they are *gratiæ factæ*, do not become ineffective at the death of the pope: the same is true of the faculties conceded by the Sacred Pœnitentiaria, when the prefect of that tribunal loses his jurisdiction through death or other cause. Jurisdiction granted by a bishop to hear the confession of an individual ceases, *re adhuc integrâ*, when the bishop dies, is transferred, or resigns: the contrary is true, when jurisdiction is given to hear confessions in general. Notwithstanding the revocation of faculties, a case already begun may be completed; and by a general revocation of faculties special faculties do not expire. Neglect to use a favour does not destroy its force, as for example, a person dispensed from fasting or the recitation of the Holy Office does not lose the grace, if he meanwhile fast or recite the Office, even for a considerable time.

All special faculties granted habitually (*habitualiter*), by the Holy See to bishops and others enjoying ordinary jurisdiction within definite territorial limits, remain in force notwithstanding the loss of jurisdiction through death or other cause of the individual to whom they are granted (Cong. Holy Office, 24 Nov., 1897), but pass on to his successor in the same office. They are considered not personal but real favours, granted to the ordinary of the diocese or place, and by the ordinary are understood bishops, their vicars-general, vicars Apostolic, prelates or prefects Apostolic ruling over territory not subject to a bishop, vicars capitular or other legitimate administrators of vacant sees (Cong. Holy Office, 20 Feb., 1888). It is to be noted that since these indults are granted to the ordinary, under which appellation is included the vicar-general of a diocese, said vicar-general uses these faculties, grants dispensations and other graces contained therein, by virtue of authority received directly from Rome, equivalent to that extended to the bishop himself. The bishop may forbid the exercise of these powers, but notwithstanding the prohibition, the vicar-general would act validly, were he to use said faculties, provided nothing else were wanting to render his action invalid. (See JURISDICTION; DELEGATION; RESCRIPTS; EXECUTOR, APOSTOLIC; DISPENSATION.)

TAUNTON, *The Law of the Church* (London, 1906); KONINGS-PUTZER, *Commentarium in Facultates Apostolicas* (New York, 1900).

ANDREW B. MEEHAN.

Faculties of the Soul.—I. MEANING.—Whatever doctrine one may hold concerning the nature of the human soul and its relations to the organism, the four following points are beyond the possibility of doubt. (1) Consciousness is the scene of incessant change; its processes appear, now in one sequence, now in another; and, normally, the duration of each is brief. (2) All do not present the same general features, nor affect consciousness in the same manner. They differ on account both of their characters as manifested in consciousness, and of the organ, either external or internal, on which their appearance depends. Yet the features they have in common under this twofold aspect, together with their differences, make it possible and necessary to group mental states in certain more or less comprehensive classes. (3) There is more in the mind than is actually manifested in consciousness; there are latent images, ideas, and feelings, which under given conditions emerge and are recognized even after a considerable interval of time. By reason of their innate or acquired aptitudes, minds differ in capacity or power. Hence, even if it were possible for two minds to experience processes perfectly similar, they would nevertheless differ greatly because one is capable of experiences impossible to the other. (4) Notwithstanding their variety and their intermittent character, these processes belong to one and the same conscious subject; they are all referred naturally and spontaneously to the self or *me*.

These facts are the psychological basis for admitting faculties (from *facere*, to do), capacities (*capax*, from *capere*, to hold), or powers (from *posse*, to be able;

the Scholastics generally use the corresponding Latin term *potentiæ*).

Any attempt, however, to define with greater precision the meaning of faculties, is sure to call forth vigorous protest. In fact, few psychological questions of similar importance have been the object of so many animated discussions, and, it may be added, of so many misunderstandings. One extreme view looks upon faculties as real, though secondary agents, exercising an active influence on one another, and as being scientific explanations of psychological facts. Why does man see and reason? Because he has the faculties of vision and reasoning. The will acts, is free; there is an interaction of the intellect, the will, the senses, the feelings, etc. Sometimes, however, such expressions are used with the understanding that they are metaphors, and with the explicit or implicit warning that they must not be taken literally.

At the other extreme are found psychologists—and they are numerous to-day—who refuse to concede any kind of reality whatsoever to faculties. Processes alone are real; faculties are simply general terms used to label certain groups of processes. Like all abstractions they should never be looked upon as having any reality outside of the mind, which uses them as logical substitutes to facilitate the classification of mental facts.

That the faculty theory has no essential connexion with Catholic dogma is sufficiently evidenced by the fact that it has found, and still finds, opponents as well as advocates among Catholic theologians and philosophers.

Judging, therefore, the question on its own merits, it may be said that the doctrine of St. Thomas avoids both extremes mentioned above, and is at least free from the absurdities with which modern psychologists so frequently charge the faculty theory. His expressions, taken apart from their context, and translated without a sufficient acquaintance with Scholastic terminology, might easily be given a wrong interpretation. For as the knowledge of the nature of the soul and its faculties, according to St. Thomas, is partly negative, and, in its positive aspect, analogical, it is necessary to use expressions taken from things which are known more directly. But we are given some principles which must always be kept in mind; for instance, "the faculties act only by the energy of the soul"; they have no energy of their own, for "they are not the agents". Coming to more special applications, "it is not the intellect that understands, but the soul through the intellect" (Quæst. Disp., De Veritate, x, 9, ad 3). Again, the question is not asked whether the will is free, but whether man is free (Summa, I, Q. lxxxiii; I-II, xiii; De Veritate, xxiv; De Malo, vi). This shows that when a real distinction is admitted between the soul and its faculties, or between the faculties themselves, the meaning is not that of a distinction between substances or agents. In Scholastic terminology, distinction does not always mean separation nor even the possibility of separation. And the distinction between a substance and its qualities, attributes or modes, was called a real distinction.

If the soul can originate or experience states which, as everybody admits, may be widely different, it is because there are in the mind various modes of energy or faculties. Since minds differ not only by the actual contents of consciousness, but also, and chiefly, by the power which they have of experiencing different processes, it is clear that if this constitutes a real difference, it must itself be something real. So unavoidable is this conclusion, that some of the strongest opponents of faculties are at the same time the strongest defenders of the theory of psychical dispositions, which they postulate in order to explain the facts of memory, mental habit, and in general, the utilization, conscious or unconscious, of past experience. And yet, what is a psychical disposition but an acquired power or faculty? Stuart Mill's "background of possibilities" or Taine's "permanent possibility" are certainly less clear and more objectionable than faculties, for the faculty is not a mere possibility, but a real power of an agent, a *potentia* (see ACTUS ET POTENTIA).

Psychical dispositions are no more explanations of facts than are faculties, if by explanation is meant the assigning of an antecedent better known than, or known independently of, the facts to be explained. In both cases, the whole knowledge of the faculty, or the disposition, is derived from the processes themselves, for neither can fall under direct observation. The possibility of an experience or action, if known, is always known by direct inference or by analogy from past experiences or actions. Yet without being a scientific explanation, and without substituting itself for scientific explanations, the faculty, like the disposition, trace, subconscious activity, etc., is a legitimate postulate.

II. CLASSIFICATION.—Plato admits three parts, forms, or powers of the soul, perhaps even three distinct souls: the intellect (*νοῦς*), the nobler affections (*θυμός*), and the appetites or passions (*ἐπιθυμητικόν*). For Aristotle, the soul is one, but endowed with five groups of faculties (*δυνάμεις*): the "vegetative" faculty (*θρεπτικόν*), concerned with the maintenance and development of organic life; the appetite (*ὀρεκτικόν*), or the tendency to any good; the faculty of sense perception (*αἰσθητικόν*); the "locomotive" faculty (*κινητικόν*), which presides over the various bodily movements; and reason (*διανοητικόν*). The Scholastics generally follow Aristotle's classification. For them body and soul are united in one complete substance. The soul is the *forma substantialis*, the vital principle, the source of all activities. Hence their science of the soul deals with functions which nowadays belong to the provinces of biology and physiology. In more recent times, however, especially under the influence of Descartes, the mind has been separated, and even estranged, from the organism. Psychology deals only with the inner world, that is, the world of consciousness and its conditions. The nature of the mind and its relations to the organism are questions that belong to philosophy or metaphysics. As a consequence, also, modern psychology fails to distinguish between the spiritual faculties of the soul, i. e. those which the soul exercises itself without the intrinsic co-operation of the organism, and the faculties of the *compositum*, i. e. the soul and organism united in one complete principle of action, or of one special animated organ. This distinction was also an essential point in the Aristotelean and Scholastic psychology.

Finally, the Scholastics reduced affective life to the general faculty of *appetitus*, whereas to-day, especially since Kant, a tripartite division is more commonly accepted, namely into cognitive, affective, and conative faculties. Some, however, still hold a bipartite division. Others, finally, reject both as unsatisfactory, and follow the order of development, or base their classification both on objective conditions and subjective characteristics. Without entering into the discussion, it may be said that, however useful and justifiable the tripartite classification may prove in psychology, the Scholastic reduction of feelings to "appetite" seems to be deeper and more philosophical. For feelings and emotions, pleasurable or painful, result from an agreement or conflict between certain experiences and the mind's tendency.

ST. THOMAS, *Summa Theologica*, I, Q. lxxvii sqq.; *Quæst. Disp., De anima*, esp. art. xi sqq.; *De spiritualibus creaturis*, art. xi; MAHER, *Psychology* (New York, 1900); MERCIER, *Psychologie* (Louvain, 1903); IDEM, *Ontologie* (Louvain, 1905); DUBRAY, *The Theory of Psychical Dispositions* (New York, 1905); GARNIER, *Traité des facultés de l'âme* (Paris, 1872); HAMILTON, *Lectures on Metaphysics* (Boston, 1859), Lect. xx; *Text-books of Psychology*, esp. by SULLY and STOUT; EISLER, *Wörterbuch der philosophischen Begriffe* (Berlin, 1904), s. v. *Seelenvermögen*.

C. A. DUBRAY.

Facundus of Hermiane, a sixth-century Christian author, Bishop of Hermiane in Africa, about whose career very little is known. His place in history is due entirely to the spirited and protracted opposition which he offered to the condemnation (by the edict of Justinian in 543 or 544) of the "Three Chapters". At the instance of Theodore Ascidas, and with the ostensible purpose of reuniting to the Church the Acephali, a sect of Monophysites, Justinian was induced to censure the "Three Chapters" (q. v.). By this act certain writings of the fifth-century Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus, and Ibas of Edessa were condemned. Facundus was in Constantinople when this censure was pronounced, and shortly after its publication he and several other western bishops refused to subscribe to the decree, alleging that it was an attack on the Council of Chalcedon, which had accepted at least the letter of Ibas to the Persian Maris. This document was especially aimed at in the decree of the emperor. Facundus also drew up a memorial in protest, but was prevented from presenting it by the arrival of Pope Vigilius. The weak and vacillating conduct of this pontiff and his acquiescence in the condemnation of the "Three Chapters" spurred Facundus to complete this work, which he entitled "Pro Defensione Trium Capitulorum". It is not known when the work was completed nor when it was presented to the emperor, so that nothing can be said of its immediate effect on the controversy. After its publication Facundus was compelled to fly from Constantinople and find safety in concealment. Because of the attitude of Vigilius in acceding to the emperor's insistence that he subscribe to the censure of the "Three Chapters", Facundus and many African bishops cut themselves off from communion with him. This schism lasted for many years, and during that time Facundus wrote two other works at the request of his fellow-bishops, in response to reproaches of insubordination ("Liber contra Mocianum Scholasticum" and "Epistola Fidei Catholicæ in defensione trium capitulorum"). The works of Facundus are in P. L., LXVII, 527–878; see Hefele, "History of the Church Councils", tr., IV, 229–286.

Leclercq, *L'Afrique Chrétienne* (Paris, 1904), II, 203; Bardenhewer, *Patrology*, tr. Shahan (Freiburg im Br.; St. Louis, 1908), 638; Dobroklonskji, *The Work of Facundus, bishop of Hermiane: Pro defensione trium capitulorum*, Russian (Moscow, 1880); Davids in *Dict. of Christ. Biog.*, s. v.

Patrick J. Healy.

Faenza, Diocese of (Faventina), in the province of Ravenna (Central Italy), suffragan of Ravenna. The earliest mention of this city is in the report of the victory of Sulla (82 B. C.) over the consul Cneius Papirius Carbo, who was compelled to flee from Italy. In A. D. 728 it was seized by the Lombard king, Liutprand, who later restored it to the exarchate. But the same king again attacked it, while the people were assembled in the church of Santa Maria Foris Portam for the services of Holy Saturday; the bishop himself was among the slain. With the exarchate Faenza passed under the authority of the Holy See. About 1000 it was made a commune and from 1100 was governed by the counts of Modigliana. During the struggle of Frederick II against the popes, the city belonged to the Guelph league; in 1241 the emperor took possession of it after a siege of eight months. During the thirteenth century different families, the Accarisi, the Manfredi, the Lambertazzi, the Nordigli, and others, disputed the possession of Faenza. From 1294 it was governed by the Manfredi. Several times the Avignon popes had to summon these lords to render service as vassals, as in 1328 through Cardinal Bertrando Poggetto and in 1356 through Cardinal Gil d'Albornoz. In 1378 the city was destroyed by the famous English *condottiere*, Sir John Hawkwood. In 1501 Cæsar Borgia put to death the Manfredi brothers, Astorgio and Giovanni Evangelista. On the death of Cæsar Borgia, Francesco Manfredi, a brother of Astorgio and Evangelista, attempted to return to Faenza, but was compelled to flee by the Venetians. In 1509 Julius II brought the city under the direct rule of the Holy See. During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries Faenza was renowned for its pottery (whence the French *faïence*). The celebrated physicist, Torricelli, was a native of Faenza. Domitia Lucilla, a martyr, the widow of Antoninus Pius, is also said to have been born there. The first historically certain bishop is Constantius, present at a council in Rome (313), at

The Cathedral, Faenza

which St. Savinus was referred to as his predecessor. Another Constantius was a contemporary of St. Ambrose. Also noteworthy are: Giovanni II, who died in 1190, as a crusader before Acre; the two distinguished theologians, Giovanni del Terma (1455), a Servite, and Pietro Andrea Gambario (1528); Ridolfo Pio of the princes of Carpi (1528), a patron of scholars and himself a learned archæologist; Giovanni Antonio de' Grassi (1568), a profound student of Cicero and of Plato's philosophy. A large part of the cathedral was built by Giuliano da Maiano between 1474 and 1486; Bramante also worked there. The body of St. Peter Damian is buried in the cathedral. Faenza has (1908) 114 parishes, 347 secular and 13 regular priests, 103,962 inhabitants, 2 male and 6 female educational institutions, 6 religious houses of men and 7 of women, and a weekly Catholic paper.

Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), II; Righi, *Annali della città di Faenza* (Faenza, 1840–41); Mittarelli, *Rerum faventinarum Scriptores* (Venice, 1771).

U. Benigni.

Fagnani, Prospero, canonist, b. in Italy, place and date of birth uncertain; d. in 1678. Some writers place his birth in 1598, others in 1587 or in 1588. It is certain that he studied at Perugia. At the age of twenty he was a doctor of civil and canon law; at twenty-two, secretary of the Congregation of the Council. He held this office for fifteen years. He fulfilled the same functions in several other Roman Congregations. It is not certain that he ever lectured on canon law at the Roman University (Sapienza). He became blind at the age of forty-four. This affliction did not prevent him from devoting himself to canonical studies and from writing a commentary on the Decretals of Gregory IX, which gained for him the title of "Doctor Cæcus Oculatissimus", i. e. the blind yet most far sighted doctor. This commentary includes interpretations of the texts of the most difficult of the Decretals of Gregory IX. It is distinguished by the clearness with which the most complex and disputed questions of canon law are explained. The work is also of great value for the purpose of ascertaining the prac-

tice of the Roman Congregations, especially that of the Congregation of the Council, of which the author quotes numerous decisions. Benedict XIV gave this work the highest praise, and its authority is still continually appealed to in the Roman Congregations. It is divided, like the Decretals of Gregory IX, into five books. The first edition was published at Rome, in 1661, under the title of "Jus canonicum seu commentaria absolutissima in quinque libros Decretalium". It has been reprinted several times. Fagnani is reproached with excessive rigour in his commentary on the chapter of the Decretals "Ne innitaris" (Book I, De constitutionibus), in which he combats the doctrine of probabilism. St. Alphonsus calls him "magnus rigoristarum princeps", the great prince of the rigorists (Homo apostolicus, Tract. I, no. 63; Theologia Moralis, IV, no. 669).

SCHULTE, *Geschichte der Quellen u. Literatur des canonischen Rechts* (Stuttgart, 1875–80), III, 485; VON SCHERER in *Kirchenlex.*, IV, 1204 sq.

A. VAN HOVE.

Fagnano, GIULIO CARLO DE' TOSCHI DI, mathematician, b. at Sinigaglia, Italy, 26 September, 1682; d. there 18 May, 1766. He made his higher studies at the Collegio Clementino in Rome and there won great distinction, except in the one subject which has made him famous; in fact his aversion to mathematics was extreme, and it was only after his college course that he took up the study of this branch, but then he did so with such earnestness and ability that, without the help of any teacher, he mastered it from its foundations. Most of his important researches were published in the current numbers of the "Giornale de' Letterati d'Italia". He is best known on account of his investigations on the length and division of arcs of certain curves, especially the lemniscate; this seems also to have been in his own estimation his most important work, since he had the figure of the lemniscate with the inscription: "Multifariam divisa atque dimensa Deo veritatis gloria", engraved on the title-page of his "Produzioni Matematiche", which he published in two volumes (Pesaro, 1750), and dedicated to Benedict XIV. The same figure and the words "Deo veritatis gloria" also appear on his tomb, a testimony to the earnest devotion to science and the deeply practical piety which characterized his entire life; his attachment to the sovereign pontiff was warm and sincere, and of his twelve children one became archdeacon of the cathedral of Sinigaglia and another a Benedictine nun. As a writer he is praised by his contemporaries for his great mildness in controversy, as well as for his clearness and accuracy of thought and diction.

COLGERA, *Memorie concernenti el Marchese Giulio Carlo de' Toschi di Fagnano*, republished from the Vatican Codex in the *Bullettino Boncompagni* (Rome, Jan., 1870), III, with an important note in which are cleared up the discrepancies as to the dates of his birth and death found in different accounts of his life; CANTOR, *Vorlesungen über Geschichte der Mathematik* (Leipzig, 1898), III, 465–472.

EDWARD C. PHILLIPS.

Faillon, ETIENNE-MICHEL, historian, b. at Tarascon, France, 3 Jan., 1800; d. at Paris, 25 Oct., 1870. He studied at Avignon and Aix (Provence), joined the Sulpicians (1821), and was ordained priest in 1824. While director of "La Solitude", he wrote several ascetic and biographical works and collected materials for future publications. In 1848, during an official visitation in Montreal, he conceived the plan of his "Histoire de la Colonie française au Canada". Of the twelve intended volumes of this work, destined to embrace the entire French domination (1534–1759), only three were published, the narrative closing with the year 1675. Two subsequent voyages to Canada enabled him to write several important biographies, those of Sister Marguerite Bourgeoys, of Jeanne Mance (with the history of the Hôtel-Dieu, Villemarie), of Mother d'Youville, and of Jeanne Le Ber. His chief works relating to Old France are his life of Monsieur Olier and "Monuments inédits sur l'apostolat de Sainte Marie-Madeleine en Provence". He has been repeatedly criticized for his partiality towards his society and towards Montreal. Most historians censure his appreciation of Bishop Laval and of the Jesuits. On the other hand, he is credited for giving prominence to persons and events of Villemarie, less elaborately treated by the Jesuit "Relations" and later histories.

BERTRAND, *Histoire littéraire de la Compagnie de Saint-Sulpice* (Paris, 1900); ROCHEMONTEIX, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle-France* (Paris, 1896); MORGAN, *Bibliotheca Canadensis* (Ottawa, 1867); J. M. LEMOINE in *Trans. of Roy. Soc. of Canada* (1882).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

Faith (אמונה, *πίστις*, fides).—I. THE MEANING OF THE WORD.—In the Old Testament, אמונה means essentially *steadfastness*, cf. Exod., xvii, 12, where it is used to describe the strengthening of Moses' hands; hence it comes to mean *faithfulness*, whether of God towards man (Deut., xxxii, 4) or of man towards God (Ps. cxviii, 30). As signifying man's attitude towards God, it means trustfulness or *fiducia*. It would, however, be illogical to conclude that the word cannot, and does not, mean "belief" or "faith" in the Old Testament, for it is clear that we cannot put trust in a person's promises without previously assenting to or believing in that person's claim to such confidence. Hence, even if it could be proved that the word אמונה does not in itself contain the notion of belief, it must necessarily presuppose it. But that the word does itself contain the notion of belief is clear from the use of the radical אמן, which in the causative conjugation, or *Hiph'il*, means "to believe", e. g. Gen., xv, 6, and Deut., i, 32, in which latter passage the two meanings —viz. of believing and of trusting—are combined. That the noun itself often means "faith" or "belief", is clear from Hab., ii, 4, where the context demands it. The witness of the Septuagint is decisive; they render the verb by *πιστεύω*, and the noun by *πίστις*; and here again the two factors, faith and trust, are connoted by the same term. But that even in classical Greek *πιστεύω* was used to signify "believe", is clear from Euripides (Helene, 710), *λόγοις δ'ἐμοῖσι πίστευσον τάδε*, and that *πίστις* could mean "belief" is shown by the same dramatist's *θεῶν δ'οὐκέτι πίστις ἄραγε* (Medea, 414; cf. Hipp., 1007). In the New Testament the meanings "to believe" and "belief", for *πιστεύω* and *πίστις*, come to the fore; in Christ's speech, *πίστις* frequently means "trust", but also "belief" (cf. Matt., viii, 10). In Acts it is used objectively of the tenets of the Christians, but is often to be rendered "belief" (cf. xvii, 31; xx, 21; xxvi, 18). In Romans, xiv, 23, it has the meaning of "conscience"—"all that is not of faith is sin"—but the Apostle repeatedly uses it in the sense of "belief" (cf. Rom., iv, and Gal., iii). How necessary it is to point this out will be evident to all who are familiar with modern theological literature; thus, when a writer in the "Hibbert Journal", Oct., 1907, says, "From one end of the Scripture to the other, faith is trust and only trust", it is hard to see how he would explain I Cor., xiii, 13, and Heb., xi, 1. The truth is that many theological writers of the present day are given to very loose thinking, and in nothing is this so evident as in their treatment of faith. In the article just referred to we read: "Trust in God is faith, faith is belief, belief may mean creed, but creed is not equivalent to trust in God." A similar vagueness was especially noticeable in the "Do we believe?" controversy; one correspondent says: "We unbelievers, if we have lost faith, cling more closely to hope and—the greatest of these—charity" ("Do we believe?", p. 180, ed. W. L. Courtney, 1905). Non-Catholic writers have repudiated all idea of faith as an intellectual assent, and consequently they fail to realize that faith must necessar-

ily result in a body of dogmatic beliefs. "How and by what influence", asks Harnack, "was the living faith transformed into the creed to be believed, the surrender to Christ into a philosophical Christology?" (quoted in Hibbert Journal, loc. cit.).

II. FAITH MAY BE CONSIDERED BOTH OBJECTIVELY AND SUBJECTIVELY.—Objectively, it stands for the sum of truths revealed by God in Scripture and tradition, and which the Church (see FAITH, RULE OF) presents to us in a brief form in her creeds; subjectively, faith stands for the habit or virtue by which we assent to those truths. It is with this subjective aspect of faith that we are here primarily concerned. Before we proceed to analyse the term *faith*, certain preliminary notions must be made clear.

(a) The twofold order of knowledge.—"The Catholic Church", says the Vatican Council, III, iv, "has always held that there is a twofold order of knowledge, and that these two orders are distinguished from one another not only in their principle but in their object; in one we know by natural reason, in the other by Divine faith; the object of the one is truth attainable by natural reason, the object of the other is mysteries hidden in God, but which we have to believe and which can only be known to us by Divine revelation."

(b) Now intellectual knowledge may be defined in a general way as the union between the intellect and an intelligible object. But a truth is intelligible to us only in so far as it is evident to us, and evidence is of different kinds; hence, according to the varying character of the evidence, we shall have varying kinds of knowledge. Thus a truth may be self-evident—e. g., the whole is greater than its part—in which case we are said to have intuitive knowledge of it; or the truth may not be self-evident, but deducible from premises in which it is contained—such knowledge is termed reasoned knowledge; or again a truth may be neither self-evident nor deducible from premises in which it is contained, yet the intellect may be obliged to assent to it because it would else have to reject some other universally accepted truth; lastly, the intellect may be induced to assent to a truth for none of the foregoing reasons, but solely because, though not evident in itself, this truth rests on grave authority—for example, we accept the statement that the sun is 90,000,000 miles distant from the earth because competent, veracious authorities vouch for the fact. This last kind of knowledge is termed faith, and is clearly necessary in daily life. If the authority upon which we base our assent is human and therefore fallible, we have human and fallible faith; if the authority is Divine, we have Divine and infallible faith. If to this be added the medium by which the Divine authority for certain statements is put before us, viz. the Catholic Church, we have Divine-Catholic Faith (see FAITH, RULE OF).

(c) Again, evidence, whatever its source, may be of various degrees and so cause greater or less firmness of adhesion on the part of the mind which assents to a truth. Thus arguments or authorities for and against a truth may be either wanting or evenly balanced; in this case the intellect does not give in its adherence to the truth, but remains in a state of doubt or absolute suspension of judgment; or the arguments on one side may predominate; though not to the exclusion of those on the other side; in this case we have not complete adhesion of the intellect to the truth in question, but only opinion. Lastly, the arguments or authorities brought forward may be so convincing that the mind gives its unqualified assent to the statement proposed and has no fear whatever lest it should not be true; this state of mind is termed certitude, and is the perfection of knowledge. Divine faith, then, is that form of knowledge which is derived from Divine authority, and which consequently begets absolute certitude in the mind of the recipient.

(d) That such Divine faith is necessary, follows from the fact of Divine revelation. For revelation means that the Supreme Truth has spoken to man and revealed to him truths which are not in themselves evident to the human mind. We must, then, either reject revelation altogether, or accept it by faith; that is, we must submit our intellect to truths which we cannot understand, but which come to us on Divine authority.

(e) We shall arrive at a better understanding of the habit or virtue of faith if we have previously analysed an act of faith; and this analysis will be facilitated by examining an act of ocular vision and an act of reasoned knowledge. In ocular vision we distinguish three things: the eye, or visual faculty, the coloured object, and the light which serves as the medium between the eye and the object. It is usual to term colour the formal object (*objectum formale quod*) of vision, since it is that which precisely and alone makes a thing the object of vision; the individual object seen may be termed the material object, e. g. this apple, that man, etc. Similarly, the light which serves as the medium between the eye and the object is termed the formal reason (*objectum formale quo*) of our actual vision. In the same way, when we analyse an act of intellectual assent to any given truth, we must distinguish the intellectual faculty which elicits the act, the intelligible object towards which the intellect is directed, and the evidence whether intrinsic to that object or extrinsic to it, which moves us to assent to it. None of these factors can be omitted, each cooperates in bringing about the act, whether of ocular vision or of intellectual assent.

(f) Hence, for an act of faith we shall need a faculty capable of eliciting the act, an object commensurate with that faculty, and evidence—not intrinsic but extrinsic to that object—which shall serve as the link between faculty and object. We will commence our analysis with the object:—

III. ANALYSIS OF THE OBJECT OR TERM IN AN ACT OF DIVINE FAITH.—(a) For a truth to be the object of an act of Divine faith, it must be itself Divine, and this not merely as coming from God, but as being itself concerned with God. Just as in ocular vision the formal object must necessarily be something coloured, so in Divine faith the formal object must be something Divine—in theological language, the *objectum formale quod* of Divine faith is the First Truth in Being, *Prima Veritas in essendo*—we could not make an act of Divine faith in the existence of India.

(b) Again, the evidence upon which we assent to this Divine truth must also be itself Divine, and there must be as close a relation between that truth and the evidence upon which it comes to us as there is between the coloured object and the light; the former is a necessary condition for the exercise of our visual faculty, the latter is the cause of our actual vision. But no one but God can reveal God; in other words, God is His own evidence. Hence, just as the formal object of Divine faith is the First Truth Itself, so the evidence of that First Truth is the First Truth declaring Itself. To use scholastic language once more, the *objectum formale quod*, or the motive, or the evidence, of Divine faith is the *Prima Veritas in dicendo*.

(c) There is a controversy whether the same truth can be an object both of faith and of knowledge. In other words, can we believe a thing both because we are told it on good authority and because we ourselves perceive it to be true? St. Thomas, Scotus, and others hold that once a thing is seen to be true, the adhesion of the mind is in no wise strengthened by the authority of one who states that it is so; but the majority of theologians maintain, with De Lugo, that there may be a knowledge which does not entirely satisfy the mind, and that authority may then find a place, to complete its satisfaction.—We may note here the absurd expression *Credo quia impossibile*, which has provoked many sneers. It is not an axiom of the Scholastics, as was

stated in the "Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale" (March, 1896, p. 169), and as was suggested more than once in the "Do we believe?" correspondence. The expression is due to Tertullian, whose exact words are: "Natus est Dei Filius; non pudet, quia pudendum est: et mortuus est Dei Filius; prorsus credibile est, quia ineptum est; et sepultus, resurrexit; certum est, quia impossibile" (De Carne Christi, cap. v). This treatise dates from Tertullian's Montanist days, when he was carried away by his love of paradox. At the same time it is clear that the writer only aims at bringing out the wisdom of God manifested in the humiliation of the Cross; he is perhaps paraphrasing St. Paul's words in I Cor., i, 25.

(d) Let us now take some concrete act of faith, e. g., "I believe in the Most Holy Trinity." This mystery is the material or individual object upon which we are now exercising our faith, the formal object is its character as being a Divine truth, and this truth is clearly inevident as far as we are concerned; it in no way appeals to our intellect, on the contrary it rather repels it. And yet we assent to it by faith, consequently upon evidence which is extrinsic and not intrinsic to the truth we are accepting. But there can be no evidence commensurate with such a mystery save the Divine testimony itself, and this constitutes the motive for our assent to the mystery, and is, in scholastic language, the *objectum formale quo* of our assent. If, then, we are asked why we believe with Divine faith any Divine truth, the only adequate answer must be, because God has revealed it.

(e) We may point out in this connexion the falsity of the prevalent notion that faith is blind. "We believe", says the Vatican Council (III, iii), "that revelation is true, not indeed because the intrinsic truth of the mysteries is clearly seen by the natural light of reason, but because of the authority of God Who reveals them, for He can neither deceive nor be deceived." Thus, to return to the act of faith which we make in the Holy Trinity, we may formulate it in syllogistic fashion thus: Whatever God reveals is true; but God has revealed the mystery of the Holy Trinity; therefore this mystery is true. The major premise is indubitable and intrinsically evident to reason; the minor premise is also true because it is declared to us by the infallible Church (cf. FAITH, RULE OF), and also because, as the Vatican Council says, "in addition to the internal assistance of His Holy Spirit, it has pleased God to give us certain external proofs of His revelation, viz. certain Divine facts, especially miracles and prophecies, for since these latter clearly manifest God's omnipotence and infinite knowledge, they afford most certain proofs of His revelation and are suited to the capacity of all". Hence St. Thomas says: "A man would not believe unless he saw the things he had to believe, either by the evidence of miracles or of something similar" (II–II, Q. i, a. 4, ad 1^{um}). The saint is here speaking of the motives of credibility.

IV. MOTIVES OF CREDIBILITY.—(a) When we say that a certain statement is incredible we often mean merely that it is extraordinary, but it should be borne in mind that this is a misuse of language, for the credibility or incredibility of a statement has nothing to do with its intrinsic probability or improbability; it depends solely upon the credentials of the authority who makes the statement. Thus the credibility of the statement that a secret alliance has been entered into between England and America depends solely upon the authoritative position and the veracity of our informant. If he be a clerk in a government office it is possible that he may have picked up some genuine information, but if our informant be the Prime Minister of England, his statement has the highest degree of credibility because his credentials are of the highest. When we speak of the motives of credibility of revealed truth we mean the evidence that the things asserted are revealed truths. In other words, the credibility of the statements made is correlative with and proportionate to the credentials of the authority who makes them. Now the credentials of God are indubitable, for the very idea of God involves that of omniscience and of the Supreme Truth. Hence, what God says is supremely credible, though not necessarily supremely intelligible for us. Here, however, the real question is not as to the credentials of God or the credibility of what He says, but as to the credibility of the statement that God has spoken. In other words, who or what is the authority for this statement, and what credentials does this authority show? What are the motives of credibility of the statement that God has revealed this or that?

(b) These motives of credibility may be briefly stated as follows: in the Old Testament, considered not as an inspired book, but merely as a book having historical value, we find detailed the marvellous dealings of God with a particular nation to whom He repeatedly reveals Himself; we read of miracles wrought in their favour and as proofs of the truth of the revelation He makes; we find the most sublime teaching and the repeated announcement of God's desire to save the world from sin and its consequences. And more than all we find throughout the pages of this book a series of hints, now obscure, now clear, of some wondrous person who is to come as the world's saviour; we find it asserted at one time that he is man, at others that he is God Himself. When we turn to the New Testament we find that it records the birth, life, and death of One Who, while clearly man, also claimed to be God, and Who proved the truth of His claim by His whole life, miracles, teachings, and death, and finally by His triumphant resurrection. We find, moreover, that He founded a Church which should, so He said, continue to the end of time, which should serve as the repository of His teaching, and should be the means of applying to all men the fruits of the redemption He had wrought. When we come to the subsequent history of this Church we find it speedily spreading everywhere, and this in spite of its humble origin, its unworldly teaching, and the cruel persecution which it meets at the hands of the rulers of this world. And as the centuries pass we find this Church battling against heresies, schisms, and the sins of her own people—nay, of her own rulers—and yet continuing ever the same, promulgating ever the same doctrine, and putting before men the same mysteries of the life, death, and resurrection of the world's Saviour, Who had, so she taught, gone before to prepare a home for those who while on earth should have believed in Him and fought the good fight. But if the history of the Church since New-Testament times thus wonderfully confirms the New Testament itself, and if the New Testament so marvellously completes the Old Testament, these books must really contain what they claim to contain, viz. Divine revelation. And more than all, that Person Whose life and death were so minutely foretold in the Old Testament, and Whose story, as told in the New Testament, so perfectly corresponds with its prophetic delineation in the Old Testament, must be what He claimed to be, viz. the Son of God. His work, therefore, must be Divine. The Church which He founded must also be Divine and the repository and guardian of His teaching. Indeed, we can truly say that for every truth of Christianity which we believe Christ Himself is our testimony, and we believe in Him because the Divinity He claimed rests upon the concurrent testimony of His miracles, His prophecies, His personal character, the nature of His doctrine, the marvellous propagation of His teaching in spite of its running counter to flesh and blood, the united testimony of thousands of martyrs, the stories of countless saints who for His sake have led heroic lives, the history of the Church herself since the Crucifixion, and, perhaps more remarkable than

any, the history of the papacy from St. Peter to Pius X.

(c) These testimonies are unanimous; they all point in one direction, they are of every age, they are clear and simple, and are within the grasp of the humblest intelligence. And, as the Vatican Council has said, "the Church herself, is, by her marvellous propagation, her wondrous sanctity, her inexhaustible fruitfulness in good works, her Catholic unity, and her enduring stability, a great and perpetual motive of credibility and an irrefragable witness to her Divine commission" (Const. "Dei Filius"). "The Apostles", says St. Augustine, "saw the Head and believed in the Body; we see the Body, let us believe in the Head" [Sermo ccxliii, 8 (al. cxliii), de temp., P. L., V, 1143]. Every believer will echo the words of Richard of St. Victor, "Lord, if we are in error, by Thine own self we have been deceived; for these things have been confirmed by such signs and wonders in our midst as could only have been done by Thee!" (de Trinitate, I, cap. ii).

(d) But much misunderstanding exists regarding the meaning and office of the motives of credibility. In the first place, they afford us definite and certain knowledge of Divine revelation; but this knowledge precedes faith; it is not the final motive for our assent to the truths of faith; as St. Thomas says, "Faith has the character of a virtue, not because of the things it believes, for faith is of things that appear not, but because it adheres to the testimony of one in whom truth is infallibly found" (De Veritate, xiv, 8); this knowledge of revealed truth which precedes faith can only beget human faith, it is not even the cause of Divine faith (cf. Suarez, De Fide, disp. iii, 12), but is rather to be considered a remote disposition to it. We must insist upon this because in the minds of many faith is regarded as a more or less necessary consequence of a careful study of the motives of credibility, a view which the Vatican Council condemns expressly: "If anyone says that the assent of Christian faith is not free, but that it necessarily follows from the arguments which human reason can furnish in its favour; or if anyone says that God's grace is only necessary for that living faith which worketh through charity, let him be anathema" (Sess. IV). Nor can the motives of credibility make the mysteries of faith clear in themselves, for, as St. Thomas says, "the arguments which induce us to believe, e. g. miracles, do not prove the faith itself, but only the truthfulness of him who declares it to us, and consequently they do not beget knowledge of faith's mysteries, but only faith" (in Sent., III, xxiv, Q. i, art. 2, sol. 2, ad 4^{um}). On the other hand, we must not minimize the real probative force of the motives of credibility within their true sphere; "Reason declares that from the very outset the Gospel teaching was rendered conspicuous by signs and wonders which gave, as it were, definite proof of a definite truth" (Leo XIII, "Æterni Patris").

(e) The Church has twice condemned the view that faith ultimately rests on an accumulation of probabilities. Thus the proposition, "The assent of supernatural faith . . is consistent with merely probable knowledge of revelation", was condemned by Innocent XI in 1679 (cf. Denzinger, Enchiridion, 10th ed., no. 1171); and the Syllabus "Lamentabili sane" (July, 1907) condemns the proposition (XXV) that "the assent of faith rests ultimately on an accumulation of probabilities". But since the great name of Newman has been dragged into the controversy regarding this last proposition, we may point out that, in the "Grammar of Assent" (chap. x, sect. 2), Newman refers solely to the proof of faith afforded by the motives of credibility, and he rightly concludes that, since these are not demonstrative, this line of proof may be termed "an accumulation of probabilities". But it would be absurd to say that Newman therefore based the final assent of faith on this accumulation; as a matter of fact he is not here making an analysis of an act of faith, but only of the grounds for faith; the question of authority does not come into his argument (cf. McNabb, "Oxford Conferences on Faith", pp. 121–122).

V. Analysis of the Act of Faith from the Subjective Standpoint.—(a) The light of faith.—An angel understands truths which are beyond man's comprehension; if then a man were called upon to assent to a truth beyond the ken of the human intellect, but within the grasp of the angelic intellect, he would require for the time being something more than his natural light of reason, he would require what we may call "the angelic light". If, now, the same man were called upon to assent to a truth beyond the grasp of both men and angels, he would clearly need a still higher light, and this light we term "the light of faith"—a light, because it enables him to assent to those supernatural truths, and the light of faith because it does not so illumine those truths as to make them no longer obscure, for faith must ever be "the substance of things to be hoped for, the evidence of things that appear not" (Heb., xi, 1). Hence St. Thomas ("De Veritate", xiv, 9, ad 2^{um}) says: "Although the Divinely infused light of faith is more powerful than the natural light of reason, nevertheless in our present state we only imperfectly participate in it; and hence it comes to pass that it does not beget in us real vision of those things which it is meant to teach us; such vision belongs to our eternal home, where we shall perfectly participate in that light, where, in fine, 'in God's light we shall see light' (Ps. xxxv, 10)."

(b) The necessity of such light is evident from what has been said, for faith is essentially an act of assent, and just as assent to a series of deductive or inductive reasonings, or to intuition of first principles, would be impossible without the light of reason, so, too, assent to a supernatural truth would be inconceivable without a supernatural strengthening of the natural light; "Quid est enim fides nisi credere quod non vides?" (i. e. what is faith but belief in that which thou seest not?) asks St. Augustine; but he also says: "Faith has its eyes by which it in some sort sees that to be true which it does not yet see; and by which, too, it most surely sees that it does not see what it believes" [Ep. ad Consent., ep. cxx 8 (al. ccxxii), P. L., II, 456].

(c) Again, it is evident that this "light of faith" is a supernatural gift and is not the necessary outcome of assent to the motives of credibility. No amount of study will win it, no intellectual conviction as to the credibility of revealed religion nor even of the claims of the Church to be our infallible guide in matters of faith, will produce this light in a man's mind. It is the free gift of God. Hence the Vatican Council (III, iii) teaches that "faith is a supernatural virtue by which we, with the inspiration and assistance of God's grace, believe those things to be true which He has revealed". The same decree goes on to say that "although the assent of faith is in no sense blind, yet no one can assent to the Gospel teaching in the way necessary for salvation without the illumination of the Holy Spirit, Who bestows on all a sweetness in believing and consenting to the truth". Thus, neither as regards the truth believed nor as regards the motives for believing, nor as regards the subjective principle by which we believe—viz. the infused light—can faith be considered blind.

(d) The place of the will in an act of faith.—So far we have seen that faith is an act of the intellect assenting to a truth which is beyond its grasp, e. g. the mystery of the Holy Trinity. But to many it will seem almost as futile to ask the intellect to assent to a proposition which is not intrinsically evident as it would be to ask the eye to see a sound. It is clear, however, that the intellect can be moved by the will either to study or not to study a certain truth, though if the

truth be a self-evident one—e. g., that the whole is greater than its part—the will cannot affect the intellect's adhesion to it; it can, however, move it to think of something else, and thus distract it from the contemplation of that particular truth. If, now, the will moves the intellect to consider some debatable point—e. g. the Copernican and Ptolemaic theories of the relationship between the sun and the earth—it is clear that the intellect can only assent to one of these views in proportion as it is convinced that the particular view is true. But neither view has, as far as we can know, more than probable truth, hence of itself the intellect can only give in its partial adherence to one of these views, it must always be precluded from absolute assent by the possibility that the other view may be right. The fact that men hold much more tenaciously to one of these than the arguments warrant can only be due to some extrinsic consideration, e. g. that it is absurd not to hold what the vast majority of men hold. And here it should be noted that, as St. Thomas says repeatedly; the intellect only assents to a statement for one of two reasons: either because that statement is immediately or mediately evident in itself—e. g. a first principle or a conclusion from premises—or because the will moves it to do so. Extrinsic evidence of course comes into play when intrinsic evidence is wanting, but though it would be absurd, without weighty evidence in its support, to assent to a truth which we do not grasp, yet no amount of such evidence can make us assent, it could only show that the statement in question was credible, our ultimate actual assent could only be due to the intrinsic evidence which the statement itself offered, or, failing that, due to the will. Hence it is that St. Thomas repeatedly defines the act of faith as the assent of the intellect determined by the will (De Veritate, xiv, 1; II–II, Q. ii, a. 1, ad 3^{um}; 2, c.; ibid., iv, 1, c., and ad 2^{um}). The reason, then, why men cling to certain beliefs more tenaciously than the arguments in their favour would warrant, is to be sought in the will rather than in the intellect. Authorities are to be found on both sides, the intrinsic evidence is not convincing, but something is to be gained by assenting to one view rather than the other, and this appeals to the will, which therefore determines the intellect to assent to the view which promises the most. Similarly, in Divine faith the credentials of the authority which tells us that God has made certain revelations are strong, but they are always extrinsic to the proposition, "God has revealed this or that", and consequently they cannot compel our assent; they merely show us that this statement is credible. When, then, we ask whether we are to give in our free assent to any particular statement or not, we feel that in the first place we cannot do so unless there be strong extrinsic evidence in its favour, for to believe a thing merely because we wished to do so would be absurd. Secondly, the proposition itself does not compel our assent, since it is not intrinsically evident, but there remains the fact that only on condition of our assent to it shall we have what the human soul naturally yearns for, viz., the possession of God, Who is, as both reason and authority declare, our ultimate end; "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved", and "Without faith it is impossible to please God." St. Thomas expresses this by saying: "The disposition of a believer is that of one who accepts another's word for some statement, because it seems fitting or useful to do so. In the same way we believe Divine revelation because the reward of eternal life is promised us for so doing. It is the will which is moved by the prospect of this reward to assent to what is said, even though the intellect is not moved by something which it understands. Hence St. Augustine says (Tract. xxvi in Joannem, 2): 'Cetera potest homo nolens, credere nonnisi volens' [i. e. other things a man can do against his will, but to believe he must will]" (De Ver., xiv, 1).

(e) But just as the intellect needed a new and special light in order to assent to the supernatural truths of faith, so also the will needs a special grace from God in order that it may tend to that supernatural good which is eternal life. The light of faith, then, illumines the understanding, though the truth still remains obscure, since it is beyond the intellect's grasp; but supernatural grace moves the will, which, having now a supernatural good put before it, moves the intellect to assent to what it does not understand. Hence it is that faith is described as "bringing into captivity every understanding unto the obedience of Christ" (II Cor., x, 5).

VI. Definition of Faith.—The foregoing analyses will enable us to define an act of Divine supernatural faith as "the act of the intellect assenting to a Divine truth owing to the movement of the will, which is itself moved by the grace of God" (St. Thomas, II–II, Q. iv, a. 2). And just as the light of faith is a gift supernaturally bestowed upon the understanding, so also this Divine grace moving the will is, as its name implies, an equally supernatural and an absolutely gratuitous gift. Neither gift is due to previous study, neither of them can be acquired by human efforts, but "Ask and ye shall receive."

From all that has been said two most important corollaries follow: (a) That temptations against faith are natural and inevitable and are in no sense contrary to faith, "since", says St. Thomas, "the assent of the intellect in faith is due to the will, and since the object to which the intellect thus assents is not its own proper object—for that is actual vision of an intelligible object—it follows that the intellect's attitude towards that object is not one of tranquillity, on the contrary it thinks and inquires about those things it believes, all the while that it assents to them unhesitatingly; for as far as it itself is concerned the intellect is not satisfied" (De Ver., xiv, 1). (b) It also follows from the above that an act of supernatural faith is meritorious, since it proceeds from the will moved by Divine grace or charity, and thus has all the essential constituents of a meritorious act (cf. II–II, Q. ii, a. 9). This enables us to understand St. James's words when he says, "The devils also believe and tremble" (ii, 19). "It is not willingly that they assent", says St. Thomas, "but they are compelled thereto by the evidence of those signs which prove that what believers assent to is true, though even those proofs do not make the truths of faith so evident as to afford what is termed vision of them" (De Ver., xiv, 9, ad 4^{um}); nor is their faith Divine, but merely philosophical and natural. Some may fancy the foregoing analyses superfluous, and may think that they savour too much of Scholasticism. But if anyone will be at the pains to compare the teaching of the Fathers, of the Scholastics, and of the divines of the Anglican Church in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, with that of the non-Catholic theologians of to-day, he will find that the Scholastics merely put into shape what the Fathers taught, and that the great English divines owe their solidity and genuine worth to their vast patristic knowledge and their strictly logical training.

Let anyone who doubts this statement compare Bishop Butler's "Analogy of Religion", chaps. v, vi, with the paper on "Faith" contributed to "Lux Mundi". The writer of this latter paper tells us that "faith is an elemental energy of the soul", "a tentative probation", that "its primary note will be trust", and finally that "in response to the demand for definition, it can only reiterate: 'Faith is faith. Believing is just believing'". Nowhere is there any analysis of terms, nowhere any distinction between the relative parts played by the intellect and the will; and we feel that those who read the paper must have risen from its perusal with the feeling that they had been wandering through—we use the writer's own expression—"a juggling maze of words".

VII. The Habit of Faith and the Life of Faith.—(a) We have defined the act of faith as the assent of the intellect to a truth which is beyond its comprehension, but which it accepts under the influence of the will moved by grace; and from the analysis we are now in a position to define the virtue of faith as a supernatural habit by which we firmly believe those things to be true which God has revealed. Now every virtue is the perfection of some faculty, but faith results from the combined action of two faculties, viz., the intellect which elicits the act, and the will which moves the intellect to do so; consequently, the perfection of faith will depend upon the perfection with which each of these faculties performs its allotted task; the intellect must assent unhesitatingly, the will must promptly and readily move it to do so.

(b) The unhesitating assent of the intellect cannot be due to intellectual conviction of the reasonableness of faith, whether we regard the grounds on which it rests or the actual truths we believe, for "faith is the evidence of things that appear not"; it must, then, be referred to the fact that these truths come to us on Divine infallible testimony. And though faith is so essentially of "the unseen" it may be that the peculiar function of the light of faith, which we have seen to be so necessary, is in some sort to afford us, not indeed vision, but an instinctive appreciation of the truths which are declared to be revealed. St. Thomas seems to hint at this when he says: "As by other virtuous habits a man sees what accords with those habits, so by the habit of faith a man's mind is inclined to assent to those things which belong to the true faith and not to other things" (II–II, Q. iv, 4, ad 3^{um}). In every act of faith this unhesitating assent of the intellect is due to the motion of the will as its efficient cause, and the same must be said of the theological virtue of faith when we consider it as a habit or as a moral virtue, for, as St. Thomas insists (I–II, Q. lvi, 3), there is no virtue, properly so called, in the intellect except in so far as it is subject to the will. Thus the habitual promptitude of the will in moving the intellect to assent to the truths of faith is not only the efficient cause of the intellect's assent, but is precisely what gives to this assent its virtuous, and consequently meritorious, character. Lastly, this promptitude of the will can only come from its unswerving tendency to the Supreme Good. And at the risk of repetition we must again draw attention to the distinction between faith as a purely intellectual habit, which as such is dry and barren, and faith resident, indeed, in the intellect, but motived by charity or love of God, Who is our beginning, our ultimate end, and our supernatural reward. "Every true motion of the will", says St. Augustine, "proceeds from true love" (de Civ. Dei, XIV, ix), and, as he elsewhere beautifully expresses it, "Quid est ergo credere in Eum? Credendo amare, credendo diligere, credendo in Eum ire, et Ejus membris incorporari. Ipsa est ergo fides quam de nobis Deus exigit; et non invenit quod exigat, nisi donaverit quod invenerit." (Tract. xxix, in Joannem, 6.—"What, then, is *to believe in God?*—It is to love Him by believing, to go to Him by believing, and to be incorporated in His members. This, then, is the faith which God demands of us; and He finds not what He may demand except where He has given what He may find.") This then is what is meant by "living" faith, or as theologians term it, *fides formata*, viz., "informed" by charity, or love of God. If we regard faith precisely as an assent elicited by the intellect, then this bare faith is the same habit numerically as when the informing principle of charity is added to it, but it has not the true character of a moral virtue and is not a source of merit. If, then, charity be dead—if, in other words, a man be in mortal sin and so without the habitual sanctifying grace of God, which alone gives to his will that due tendency to God as his supernatural end which is requisite for supernatural and meritorious acts—it is evident that there is no longer in the will that power by which it can, from supernatural motives, move the intellect to assent to supernatural truths. The intellectual and Divinely infused habit of faith remains, however, and when charity returns this habit acquires anew the character of "living" and meritorious faith.

(c) Again, faith being a virtue, it follows that a man's promptitude in believing will make him love the truths he believes, and he will therefore study them, not indeed in the spirit of doubting inquiry, but in order the better to grasp them as far as human reason will allow. Such inquiry will be meritorious and will render his faith more robust, because, at the same time that he is brought face to face with the intellectual difficulties which are involved, he will necessarily exercise his faith and repeatedly "bring his intellect into submission". Thus St. Augustine says, "What can be the reward of faith, what can its very name mean, if you wish to see now what you believe? You ought not to see in order to believe, you ought to believe in order to see; you ought to believe so long as you do not see, lest when you do see you may be put to the blush" (Sermo, xxxviii, 2, P. L., V, 236). And it is in this sense we must understand his oft-repeated words: "Crede ut intelligas" (Believe that you may understand). Thus, commenting on the Septuagint version of Isaias, vii, 9, which reads: "nisi credideritis non intelligetis", he says: "Proficit ergo noster intellectus ad intelligenda quæ credat, et fides proficit ad credenda quæ intelligat; et eadem ipsa ut magis magisque intelligantur, in ipso intellectu proficit mens. Sed hoc non fit propriis tanquam naturalibus viribus, sed Deo donante atque adjuvante" (Enarr. in Ps. cxviii, Sermo xviii, 3, "Our intellect therefore is of use to understand whatever things it believes, and faith is of use to believe whatever it understands; and in order that these same things may be more and more understood, the thinking faculty [*mens*] is of use in the intellect. But this is not brought about as by our own natural powers, but by the gift and the aid of God." Cf. Sermo xliii, 3, in Is., vii, 9; P. L., V, 255).

(d) Further, the habit of faith may be stronger in one person than in another, "whether because of the greater certitude and firmness in the faith which one has more than another, or because of his greater promptitude in assenting, or because of his greater devotion to the truths of faith, or because of his greater confidence" (II–II, Q. v, a. 4).

(e) We are sometimes asked whether we are really certain of the things we believe, and we rightly answer in the affirmative; but strictly speaking, certitude can be looked at from two standpoints: if we look at its cause, we have in faith the highest form of certitude, for its cause is the Essential Truth; but if we look at the certitude which arises from the extent to which the intellect grasps a truth, then in faith we have not such perfect certitude as we have of demonstrable truths, since the truths believed are beyond the intellect's comprehension (II–II, Q. iv, 8; de Ver., xiv, and i, ad 7^{um}).

VIII. The Genesis of Faith in the Individual Soul.—(a) Many receive their faith in their infancy, to others it comes later in life, and its genesis is often misunderstood. Without encroaching upon the article Revelation, we may describe the genesis of faith in the adult mind somewhat as follows: Man being endowed with reason, reasonable investigation must precede faith; now we can prove by reason the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, and the origin and destiny of man; but from these facts there follows the necessity of religion, and true religion must be the true worship of the true God not according to our ideas, but according to what He Himself has revealed. But can God reveal Himself to us? And, granting that He can, where is this revelation to be found? The Bible is said to contain it; does in-

vestigation confirm the Bible's claim? We will take but one point: the Old Testament looks forward, as we have already seen, to One Who is to come and Who is God; the New Testament shows us One Who claimed to be the fulfilment of the prophecies and to be God; this claim He confirmed by His life, death, and resurrection, by His teaching, miracles, and prophecies. He further claimed to have founded a Church which should enshrine His revelation and should be the infallible guide for all who wished to carry out His will and save their souls. Which of the numerous existing Churches is His? It must have certain definite characteristics or "notes". It must be One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic; it must claim infallible teaching power. None but the Holy, Roman, Catholic, and Apostolic Church can claim these characteristics, and her history is an irrefragable proof of her Divine mission. If, then, she be the true Church, her teaching must be infallible and must be accepted.

(b) Now what is the state of the inquirer who has come thus far? He has proceeded by pure reason, and, if on the grounds stated he makes his submission to the authority of the Catholic Church and believes her doctrines, he has only human, reasonable, fallible, faith. Later on he may see reason to question the various steps in his line of argument, he may hesitate at some truth taught by the Church, and he may withdraw the assent he has given to her teaching authority. In other words, he has not Divine faith at all. For Divine faith is supernatural both in the principle which elicits the acts and in the objects or truths upon which it falls. The principle which elicits assent to a truth which is beyond the grasp of the human mind must be that same mind illumined by a light superior to the light of reason, viz. the light of faith; and since, even with this light of faith, the intellect remains human, and the truth to be believed remains still obscure, the final assent of the intellect must come from the will assisted by Divine grace, as seen above. But both this Divine light and this Divine grace are pure gifts of God, and are consequently only bestowed at His good pleasure. It is here that the heroism of faith comes in; our reason will lead us to the door of faith, but there it leaves us; and God asks of us that earnest wish to believe for the sake of the reward—"I am thy reward exceeding great"—which will allow us to repress the misgivings of the intellect and say, "I believe, Lord, help Thou my unbelief". As St. Augustine expresses it, "Ubi defecit ratio, ibi est fidei ædificatio" (Sermo ccxlvii, P. L., V, 1157—"Where reason fails there faith builds up").

(c) When this act of submission has been made, the light of faith floods the soul and is even reflected back upon those very motives which had to be so laboriously studied in our search after the truth; and even those preliminary truths which precede all investigation, e. g. the very existence of God, become now the object of our faith.

IX. Faith in Relation to Works.—(a) *Faith and no works* may be described as the Lutheran view. "Esto peccator, pecca fortiter sed fortius fide" was the heresiarch's axiom, and the Diet of Worms, in 1527, condemned the doctrine that good works are necessary for salvation.

(b) *Works and no faith* may be described as the modern view, for the modern world strives to make the worship of humanity take the place of the worship of the Deity ("Do we believe?" as issued by the Rationalist Press, 1904, ch. x: "Creed and Conduct" and ch. xv: "Rationalism and Morality". Cf. also "Christianity and Rationalism on Trial", published by the same press, 1904).

(c) Faith shown by works has ever been the doctrine of the Catholic Church and is explicitly taught by St. James, ii, 17: "Faith, if it have not works, is dead." The Council of Trent (Sess. VI, canons xix, xx, xxiv, and xxvi) condemned the various aspects of the Lutheran doctrine, and from what has been said above on the necessity of charity for "living" faith, it will be evident that faith does not exclude, but demands, good works, for charity or love of God is not real unless it induces us to keep the Commandments; "He that keepeth his word, in him in very deed the charity of God is perfected" (I John, ii, 5). St. Augustine sums up the whole question by saying "Laudo fructum boni operis, sed in fide agnosco radicem"—i. e. "I praise the fruit of good works, but their root I discern in faith" (Enarr. in Ps. xxxi, P. L., IV, 259).

X. Loss of Faith.—From what has been said touching the absolutely supernatural character of the gift of faith, it is easy to understand what is meant by the loss of faith. God's gift is simply withdrawn. And this withdrawal must needs be punitive, "Non enim deseret opus suum, si ab opere suo non deseratur" (St. Augustine, Enarr. in Ps. cxlv—"He will not desert His own work, if He be not deserted by His own work"). And when the light of faith is withdrawn, there inevitably follows a darkening of the mind regarding even the very motives of credibility which before seemed so convincing. This may perhaps explain why those who have had the misfortune to apostatize from the faith are often the most virulent in their attacks upon the grounds of faith; "Væ homini illi", says St. Augustine, "nisi et ipsius fidem Dominus protegat", i. e. "Woe be to a man unless the Lord safeguard his faith" (Enarr. in Ps. cxx, 2, P. L., IV, 1614).

XI. Faith is Reasonable.—(a) If we are to believe present-day Rationalists and Agnostics, faith, as we define it, is unreasonable. An Agnostic declines to accept it because he considers that the things proposed for his acceptance are preposterous, and because he regards the motives assigned for our belief as wholly inadequate. "Present me with a reasonable faith based on reliable evidence, and I will joyfully embrace it. Until that time I have no choice but to remain an Agnostic" ("Medicus" in the "Do we Believe?" Controversy, p. 214). Similarly, Francis Newman says: "Paul was satisfied with a kind of evidence for the resurrection of Jesus which fell exceedingly short of the demands of modern logic; it is absurd in us to believe, barely because they believed" ("Phases of Faith", p. 186). Yet the supernatural truths of faith, however they may transcend our reason, cannot be opposed to it, for truth cannot be opposed to truth, and the same Deity Who bestowed on us the light of reason by which we assent to first principles is Himself the cause of those principles, which are but a reflection of His own Divine truth. When He chooses to manifest to us further truths concerning Himself, the fact that these latter are beyond the grasp of the natural light which He has bestowed upon us will not prove them to be contrary to our reason. Even so pronounced a rationalist as Sir Oliver Lodge says: "I maintain that it is hopelessly unscientific to imagine it possible that man is the highest intelligent existence" (Hibbert Journal, July, 1906, p. 727).

Agnostics, again, take refuge in the unknowableness of truths beyond reason, but their argument is fallacious, for surely knowledge has its degrees. I may not fully comprehend a truth in all its bearings, but I can know a great deal about it; I may not have demonstrative knowledge of it, but that is no reason why I should reject that knowledge which comes from faith. To listen to many Agnostics one would imagine that appeal to authority as a criterion was unscientific, though perhaps nowhere is authority appealed to so unscientifically as by modern scientists and modern critics. But, as St. Augustine says, "If God's providence govern human affairs we must not despair or doubt but that He hath ordained some certain authority, upon which staying ourselves as upon a certain ground or step, we may be lifted up to God"

(De utilitate credendi); and it is in the same spirit that he says: "Ego vero Evangelio non crederem, nisi me Catholicæ Ecclesiæ commoveret auctoritas" (Contra Ep. Fund., V, 6—"I would not believe the Gospel if the authority of the Catholic Church did not oblige me to believe").

(b) Naturalism, which is only another name for Materialism, rejects faith because there is no place for it in the naturalistic scheme; yet the condemnation of this false philosophy by St. Paul and by the author of the Book of Wisdom is emphatic (cf. Rom., i, 18–23; Wis., xiii, 1–19). Materialists fail to see in nature what the greatest minds have always discovered in it, viz., "ratio cujusdam artis, scilicet divinæ, indita rebus, qua ipsæ res moventur ad finem determinatum" —"the manifestation of a Divine plan whereby all things are directed towards their appointed end" (St. Thomas, Lect. xiv, in II Phys.). Similarly, the vagaries of Humanism blind men to the fact of man's essentially finite character and hence preclude all idea of faith in the infinite and the supernatural (cf. "Naturalism and Humanism" in "Hibbert Journal", Oct., 1907).

XII. Faith is Necessary.—"He that believeth and is baptized", said Christ, "shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be condemned" (Mark, xvi, 16); and St. Paul sums up this solemn declaration by saying: "Without faith it is impossible to please God" (Heb., xi, 6). The absolute necessity of faith is evident from the following considerations: God is our beginning and our end and has supreme dominion over us; we owe Him, consequently, due service which we express by the term *religion*. Now true religion is the true worship of the true God. But it is not for man to fashion a worship according to his own ideals; none but God can declare to us in what true worship consists, and this declaration constitutes the body of revealed truths, whether natural or supernatural. To these, if we would attain the end for which we came into the world, we are bound to give the assent of faith. It is clear, moreover, that no one can profess indifference in a matter of such vital importance. During the Reformation period no such indifference was professed by those who quitted the fold; for them it was not a question of faith or unfaith, so much as of the medium by which the true faith was to be known and put into practice. The attitude of many outside the Church is now one of absolute indifference; faith is regarded as an emotion, as a peculiarly subjective disposition which is regulated by no known psychological laws. Thus Taine speaks of faith as "une source vive qui s'est formée au plus profond de l'âme, sous la poussée et la chaleur des instincts immanents"—"a living fountain which has come into existence in the lowest depths of the soul under the impulse and the warmth of the immanent instincts". Indifferentism in all its phases was condemned by Pius IX in the Syllabus "Quanta cura": in Prop. XV, "Any man is free to embrace and profess whatever form of religion his reason approves of"; XVI, "Men can find the way of salvation and can attain to eternal salvation in any form of religious worship"; XVII, "We can at least have good hopes of the eternal salvation of all those who have never been in the true Church of Christ"; XVIII, "Protestantism is only another form of the same true Christian religion, and men can be as pleasing to God in it as in the Catholic Church."

XIII. The Objective Unity and Immutability of Faith.—Christ's prayer for the unity of His Church, the highest form of unity conceivable, "that they all may be one, as thou, Father, in me, and I in Thee" (John, xvii, 21), has been brought into effect by the unifying force of a bond of a faith such as that we have analysed. All Christians have been taught to be "careful to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, one body and one spirit, as you are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all" (Eph., iv, 3–6). The objective unity of the Catholic Church becomes readily intelligible when we reflect upon the nature of the bond of union which faith offers us. For our faith comes to us from the one unchanging Church, "the pillar and ground of truth", and our assent to it comes as a light in our minds and a motive power in our wills from the one unchanging God Who can neither deceive nor be deceived. Hence, for all who possess it, this faith constitutes an absolute and unchanging bond of union. The teachings of this faith develop, of course, with the needs of the ages, but the faith itself remains unchanged. Modern views are entirely destructive of such unity of belief because their root principle is the supremacy of the individual judgment. Certain writers do indeed endeavour to overcome the resulting conflict of views by upholding the supremacy of universal human reason as a criterion of truth; thus Mr. Campbell writes: "One cannot really begin to appreciate the value of united Christian testimony until one is able to stand apart from it, so to speak, and ask whether it rings true to the reason and moral sense" ("The New Theology", p. 178; cf. Cardinal Newman, "Palmer on Faith and Unity" in "Essays Critical and Historical", vol. I, also, Thomas Harper, S.J., "Peace Through the Truth", London, 1866, 1st Series.)

I. Patristic.—The Fathers in general have never attempted any analysis of faith, and most patristic treatises *De fide* consist of expositions of the true doctrine to be held. But the reader will have already noticed the precise teaching of St. Augustine on the nature of faith. Besides the gems of thought which are scattered throughout his works, we may refer to his two treatises *De Utilitate Credendi* and *De Fide Rerum quæ non videntur*, in *P. L.*, VI, VII.

II. Scholastics.—The minute analysis of faith was worked out by the theologians of the thirteenth century and onwards; they followed mainly the lines laid down by St. Augustine. St. Thomas, *Summa*, II–II, QQ. i–vii; *Quæst. Disp.*, Q. xiv; Holcot, *De actibus fidei et intellectus et de libertate Voluntatis* (Paris, 1512); Suarez, *De fide, spe, et charitate*, in *Opera*, ed. Vives (Paris, 1878), XII; De Lugo, *De virtute fidei divinæ* (Venice, 1718); Joannes a S. Thoma, *Comment. on the Summa*, especially on the *De Fide*, in *Opera*, ed. Vives (Paris, 1886), VII; Cajetan, *De Fide et Operibus* (1532), especially his *Commentary* on the *Summa*, II–II, QQ. i–vii.

III. Modern Writers.—The decrees of the Vatican Council, a handy edition by McNabb (London, 1907); cf. also *Coll. Lacensis*, VIII; Pius X, *Syllabus, Lamentabili Sane* (1907); Id., *Encyclical, Pascendi Gregis* (1907); Zigliara, *Propædeutica ad Sacram Theologiam* (5th ed., Rome, 1906), I, xvi, xvii; Newman, *Grammar of Assent, Essay on Development*, and especially *The Ventures of Faith* in Vol. IV of his *Sermons*, and *Peace in Believing* and *Faith without Demonstration*, VI; Weiss, *Apologie du Christianisme*, Fr. tr., V, conf. iv, *La Foi*, and VI, conf. xxi, *La Vie de la Foi;* Bainvel, *La Foi et l'acte de Foi* (Paris, 1898); Ullathorne, *The Groundwork of the Christian Virtues*, ch. xiv, *The Humility of Faith;* Hedley, *The Light of Life* (1889), ii; Bowden, *The Assent of Faith*, taken mainly from Kleutgen, *Theologie der Vorzeit*, IV, and serving as an introductory chapter to the tr. of Hettinger, *Revealed Religion* (1895); McNabb, *Oxford Conferences on Faith* (London, 1905); *Implicit Faith*, in *The Month* for April, 1869; *Reality of the Sin of Unbelief*, *ibid.*, October, 1881; *The Conceivable Dangers of Unbelief* in *Dublin Review*, Jan., 1902; Harent in Vacant and Mangenot, *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, s. v. *Croyance.*

IV. Against Rationalist, Positivist, and Humanist Views.—Newman, *The Introduction of Rationalistic Principles into Revealed Religion*, in *Tracts for the Times* (1835), republished in *Essays Historical and Critical* as Essay ii; *St. Paul on Rationalism* in *The Month* for Oct., 1877; Ward, *The Clothes of Religion, a Reply to Popular Positivism* (1886); *The Agnosticism of Faith* in *Dublin Review*, July, 1903.

V. The motives of faith and its relation to reason and science.—Manning, *The Grounds of Faith* (1852, and often since); *Faith and Reason* in *Dublin Review*, July, 1889; Aveling, *Faith and Science* in *Westminster Lectures* (London, 1906); Gardeil, *La crédibilité et l'apologétique* (Paris, 1908); Idem in Vacant and Mangenot, *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, s. v. *Crédibilité.*

VI. Non-Catholic writers.—*Lux Mundi*, i, *Faith* (10th ed., 1890); Balfour, *Foundations of Belief* (2nd ed., 1895); Coleridge, *Essay on Faith* (1838), in *Aids to Reflection;* Mallock, *Religion as a Credible Doctrine* (1903), xii.

VII. Rationalistic Works.—The *Do We Believe* correspondence, held in the *Daily Telegraph*, has been published in the form of selections (1905) under the title, *A Record of a Great Correspondence in the Daily Telegraph*, with *Introduction* by Courtney. Similar selections by the *Rationalist Press* (1904); Santayana, *The Life of Reason* (3 vols., London, 1905–06); *Faith and Belief* in *Hibbert Journal*, Oct. 1907. Cf. also Lodge, *ibid.*, for Jan., 1908, and July, 1906.

Hugh Pope.

Faith, PROTESTANT CONFESSIONS OF.—That the Catholic Church, which claims the prerogative of teaching revealed truth with infallible certitude, should have drawn up articles of faith and demanded for them the internal assent and outward confession of her children, was logical and consistent; but it is difficult to understand with what logic or consistency Protestantism, which proclaimed the Bible, as interpreted by the private judgment of the individual, to be the sole and sufficient rule of faith, could follow her example. It is said that Protestants look upon their doctrinal standards as authoritative only in so far as they agree with the "word of God"; but each sect so imbues its members from early childhood with its peculiar tenets, that long before they are able to read the Bible intelligently, their religious views are fixed. Stray individuals may change their religion and may be able to gather a sufficient number of followers to form a separate communion; but the bulk of the population remain true to the faith of their parents, or of their native land. In the palmy days of Protestantism, it was not the reading of the Bible that held the denominations together, but their respective Confessions of Faith, inculcated by the preachers and enforced under severe penalties by the civil power. As a practical result, the "word of God" was interpreted in accordance with formulæ devised by men; the Anglican read into his Bible the Thirty-Nine Articles, the Lutheran the Augsburg Confession, the "Reformed Churches" the Heidelberg Catechism. Each new sect being obliged to prove its *raison d'être* by showing just how far it differed from others, a very large number of Confessions appeared, varying in size from a few articles to long theological treatises. As a rule, the later Confessions are merely modified copies of the older ones, altered to suit local circumstances or personal views.

TYPES.—Since the Protestant revolt originated almost independently, and simultaneously, in Germany and in Switzerland, there has been, from the beginning, a sharp distinction between the Lutheran and the "Reformed" tenets of Zwingli, afterwards merged into Calvinism. The cleavage between Lutheranism and Calvinism goes deeper than the divergence of views concerning the Real Presence in the Eucharist. Luther drifted into heresy gradually. In spite of his hatred of the pope, he preserved a lingering reverence for the Church in which he had been a monk and a priest for so many years. He retained as much of the ancient beliefs and liturgy as could be made to fit into his peculiar views on sin and justification. So adroitly and tentatively were the changes made in Catholic phraseology and worship, that but few of the Lutheran common people felt they had drifted away from the Church of their fathers. Luther himself, in a famous passage, boasted that the eye of the ordinary layman could detect little or no difference between the Lutheran service and the Catholic Mass. As to the theological opinions, the layman was equally deceived; for it was not new for him to be taught that we are saved by the free grace of God through the merits of Christ's Blood. That the temporal ruler was zealous in the extirpation of "abuses" rather edified than shocked the common man, for a certain *jus reformandi* had always been claimed, and had frequently been exercised, by Catholic German princes. Quite different was the case with Zwinglianism and Calvinism. Laying no claim to identity or continuity with the ancient Church, the "Reformed Churches" began, generally amidst iconoclastic riots, by rooting out the entire fabric of Catholicism. After the futile attempt of Philip of Hesse, at the Marburg Conference (1–4 Oct., 1529), to reconcile the German and Swiss Reformers, these went their several ways, hating and reviling each other little less than they hated and reviled the Church of Rome. It is scarcely needless to add that since the collapse of dogmatic Protestantism, its conflicting creeds possess little more than an historical interest. Even where subscription to a Confession is still exacted as a condition for holding office, the ceremony is regarded as a mere formality.

THE LUTHERAN CONFESSIONS.—(1) The oldest and most authoritative of the Lutheran creeds was the Augsburg Confession. It was drafted chiefly by Melanchthon, on the basis of Luther's Marburg, Schwabach, and Torgau articles, and bore the signature of seven German princes, Elector John of Saxony, his son John Frederick, Ernest and Francis, Dukes of Lüneburg, Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, Wolfang, Prince of Anhalt, and of the representatives of the two imperial cities, Nuremberg and Reutlingen. On 25 June, 1530, copies of it, in Latin and German, were presented to Charles V, at the diet of Augsburg, and the German version was read aloud before the secular and ecclesiastical Estates of the Empire. Charles retained the Latin copy which he brought with him to Spain, giving the other into the custody of the Archbishop of Mainz. Both seem now to be irretrievably lost. The document ought to have retained its original title of Apologia, for it is an artful attempt to persuade the Emperor and the Estates that in the Lutheran doctrine, "there is nothing discrepant with the Scriptures, or with the Catholic Church, or with the Roman Church, so far as that Church is known from its writers".

The Lutherans teach (Art. I) the Nicene belief in God and the Trinity; (Art. II) Original Sin; (Art. III) the Incarnation; Death and Resurrection of the Son of God; (Art. IV) Justification by Faith. By leaving out the obnoxious word *sola* (alone), the article might be glossed in a Catholic sense. They believe furthermore (Art. V) in a Divinely appointed ecclesiastical ministry, no mention being made of Luther's universal priesthood of believers. They teach (Art. VI) that "faith should bring forth good works, and that men ought to do the good works commanded by God, because it is God's will, and not on any confidence of meriting justification before God by their works", as if any one had taught differently. In Articles VII and VIII, "On the Church", instead of asserting the heresy of an invisible Church, they define it to be "the congregation of saints [the German version has it *the assembly of all the faithful*], in which the Gospel is rightly taught and the Sacraments rightly administered". They condemn the Donatists and others who held that the ministry of evil men is useless and inefficacious. In Article IX, "On Baptism", they teach that it is necessary to salvation, and that infants are to be baptized. The famous Article X reads as follows: "Of the Lord's Supper they teach that the Body and Blood of Christ are truly present and are distributed to those who eat of the Lord's Supper, and they reject the contrary teaching." Here Luther's theory of companation is sedulously slurred over. Art. XI teaches that private absolution must be retained, though in confession it is not necessary to enumerate all sins committed.

Art. XII, "On Penance", teaches that those who fall, after Baptism, may obtain the remission of sins, whenever they repent, and that it is the duty of the Church to absolve the repentant. Penance, they teach, consists of two parts, confession and faith. In the hazy Article XIII, "On the use of the Sacraments", they "condemn those who teach that the Sacraments justify *ex opere operato*, without teaching that faith in the remission of sins is requisite in the use of the Sacraments", which statement shows how scant was Melanchthon's acquaintance with Catholic doctrine. Art. XIV, "On Ecclesiastical Orders", limits itself to the harmless assertion that "no one should publicly teach in the Church, or adminster the Sacraments, unless he be rightly called." Art. XV, "On Ecclesiastical Rites", retains such rites "as may be observed without sin", instancing "fixed holydays, feasts and such like", but "consciences are not

to be burdened by such things, as if necessary to salvation." Art. XVI inculcates the duty of obedience to civil rulers. Art. XVII deals with the Last Judgment. Art. XVIII, "On Free Will", is a bold departure, on the part of Melanchthon, from Luther's fundamental heresy of the enslaved will of fallen man. "They teach that man's will hath some liberty to work a civil righteousness, and to choose such things as reason can reach unto; but that it hath no power to work the righteousness of God or a spiritual righteousness, without the Spirit of God." This sounds Catholic enough. Art. XX repels the accusation that the Lutherans "forbid good works", and falsely accuses the Catholics of relying on good works for justification. Art. XXI teaches that we should honour the memory of the Saints, but not invoke their aid.

They conclude the doctrinal part of the Confession with the words: "This is about the sum of our doctrine," with the protest of agreement with the Roman Church given above. "We have no dogmas", Melanchthon wrote to the papal legate, 6 July, "which differ from the Roman Church. Moreover, we are ready to submit to the Roman Church, if Rome, with the leniency she has at all times shown to all nations, will consent to overlook and keep silence on some slight matters which we cannot alter, even if we wished to do so. We reverence the authority of the Pope of Rome", etc. Meanwhile Luther was denouncing "the Pope and his crew" as "veritable devils", and Melanchthon styled the pope "an Anti-Christ, under whose rule they would be like the Jews under Pharaoh in Egypt" (Janssen, History of the German People, tr. St. Louis, 1903, V, 254). The "slight matters", which Rome was asked to connive at, are enumerated in seven articles in Part II of the Confession, with such prolixity that we can scarcely blame the emperor if during the reading on a hot day he fell into a slumber. They are grouped under the headings of (1) Communion under both kinds; (2) The Marriage of Priests; (3) The Mass; (4) Compulsory Confession; (5) Distinction of Meats, and Traditions; (6) Monastic Vows; and (7) The Authority of Bishops. To any one who had followed the course of the Lutheran revolution, it must have been amusing to read the following statement: "Our churches are wrongfully accused to have abolished the Mass. For the Mass is retained still among us, and celebrated with great reverence, yea, and almost all the ceremonies that are in use"—evidently the omission of the Canon was a slight matter—"saving that with the things sung in Latin we mingle certain things sung in German."

We have given this synopsis of a document often spoken of, but seldom read, to show the spirit in which it was drawn up. It has been aptly termed a political campaign document, calculated to impress the Estates that the Lutherans, themselves supremely intolerant towards Catholics, should be permitted to proceed in peace in the uprooting of the ancient Faith. The Confession was accompanied with a Preface, written by Chancellor Brück of Saxony, in which the engagement was made that should the controversy not be settled at the Diet, the signers were "ready to compare views and defend their cause in a general, free, and Christian Council". What this engagement amounted to was made manifest later on when the council convened at Trent. The studied moderation, not to say disingenuousness, of the Augsburg Confession is said to have deceived some members of the Diet, as to the importance of the issue at stake between Catholics and Lutherans; but it could not deceive such veteran controversialists as Eck, Wimpina, Cochlæus, and the other theologians to whom Charles referred the document for discussion.

In a remarkably calm and able "Answer", afterwards called "Confutation", they analyze the Confession, giving praise and censure where either is due. Melanchthon retorted with an "Apologia" which Lutherans generally regard as their second symbolic book; Charles refused to accept it, because of the violent language used against the Catholic Church. Since Melanchthon looked on the "Confessio Augustana" as his private property, he continued ever after to comment on it, and revise the text to suit his wavering views. Most notorious, and the source of endless controversies amongst Lutherans, was the altered edition of 1540, issued at a time when Melanchthon was under the spell of Calvin. Art. X lost its Catholic tone and was made to read that "with the bread and wine the Body and Blood of Christ are truly exhibited to those who eat in the Lord's Supper", a statement to which a Calvinist might subscribe. We must not, however, throw too much blame on Melanchthon and other preachers; the political magnates have to be considered.

THE SMALCALD ARTICLES.—Any hopes of a reconciliation which were founded on the studied moderation of the Augsburg Confession were rudely dispelled seven years later when the Protestant Estates, assembled at Smalcald, spurned the pope's offer of that General Council for which, with more than dubious sincerity, they had clamored so long, and commissioned Luther to expound the articles in which they differed from the Roman Church. Following the general lines of the Augsburg Confession, Luther, by injecting his strongest anti-papal virus into the document, changed it from an olive-branch into an open declaration of war with the Catholic Church. The pope and the devil are identical; the Mass is the dragon's tail, producing all sorts of abominations and idolatries; purgatory is a Satanic delusion, etc., etc. When asked to affix his signature to this insane effusion, Melanchthon did so, with the proviso that "if the pope would admit the gospel, we might permit him, for the sake of peace and the common concord of Christendom, to exercise by human right, his present jurisdiction over the bishops, who are now or may hereafter be under his authority." The princes, resenting this covert attack upon their spiritual sovereignty, compelled the weak man to write a pamphlet denouncing the pope as anti-Christ.

The Formula of Concord.—Scarcely were Luther's remains placed in the tomb than, as he had foreseen, fierce contentions broke out among the preachers, which shook the Lutheran Churches to their foundations. The earliest of these theological battles raged about the person of Melanchthon, who in his later years departed more and more openly from the two most important tenets of his master; on the subject of free will in fallen man, he approached closely to the Catholic position; regarding the Eucharist he became ever more Calvinistic. He also incurred the reproaches of the orthodox by accepting, with modifications, the "Interim Religion" of Charles V. In course of time, new topics of controversy rose to divide the theologians, until, in 1570, Jacobus Andreæ could write "that there were scarcely a couple of preachers among them who did not disagree about some article or other of the Augsburg Confession" (Janssen, op. cit., VIII, 403). Tired of their endless wranglings, which were as destructive of moral and social as of religious order, the Elector Augustus of Saxony proposed to cut the knot "by princely edict". He suggested to the Lutheran princes to convene an assembly to which each would bring his own code of doctrine. From all these different formulæ they would then, with the help of a few amicable theologians, construct a general code which should be printed, and should be considered binding on the whole body of preachers. This convention was held at Torgau, in June, 1576. In addition to twelve Saxon divines, whom the Elector had cowed into submission, there were present, Andreæ, Chemnitz, Chytræus, Musculus and Kœrner.

A new "Formula of Concord", known as the "Tor-

gau Book", was drawn up entirely in the spirit of Luther, eliminating Calvinism and Philipism. This book not being favourably received by several princes, Augustus summoned a fresh convention in the monastery of Bergen, near Magdeburg, where several alterations were proposed. As finally revised, the "Formula of Concord" was sent to the princes to be promulgated and enforced. Augustus of Saxony, John George of Brandenburg, and other princes, gathered their preachers together and compelled them publicly to subscribe their signatures, "not only with their hands, but with their hearts". Many of the princes repudiated the book; the King of Denmark threw his copy into the fire. The only Lutherans at the present day who attach any importance to it are in Missouri. The "Formula" is divided into two parts (1) the Epitome, and (2) the Solida Declaratio. The Epitome sums up Luther's "pure doctrine" in succinct form; the second part goes over the same ground more at large. Although the "Formula" begins with the stereotype Protestant declaration that the Bible is "the only rule and norm" of faith, yet, as Dr. Schaff remarks, it quotes Dr. Luther "as freely, and with at least as much deference to his authority, as Roman Catholics quote the Fathers".

CONFESSIONS OF THE "REFORMED" CHURCHES.—The so-called Reformed creeds, of which thirty or more are extant, are based on the radical tenets of Zwingli and Calvin. We can only notice the most important of them. *The Confessio Tetrapolitana.*—As the Strasburg preachers, Bucer and Capito, inclined to the Zwinglian view of the Eucharist, they were shunned by the Lutherans at the Diet of Augsburg (1530), and were not allowed to sign the Augustana. They therefore drew up a separate Confession, following the general lines of the Lutheran document, a copy of which had been given to them by Philip of Hesse. Bucer touches upon several topics that Melanchthon had cautiously avoided, among them "the invisible church", the rejection of tradition and of images. The Mass is denounced as "an intolerable abomination". Art. 18, "On the Eucharist", is given so enigmatically, that it is impossible to discover the real meaning. After great trouble the Strasburgers were able to secure the adhesion of three Southern German towns, Constance, Memmingen, and Lindau. From these four cities the Confession obtained the name of Tetrapolitan. It was delivered to the Emperor, 9 July. Charles refused to permit it to be read at the Diet, and commissioned the Catholic theologians to confute it. It was printed in the autumn of 1531 at Strasburg, together with a "Vindication". It did not long remain in authority, for the towns subscribed to the Augsburg Confession in order to join the Smalcald League. Zwingli himself sent to the Diet, July 1530, a Confession of Faith in which he openly denied the Real Presence, and denounced purgatory as "an injurious fiction which sets Christ's merits at naught." He also, shortly before his death, sent a Confession to Francis I.

The First Confession of Basle, also called of Mülhausen because adopted by that city, was drafted in 1531 by Œcolampadius and after his death elaborated by his successor, Oswald Myconius. It was promulgated by the city authorities of Basle, 21 Jan., 1534. It is a brief document, moderate in tone and calculated to conciliate the Lutherans. The text, as we now possess it, was revised in a Calvinistic sense in 1561. Of more importance is the Second Confession of Basle, known also as the "Helvetica Prior". In the "Wittenberg Concord" Luther had forced his peculiar views, regarding the Eucharist, on Bucer and several other mediating preachers. The formula was reluctantly accepted by the Southern German towns, whose only protection was to be admitted into the Smalcald League; but it was rejected by the independent Swiss. At the same time, it was recognized that some means should be devised of healing the dissensions among the Protestants, now that the convening of a General Council was in prospect. It was resolved to draft a new Confession which should be presented to the council as the national creed of the Protestant Cantons. An assembly met at Basle, 30 Jan., 1536, composed of the most prominent Swiss preachers and delegates from Zurich, Bern, Basle, Schaffhausen, St. Gall, Mülhausen, and Biel. A committee consisting of Henry Bullinger, Oswald Myconius and Simon Grynæus, was commissioned to draw up the document. It was written in Latin, and a free German translation made by Leo Judä was adopted by the meeting. Its tone is decidedly Zwinglian, but on the disputed points of the sacraments and the Lord's Supper there is an evident effort to approach as near as possible to the Lutheran phraseology.

A copy of the Confession was brought to Luther by Bucer; and it was a great surprise to the Swiss that the Wittenberg reformer declared himself satisfied with it. Luther's change of attitude was due partly to the political needs and wishes of the Smalcald princes, and partly to the altered phraseology of the Confession on the subject of the sacraments, due to the growing influence of Calvin. Whereas the Zwinglian flatly denied the corporal presence of Christ in the Eucharist, Calvin preached His "spiritual presence," which really amounts to the same thing. The "Helvetica Prior" remained for some years the national creed of the Swiss Protestants; but it was superseded in 1566 by the "Helvetica Posterior". This latter document was originally the private confession of Henry Bullinger of Zurich; but it was formally accepted as a symbolic book by nearly all the Reformed Churches of Europe. It follows the main lines of the earlier confessions, but is much lengthier, and more in the nature of a theological treatise. It is the storehouse from which later framers of Reformed Confessions have copiously drawn. These documents of Calvin have been looked upon as of dogmatic authority, viz. "The Catechism of Geneva" (1541), the "Consensus of Zurich" (1549), which in twenty-six articles expounds Calvin's views on the sacraments, and the "Consensus of the pastors of the Church of Geneva" (1552), which proclaims the Calvinistic dogma of absolute predestination.

The Gallicana, for the use of the French Protestants, was the first of the purely Calvinistic Confessions. The original draft was made by Calvin himself. It was revised in various synods, from the first of Paris (1559), to the seventh National Synod at La Rochelle (1571), from which latter town it drew its popular name of "the Rochelle Confession". Its Calvinism is undiluted, and it offers all the peculiar doctrines of that innovator. The Roman Church comes in for a fair share of vituperation, for its "corruptions", "superstitions", and "idolatries". "Nevertheless", it says, "as some trace of the Church is left in the papacy . . . we confess that those baptized in it do not need a second baptism." This concession does not imply that "idolaters" are to be tolerated; for the Author of just government "has put the sword into the hands of magistrates, to suppress crimes against the first as well as against the second table of the Commandments of God." This Confession remained in authority among French Protestants, until the Voltairianism and Rationalism of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries deprived it of all value. In the thirtieth General Synod of the Reformed Church of France (6 June to 10 July, 1872), the only approach to a Confession of Faith that could be made was the adoption by the slender majority of sixteen votes of the following vague resolution:

"The Reformed Church of France, on resuming her synodical action, which for so many years had been interrupted, desires, before all things to offer her thanks to God, and to testify her love to Jesus Christ, her Divine Head, who has sustained and comforted

her during her successive trials. She declares, through the organ of her representatives, that she remains faithful to her principles of faith and freedom on which she was founded. With her fathers and her martyrs in the Confession of Rochelle, and with all the Churches of the Reformation in their respective creeds, she proclaims the sovereign authority of the Holy Scriptures in matters of faith, and salvation by faith in Jesus Christ, the Only-begotten Son of God, who died for our sins, and was raised again for our justification. She preserves and maintains, as the basis of her teaching, of her worship and her discipline, the grand Christian facts represented in her religious solemnities, and set forth in her liturgies, especially in the Confession of sins, the Apostles' Creed, and in the order for the administration of the Lord's Supper."

The Heidelberg Catechism, published in 1563 by order of the Elector Palatine, Frederick III, was generally accepted by Calvinists throughout the world as a faithful and authoritative exposition of the faith of the Reformed Churches. It was written by two professors at the Heidelberg university, Zachary Bär (commonly known as Ursinus) and Caspar Olewig (Olevianus). It was drawn up with the twofold purpose of furnishing a manual of Christian doctrine and serving as a public profession of faith. In 129 questions and answers, it treats of man's sin and misery (3–11), the redemption by Christ (12–85), and the gratitude of the redeemed (86–129). The second part is the largest, as it gives an explanation of the Apostles' Creed and the sacraments. The third part deals with the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer. The general tone of the document is moderate, with the exception of the truculent 80th question, for which the professors are not responsible; for it did not appear in the first edition, and was later inserted by the fanatical Elector. Since it has been in no small measure the source of Protestant anti-Catholic intolerance, it is worth while to lay it before the reader:

"What difference is there between the Lord's Supper and the Popish Mass? The Lord's Supper testifies to us that we have full forgiveness of all our sins by the one sacrifice of Jesus Christ, which he himself has once accomplished on the cross; and that by the Holy Ghost we are engrafted into Christ, who with his true body is now in heaven at the right hand of the Father, and is to be there worshipped. But the Mass teaches that the living and the dead have not forgiveness of sins through the sufferings of Christ, unless Christ is still daily offered for them by the priests; and that Christ is bodily under the form of bread and wine, and is therefore to be worshipped in them. And thus the Mass, at bottom, is nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and passion of Jesus Christ, and an accursed idolatry."

Dr. Schaff doubts the "wisdom of inserting controversial matter into a catechism"; but strangely enough pronounces, that "it must be allowed to remain as a solemn protest against idolatry" (Creeds of Christendom, I, 536). If the central dogma of the Catholic worship is really idolatrous, what is the harm in proclaiming it as such in a Confession of Faith? The Heidelberg Catechism was translated into all the languages of Europe, and into several extra-European tongues. It obtained great authority in Scotland and England; but during the following century it was supplanted by the Westminster Confession. It was introduced into America by the Dutch and German Reformed churches, and is said to be now more highly prized by the American Reformed Churches than by the Germans in the Fatherland.

The Confessio Belgica is venerated as of symbolic authority, together with the Heidelberg Catechism, by the Reformed Churches in Belgium, Holland and their offshoots throughout the world. This document, consisting of thirty-seven articles, was written in French about 1561, by Guy de Bray, assisted by other preachers. The intentions of the authors, we are told by one of themselves, was not to issue a new creed, but to prove the truth of their belief from the canonical writings. They follow closely the Confessio Gallicana, seeking to support their theses by texts of Scripture. Translations were made into Dutch and Latin, and the document was submitted to Calvin and many other Reformed divines. In 1562 a copy was transmitted to Philip II with a letter protesting the innocence of the innovators from crime and rebellion. In the opinion of Calvinists, the wrecking of churches and maltreatment of priests and nuns were not crimes but imperative duties. Art. 36 admonishes magistrates of their obligation "to remove and prevent all idolatry and false worship; that the kingdom of anti-Christ (i. e. popery) may be destroyed." The Confessio Belgica was revised and adopted by the successive synods in the Netherlands, until finally the Synod of Dort, in its 149th session (29 April, 1619), subscribed to it as the public creed of the Reformed Churches. The Synod of Dort, the most representative gathering of the Calvinists, was convened by the authority and at the expense of the States-General. It opened its sessions at Dort, or Dordrecht, 13 Nov., 1618, and concluded its labours after 144 sessions, 9 May, 1619. In addition to the Dutch and Belgians, there were delegates from Great Britain, the Palatinate, Hesse, and Switzerland. The delegates chosen by the French Huguenots were forbidden by the crown to leave France. The occasion of this international gathering was the defection from pure Calvinism of the Remonstrants (see ARMINIANISM). Since the members of the synod were orthodox on the subject of predestination absolute, the condemnation of the Remonstrants was a foregone conclusion. The canons were framed in the most unbending form, and 200 ministers who refused to subscribe were deposed. Although the foreign delegates attached their names to the canons of Dort, yet, outside of the Netherlands, these were never regarded as authoritative. In England, especially, there was fierce opposition, and from rival pulpits the pros and cons of God's (or Calvin's) eternal decree were thundered into the ears of the bewildered people.

The numerous *Minor Reformed Confessions*, such as the Marchica (Brandenburg), the Hungarian, the Bohemian, and the Polish, being of a local and for the most part of an ephemeral nature, need not detain us. For an account of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican Church the reader is referred to the article ANGLICANISM. When the American colonies achieved their independence, the Anglicans in America, until then subject to the Bishop of London, formed themselves into "The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America" and, after lengthy debates, in a General Convention held at Trenton, New Jersey, 8–12 Sept., 1801, adopted the Thirty-Nine Articles, omitting in Art. 8 the Athanasian Creed and making such other alterations as were demanded by the changed political conditions. They retained the offensive coda to Art. 31, in which "the sacrifices of Masses" (i. e. the public worship of the vast majority of Christians) are denounced as "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits"; but in later editions the milder statement is substituted, that Transubstantiation "hath given occasion to many superstitions". Episcopalians, also, have not yet eliminated from their articles the calumny (Art. 22), that the "Romish" doctrine sanctions the "Adoration, as well of Images as of Relics".

The Scottish Confession.—By the year 1560, Protestantism in Scotland, through the aid of English gold and troops, had gained complete ascendency. Losing no time, the Protestant "Lords of the Congregation", convened a revolutionary Parliament of the estates of the realm, at Edinburgh, 1 Aug., whose first act was to

repudiate the Catholic religion, and commission John Knox and other preachers to compile a new creed. Familiar with the Swiss Confessions, Knox performed his task in four days. The document, amended by the leaders, was submitted to Parliament and with very little discussion and a mere handful of dissentient votes, ratified by the estates, 17 Aug. Though repudiated by Queen Mary, who was at the time in France, it was imposed upon the people as the religion of Scotland and the exercise of the ancient worship was forbidden under penalty of confiscation, exile, and death.

The "Confessio Scotica", or "Confession of the Faith and Doctrine belevet and professit be the Protestantis of Scotland", begins with a brief preface, in which the writers "take God to recorde in our consciences, that fra our heartis we abhorre all sectis of heresie and all teachers of erroneous doctrine." They do not claim to be infallible. "Gif onie man shall note in this our Confessioun onie Artickle or sentence repugnand to God's halie word" they "do promise unto him satisfactioun fra the mouth of God, that is, fra his haly scriptures, or else reformation of that quhilk he sal prove to be amisse." This hypothetical admission of fallibility, so remarkable in a Calvinistic document, was practically harmless; for no one ever convinced John Knox that he was in error.

The Confession presents, in twenty-five articles, a summary of the Christian Faith as held by the Scottish Protestants. The articles follow broadly the lines of the Apostles' Creed. They are written in a vigorous, original, and, for a document proceeding from the pen of Knox, in an extremely moderate style. The moderation was obviously due to the necessity of securing, if possible, for the sake of legality, the signature of the Catholic sovereign. Although the ground tone of the Confession is Calvinistic, yet the Calvinistic tenets are not set forward with prominence. It is only when treating of the "Kirk" and the Sacraments that the "Papistical Kirk" and the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Mass are denounced and misrepresented: "The notes, signes, and assured tokens whereby the immaculate Spouse of Christ Jesus is knawen fra the horrible harlot, the Kirk malignant, we affirme, are nouther Antiquitie, Title usurpit, lineal Descence, Place appointed, nor multitude of men approving ane error." In addition to the usual Protestant notes of the true Church, viz. "the trew preaching of the Word of God" and "the right administration of the Sacraments", the Confession assigns a third element peculiar to the Scottish Kirk, i. e. "Ecclesiastical discipline uprightlie ministered, as Goddis Worde prescribes, whereby vice is repressed, and vertew nurished". The development of Presbyterianism was a lucid commentary on the new principle herein tentatively propounded. In Art. 24, "Of the Civile Magistrate", the Confession proclaims openly the duty of suppressing the Catholic religion. "To Kings, Princes, Rulers and Magistrates, wee affirme that most chieflie and most principallie the conservation and purgation of the Religioun apperteinis; so that not onlie they are appointed for Civill policie, bot also for maintenance of the trew Religioun, and for suppressing of Idolatrie and Superstioun whatsoever."

After the forced abdication of Queen Mary in 1567, Parliament again proclaimed the Confession as the creed of "the only true and holy Kirk of Jesus Christ within this realm"; and it remained the doctrinal standard of the Scots, until superseded by the Westminster Confession. In the estimation of the Presbyterian preachers, the Confession of Knox was sadly defective; it had failed to denounce with sufficient vigour the Roman Antichrist. This omission was deemed particularly unfortunate about 1580, when the young King James VI had fallen under the spell of his French kinsman, Esmé Stuart, upon whom the king had bestowed the earldom of Lennox, and who reigned supreme in his councils. It was probably at the suggestion of this able and unscrupulous politician, that James commissioned the preacher John Craig to draw up the most violent condemnation of Papistry that ever issued from a Calvinistic pen. It is known to historians as the King's Confession, sometimes as the "Scotica Secunda", later, when the religious conflicts in Scotland turned on the question of prelacy in general, as the "National Covenant". After endorsing the Confession of Faith in 1560, it proceeds to "abhor and detest all contrary Religion and Doctrine; but chiefly all kind of Papistry in general and particular heads", among others, "the usurped tyranny of the Roman Antichrist upon the Scriptures of God, upon the Kirk, the civil magistrate, and consciences of men; all his tyrannous laws made upon indifferent things, against our Christian liberty; . . . his five bastard sacraments, with all his rites, ceremonies, and false doctrine added to the ministration of the true sacraments without the Word of God; his cruel judgment against infants departing without the sacrament; his absolute necessity of baptism; his blasphemous opinion of transubstantiation; his devilish mass; his blasphemous priesthood; his profane sacrifice for sins of the dead and the quick; . . . his worldly monarchy and wicked hierarchy; his three solemn vows; his erroneous and bloody decrees made at Trent, with all the subscribers and approvers of that cruel and bloody band conjured against the Kirk of God." This "Confession" was subscribed by James and his Court at Edinburgh, 28 Jan., 1581; afterwards by the Presbyterian Assembly and by persons of all ranks. It remained for generations the strong spiritual pabulum which fortified the Scottish people against Papistry, until men began to think for themselves.

The Westminster Confession.—In the Reformed Churches of English speech, all the earlier standards were practically supplanted by the "Westminster Confession of Faith" and the "Longer" and "Shorter Catechisms". These documents, together with a "Directory of Worship", were the fruits of the long labours of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, convened in Westminster Abbey by authority of the Long Parliament at the opening of the Civil War. After the abolition of prelacy in September, 1642, the religious condition of England was completely chaotic. In order to stem the evil, Parliament by an ordinance dated 12 June, 1642, "thought fit and necessary to call an Assembly of learned, godly and judicious divines, to consult and advise of such matters and things, touching the premises, as shall be proposed unto them by both or either of the Houses of Parliament, and to give their advice and counsel therein to both or either of the said Houses, when, and as often as they shall be thereunto required." Lest any of these invited "divines" should be tempted to dispute the omnipotence of Parliament, they are admonished that "this ordinance, or anything therein contained shall not give unto the persons aforesaid, or any of them, nor shall they in this Assembly assume to exercise, any jurisdiction, power, or authority ecclesiastical whatsoever, or any other power, than is herein particularly expressed". The ordinance provides that forty members shall constitute a quorum; "that William Twisse, Doctor in Divinity shall sit in the chair." Should he die, or be "letted, Parliament shall appoint his successor." Furthermore, "in case any difference of opinion shall happen amongst the said persons so assembled, touching any of the matters that shall be proposed to them, as aforesaid, that they shall represent the same, together with the reasons thereof, to both or either the said Houses respectively, to the end such further directions may be given therein as shall be requisite in that behalf." The ordinance mentions by name one hundred and twenty-one "divines"; but, as if these were not sufficiently muzzled, it adds ten lords and twenty commoners as "lay assessors". On 22 June, King Charles, from Oxford, issued a de-

cree condemning the proposed assembly, annulling beforehand all its proceedings, and prohibiting his subjects from taking any part in it. This had the consequence of keeping nearly all the Episcopalians away, thus placing the Puritans in supreme control. The assembly was formally opened in King Henry VII's chapel in the historic abbey; but since no matter for discussion was submitted to the divines by the Parliament, and they were inhibited from taking the initiative, an adjournment was taken until the following week, when, as its first task, the assembly was ordered to revise the Anglican "Thirty-nine Articles", "for the purpose of simplifying, clearing, and vindicating the doctrines therein contained". Ten weeks were devoted to this work; the divines had remodelled the first fifteen, when they were ordered to lay aside the "Articles" and engage in matters of more pressing importance to the Parliament. The war with King Charles was proceeding with disastrous results to the Parliamentary party. Success seemed possible only through the aid of the Scots.

Now the Scots demanded, as an indispensable condition of alliance, "the reformation of religion in the kingdoms of England and Ireland, in doctrine, worship, discipline and government, according to the Word of God, and the example of the best reformed Churches". In other words, they insisted upon the adoption by the English of Presbyterianism in its integrity, a system repugnant to the national instincts and traditions of Englishmen. But there was no alternative, except the collapse of the rebellion. A "Solemn League and Covenant", framed by the Presbyterian preacher, Henderson, was sworn and subscribed by the Scottish and English Parliaments, by the General Assembly of Scotland, and by the Westminster divines, and afterwards by the lords and commons of both nations. To aid the inexperienced English divines in drawing up Presbyterian formularies, six Scottish commissioners, four preachers and two laymen, were sent to Westminster, with authority to take part in the discussions, but without votes. On 12 Oct., 1643, the Assembly received an order from the Lords and Commons to forthwith confer and treat among themselves, of such a discipline and government as may be most agreeable to God's Holy Word, and most apt to procure and preserve the peace of the Church at home, and nearer agreement with the Church of Scotland and other Reformed Churches". Also, "touching and concerning the Directory of Worship, or Liturgy, hereafter to be in the Church". This order was the signal for protracted and at times bitter disputes between the Presbyterian majority and the Scottish commissioners on the one side, who advocated the adoption of the full Presbyterian machinery of Church government, and on the other the Independents and the Erastians, the former of whom argued for the complete independence of each separate congregation (see CONGREGATIONALISM) while the latter opposed any kind of jurisdiction independent of the civil power. Although the Independent members numbered scarcely a dozen, and the Erastians were fewer still, their influence was vastly in excess of their numerical strength; for the Independents were in close touch with Cromwell's army, and the Erastians could count on the sympathies of an Erastian parliament. Into the details of this debate, we need not enter. While it was still raging, an order was sent down to the Assembly "to frame a Confession of Faith for the three kingdoms, according to the Solemn League and Covenant". This task presented no extraordinary difficulties; all the Puritan factions were, as regarded matters of doctrine, more or less strictly Calvinistic, and there was not one Arminian in the assembly. Moreover, the Westminster divines had copious material to work upon in the numerous Reformed symbols already in existence. The Confession occupied their attention from 20 Aug., 1644, until 25 Sept., 1646, when the first nineteen chapters were sent to the Commons, and a few days later a duplicate copy was presented to the House of Lords. The Lords gave their assent to "The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines", so the title ran; but the Commons refused to take definite action until they had the complete Confession before them. This took place on 4 Dec., 1646. A limited number of copies was printed for the use of the Parliament and the assembly; but the House of Commons, probably to gain time, demanded that each assertion should be supported by Scriptural texts. This was promptly done by the divines (29 April, 1647); whereupon the Commons ordered 600 copies, "and no more", to be printed. This edition was received as authoritative by the Scottish Church and Parliament, and was regarded by Presbyterians generally as their authentic Confession of Faith. But in the eyes of the Erastian Parliament of England, it was simply "The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines", convoked by its authority, and valueless without its sanction. After intermittent discussions, which extended above a year, the Parliament, 20 June, 1648, ordered an expurgated edition to be printed by its authority, in which every reference to the spiritual jurisdiction of the Church is carefully eliminated.

As to its contents, the Westminster Confession of Faith, is the most elaborate, as it is the latest of the Reformed creeds. In thirty-two chapters, divided into sections, it labours to give a full and logical exposition of Christian doctrine as understood by the Reformed Churches. Chap. i, "Of the Holy Scripture" gives a list of the inspired books, including the deutero-canonical books of the New Testament and rejecting the "Apocrypha" of the Old. "The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the authority of any man or church, but wholly upon God". "The Supreme Judge by which all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits, are to be examined, and in Whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Ghost speaking in the Scripture." Chap. ii repeats the ancient doctrine "Of God and of the Holy Trinity". Chap. iii, "Of God's Eternal Decree", teaches that "God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of His own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass". The divines strive to ward off the obvious objection to this fatalistic tenet by denying that it makes "God the author of sin", or that violence is offered to the will of the creature. Yet, in the same breath, they insist, that "He hath not decreed anything because He foresaw it as future", and that "by decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestined unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death". The elect, who fell in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, effectually called and eventually saved; but "neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified and saved, but the elect only. The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth mercy as He pleaseth, for the glory of His sovereign power over His creatures, to pass by, and ordain them to dishonour and wrath for their sin, to the praise of His glorious justice." The "Confession" judiciously warns the preachers that "the doctrine of this high mystery of predestination is to be handled with special prudence and care". In Chap. v, "Of Providence", we find the unintelligible utterance, evidently having in view the Supralapsarians, that God's providence "extendeth itself even to the first fall, and all other sins of angels and men, and that not by a bare permission, but such as hath joined with it a most wise and powerful bounding". Chap. x, "Of Effectual

Calling", teaches that "all those whom God hath predestined unto life, and those only" are effectually called and saved. "Others, not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the Word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, yet they never truly come unto Christ, and therefore cannot be saved." Chapter xxi, "Of Religious Worship and the Sabbath Day", differs from the Continental creeds by adding the injunction that the Sabbath is to be kept holy by observing "a holy rest all the day from their own works, words, and thoughts about their worldly employments and recreations", and that a man be "taken up the whole time in the public and private exercises of his worship, and in the duties of necessity and mercy". Chap. xxii, "Of Lawful Oaths and Vows", gives the divines an opportunity for denouncing "popish monastical vows" as "superstitious and sinful snares". Chap. xxiii, "Of the Civil Magistrate" (one of the chapters expunged by the Parliament), states that "the civil magistrate may not assume to himself the administration of the Word and the Sacraments or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven; yet he hath authority, and it is his duty to take order, that unity and peace be preserved in the Church, that the truth of God be kept pure and entire, that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed". In the American revision, this is made to read that "as nursing fathers, it is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the Church of our common Lord, without giving the preference to any denomination of Christians above the rest" etc. In Chap. xxiv, "Of Marriage and Divorce", "such as profess the true reformed religion" are admonished that they "should not marry with infidels, Papists, or other idolators". Divorce is permitted on grounds of "adultery, or such wilful desertion as can no way be remedied by the Church or civil magistrate". Chap. xxv, "Of the Church", speaks in no complimentary terms of the "Pope of Rome", who is denounced as "that Antichrist, that man of sin and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ, and all that is called God". The doctrine of the Sacraments differs in nothing from the earlier Calvinistic creeds. Chap. xxix, "Of the Lord's Supper", proclaims that "the Popish Sacrifice of the mass", as they call it, "is most abominably injurious to Christ's one only sacrifice", whilst the doctrine of transubstantiation "is repugnant, not to Scripture alone, but even to common sense and reason; overthrowing the nature of the sacrament; and hath been and is the cause of manifold superstitions, yea, of gross idolatries". These are the main features of the "Westminster Confession of Faith" which are of interest to a Catholic. For many generations, the "Westminster Standards", viz., the Confession and the Catechisms, leavened the religious thought and controlled the conduct of the Presbyterians of Scotland, Ulster, and America. They were also accepted, with modifications of various sorts, by the Congregationalists, the Regular Baptists, and other newer sects.

SCHAFF, *The Creeds of Christendom* (5th ed., New York, 1890); BUTLER, *An Historical and Literary Account of the Formularies, Confessions of Faith, or Symbolic Books of the R. C., Greek and principal Protestant Churches* (London, 1816); NIEMEYER, *Collectio Confessionum in Eccl. Ref. publicatarum* (Leipzig, 1840); WINER, *A Comparative View of the Doctrines and Confessions . . .* tr. POPE (Edinburgh, 1873); AUGUSTI, *Corpus librorum symbolicorum* (Leipzig, 1846); GUERICKE, *Allgemeine Christliche Symbolik* (Leipzig, 1861); MÜLLER, *Die Bekenntnisschriften d. ref. Kirche* (Erlangen, 1903); MOEHLER, *Symbolism*, tr. (New York, 1844, 1894).

J. F. LOUGHLIN.

Faith, Hope and Charity, SAINTS, the names of two groups of Roman martyrs around whom a considerable amount of legendary lore has gathered; though the extent of sound historical data possessed concerning them is so slight, that until very recent times the most eminent scholars failed to distinguish between them. However, the extent and antiquity of their cult and the universality with which their names are found not only in the various early martyrologies of the Western Church, but also in the Menaia and Menologies of the Greeks, render the fact of their existence and martyrdom unquestionable. Setting aside the purely legendary accounts that have come down to us (see Migne, P. G. CXV, 497; Mombritius, Vitæ Sanctorum, II, 204), we find that in the reign of Hadrian, a Roman matron Sophia (Wisdom), with her three youthful daughters, Pistis, Elpis, and Agape (Faith, Hope and Charity), underwent martyrdom for the Faith and were interred on the Aurelian Way, where their tomb in a crypt beneath the church afterwards erected to St. Pancratius was long a place of resort for pilgrims, as we learn from various indubitable documents of the seventh century, such as an *Itinerarium* (or guide to the holy places of Rome compiled for the use of pilgrims) still preserved at Salzburg, the list, preserved in the cathedral archives of Monza, of the oils gathered from the tombs of the martyrs and sent to Queen Theodelinda in the time of Gregory the Great, etc.

Later surely than the reign of Hadrian, but at what time is uncertain, another band of martyrs, Sapientia (Wisdom) and her three companions, Spes, Fides and Caritas (Hope, Faith and Charity), suffered death and were buried near the tomb of St. Cecilia in the cemetery of St. Callistus on the Appian Way. Despite the meagreness of these authentic details, the explicit references in the documents cited to a band of martyrs, mother and daughters, whose names are always given in Greek, and who are buried on the Aurelian Way, and to another band of four martyrs, interred on the Via Appia, whose relationship is not indicated and whose names, though the same as those of the martyrs of the Aurelian Way, are yet always given in Latin, certainly point to distinct groups. Nor is the coincidence in names remarkable, seeing that the early Christians so often (according to De Rossi) took in baptism mystical names indicative of Christian virtues, etc. Thus Sophia, Sapientia, Fides and the like are common names in early Christian inscriptions and martyrologies. The Roman martyrology names, on 1 Aug., "the holy virgins, Faith, Hope and Charity, who won the crown of martyrdom under the Emperor Hadrian" and, on 30 Sept., "St. Sophia, widow, mother of the holy virgins, Faith, Hope and Charity". In some places, on 1 Aug., St. Sapientia is also venerated; but generally, owing to the confusion of the two groups, none of the second group receives special recognition. In the Eastern Church the feast is kept on 17 Sept.

Acta S., XXXV, 16; DE ROSSI, *Roma Sotterranea*, I, 182; II, 171 (Rome, 1864); ALLARD, *Histoire des persécutions pendant les deux premiers siècles* (Paris, 1885), 221.

JNO. F. X. MURPHY.

Faith, THE RULE OF.—The word *rule* (Lat. *regula*, Gr. κανών) means a standard by which something can be tested, and the rule of faith means something extrinsic to our faith, and serving as its norm or measure. Since faith is Divine and infallible, the rule of faith must be also Divine and infallible; and since faith is supernatural assent to Divine truths upon Divine authority, the ultimate or remote rule of faith must be the truthfulness of God in revealing Himself. But since Divine revelation is contained in the written books and unwritten traditions (Vatican Council, I, ii), the Bible and Divine tradition must be the rule of our faith; since, however, these are only silent witnesses and cannot interpret themselves, they are commonly termed "proximate but inanimate rules of faith". Unless, then, the Bible and tradition are to be profitless, we must look for some proximate rule which shall be animate or living.

I. PRIVATE JUDGMENT AS THE RULE OF FAITH.—The Reformed Churches were unanimous in declaring the Bible to be the sole rule of faith. "We believe

that the only rule and standard by which all dogmas and all doctors are to be weighed and judged, is nothing else but the prophetic and apostolic writings of the Old and New Testaments" (Form. Concordiæ, 1577). But men had already perceived that the Bible could not be left to interpret itself, and in 1571 Convocation had put forward what was, perhaps unwittingly, a double rule of faith; "preachers", they say, "shall see that they never teach anything . . . except what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and what the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops have collected out of that very doctrine" (Wilkins, "Concilia", IV, 267). Convocation thus not only laid down that the Bible was the rule of faith, but insisted upon its inanimate character as a witness to the Faith, for they declared the early Church to be its acknowledged interpreter; moreover, they were themselves exercising church authority. A somewhat different doctrine appeared in the Westminster Confession of Faith (1643–7), which declared that the "Books of the Old and New Testaments are . . . given by inspiration of God, to be the rule of faith and life" (art. ii), but that the "authority of the Holy Scripture . . . dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or church" (art. iv). They add: "We may be moved by the testimony of the Church to an high and reverent esteem of the Holy Scripture . . . yet our full persuasion of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the word in our hearts" (art. v). This is a clear enunciation of the principle that the judgment of each individual, moved by the assistance of the Holy Spirit, is the proximate living rule of faith. But apart from its solvent effect upon any true view of the Church, it is easy to see that such a rule could never serve as an infallible interpreter of the inanimate rule, viz., the Bible. For where does the Bible ever testify to the inspiration of certain books? And what limits does it assign to the canon? Moreover, the inward work of the Holy Spirit, being purely subjective, can never be a decisive and universal test of doctrinal divergences or critical views; thus Luther himself termed St. James's Epistle an "epistle of straw". The fruits of this principle are everywhere apparent in Protestant Biblical criticism. "The Reformation theologians treated Paul as if he were one of themselves. More recent writers do the same. In Neander and Godet Paul is a pectoral theologian, in Rückert a pious supernaturalist, in Baur a Hegelian, in Luthardt orthodox, in Ritschl a genuine Ritschlian" (Expository Times, 1904, p. 304). In practice, however, the Reformed Churches have never acted up to the principle of private judgment, but have, in one form or another, urged the authority of the Church in deciding the contents of the Bible, its inspiration, and its meaning.

II. The Church as the Rule of Faith.—This follows necessarily from any adequate view of the Church as a Divinely constituted body, to whose keeping is entrusted the deposit of faith, but the grounds for this doctrine may be briefly stated as follows:—

(1) *New Testament.*—Christ gave His disciples no command to write, but only to teach: "going therefore, teach ye all nations, . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matt., xxviii, 19–20). "As the Father hath sent me, I also send you" (John, xx, 21). And in accordance with this, the Church is everywhere presented to us as a living and undying society composed of the teachers and the taught. Christ is in the Church, and is its Head; and He promised that the Holy Spirit should be with it and abide in it. "He will teach you all things, and bring all things to your mind, whatsoever I shall have said to you" (John, xiv, 26). Hence St. Paul calls the Church "the pillar and ground of the truth" (I Tim., iii, 15; cf. Mark, xvi, 16; Rom., x, 17; Acts, xv, 28).

(2) *Tradition.*—The same doctrine appears in the writings of the Fathers of every age; thus St. Ignatius (ad Trall., vii), "Keep yourselves from heretics. You will be able to do this if you are not puffed up with pride, and (so) separated from(our) God, Jesus Christ, and from the bishop, and from the precepts of the Apostles. He who is within the altar is clean, he who is without is not clean; that is, he who acts any way without the bishop, the priestly body, and the deacons, is not clean in conscience." And St. Irenæus ("Adv. Hær.", III, ii) says, of heretics, that "not one of them but feels no shame in preaching himself, and thus depraving the rule of faith" (*τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας κανόνα*); and again (III, iv), "it is not right to seek from others that truth which it is easy to get from the Church, since the Apostles poured into it in fullest measure, as into a rich treasury, all that belongs to the truth, so that whosoever desires may drink thence the draught of life". A little further on, he speaks (V, xx) of the "true and sound preaching of the Church, which offers to the whole world one and the same way of salvation". Such testimonies are countless; here we can only refer to the full and explicit teaching which is to be found in Tertullian's treatises against Marcion, and in his "De præscriptionibus Hæreticorum", and in St. Vincent of Lérins' famous "Commonitorium". Indeed St. Augustine's well-known words may serve as an epitome of patristic teaching on the authority of the Church. "I would not believe the Gospels unless the authority of the Catholic Church moved me thereto" (Contra Ep. Fund., V). It should be noted that the Fathers, especially Tertullian and St. Irenæus, use the term *tradition* not merely passively, viz., of orally bestowed Divine teaching, but in the active sense of ecclesiastical interpretation. And this is undoubtedly St. Paul's meaning when he tells Timothy to uphold "the form of sound words which thou hast heard from me" (II Tim., i, 13). It is in this sense that the various formulæ of faith, of which we have the earliest sample in I Cor., xv, 3–4, became the rule of faith.

(3) *Theologians.*—The teaching of the Church's Doctors on this point has ever been the same, and it will suffice if we quote two passages from St. Thomas, who, however, has no set treatise on a question which he took for granted. "The formal object of faith", he says, "is the First Truth as manifested in Holy Scripture and in the Church's teaching. Hence if anyone does not adhere as to an infallible and Divine rule to the Church's teaching, which proceeds from the Church's truth manifested in Holy Scripture, such an one has not the habit of faith, but holds the truths of faith not by faith but by some other principle" (II-II, Q. v, a. 3). And still more explicitly when (Quodl., ix, art. 16) he asks whether canonized saints are necessarily in heaven, he says, "it is certain that the judgment of the universal Church cannot possibly err in matters pertaining to the faith; hence we must stand rather by the decisions which the pope judicially pronounces than by the opinions of men, however learned they may be in Holy Scripture."

(4) *Reason.*—If faith is necessary for all men at all times and in all places, and if a true saving faith demands a clear knowledge of what we have to believe, it is clear that an infallible teaching Church is an absolute necessity. Such a Church alone can speak to men of all classes and at all times; it alone can, by reason of its perpetuity and ageless character, meet every new difficulty by a declaration of the sound form of doctrine which is to be held. If the teaching of Christ and His Apostles is distorted, none but the Church can say "This is its true meaning, and not that; I know that it is as I say because the Spirit which assists me is One with the Spirit which rested on Him and on them"; the Church alone can say, "Christ truly rose from the tomb, and I know it, because I was there, and saw the stone

rolled back". The Church alone can tell us how we are to interpret the words "This is My Body", for she alone can say, "He Who spoke those words speaks through me, He promised to be with me all days, He pledged Himself to safeguard me from error at all times".

III. In what Sense is the Church the Rule of Faith?—(1) All non-Catholic systems have felt the need of some such authoritative rule as that sketched out above, and the history of Anglicanism practically resolves itself into a series of attempts to formulate a theory which shall, while avoiding the Scylla of Rome, enable the Church of England to escape the Charybdis of dissolution. This has never been more painfully evident than at the present time, when an apparently destructive Biblical criticism has compelled men to look for some firmer standing ground than the Bible alone. But in formulating their various theories, non-Catholic theologians have never seemed to realize the absolutely vital character of the question at issue, and have contented themselves with illogical views, which have done more to alienate thinking men than the direct and unveiled assaults of infidels and agnostics. At the Reformation the only authority deserving of the title was overthrown, and since then men have been seeking, at all costs, to replace it by some form other than that of the Apostolic Church, from which they cut themselves adrift. All the sects are seeking an active rule of faith; the High Church in the testimony of the primitive Church; the Low Church in what we may term the spiritual intuitions of the illuminated soul; the Broad Church does the same, but refuses to be bound by any dogmatic formulæ, and regards the Bible as no more than the best of all inspired books; and lastly the Ritualists appeal to the testimony of the Living Church, but naively confess that such testimony is not to be found at the present time, owing to "our unhappy divisions" which preclude the assembling of a truly representative council. The Low Church and the Broad Church content themselves with a purely subjective criterion of truth; the High Church with one which itself needs interpreting; and the Ritualist looks to "the Church of the future", he clings to the illusory "branch theory", but forgets that none of the Churches he calls "branches" accepts the designation.

(2) *Modernism.*—There has of late years arisen, within the pale of the Church, a school of theologians who make appeal to the conscience of the invisible Church rather than to any conciliar gathering, and appear to neglect entirely what theologians term the *quotidianum magisterium* of the Church. Thus, the Rev. G. Tyrrell writes: "It is all important to distinguish the pre-constitutional formless church from the governmental form, which it has now elaborated for its own apostolic needs" (Scylla and Charybdis, 49). He would even make this formless church the rule of faith. "Authority is something inherent in, and inalienable from, that multitude itself; it is the moral coerciveness of the Divine Spirit of Truth and Righteousness immanent in the whole, dominant over its several parts and members; it is the imperativeness of the collective conscience" (op. cit., 370). Such doctrine inevitably leads to the individual soul as the ultimate criterion of religious truth, as is forcibly pointed out in the Encyclical "Pascendi". But the most remarkable feature of Modernism is its return to the old Protestant rule of faith, for Modernists insist, not only on the pre-eminence of the Bible, but on the independence of Biblical critics. In the Syllabus, "Lamentabili Sane", Pius X has condemned such views as that the opinions of Biblical exegetes are beyond the jurisdiction of the Church (props. i-iii, and lxi); that the teaching office of the Church does not extend to a determination of the sense of Holy Scripture (prop. iv); that the office of the Church is merely to ratify the conclusions arrived at by the Church at large (prop. vi); and that the Church's dogmas are often in conflict with the plain teaching of the Bible (props. xxiii-xxiv, and lxi).

(3) *The Catholic Doctrine Touching the Church as the Rule of Faith.*—The term *Church*, in this connexion, can only denote the teaching Church, as is clear from the passages already quoted from the New Testament and the Fathers. But the teaching Church may be regarded either as the whole body of the episcopate, whether scattered throughout the world or collected in an œcumenical council, or it may be synonymous with the successor of St. Peter, the Vicar of Christ. Now the teaching Church is the Apostolic body continuing to the end of time (Matt., xxviii, 19–20); but only one of the bishops, viz., the Bishop of Rome, is the successor of St. Peter; he alone can be regarded as the living Apostle and Vicar of Christ, and it is only by union with him that the rest of the episcopate can be said to possess the Apostolic character (Vatican Council, Sess. IV, Proœmium). Hence, unless they be united with the Vicar of Christ, it is futile to appeal to the episcopate in general as the rule of faith. At the same time, it is clear that the Church may derive from the conflicting views of the Doctors a clearer knowledge of the Deposit of Faith committed to her, for as St. Augustine pointedly asked, when treating of the re-baptism question, "how could a question which had become so obscured by the dust raised in this controversy, have been brought to the clear light and decision of a plenary council, unless it had first been discussed throughout the world in disputations and conferences held by the bishops?" (De Baptismo, ii, 5).

Thus the appeal of the Ritualist to a future council, that of the Modernist to the conscience of the universal Church, and that of the High-Churchman to the primitive Church, are, besides being mutually exclusive, destructive of the true idea of the Church as the "pillar and ground of truth". If the Church is to exercise her prerogative, she must be able to decide promptly and infallibly any question touching faith or morals. Her conciliar utterances are rare, and though they are weighty with the majesty of œcumenical testimony, the Church's teaching is by no means confined to them. The Vicar of Christ can, whenever necessary, exercise the plenitude of his authority, and when he does so we are not at liberty to say, with the Jansenists, that he has not done justice to the views of those he condemns (cf. Alex. VII, "Ad Sacram", 1656); nor can we take refuge, as did the later Jansenists, and as the Modernists appear to do, in obsequious silence, as opposed to heartfelt submission and mental acceptance of such pronouncements by the supreme pastor of souls. (Cf. Clement XI, "Vineam Domini", 1705; and Pius X, "Lamentabili Sane", 1907, prop. vii.) When Newman was received into the Church, he penned those famous lines which form the conclusion of the "Essay on Development". "Put not from you what you have here found; regard it not as mere matter of present controversy; set not out resolved to refute it, and looking out for the best way of doing so; seduce not yourself by the imagination that it comes of disappointment, or disgust, or restlessness, or wounded feeling, or undue sensibility, or other weakness. Wrap not yourself round in the associations of years past, nor determine that to be truth which you wish to be so, nor make an idol of cherished anticipations. Time is short, eternity is long."

Patristic Writers.—Irenæus, *Adversus Hæres.*, ed. Migne, *P. G.*, VII; Tertullian, *De præscriptionibus Hæreticorum*, ed. Hurter (Utrecht, 1870); Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses*, ed. Migne, *P. G.*, XXXIII; Cyril of Alexandria, *Second Letter to Nestorius*, styled by Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon "the Rule of Faith" (ἐπιστολὴ κανονική); Vincent of Lérins, *Commonitorium*, ed. Hurter. See also Schanz, *Apologie*, tr. (New York, 1892); Harnack, *History of Dogma*, tr.

Writers of the Scholastic Period.—Melchior Canus, *De locis theologicis* (Rome, 1890); Suarez, *Defensio Fidei Catholicæ et Apostolicæ*, ed. Vives (Paris, 1878); Bellarmine, *Disputationes de controversiis fidei* (Ingolstadt, 1586).

Catholic Writers of the Reformation Period in England.—CAMPIAN, *Decem Rationes etc.;* BRISTOW, *Motives* (Antwerp, 1574); HUDDLESTONE, *A short and plain way to the Faith and Church* (1688), reprinted by DOLMAN (1844).

Modern Writers.—MILNER, *The End of Religious Controversy* (1818; reprinted Shrewsbury, 1831); WISEMAN, *Lectures on the Catholic Church;* IDEM, *The Rule of Faith;* SWEENEY, *The Nature, the Grounds, and the Home of Faith* (1867); WILHELM AND SCANNELL, *Manual of Dogmatic Theology* (London, 1898); HUMPHREY, *The Bible and Belief* (London, 1886).

Anglican Writers in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries.—THORNDIKE, *On the Principles of Christian Truth*, ed. PARKER (Oxford, 1845); PEARSON, *Exposition of the Creed* (1659); BULL, *Works*, ed. BURTON (Oxford, 1827), 6 vols.; BUTLER (said to have died a Catholic), *Analogy of Religion*, II. During the Nineteenth Century.—NEWMAN, *The Via Media of the Anglican Church* (revised edition, 1877); W. G. WARD, *The Ideal of a Christian Church* (1844); R. I. WILBERFORCE, *An Enquiry into the Principles of Church Authority* (1854); PUSEY, *An Eirenicon* (Oxford, 1865), I; MANNING, *The Rule of Faith* (a sermon at Chichester, 1838); *Lux Mundi*, art. 9, *The Church* (10th ed., 1890); STALEY, *The Catholic Religion for Members of the Anglican Church;* GORE, *The Incarnation of the Son of God* in *Bampton Lectures* (1891). See also references under FAITH.

HUGH POPE.

Faithful (Lat. *fideles*, from *fides*, faith), THE, those who have bound themselves to a religious association, whose doctrine they accept, and into whose rites they have been initiated. Among Christians the term is applied to those who have been fully initiated by baptism and, regularly speaking, by confirmation. Such have engaged themselves to profess faith in Jesus Christ, from Whom they received it as a gift; henceforth they will proclaim His teachings, and live according to His law. Hence the term so frequent in papal documents, *Christifideles*, "the faithful of Jesus Christ". The distinction between Christians and faithful is now very slight, not only because adult baptism has become the exception, but also because liturgically the rite of the catechumenate and that of baptism have merged into one another. On the other hand, in the Latin Church at least, confirmation and first Communion have been separated from the baptismal initiation. In the primitive Church it was otherwise; initiation into the Christian society consisted in two distinct acts, often accomplished years apart from one another. First, one became a catechumen by the imposition of hands and the sign of the cross; this was a kind of preliminary profession of Christian faith—"eos qui ad primam fidem credulitatis accedunt" (Council of Elvira, about 300, can. xlii), which authorized the catechumen to call himself a Christian. Only by the second act of initiation, i. e. by baptism itself, was he authorized to call himself one of the faithful, and to participate immediately in all the Christian mysteries, including the Eucharist.

Strictly speaking, therefore, the term *faithful* is opposed to catechumen; hence, it is not met in the writings of those early Christian Fathers who flourished before the organization of the catechumenate. It is not found in St. Justin nor in St. Irenæus of Lyons; Tertullian, however, uses it, and reproaches the heretics for obliterating all distinction between catechumens and the faithful: *quis catechumenus, quis fidelis incertum est* (De præscr., c. xli; P. L., II, 56). Henceforth, in the patristic writings and the canons of councils we meet quite frequently the antithesis of catechumens and baptized Christians, Christians and faithful. Thus St. Augustine (Tract. in Joannem, xliv, 2; P. L., XXXV, 1714): "Ask a man: are you a Christian? If he be a pagan or a Jew, he will reply: I am not a Christian. But if he say: I am a Christian, ask him again: are you a catechumen, or one of the faithful?" Similarly the Council of Elvira considers the case of a "faithful" Christian baptizing a catechumen in case of necessity (can. xxxviii); again, of sick pagans asking for the imposition of hands of the catechumenate, and thus becoming Christians (can. xxxix); of participation in an idolatrous sacrifice on the part of a Christian, and again by one of the faithful (can. lix); of betrayal to the pagan magistrate (*delatio*), to which a difference of guilt is attached according as the crime was perpetrated by one of the faithful or by a catechumen (can. lxxiii).

The title *fidelis* was often carved on epitaphs in the early Christian period, sometimes in opposition to the title of catechumen. Thus, at Florence, a master (*patronus*) dedicates to his catechumen servant (*alumna*) the following inscription: "Sozomeneti ALUMNÆ audienti patronus fidelis", i. e. "her master, one of the faithful, to Sozomenes, his servant and a hearer", by which term he means one of the well-known degrees of the catechumenate (Martigny, Dict. des antiq. chrét., Paris, 1877). Even now the baptismal rite provides for voluntary request of baptism on the part of an *infidelis*, i. e. a non-Christian (see INFIDEL); it exhibits venerable vestiges of the primitive *scrutinium* or preliminary examination, the guarantors (*sponsores*) or god-father and god-mother, the rites of the catechumenate, the communication of the Creed (*traditio symboli*) and the Our Father, the renunciation of Satan and evil, the adhesion to Jesus Christ, and the triple profession of faith. The candidate for baptism is still asked at the entrance to the baptismal font: "Wilt thou be baptized?" It was voluntarily, therefore, and is so yet, that one entered the ranks of the faithful through the principal initiatory rite of baptism.

Naturally enough, even in Christian antiquity, attention was drawn to the analogous ceremonies of circumcision (the sign, if not the rite, of the admission of proselytes to the profession of Judaism) and of the bloody bath of the *taurobolium*, by which the faithful of Mithra were initiated (Cumont, Les Mystères de Mithra, Paris, 1902). The obligations of the faithful Christian are indicated by the preparatory rites of his reception and by his actual baptism. He begins by asking for faith (in Jesus Christ) and, through that faith, for eternal life. The Creed is then delivered to him, and he returns it (*redditio symboli*), i. e. repeats it aloud. At the baptismal font he recites solemnly the profession of faith. From all this it is clear that his first duty is to believe (see FAITH). His second duty is to regulate his life or conduct with his new Christian faith, i. e. having renounced Satan and evil, he must avoid all sin. "So behave", was it said to him, "that henceforth thou mayest be the temple of God." St. Gregory I says (Hom. in Evang. xxix, 3; P. L., LXXVI, 1215): "Then only are we truly the faithful when by our acts we realize the promises made with our lips. On the day of our baptism, indeed, we promised to renounce all the works and all the pomps of the ancient enemy."

Finally, since the faithful have voluntarily sought membership in the Christian society they are bound to submit to its authority and obey its rulers. As to the rights of the faithful, they consist chiefly in the fullest participation in all the Christian mysteries, so long as one does not become unworthy of the same. Thus the faithful Christian is entitled to take part in the Holy Sacrifice, to remain in the assembly after the deacon has sent away the catechumens, to offer up with the priest the *oratio fidelium* or prayer of the faithful, to receive there the Body and Blood of Christ, and to receive the other rites and sacraments. He may also aspire to a position among the clergy. In a word, he is a full member of the Christian society, and is such, regularly speaking, in perpetuity. If by reason of his own misdeeds he deserves to be expelled from said society, repentance and the reparatory penitential rite, a second baptism, as it were, permit his return. Finally, if he persist in the observance of his baptismal promises, he will obtain eternal life, i. e. his original petition at the moment of baptism. See BAPTISM; CATECHUMEN.

A. BOUDINHON.

Faithful Companions of Jesus, SOCIETY OF THE, a religious institute of women founded by the Viscountess de Bonnault d'Houet in 1820 at Amiens,

France. It was solemnly approved by Gregory XVI, 5 Aug., 1837.

The Faithful Companions of Jesus are devoted to the education of all classes, adapting themselves to the special educational needs of each country. In 1903 the society possessed forty-one convents in France, Italy, Switzerland, England, Ireland, Scotland, Australia, Canada, and the United States. The religious persecution in France, with the consequent closing of the French houses, has been the cause of new foundations in Belgium (at Brussels, Graty, and Namur), also in the Isle of Guernsey, and at Fribourg, Switzerland. The society is governed by a superior general who, up to the time of the religious persecution in France, resided at the mother-house in Paris; the home of the superior general is at present in Namur, Belgium. The society numbers about 1200 religious, who in England, Ireland, Scotland, and Australia conduct about 60 grammar and high schools, technical schools, science and art schools. The new training college for teachers at Sedgley, near Manchester, England, has met with great success. In the United States the sisters have charge of about one thousand children attending St. Joseph's parochial school at Fitchburg, Mass. They also have an academy where high school branches are taught. A small foundation has recently been made at Gilbertville, Mass. In the United States there are 46 sisters, 4 novices, 2 schools, and 1 high school. The society now possesses thirty-two convents. The novitiates are at Namur, Belgium, Upton Hall, near Liverpool, England, Limerick, Ireland, and Fitchburg, Mass.

SISTER MARY PHILOMENA.

Falco, JUAN CONCHILLOS, painter, b. at Valencia of an ancient noble family in 1641; d. 14 May, 1711. He was a pupil of Esteban March, the eminent but eccentric Valencian painter, and was one of the first Spanish artists to start and maintain a school of design, gathering about him various youthful artists and insisting upon their working in charcoal in order to obtain freedom of draughtsmanship. He was a brilliant sketcher and in his journeys through his native country made some clever and humorous pencil drawings of scenes which took place on the road. Falco is almost the only Spanish artist of whom it can be said that he had a keen sense of humour, but he is further described by his contemporaries as "the most amiable of men, humble, modest, a model of virtue, and altogether of the stuff whereof angels are made". Two of his most important works were those executed for the church of San Salvador in Valencia; others are the "Immaculate Conception", painted for the Franciscans in the same city, the frescoes in the church of San Juan, and the two altar-pieces of the Cistercian monastery of Valdigna. The close of his life was full of sadness. He was suddenly struck with palsy and became a confirmed cripple. Soon after that he lost his sight and died completely blind.

DE CASTRO Y VELASCO, *El Museo Pictorico y Escala* (Madrid, 1724); QUILLIET, *Peintres Espagnols* (Paris, 1816); BERMUDEZ, *Diccionario Historico de las Bellas Artes en España* (Seville, 1800); STIRLING, *Annals of the Artists of Spain* (London, 1891).

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Falconieri, JULIANA, SAINT. See JULIANA FALCONIERI, SAINT.

Faldistorium (FALDESTOLIUM). See FALDSTOOL.

Faldstool (Lat. *faldistorium;* also *facistorium, faudestolus, faudestola*), a movable folding chair used in pontifical functions by the bishop outside of his cathedral, or within it if he is not at his throne or cathedra. Other prelates enjoying the privilege of full pontificals also use it. The rubrics prescribe it as a seat in the conferring of baptism and Holy orders, in the consecration of oils on Maundy Thursday, at the ceremonies of Good Friday, etc. It is prescribed as a *genuflexorium* at the door of the church at the solemn reception of a bishop, at the altar of the Blessed Sacrament, and before the high altar. Red, green, and violet cloths are ordered as a covering to correspond to the season or the rank of the prelate. It may have once been something like a campstool and it accompanied the bishop in his journeys. Materials, even the most costly, were employed in its construction; one wrought of gold and jewelled was presented to Pope Clement IV by Charles, King of Naples. Some were made of silver, of gilt metal, of ebony, or of wood. They were sometimes elaborately carved, ending in clawlike feet, the four corners at the top representing the neck and head of animals. Cloths of silk of a rich texture with gold and silver served to cover them. A faldstool is prescribed by the old English Ritual in the consecration of a bishop. Of Hugh Pudsey, Bishop of Durham (d. 1195), we are told that on taking the cross for the holy war he had made among other things to carry along with him a magnificent silver chair.

FALDSTOOL.

ROCK, *Church of our Fathers* (London, 1904), II, 209–213; SCHMID in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Faldistorium;* MARTÈNE, *De antiquis Ecclesiæ ritibus*, I, 613.

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Falerii, DIOCESE OF. See CIVITÀ CASTELLANA, ORTE, AND GALLESE.

Falkenberg, JOHN OF. See JOHN OF FALKENBERG.

Falkner, THOMAS, b. 6 Oct., 1707; d. 30 Jan., 1784. He was the son of Thomas Falkner, a Manchester apothecary, and obtained his education at the Manchester grammar school. Later on, having studied medicine under the well-known Dr. Richard Mead, he became a surgeon and practised at his native place. His own health being delicate, he was advised to take a sea-voyage, and being acquainted with a ship chaplain on board the "Assiento", a vessel trading with Guinea and carrying slaves thence to Buenos Aires, he accepted an invitation to accompany the vessel as surgeon. This was in or about 1731. On reaching Buenos Aires he was so ill that the captain was compelled to leave him there in the care of Father Mahoney, the superior of the Jesuit College. Here he not only recovered his health, but was received into the Church, and on 15 May, 1732, entered the Society of Jesus, becoming a member of the Paraguay province. Having spent some time at the Jesuit College of Cordoba de Tucuman, he went as a missionary to the Puelches, near Rio Legundo. His knowledge of medicine and mechanics procured for him considerable influence among the Indians, and in 1740 or soon after he was sent to assist Father Strobel in his successful mission to the Patagonian Indians at Cape San Antonio. For more than thirty years he laboured among the Patagonians until 1768 when the Jesuits were expelled from South America. He then returned to England where, in 1771 or 1772, he joined the English province of the Society. He was appointed chaplain to Mr. Berkeley of Spetchley, and here, in addition to his priestly labours, he wrote an account of his Patagonian experiences, which was published at Hereford in 1774 under the title "A Description of Patagonia and the adjoining parts of South America, with a grammar and a short vocabulary, and some particulars relating to Falkland's Islands". The book as published was not

his original work, but a compilation by William Combe, who used Falkner's papers. Kirk (see below) quotes a remark by Rev. Joseph Berington: "Mr. Falkner was a man of a vigorous mind, well exercised in various points of science, and had he been allowed to tell his story in his own way, stored as his mind was with anecdotes and incidents, on which he delighted to dwell, we should have had from him an amusing and interesting performance. But his papers were put into the hands of the late Mr. Robert Berkeley of Spetchley, who extracted from them the whole spirit of the original. He made them what they are." But though Mr. Berkeley wrote the preface, the responsibility for the taming process must rest with Combe. Even in its emasculated form the book was successful, and was translated into German, French, and Spanish. Another account of the Patagonians due to Father Falkner is found in the works of Thomas Pennant, who described his essay as "formed from the relation of Fr. Falkner, a Jesuit, who had resided among them thirty-eight years". On leaving Spetchley, he became chaplain to Mr. Berington of Winsley in Herefordshire, and afterwards to the Plowdens of Plowden Hall in Shropshire. After his death, which occurred at the latter place, the Spanish Jesuits, who had known him in South America, were very anxious to obtain his unpublished works, which included treatises on the botanical and mineral products of America, and "American distempers as cured by American drugs". It is stated by Fr. Caballero, S. J., that he had also edited "Volumina duo de anatomiâ corporis humani".

KIRK, *Biographies of Eighteenth Century Catholics* (London, 1908); CABALLERO, *Supplementa Bibl. Script. S. J.* (Rome, 1815); FOLEY, *Records Eng. Prov. S. J.* (London, 1878), IV, 563; (London, 1882), VII, 243; MULHALL, *English in South America* (London, 1878), 79 sqq.; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.* (London, 1886), II; *The Month* (June, 1888), No. 288, pp. 220–221; SUTTON in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (London, 1889), XVIII.

EDWIN BURTON.

Fall, THE. See SIN.

Fall River, DIOCESE OF (RIVERORMENSIS), U. S. A., a suffragan see of the province of Boston, comprises the counties of Bristol, Barnstable, Dukes, and Nantucket, with the towns of Marion, Mattapoisett and Wareham in Plymouth county, Massachusetts, an area of 1194 square miles. It was created 12 March, 1904, by a division of the Diocese of Providence, which had included the entire State of Rhode Island and a portion of south-eastern Massachusetts, and has the distinction of being the first diocese erected by Pope Pius X. The total population of the diocese is 309,438, of which 151,633 are Catholics. Among the latter are Americans, Irish, French-Canadians, Portuguese, Poles, and Italians, with some few Greeks and Syrians. The heavy immigration in years past of the Irish and French-Canadian people has caused them to far outnumber the Catholics of other nationalities; but this immigration is now at a standstill, while that of Portuguese and Poles is steadily on the increase. The diocese, by reason of recent creation, has no history of its own, its records being included in the history of the Dioceses of Boston, Hartford, and Providence (q. v.), in each of which its territory has successively been included.

WILLIAM STANG, the first bishop, was born in 1854 in Langenbrücken, in the Grand Duchy of Baden, Germany. His early education was received in the gymnasia of his native land and the *petit séminaire* at Saint-Nicolas, Belgium. In October, 1875, he began the study of theology at the American College, Louvain, Belgium, where he was ordained priest in 1878. In September of the same year he emigrated to America, to labour in the Diocese of Providence, where his first assignment was to the cathedral. In 1884 he assumed charge of St. Ann's parish, Cranston, Rhode Island. Shortly after he was named rector of the cathedral and chancellor of the diocese, positions which he ably filled until 1895. In April of that year he went to Louvain to become vice-rector of the American College. Georgetown University, in 1887, had conferred upon him the degree of doctor of theology; but a greater recognition awaited him. In August, 1898, the Belgian bishops as the governing board of the University of Louvain, to which the American College is affiliated, named him professor of fundamental moral theology in the schola minor of the university. In April, 1899, he returned to Providence, to become head of the diocesan Apostolate Band. While still head of the latter, in 1901, he was made pastor of St. Edward's church, Providence, and on 12 March, 1904, he was appointed bishop of the newly erected See of Fall River. His consecration took place in the cathedral, Providence, 1 May, 1904. In the short space of two years and nine months he proved himself to be a zealous, indefatigable worker, and charitable to an extreme. He died 2 February, 1907, in St. Mary's Hospital, Rochester, Minnesota. Bishop Stang was the author of a number of works, notably: "Pastoral Theology" (1896); "Historiographia Ecclesiastica" (1897); "Business Guide for Priests" (1899); "Pepper and Salt" (1901); "Socialism and Christianity" (1905); "Medulla Fundamentalis Theologiæ Moralis" (1906). He also left many pamphlets and essays and contributed frequently to the "American Ecclesiastical Review".

DANIEL FRANCIS FEEHAN, the second incumbent of the see, was b. in 1855, at Athol, Massachusetts. His classical and philosophical studies were pursued in St. Mary's College, Montreal, Canada, from which he was graduated in June, 1876. During the three following years he studied theology at St. Joseph's Seminary, Troy, New York, where he was ordained priest 20 December, 1879. Parish work in West Brighton and Fitchburg in the Diocese of Springfield engaged his energies until 1889, when he was made permanent rector of St. Bernard's, Fitchburg. He was in charge there when, on 2 July, 1907, he was appointed second Bishop of Fall River, and consecrated 19 September following.

The diocese has a well-equipped educational system. There are 28 parochial schools with a staff of 191 teachers and an enrolment of 10,451 pupils, 4464 boys and 5987 girls. There are three convent boarding schools conducted by the Religious of the Holy Union of the Sacred Hearts, the Sisters of St. Dominic, and the Sisters of Jesus and Mary, respectively. A boarding college for boys and young men pursuing classical and commercial courses is under the guidance of the Fathers of the Sacred Heart. The Christian Brothers have a well-established commercial day school with a register of 363 pupils. An industrial school for girls is conducted by the Franciscan Missionary Sisters of Mary.

Charity is also well organized. A large hospital, St. Ann's, at Fall River, is presided over by the Dominican Sisters of Charity of the Presentation. Three orphan asylums directed by the Sisters of Mercy, the Sisters of Charity (Grey Nuns), and the Sisters of St. Francis, respectively, shelter 600 orphans. In connexion with one of these asylums is maintained a home for the aged. Admirable work has also been done by the St. Vincent de Paul Society.

There are 108 secular and 20 regular priests labouring in the diocese. Of the secular clergy 57 are English-speaking, 30 French-speaking, 15 Portuguese, 5 Poles, and 1 Italian. The Dominican Fathers of the Sacred Hearts, and the Christian Brothers have communities, as also have the Sisters of Charity (Grey Nuns), Dominican Sisters of Charity of the Presentation, Sisters of St. Dominic, Felician Sisters, Franciscan Missionaries of Mary, Sisters of the Holy Ghost, Sisters of Holy Cross and Seven Dolors, Religious of the Holy Union of the Sacred Hearts, Sisters of Jesus and Mary, Sisters of Mercy, Sisters of St. Joseph (Le Puy), and Sisters of St. Francis.

Diocesan Archives; Catholic Directory (Milwaukee, 1908); *Missiones Catholicæ* (Rome, 1907); *American College Bulletin* (Louvain), April, 1907; *Catholic Union* (New Bedford, Feb., 1908).

EDWARD J. CARR.

Fallopio, GABRIELLO, anatomist, "one of the most important of the many-sided physicians of the sixteenth century" (Haeser); b. at Modena, Italy, 1523; d. 9 October, 1562, at Padua. Some writers have placed his birth as early as 1490, but contemporary authority is for the date mentioned. His family was noble but very poor and it was only by a hard struggle he succeeded in obtaining an education. He studied medicine at Ferrara, at that time one of the best medical schools in Europe. After taking his degree he worked at various medical schools and then became professor of anatomy at Ferrara, in 1548. He was called the next year to Pisa, then the most important university in Italy. In 1551 Fallopio was invited by Cosmo I, Grand Duke of Tuscany, to occupy the chair of anatomy and surgery at Padua. He held also the professorship of botany and was superintendent of the botanical gardens. Though he died when less than forty, he had made his mark on anatomy for all time. This was the golden age of anatomy and Fallopio's contemporaries included such great anatomists as Vesalius, Eustachius, and Columbus. It has sometimes been asserted that he was jealous of certain of the great discoverers in anatomy and that this is the reason for his frequent criticisms and corrections of their work. Haeser, whose authority in medical history is very high, declares that Fallopio was noted for his modesty and deference to his fellow-workers and especially to Vesalius. His purpose in suggesting corrections was the advance of the science of anatomy. Fallopio's own work dealt mainly with the anatomy of the head. He added much to what was known before about the internal ear and described in detail the tympanum and its relations to the osseous ring in which it is situated. He also described minutely the circular and oval windows (*fenestræ*) and their communication with the vestibule and cochlea. He was the first to point out the connexion between the mastoid cells and the middle ear. His description of the lachrymal passages in the eye was a marked advance on those of his predecessors and he also gave a detailed account of the ethmoid bone and its cells in the nose. His contributions to the anatomy of the bones and muscles were very valuable. It was in myology particularly that he corrected Vesalius. He studied the organs of generation in both sexes, and his description of the canal or tube which leads from the ovary to the uterus attached his name to the structure. Another structure, the little canal through which the facial nerve passes after leaving the auditory, is also called after him the *aquæductus Fallopii*. He was much more than a discoverer in anatomy. His contributions to practical medicine were important. He was the first to use an aural speculum for the diagnosis and treatment of diseases of the ear. His writings on surgical subjects are still of interest. He published two treatises on ulcers and tumors; a treatise on surgery; and a commentary on Hippocrates's book on wounds of the head. His treatise on syphilis is wonderful in its anticipation of what is sometimes thought most modern in this subject. Fallopio was also interested in every form of therapeutics. He wrote a treatise on baths and thermal waters, another on simple purgatives, a third on the composition of drugs. None of these works, except his anatomy (Venice, 1561), was published during his lifetime. As we have them they are from the manuscripts of his lectures and notes of his students. They were published by Koyter (Nuremberg, 1575).

Opera Omnia (Venice, 1584); TIRABOSCHI, *Biblioteca degli Scrittori Modenesi;* FISHER, *Annals of the Anatomical and Surgical Society* (Brooklyn, 1880).

JAMES J. WALSH.

Falloux du Coudray, FRÉDÉRIC ALFRED PIERRE, VICOMTE DE, b. at Angers, 7 March, 1811; d. there 6 Jan., 1885. Two persons are largely responsible for the moulding of his character, his mother, who was at the court of Louis XVI, and Madame Swetchine, whose "Life and Letters" he later published. The first works by which he drew attention to himself revealed the future statesman as a man of unyielding principles. His "Histoire de Louis XVI" (Paris, 1840) exhibits him as a staunch monarchist; in it he maintains that the needed reforms could have been accomplished by the monarchy without the Revolution. His "Histoire de Saint Pie V" (Paris, 1844) ably sustains the traditional thesis that the Church may use coercion to prevent the spread of heresy. Nevertheless, in less than ten years this partisan of monarchy took office under President Louis Bonaparte; this defender of the coercive authority of the Church was ranked among "Liberal Catholics". To take advantage of opportunities was henceforth de Falloux's maxim as a practical statesman.



DE FALLOUX DU COUDRAY

Under the monarchy de Falloux was elected (1846) deputy for Segré on a legitimist platform; in 1848 he was chosen a member of the Constitutional Assembly to represent Maine et Loire, on a platform which supported the social aspirations of the time as compatible with Christian ideas. It was at his suggestion that the Catholic members helped to elect Buchez president of the assembly. To de Falloux, as mouthpiece of the committee charged with the question of investigating the "national workshops", was assigned the perilous duty of proposing their abolition; this measure was followed by the bloody insurrection of June. Those who blame him for this action overlook the fact that he was neither the first nor the only one to insist on this inevitable measure and unjustly attribute to him a Machiavellian scheme by which, in the interest of his religious policy, he sought to goad the advanced parties to compromise their cause by disorder and rioting. As a matter of fact the sight of these excesses brought home to Thiers the necessity of moral restraint as a part of education, and thus led him to collaborate with de Falloux in promoting the educational projects of the latter. Minister of Education from December, 1848, until 31 October, 1849, de Falloux immediately determined to push vigorously against the educational monopoly of the university the campaign which Montalembert had begun during the last years of the July monarchy. As early as 4 Jan., 1849, de Falloux appointed an extra parliamentary commission to further this scheme in the legislature and in June, 1849, while the advanced parties were still smarting under the sense of defeat, he strongly advocated the passage of a law establishing liberty of education. The assembly, however, voted against it, since the bill had not the approval of the Council of State. It was only during the ministry of 1850, in which de Falloux had not a seat, that on 15 March his successor Parieu, with the help of Thiers and Dupanloup, and despite the opposition of Victor Hugo, succeeded in having the law passed. Though de Falloux could not take part in the proceedings on

account of ill-health, the law bears his name, and rightly, for it was his work.

The aim of this law was twofold. It dealt with both primary and secondary education. In the first case, to conduct a primary school, a Frenchman had to be at least twenty-one years of age, with three years' experience in an elementary school, or a certificate from a commission appointed by the Minister of Education. For members of religious congregations in girls' schools the *lettres d'obédience* took the place of this certificate. In the second case the law required the candidate to be twenty-five years of age, to have had five years of experience, and a degree of Bachelor of Letters, or a diploma from a ministerial commission. The new council of the university represented the leading philosophical opinions of France; besides a commission composed of university men proper it included 3 bishops, 1 rabbi, 1 Protestant minister, 3 councillors of the high court of appeals (*cour de cassation*), 3 councillors of state, 3 members of the institute, and 3 members of the board of free education. In two years' time 257 free schools sprang up, and it is from this law, the last remnants of which the French Parliament is now (1908) preparing to abrogate, that dates the development of the Catholic teaching orders in France. In a consistorial address (20 May, 1850) Pius IX praised it as a measure of progress. Those Catholics who opposed, as a matter of principle, all State education were disappointed at the passage of the law, and their views found an ardent exponent in Louis Veuillot. In the Constituent and in the Legislative Assembly, as minister and as deputy, de Falloux always maintained that France was obliged to protect Pius IX as a temporal ruler; he was one of the prime movers of the *expédition de Rome*. During the Second Empire, he withdrew from public life. In 1856 he was elected to the French Academy. In the discussions which took place in royalist circles during the early years of the Third Republic, de Falloux invariably declared in favour of the national flag (the tricolor) and in an article in the "Correspondant" (1873) he insisted that neither as a policy nor as a party cry should the monarchists put forth the idea of a counter-revolution. Spuller, however, declared that because of his conspicuous ability as a statesman de Falloux was one of the most dangerous opponents the Revolutionary party had to encounter during the nineteenth century. It was on the basis of liberty that de Falloux desired to combat the false principles of the Revolution. He believed that politics should take into consideration not only the "thesis" or principle, but also the "hypothesis" or actual conditions, and that certain too extreme formulas or too exacting claims were sure to prejudice rather than help the cause of the Church and the monarchy. The posthumous publication of his "Memoirs" in 1888 revived earlier controversies between the "Correspondant" and the "Univers" and provoked a sharp reply from Eugène Veuillot.

DE FALLOUX, *Mémoires d'un royaliste* (Paris, 1888); DE MAZADE, *L'opposition royaliste: Berryer, Villèle, Falloux* (Paris, 1874); DE LACOMBE, *Les débuts de la loi de* 1850 (Paris, 1901); VEUILLOT, *Le comte de Falloux et ses mémoires* (Paris, 1888).

GEORGES GOYAU.

False Decretals, or THE DECRETALS OF THE PSEUDO-ISIDORE, is a name given to certain apocryphal papal letters contained in a collection of canon laws composed about the middle of the ninth century by an author who uses the pseudonym of Isidore Mercator, in the opening preface to the collection. For the student of this collection, the best, indeed the only useful edition, is that of Hinschius, "Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianæ" (Leipzig, 1863). The figures in parenthesis occurring during the course of this article refer the reader to the edition of Hinschius. The name "False Decretals" is sometimes extended to cover not only the papal letters forged by Isidore, and contained in his collection, but the whole collection, although it contains other documents, authentic or apocryphal, written before Isidore's time.

The Collection of Isidore falls under three headings: (1) A list of sixty apocryphal letters or decrees attributed to the popes from St. Clement (88–97) to Melchiades (311–314) inclusive. Of these sixty letters fifty-eight are forgeries; they begin with a letter from Aurelius of Carthage requesting Pope Damasus (366–384) to send him the letters of his predecessors in the chair of the Apostles; and this is followed by a reply in which Damasus assures Aurelius that the desired letters were being sent. This correspondence was meant to give an air of truth to the false decretals, and was the work of Isidore. (2) A treatise on the Primitive Church and on the Council of Nicæa, written by Isidore, and followed by the authentic canons of fifty-four councils. It should be remarked, however, that among the canons of the second Council of Seville (page 438) canon vii is an interpolation aimed against *chorepiscopi*. (3) The letters mainly of thirty-three popes, from Silvester (314–335) to Gregory II (715–731). Of these about thirty letters are forgeries, while all the others are authentic. This is but a very rough description of their contents and touches only on the more salient points of a most intricate literary question.

THEIR APOCRYPHAL CHARACTER.—Nowadays every one agrees that these so-called papal letters are forgeries. These documents, to the number of about one hundred, appeared suddenly in the ninth century and are nowhere mentioned before that time. The most ancient MSS. of them that we have are from the ninth century, and their method of composition, of which we shall treat later, shows that they were made up of passages and quotations of which we know the sources; and we are thus in a position to prove that the Pseudo-Isidore makes use of documents written long after the times of the popes to whom he attributes them. Thus it happens that popes of the first three centuries are made to quote documents that did not appear until the fourth or fifth century; and later popes up to Gregory I (590–604) are found employing documents dating from the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries, and the early part of the ninth. Then again there are endless anachronisms. The Middle Ages were deceived by this huge forgery, but during the Renaissance men of learning and the canonists generally began to recognize the fraud. Two cardinals, John of Torquemada (1468) and Nicholas of Cusa (1464), declared the earlier documents to be forgeries, especially those purporting to be by Clement and Anacletus. Then suspicion began to grow. Erasmus (d. 1536) and canonists who had joined the Reformation, such as Charles du Moulin (d. 1568), or Catholic canonists like Antoine le Conte (d. 1586), and after them the Centuriators of Magdeburg, in 1559, put the question squarely before the learned world. Nevertheless the official edition of the "Corpus Juris", in 1580, upheld the genuineness of the false decretals, many fragments of which are to be found in the "Decretum" of Gratian. As a partial explanation of this it is enough to recall the case of Antonio Agustin (d. 1586), the greatest canonist of that period. Agustin seriously doubted the genuineness of the documents, but he never formally repudiated them. He felt he had not sufficient proof at hand, so he simply shirked the difficulty. And it is also to be remembered that, owing to the irritating controversies of the time, anything like an impartial and methodical discussion of such a subject was an utter impossibility. In 1628 the Protestant Blondel published his decisive study, "Pseudo-Isidorus et Turrianus vapulantes". Since then the apocryphal nature of the decretals of Isidore has been an established historical fact. The last of the false decretals that had escaped the keen criticism of Blondel

were pointed out by two Catholic priests, the brothers Ballerini, in the eighteenth century.

How the Forgery was done.—Isidore was too clever to invent these documents *in toto* out of his own head. For the most part he plagiarized them in substance, and often in form. For the background he made use of certain data such as the "Liber Pontificalis", a chronicle of the popes from St. Peter onward, which was begun at Rome during the first twenty years of the sixth century. For instance, in the "Liber" it is recorded that such a pope issued such a decree that had been lost or mislaid, or perhaps had never existed at all. Isidore seized the opportunity to supply a pontifical letter suitable for the occasion, attributing it to the pope whose name was mentioned in the "Liber". Thus his work had a shadow of historical sanction to back it up. But it was especially in the form of the letters that the forger played the plagiarist. His work is a regular mosaic of phrases stolen from various works written either by clerics or laymen. This network of quotations is computed to number more than 10,000 borrowed phrases, and Isidore succeeded in stringing them together by that loose, easy style of his, in such a way that the many forgeries perpetrated either by him or his assistants have an undeniable family resemblance. Without doubt he was one of the most learned men of his day. From Blondel in the seventeenth century to Hinschius in the nineteenth, even up to quite recently, efforts have been made to discover all the texts made use of in the False Decretals. They make up quite a library. It is clear that the forger could not have had at hand the entire text from which he drew. He must have been content with extracts, selections, florilegia. But thereon we can only fall back on conjecture.

Isidore might have united the hundred documents he had forged in one single homogeneous collection, which would have been exclusively his work, and then secured its circulation, but, clever man that he was, he chose a different plan. To baffle suspicion he inserted or interpolated all his forgeries in an already existing collection. There was a genuine canonical collection which had been drawn up in Spain about 633, and was known as the "Hispana", or Spanish. It contained (cf. Migne, P. L., LXXXIV, 93–848) first of all the texts of the councils from that of Nicæa; secondly the decretals of the popes from Damasus (366–384). Isidore took the volume and prefixed to it the first sixty of his forged decretals from Clement to Miltiades inclusive; these now became the first part of the collection of Isidore. As part II of his collection he retained part I of the Hispana collection, i. e. the genuine collection of councils since Nicæa (325). And as part III of his new volume added part II of the old Hispana, i. e. the genuine pontifical letters since Pope Damasus, but he inserted here and there among them the letters he had forged under the names of the various popes between Damasus and Gregory I (590–604). He was not yet safe, however. So, in order to give a more imposing appearance to the work, he inserted other documents not forged by him, but borrowed bodily from other collections of canon laws. Besides all this he interpolated many additions to authentic documents and added several prefaces to bolster up the fraud. To simplify this description it has been assumed that the forger made use of the unadulterated text of the Hispana. But as a matter of fact he used a French edition, and a very incorrect one at that, of the Hispana, and which was known on that account as the "Hispana Gallica", or French Hispana, which has never been edited, and which is to be found in the MS. 411 of the Latin Documents in the Library of Vienna. Furthermore, the forger tampered with the text of this French Hispana, so that his copy becomes, so to speak, a third edition or revision of the old Hispana. This is known as the "Hispana Gallica Augustodunensis", or "of Autun", so called because the Latin MS., 1341, of the Vatican, which contains it, came from Autun. This collection likewise has remained unedited.

The Isidorian collection was published between 847 and 852. On the one hand it must have been published before 852, because Hincmar quotes the false decretal of Stephen I (p. 183) among the statutes of a council (Migne, P. L., CXXV, 775), and on the other hand it cannot have been published before 847, because it makes use of the false capitularies of Benedict Levitas, which were not concluded until after 21 April, 847. As to the place where the Decretals were forged, critics are all agreed that it was somewhere in France. The documents used by the forger, and especially those relating more nearly to his own epoch, are nearly all of French origin. And, as we have already pointed out, the frame chosen for the forgeries was the French edition of the Hispana. He also makes use of the "Dionysio-Hadriana" collection, which was the code of the Frankish Church, and of the Quesnel collection, which had a French origin. Moreover, he refers to the Councils of Meaux and of Aachen of 836, and to that of Paris of 829, etc. On legal matters he quotes the "Breviarium" of Alaric. When he refers to civil affairs it is those of France he illustrates by. Lastly, it was in France that his work was first quoted, and there it had its greatest vogue. But while critics are all agreed that the forgery was done in France, they differ very widely when it comes to fixing the locality. Some are in favour of Le Mans and the province of Tours; others incline towards the province of Reims. We shall have occasion to refer to these differences later on; for the present we may be satisfied that the false decretals were forged in the North of France between 847 and 852.

Now, what was the condition of the Church in France at that time? It was but a few brief years after the Treaty of Verdun (843), which had put a definitive close to the Carlovingian empire by founding three distinct kingdoms. Christendom was a prey to the onslaught of Normans and Saracens; but on the whole the era of civil strife was over. In ecclesiastical circles Church reform was still spoken of, but hardly hoped for. It was especially after the death of Charlemagne (814) that reform began to be considered, but the abuses to be corrected dated from long before Charlemagne's time, and went back to the very beginnings of the Frankish church under the Merovingians. The personal government of the king or emperor had many serious drawbacks on religious grounds. In the mind of the bishops reform and ecclesiastical liberty were identical, and this liberty they required for their persons as well as for the Church. Doubtless Charlemagne's government had been advantageous to the Church, but it was none the less an oppressive protection and dearly bought. The Church was frankly subject to the State. Initiatives which ought to have been the proper function of the spiritual power were usurped by Charlemagne. He summoned synods and confirmed their decisions. He disposed largely of all church benefices. And in matters of importance ecclesiastical tribunals were presided over by him. While the great emperor lived these inconveniences had their compensating advantages and were tolerated. The Church had a mighty supporter at her back. But as soon as he died the Carlovingian dynasty began to show signs of ever-increasing debility, and the Church, bound up with, and subordinate to, the political power, was dragged into the ensuing civil strife and disunion. Church property excited the cupidity of the various factions, each of them wished to use the bishops as tools, and when defeat came the bishops on the vanquished side were exposed to the vengeance of their adversaries. There were charges brought against them, and sentences passed on them, and not canon law, but political exigencies, ruled in the synods. It was the triumph of

the lay element in the Church. Success, even when it came, had its drawbacks. In order to devote themselves to political questions the bishops had to neglect their spiritual duties. They were to be seen more often on the embassies than on visitations. As supplies in their dioceses they had to call in auxiliaries known as *chorepiscopi*. What wonder, then, that these abuses gave rise to complaints? Especially after 829 the bishops were clamouring for ecclesiastical liberty, for legal guarantees, for immunity of church property, for regularity of church administration, for the decrease of the number of chorepiscopi and of their privileges. But all in vain; the Carlovingian nobles, who profited by these abuses, were opposed to reform. Powerless to better itself, could the Frankish Church count on Rome? At this very time the situation of the papacy was by no means inspiring; the Church at Rome was largely subject to the lay power in the hands of the imperial *missi*. Sergius II (844–847) has not escaped the reproach of Simony. Leo IV (847–855) had to defend his person just like any simple Frankish bishop. In the face of such a wretched situation the juridical prescriptions of Isidore are ideal.

Canon Law According to the False Decretals.—We are not here concerned with the whole collection, but only with the laws contained in the forged documents. At the outset, let it be noted that Isidore's prescriptions have to do with a very limited number of cases and recur over and over again under slightly varying forms. Yet the forger's legal system is far from having any perfect cohesion. Inconsistencies, and even contradictions, are to be met within it. In the following synopsis, which is necessarily short, no notice is taken of these legal stumblings of Isidore; we are content to simply sum up the teachings of the false decretals, under their principal headings.

In matters concerning the relations of the political and ecclesiastical powers, Isidore sets forth the ordinary ideas of his time as to the supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal authority. Of his own authority alone, the ruler cannot assemble a regular synod; he must have pontifical authorization to do so (p. 228). That is a new requirement. A bishop may be neither accused nor condemned before a secular tribunal (pp. 98, 485). The Theodosian Code, from which the forger borrows in this matter, granted the *privilegium fori* only for minor faults. In such matters the Frankish law was not very explicit and was open to various interpretations. What is novel in Isidore is the general character of the law withdrawing bishops from the secular courts. Then again he recognizes in bishops a certain jurisdiction in secular matters. Roman law had already recognized this. He goes on to deal with the immunity of church property, which cannot be diverted from its original purpose without sacrilege. The evangelization of Christendom is a complex story which modern criticism has retold for us, by showing the slow onward march of the Faith. But Isidore's ideas thereon were those of his time, and therefore for the most part legendary. According to him, the organization of parishes was laid down by Clement of Rome, as early as the close of the first century, and was to be modelled on the ecclesiastical divisions of Rome and of the catacombs. This meant that dioceses were also a primitive institution, and that metropolitan divisions also existed in primitive times. The Apostles were thought to have accepted the territorial divisions of the Roman Empire, which had been handed down since then as ecclesiastical provinces. There is not much historical basis for such an explanation. It stands to reason that in Isidore we must clearly distinguish between this fantastic view of history and his explanation of hierarchical organization. On all essential points the forger reproduces the current ideas of his time. But he deserves attention when he speaks of chorepiscopi, or those auxiliary bishops we have already referred to. According to him they are usurpers; so far as power of order goes, they have priestly orders and nothing more. Every episcopal function exercised by them is null; all their sacramental acts ought to be reiterated. As a matter of fact, Isidore was wrong; chorepiscopi had full power of order and might validly administer both confirmation and ordination. Isidore forged theology as well as letters. He strongly affirms the authority of the bishops. That is his great concern. With him nothing else counts (pp. 77, 117, 145, 243). The bishop is monarch in his own diocese, but he does not stand alone; bonds unite him to his neighbours, and thus we have the metropolitan idea. The capital of each ecclesiastical province has a juridical right or title to be a centre of assembly for the bishops; this right is derived from the primitive division made by the popes. The province is to be governed by the provincial council, presided over by the metropolitan. On the prerogatives of this dignitary Isidore reproduces the prescriptions of the ancient law prior to the eighth century. After the middle of the eighth century the metropolitans had increased their prerogatives, and Isidore tries to ignore this *de facto* situation; for him nothing counts but canonical texts; the metropolitan is *primus inter pares*, and he can do nothing without the consent of his colleagues. The forger goes on to mention higher jurisdictions, those of primates and of patriarchs. But on these matters he shows but a slight knowledge of church government in Africa and in the East, and we have one of the most glaring examples of his incoherence.

The Authority of the Pope.—In the many texts where the pope is in question Isidore is true to his task of plagiarizing. Very often he copies passages borrowed from ancient sources. This fact alone helps in a great measure to explain his insistence on the rights of the papacy. In many cases Isidore is but the mouthpiece repeating the sayings of the earlier popes, and we know how clear and uncompromising those early popes were on the question of their prerogatives. For example, call to mind the popes between Innocent I (401–417) and Hormisdas (514–523) and the series of their declarations. All that was well known in the ninth century, at least in theory. And it was all embodied by Isidore. But on the relations between pope and bishops he shows a certain inconsistency. Following the traditional teaching, he declares that the Apostolate and the episcopate were directly instituted by Jesus Christ. Yet at times he seems to be on the point of denying the *potestas ordinaria* of the bishops. He makes Pope Vigilius (p. 712) say: "Ipsa namque ecclesia quæ prima est ita reliquis ecclesiis vices suas credidit largiendas ut in partem sint vocatæ sollicitudinis non in plenitudinem potestatis."

Taking this passage strictly and by itself, it would seem to deny the *potestas ordinaria* of the bishops. But nevertheless the sentence is not an intentional forgery; it is merely another case where Isidore is a plagiarist. He had got hold of a famous text by St. Leo (Migne, P. L., LIV, 671), addressed to the Bishop of Thessalonica. From the end of the fourth century this bishop had been named by the popes as their representative in the province of Illyricum. Hence the Bishop of Thessalonica exercised by delegation certain rights belonging to the popes in these countries by reason of their title of Patriarch of the West. About 446, St. Leo had to find fault with the Bishop of Thessalonica, not in his character of bishop, but as legate, or vicar, of the Holy See. And on that occasion the pope pointed out to his vicar in Illyricum that he had received merely a partial delegation, not a plenitude of power. It is clear, then, that the text in question referred to a peculiar relation between the pope and a special bishop. Addressed to the vicar of Illyricum, St. Leo's words are quite accurate; but, applied to all bishops, they cease to be so, and might easily create much confusion. Isidore further de-

mands that provincial councils be held at regular intervals. He asserts for the pope the right to authorize the calling of all councils and to approve their decisions. Laid down in this general and imperative manner, these claims were something new. Nothing like it had been of obligation for the holding of provincial councils; as for approving of the decrees of councils, it was a common occurrence in antiquity. When matters of serious importance were in question the popes claimed the right of approval, but there was no formal or general precept asserting such right. And in any case Isidore's legislation thereon never became the practice.

Ecclesiastical Trials.—The procedure to be followed in the trial of ecclesiastics is of special interest to Isidore. According to him, the judging of clerics of all ranks up to and including the priesthood belongs as a last resource to the provincial councils and the primates. He says nothing about priests appealing to Rome, and in this he agrees with the fourteenth canon of the Council of Sardica. Apropos of the trials of bishops he shows some inconsistency in his legislation. On the one hand, he upholds the law as it existed prior to his time, and on the other hand, he lays down a new law. Hence we find two series of texts which it is not easy to reconcile. The first series agrees with the existing law. A provincial council is the ordinary judge of bishops. The pope interferes only on appeal made to him by one of the interested parties. However, in the case where the impartiality of the judge is seriously doubtful, the bishop need not wait for the council to pass sentence, but may take his case straight to Rome. Stated in this general way, the latter provision is new. But as it is based on the idea of plain justice, it is not altogether foreign to the ancient ecclesiastical law. It was expressly mentioned in Roman law, from which Isidore borrowed it. How may the pope set about hearing an appeal? The ancient law did not exclude, but did not make provision for, sentence being passed at Rome itself. It recognized the pope's right to appoint a court of appeal composed of bishops from the neighbourhood of the accused; furthermore, he had the right to be represented there by a legate, who would naturally have a preponderating rôle at the trial. Such were the rulings of the Council of Sardica. But as a matter of fact, from the fifth century we have cases where the pope summoned episcopal appeals to be heard in Rome itself. So it is not a great surprise that Isidore should leave the pope free to decide where the final trial should take place. But, as we pointed out, side by side with this first series of decisions along the lines of the ancient law, we find another series which lays down a new law. Therein it is said that in the trial of bishops, the function of the provincial council is limited to hearing both sides of the case and referring it to the pope for judgment. Sentence can only be passed with his approbation. This is new legislation. But once more Isidore is not really inventing; he is merely giving clear and direct expression to the tendencies of his day. In face of the dangers created for the bishops by political disturbances, by the fear of being condemned for party feeling or through motives of revenge, the bishops themselves were eager that charges against them should not be decided without the approval of the pope.

One of the most characteristic peculiarities of the false decretals is the procedure laid down for the trial of bishops. Isidore declares over and over that it was the will of the Apostles that there be as few charges as possible made against bishops, and that, when there are any, their trial should be made as difficult as possible. This is a point worth remembering. The accusation of bishops will be a difficult thing, their defence an easy matter. Isidore's legislation on this head, when systematized, so efficaciously hindered any judicial action against a bishop that the reader is almost inclined to treat it as a joke. However, we must be just; it was not all an invention on Isidore's part. His procedure in the main reproduces the requirements of Roman law; it draws on the decisions of the Roman apocrypha of the time of Symmachus (498–514), and it levies tribute from the laws of the Barbarian kingdoms. In a case of this kind, anything like a careful and thorough criticism requires that great attention be paid to the question of the sources employed. Isidore piles up obstacles against the accusation of bishops, but the obstacles are not all of Isidore's own devising. Any bishop dispossessed of his see by violence, and who is summoned to the courts, has a right to raise the plea of *actio spolii*, i. e. to fall back on the fact of dispossession in order to avoid trial, until he has been provisionally restored to his possessions and dignities. This appeal before trial is one of the main points in the Isidorian procedure. The only one who is competent to bring a charge against a bishop is the council of his province. Foreign tribunals are excluded, and the provincial council must have a full quorum. The charge must be made in the presence of accused and accusers. If one of the interested parties absconds, the whole judicial machine comes to a standstill.

The following are the rules governing accusations. A layman can bring no charge against a bishop. This rule, which occurs also in the Roman apocrypha of the time of Symmachus, may be explained by the different judicial status of clerics and laymen at the time of Isidore. Clerics were judged according to Roman law, whereas many laymen were subject to Germanic law, and the procedure under these two laws was different and even hostile. Moreover, at times laymen would not recognize clerics as having the rights to accuse them in the courts; and thus the clerics might well declare laymen incompetent in their courts. Then, too, it must not be lost sight of that Isidore's principle was never observed in practice; a *modus agendi* was always found. Isidore's second principle was that a cleric could never bring a charge against his superior. It is evident that thus the number of possible accusers became very restricted. The accusation must be made not in writing, but by word of mouth. Only those might bring charges who fulfilled exceptional conditions in respect to rank and standing. In this way it was easy to get rid of a troublesome accuser. The witnesses must be of equal merit with the accuser, and it took seventy-two witnesses to condemn a bishop. This again is not an invention of Isidore's. It was an old custom that a bishop might only be condemned by a council of seventy or seventy-two bishops. The numbers are an allusion either to the seventy elders of the Jewish people or to the Seventy-Two Disciples. But Isidore managed to complicate the situation by applying the number to the witnesses; though even if it were applied to the judges, the difficulty would not be lessened in practice. It was no easy matter to get together so numerous a tribunal. In the ninth century Photius declared that these two traditional numbers were not necessary; in any case Isidore's legislation was never enforced. The hearing of the charge follows Roman law, and minute regulations were drawn up to secure all the necessary scope and impartiality to the arguments for and against. Any admission of guilt had to be absolutely spontaneous, and no signature obtained by force was valid.

In his preface Isidore declares the purpose of his work. His aim is to build up a collection of canons more complete than any other by uniting together all the canons dispersed among the various existing collections. What must we think of this declaration? There is some truth in it, but his collection takes on a character all its own by the fact that it includes a hundred documents forged in Isidore's workshop. He might easily have made that more complete collection, without having recourse to forging documents for it.

And, as a matter of fact, is his collection more complete than any other? Even a summary examination soon shows that there are many lacunæ in this collection of canon law. It omits all mention of many important matters, governing of rural parishes, ecclesiastical benefices, tithes, simony, the monastic life, questions concerning the matrimonial laws, privileges and dispensations, and the pallium. The governing of parishes and the question of benefices were of vital interest when Isidore lived. Though not quite so acute as during the tenth and eleventh centuries, these points of law became occasions of conflict between the Church and the feudal society in progress of formation. They were already preoccupying men's minds, and as Isidore does not refer to them he can hardly claim to have wished to supply a complete ecclesiastical code. So we are driven to conclude that he had a very special object in view in composing his partial code. How are we to discover what this object was? Evidently by examining the documents he forged. There, if at all, are to be found his dominant ideas. And such an examination is by no means difficult after what we have just said concerning the legal side of the false decretals. Isidore's object is so clearly defined that it requires no very laboured analysis to discover it. His chief aim is to assure the dignity and fruitfulness of the episcopal office. In his view the diocese is the life-giving centre of the whole ecclesiastical organism, and the vitality of this centre is his chief concern. All his legislation has this same object. But perhaps it may be argued that, while he is indeed concerned to safeguard the authority of the bishops, he is even more careful to increase that of the pope. This was a view long in favour among both Gallicans and Protestants, but it is no longer the fashion. In our day critics are, on the whole, agreed that the immediate object of Isidore was to win respect for the episcopal authority. If he touches on the prerogatives of the pope, it is never in the interests of Rome, but always in those of the bishops. It was for this that he tried to facilitate appeals to Rome. But in his idea the rôle to be played by the pope would not restrict the rights of the bishops. It has been observed that Isidore does not mention the temporal power of the popes, and that he never thinks of turning to profit Constantine's pretended donation to the Church of Rome, nor does he seem to aim at increasing the French protectorate at Rome. Yet if his object had been to favour the Holy See, how differently would he have gone to work. Now, if we compare these aims of Isidore with the actual situation of the Frankish Church when the forger was at work, between the years 847 and 852, it will be evident that false decretals are directly opposed to the chief abuses of which the bishops were the victims at that time: condemnations of a political character, neglect of the episcopal office, and the establishment of chorepiscopi. This explains the lacunæ in Isidore's ecclesiastical code. He was fighting against urgent and glaring abuses. A contemporary is always at a disadvantage in forming a clear opinion of his age, of those deep causes of which the slow but measured action must inevitably transform society. And hence it was that Isidore confined himself to things that were more or less on the surface in the everyday life around him. If he foresaw other dangers in the path of the Church, he certainly made no attempt to provide against them.

It remains true, however, that Isidore was a forger. But there are forgers and forgers. Let us not forget that the false decretals are from the same workshop that forged the capitularies of Angibramne (Angilram) and the false capitularies of Benedictus Levita. When the capitularies had been forged it was but a natural step to the forging of pontifical letters. For this new work Isidore owed much to the "Liber Pontificalis", or chronicle of the popes. Thus when the Liber tells us that such a pope issued such a decree long since lost, the forger noted the fact and set to work to invent a decree for his collection along the lines hinted at by the "Liber". This is a method well known in diplomatic work, and one that has left us the *acta rescripta*, of which we have many specimens in ancient charters. These acta rescripta are documents which, at a date long subsequent to that they bear, and because the originals or ancient copies of them had been damaged or lost, were drawn up by the aid of the remnants of the originals, or from extracts therefrom, or analyses of them, or at times from mere tradition concerning their contents (cf. Giry, "Manuel de diplomatique", Paris, 1894, pp. 12, 867, etc.). In Isidore's opinion many of the false decretals were merely such acta rescripta. It was not a very honest proceeding, and Isidore was far from being scrupulous. With a faint modification it might be said of him as of another forger in the seventeenth century, the crafty Father Jérôme Vignier, "He was the greatest liar in Paris." But men of the ninth century must not be judged according to modern ideas of literary morality. Neither can the false decretals be looked at as a purely literary work. They are a landmark in the evolution of law. In every society law develops or evolves itself like other things, but under conditions of its own, and step by step with the social life it regulates, and which it must keep pace with in order to regulate. The state of society, the ensemble of its customs, change more or less according to time and place, and are never stationary. And slight changes, when multiplied to any degree, end by causing a chasm between former legislation and the newly born needs of a changed society. The written laws no longer meet the requirements of the social state they ought to regulate, and a readjustment of legal provisions becomes necessary. History shows us that this may take place in many ways, according to the nature of the desired change and the surroundings in which it takes place. It may be effected by the gradual substitution of new laws for those that have grown antiquated or, less courageously, by what is known as a creative interpretation of existing laws, of which we have many examples in Roman law; and again, in desperate cases, the change may be brought about by forgeries, when no other means seems practicable. Now, in the middle of the ninth century, the rules of canonical legislation did not seem to be the best possible to meet the existing state of ecclesiastical affairs. The reform councils of the ninth century had tried to bring about the new laws demanded by the situation, but the lay power had blocked the way. And thus the evolution of law, finding an obstacle to its growth on one side, was constrained to seek freedom on another. Unable to advance in normal fashion, a canonist whose intentions were more commendable than his acts bethought him of calling in the aid of the forger. It is impossible to condone such forgeries, but the history of the case puts us in a better position to judge them, and even to discover extenuating circumstances in their favour, by emphasizing the powerful forces at work in the society of the period, and which were acting with what one may call historical fatalism. Moreover, the false decretals are the work of private enterprise and have no official character. The theory that they were planned in Italy has been long since abandoned. They are of purely Gallican origin, and if they deceived the Church, the Church accepted them in good faith and without any complicity.

THE SPREAD.—We saw above, in the case of Hincmar, that Isidore's forgeries were known among the Franks as early as 852. In Germany we hear of them a little later. We find traces of them in the Acts of the councils of Germany dating from that of Worms in 868, but in Spain we find no reference to them, and they seem to have been hardly known there. They found their way into England towards the close of the eleventh century, probably through Lanfranc, Arch-

bishop of Canterbury. Their reception in Italy is of greater importance. It occurred probably during the pontificate of Nicholas I (858–867). It seems certain that he knew of the decretals, and it is possible that he may have even possessed a copy of them, and showed proof of this on the occasion of the appeal to Rome made by Bishop Rothade of Soissons, who had got into difficulties with his metropolitan, Hincmar of Reims. Rothade reached Rome about the middle of 864. He had already caused his appeal to be presented to the pope, but he now explained his case in detail. It was to his interest to quote the authority of the false decretals, and he did not fail to do so. This is proved by a letter written by Nicholas I on 22 January, 865, dealing with Rothade's appeal. Pope Adrian II (867–872) was acquainted with them, and in a letter dated 26 December, 871, he approves of the translation of Actard, Bishop of Nantes, to the metropolitan See of Tours, and quotes apropos one of the false decretals. Quotations made by Stephen V (885–891) are not conclusive proof that he directly used Isidore's text; and the same may be said of occasional references to it during the tenth century, which occur in the letters of the popes or of the papal legates. However, other authors in Italy show less reserve in using the false decretals. Thus, at the end of the ninth and the beginning of the tenth century they are quoted by Auxilius in the treatises he wrote in defence of the ordinations performed by Pope Formosus (891–896). It is true that Auxilius was born among the Franks, as was also Rathier, Bishop of Verona, who likewise quotes Isidore. Attone of Vercelli, however, was an Italian, and he quotes him. At the end of the ninth century and during the tenth, extracts from the false decretals begin to be included in canon law collections—in the collection dedicated to Bishop Anselm of Milan, in the Réginon collection about 906, among the decrees of Burchard, Bishop of Worms. Nevertheless, until the middle of the eleventh century the false decretals did not obtain an official footing in ecclesiastical legislation. They were nothing more than a collection made in Gaul, and it was only under Leo IX (1048–1054) that they took firm hold at Rome. When the Bishop of Toul became pope and began the reform of the Church by reforming the Roman Curia, he carried with him to Rome the apocryphal collection. Anselm of Lucca, the friend and adviser of Gregory VII, composed an extensive collection of canons among which those of Isidore figure largely. The same thing happened in the case of Cardinal Deusdedit's collection made about the same time. And finally, when in 1140 Gratian wrote his "Decree" he borrowed extensively from Isidore's collection. In such manner it gained an important place in schools of law and jurisprudence. It is true that the Gratian collection had never the sanction of being the official text of ecclesiastical law, but it became the textbook of the schools of the twelfth century, and, even with the false decretals added to it, it retained a place of honour with the faculty of canon law. It was it that supplied the text of the "everyday" instructor on the things most essential to be known. And the faculty of law styled itself faculty of the Decree; which shows how important a place in the schools was given to the Isidorian texts inserted in the decretals.

INFLUENCE.—For a long time the Gallicans and the Protestants dwelt on the innovation contained in these apocrypha and on the rights, altogether novel, which they conferred on the popes and which would never have come to pass had it not been for these forgeries. Nowadays Isidore's aim is understood to have been quite different. His chief concern was to defend the bishops; and if the papacy profited by what he did, it can be shown that it was a necessary consequence of the pope's being made the champion of the bishop. And even though it must be admitted that the popes benefited by the forgeries, their good faith is beyond question. Isidore wrote a long way off from Rome; he deceived his own neighbours in France, and among them the learned Hincmar of Reims. What wonder, then, that he deceived the popes also, when his work was carried to Rome by Rothade of Soissons about the summer of 864? It is true that some have hinted that Nicholas I erred against truthfulness; that he pretended that the Isidorian texts were contained in the archives of the Roman Church, an assertion not only inexact but untruthful (Migne, P. L., CXIX, 901). But as a matter of fact his words do not necessarily mean that at all. What he does say refers equally to the authentic decretals not included in the Dionysio-Hadriana collection. On the dubious interpretation of an obscure text it is not fair to bring a charge of untruthfulness against a man of character like Nicholas I. And if an unfavourable interpretation be accepted as the real one, the blame falls on the draftsman of the pontifical letters, the famous Anastasius the Librarian. Another reason for not impugning the honesty of Nicholas I under the circumstances is that he was under no necessity; he had no interest in approving of Isidore's letters. Indeed, he is much more reserved in his treatment of them than the Frankish bishops were at that very time. In that very letter of 22 January, 865, he points out to them their inconsistency, how, when it is to their own interest, they quote the letters of the early popes (i. e. Isidore's forgeries), and when the letters are unfavourable to them, they repudiate them. We saw above that according to Isidore's judicial system a bishop dispossessed of his see by violence and then haled to the courts had the right to plead the fact of dispossession in order to escape appearing before the courts, and that he must first be provisionally restored to his possessions and honours so as to arrange properly for his defence. No doubt Isidore had not invented all this. Roman law and canon law supplied him with precedents and even laws for it. But he made such procedure an essential factor in canon law. And it is an undoubted fact that from the year 864, in cases such as the one we refer to, Isidore's ideas and expressions exercised a marked influence on the conduct and decisions of Nicholas I. There is nothing calling for adverse criticism in all this as far as Nicholas is concerned. As a piece of legislation it was altogether in favour of the bishops. From another point of view it is important to consider whether, in the appeals of bishops to Rome, the conduct of Nicholas I was really influenced by Isidore's forgeries.

What we have already said concerning the forger's objects and aims limits the bearing of this question to a great extent. As a piece of general hard and fast legislation, Isidore's method of procedure was quite new. But the practice of the popes and the custom of the ecclesiastical courts supplied precedents which more or less bore out the principles laid down by Isidore. Hence we see that if Nicholas I made use of the apocrypha to justify his teaching on appeals to Rome, we must necessarily admit that he relied on a forged document; but even then we should not be obliged to admit that he was influenced by teaching altogether foreign to ecclesiastical antiquity, but only that by means of Isidore he was put in touch with teaching closely resembling that of St. Leo and of Gelasius I, two popes of the fifth century. And, as a matter of fact, did Nicholas I gain his teaching concerning appeals from these apocrypha? We have no proof whatever that he did. His firm and solid conviction of the rights of the Holy See had nothing to learn from the weak inventions of a forger among the Franks; he had learned those rights in the school of Roman traditions dating from the fifth and sixth centuries. We can admit that, while the pope's contention is justified, the arguments with which he supports it are at times open to attack. Thus, in a letter addressed to the

Council of Soissons in 863, he wishes to assert his right to intervene in the trials of bishops, even when there was no question of an appeal to Rome. This amounted to an assertion of the absolute power of the Holy See, a claim he might have supported by many solid arguments; yet what is our surprise to find him claiming in support thereof the canons of the Council of Sardica, which say nothing of the sort. The Council of Sardica (343) intended very particularly to safeguard the legal rights of bishops who were being persecuted; that was its main object, and it by no means intended to define the rights of Rome in matters of the kind. These canons mark one of the early steps in the question of church discipline.

The claim of Nicholas I ought to have been supported by texts from the fifth and sixth centuries; and in the case in question his object was much more creditable than the reasons he gave in support of it. On the whole, then, from the beginning of his pontificate, and before he knew of the Isidorian texts, Nicholas I was in full sympathy with the ideas expressed therein. Acquaintance with those texts did not seriously affect him. Yet, in his letter to the Frankish bishops, dated 22 January, 865, apropos of Rothade, he puts the theory on appeals much after the manner in which Isidore had put it; so much so, that one writer speaks of the *parfum isidorien* that letter exhales (Fournier). If the letters of the early popes (i. e. the decretals of Isidore) are not explicitly quoted, they are at least alluded to. But from all that has been said we must conclude that Nicholas I took none of his essential ideas from Isidore, and that any influence he did exercise on that pope was too insignificant to be taken into account in a pontificate so filled with enterprises of daring and of moment. And this conclusion in Nicholas's case gives us more or less the answer to the further question as to how far the apocrypha influence the subsequent history of the Church. As we have seen, even without Isidore, Nicholas I would have brought about the same mode of government. And it has been well said that the principles of Nicholas I were those of Gregory VII and of the great popes of the Middle Ages; that is to say, Isidore or no Isidore, Gregory VII and Innocent III would not have acted otherwise than they did. As a matter of history, such a conclusion is quite justifiable, and as far as apologetics go it is quite sufficient answer. In the domain of theology and canon law, Isidore's forgeries never had any serious consequences.

Having said this, we are free to confess frankly that in lesser spheres than those of theology and law, the false decretals have not always exercised a fortunate influence. On history, for instance, their influence was baneful. No doubt they do not bear all the blame for the distorted and legendary view the Middle Ages had of ecclesiastical antiquity. During the Middle Ages it was almost an impossibility to consult all the sources of information, and it was difficult to check and control those at hand. It was not easy to distinguish genuine documents from apocryphal ones. And this difficulty, which was the great stumbling-block of medieval culture, would have been always an obstacle to the progress of historical study. It must be admitted that Isidore's forgeries increased the difficulty till it became almost insurmountable. The forgeries blurred the whole historical perspective. Customs and methods proper to the ninth century stood out in relief side by side with the discipline of the first centuries of the Church. And, as a consequence, the Middle Ages knew very little concerning the historical growth of the rights of the papacy during those first centuries. Its view of antiquity was a very simple one, and perhaps it was just as well for the systematizing of theology. In the main, it was no easy matter to develop a historical sense during the Middle Ages. The absence of such a sense is all the more remarkable when we consider what civilization owes the Middle Ages in the realms of philosophy, theology, and architecture.

PLACE OF ORIGIN.—We have purposely reserved this question for the end. In the first place, it is of lesser importance than the others; and in the second, whereas critics are for the most part in agreement concerning the questions we have been treating, they are divided into two parties on this final question. For a time the decretals were thought to have been forged at Mainz, but that theory has been altogether abandoned, and now the disputed honour lies between Reims and Le Mans in the province of Tours. Here are the arguments put forth on both sides. The majority of German critics and a section of those in France favour Reims as the place where the decretals originated. According to them, Isidore's legislation concerning the trial of bishops was intended to support the cause of Ebbon, Archbishop of Reims, and to facilitate the retrial of that dignitary. Ebbon had been deposed in 835 for political reasons. He was reinstated at Reims in 840; he had to leave his see in 845 and ended his career in 851 as Bishop of Hildesheim. According to the critics, a comparison between his case and Isidore's procedure at trials shows such agreement that it must have been intentional; thus, for instance, the provisional restoration of the accused and dispossessed bishop, the arrest of the bishop, the possibility of a translation from one see to another (from Reims to Hildesheim). Besides this, it was in the province of Reims the forgeries first appeared, and from there they were carried to Rome by Rothade of Soissons; then, too, it was in this same diocese that, ever since Ebbon's time, the struggle against chorepiscopi was most intense. Isidore's opposition to archiepiscopal authority is also very marked; and, according to the critics, the province of Reims was the birthplace of that opposition during the years that intervened between Ebbon's deposition (838–841) and Hincmar's nomination (845); hence the conclusion that the forgeries were committed between 847 and 852 by partisans of Ebbon, and probably by clerics ordained by him in 841, and against whose ordination Hincmar, Ebbon's successor, raised objections soon after his election. This cumulative mass of argument is impressive; but to be really conclusive it would be necessary to prove that Isidore's legislation was invoked by these clerics against their archbishop, before his death in 851 or at least before 853, when the Council of Soissons was held, in which the ordinations held by Ebbon at Reims in 841 after his restoration were declared invalid. No such proof is forthcoming. The documents in favour of Ebbon in which is discovered a similarity to the teaching of the apocrypha are later than 853. At that time Isidore's work had begun to spread. That it was known and used at Reims after 853 is not at all surprising and is no proof of its having been composed in the Province of Reims. Furthermore, if these apocrypha had been composed in favour of Ebbon and of the clerics he ordained, then the question of the validity of ordinations performed by a deposed bishop ought to have been treated of. Yet not a word is said concerning it; though, on the other hand, Isidore submits all questions concerning clerics up to and including priests to the metropolitan council and to the primates. No mention is made of an appeal by priests to Rome, an omission that is inexplicable if the documents were written in favour of the clerics ordained by Ebbon, and who are supposed to have been the actual writers. Add to this that the period 847–852, when the forgery was committed, was for the clerics of Reims, Ebbon's partisans, a period pending appeal and a time of *entente* with Hincmar. For the moment, they had no reason to need such a weapon against the archbishop. Lastly, P. Fournier points out that the theory which makes Reims the scene of the forgery in opposition to Hincmar is at variance with what we know of Hincmar's attitude.

If Hincmar had the faintest suspicion that the decretals were aimed at him, he would have treated them differently. Though he had a suspicion that one or other document had been forged in part, he offered no objection to the collection as a whole. But it is certain that he would have spared no pains to discredit a code intended as a weapon against him. On the whole, then, this theory is an attractive one; but while no solid proof can be brought in its favour, many solid arguments can be brought against it.

There is another set of critics who fix on the province of Tours and the neighbourhood of Le Mans as the scene of the forgery. The principal among these critics are Langen, Döllinger, M. M. Simson, Viollet, J. Havet, P. Fournier and L. Duchesne. According to them, the forged legislation on the trial of bishops and the organization of dioceses and ecclesiastical provinces aim at a state of things existing in Brittany after 845, when Noménoé, Duke of Brittany, gained a victory over Charles the Bald. At that time Brittany was eager for independence, in the ecclesiastical as well as in the civil order. The bishoprics in Brittany were subject to the metropolitan of Tours, and the Carlovingian sovereigns clung to this ecclesiastical subjection as a pledge of political subordination. On the other hand, the Duke of Brittany was anxious to get rid of four bishops whom he suspected of favouring the Franks. He gave them a quick trial and expelled them from his domains. The affair was carried to Rome, and about 847 Leo II wrote a letter to the Duke of Brittany reminding him of the claims of canon law. The whole thing caused much commotion among the Franks and at Rome. As it was a matter of public knowledge, and more or less contemporary with the appearance of the decretals, nearly all the critics are agreed that Isidore had this affair in his mind when he wrote, and that many of his laws presupposed some such state of affairs as existed in the province of Tours and the Church of Brittany. These are only appearances, however, and we want precise proofs, something more definite. Now the critics in question think they recognize a family likeness between two documents which were certainly written at Le Mans and the decretals of Isidore. The first of these is the apocryphal Bull of Pope Gregory IV (827–844) in favour of Aldric, Bishop of Le Mans. In this letter (Migne, P. L., CVI, 853) the pope recognizes the right of the Bishop of Le Mans to take his case to Rome whenever a charge is brought against him. The letter is supposed to have been written on 8 July, 833. It is quite after Isidore's own heart; and its style is wonderfully similar to that of the forger. The forged Bull of Gregory IV is a mosaic of authentic texts, and very often they are texts which Isidore used over and over again.

The critics are all agreed that this forged Bull and the decretals are independent documents; that is, that neither makes use of the other. But the critics we are now considering maintain that both come from the same workshop; that they are alike in materials and methods of composition. And they further point out the closeness of their dates. The forged Bull was certainly drawn up at Le Mans, they say, about 850, when Le Mans was in the hands of the Duke of Brittany. The bishop, who favoured the Franks, was in a sorry plight; and to protect him the Bull of Gregory IV was forged. We are certainly very near now to the date of the decretals, and the family likeness between the documents would be explained by the identity of their origin. The same critics argue in the same way in the case of a memoir or story of a dispute that took place in 838 between Aldric, Bishop of Le Mans and the Abbey of St-Calais (Migne, P. L., CXV, 81–82). During the course of the trial the authority of the canons is quoted after the manner of Isidore, i. e. in mosaic-fashion made up of those fragmentary passages Isidore was so fond of using. And this document belongs to the years between 842 and 846. We are still at Le Mans and about the period when the decretals appeared. Moreover, it is a fact that there were chorepiscopi at Le Mans at this time. Now, what are we to think of these arguments? They are not without value, but not all their assumptions are beyond question. Thus, we have no proof that the forged Bull of Gregory IV was written during the lifetime of Aldric. The present writer is of the opinion that it was after his time and as a support to Robert of Le Mans, successor to Aldric, in his quarrel with the monks of St-Calais. But the question as to the date of the Bull is merely a secondary one. The most important argument is the existence at Le Mans, about the very time when the decretals were forged, not of a document, but of two documents concocted in the very style of the forger Isidore. And there seems reason to believe that Le Mans has most claim to being the scene of the forgery of the decretals. In the interests of fairness we must, however, say one thing. As we have seen, the knowledge of the decretals shown by Pope Nicholas I dates from the visit to Rothade to Rome in 864. It is a matter, for us, of some surprise, since in the previous year the same pope had to deal with the appeal of Bishop Robert of Le Mans, successor of Aldric. If the false decretals were forged at Le Mans, how comes it that Bishop Robert did not use them exactly as Bishop Rothade of Soissons did one year later? It is true that in his letter of 22 January, 865, Nicholas I declares that the Frankish bishops appeal to the decrees of the early popes (i. e. the decretals of Isidore). And it may be that Bishop Robert of Le Mans is included in this generalization.

MANUSCRIPTS AND EDITIONS.—The MSS. of the false decretals belong to many classes, but we shall mention only three, which serve to show us how the work spread. The first class comprises twenty-five MSS. Although all of them are incomplete, yet we are able to restore the full text from them, i. e. the text of the canonical collection described above, and restored in the edition of Hinschius. A second class of MSS. contains only a part of Isidore's work. This class comprises eighteen MSS., which give Part I of the collection, i. e. the apocryphal decretals up to Melchiades, but omit Part II, and give only a portion of Part III. These MSS. cease at page 508 of the edition of Hinschius. Everything leads to the belief that the MSS. of this second class are merely extracts from the first. A third class of MSS. is represented only by number 1341 of the Latin MSS. in the Vatican Library. This MS. contains the "Collectio Hispana Gallica Augustodunensis", of which we have already spoken. This collection may be looked on as a first edition, a trial edition of the false decretals. It does not contain Part I, i. e. the apocryphal decretals from Clement to Melchiades, but only those parts which correspond to the genuine Hispana, namely the councils and the decretals of the popes from Damasus. In this latter part the forger has interpolated some of his apocrypha which later found their way into the completed edition of the false decretals. The principal of these apocrypha are to be found on pages 501–508 and 509–515 of the edition of Hinschius. It should be remembered that the Hinschius edition is a critical edition; i. e. one edited after a thorough study of the manuscripts of the forged texts. The text of the genuine documents has not been subjected to any criticism, the editor contenting himself with reproducing it just as he found it in already extant collections, that is to say, existing previous to Isidore's treatment of them.

An endless number of books have been written on this subject, but we give here those that are indispensable and that sum up all others of importance. The *Preface* to the edition of HINSCHIUS; SECKEL, *Pseudoisidor* in *Realencyck. für prot. Theol. und Kirche;* FOURNIER, *Etudes sur les fausses décrétales* in *Revue d'histoire eccl.*, VII (Louvain, 1906), pp. 33–51; 301–16; 543–64; 761–784; VIII (1907), pp. 19–56.

LOUIS SALTET.

Falsity (Lat. *Falsitas*), a perversion of truth originating in the deceitfulness of one party, and culminating in the damage of another party. Counterfeiting money, or attempting to coin genuine legal tender without due authorization; tampering with wills, codicils, or such-like legal instruments; prying into the correspondence of others to their prejudice; using false weights and measures; adulterating merchandise, so as to render saleable what purchasers would otherwise never buy, or so as to derive larger profits from goods otherwise marketable only at lower figures; bribing judges; suborning witnesses; advancing false testimony; manufacturing spurious seals; forging signatures; padding accounts; interpolating the texts of legal enactments; and sharing in the pretended birth of suppositious offspring are among the chief forms which this crime assumes. The punishment determined by the laws of former times for those convicted of it could scarcely savour of greater severity, or awaken a deeper horror of the crime itself. In the first place, the Roman law inflicted the death penalty on such evil-doers as were found guilty of falsifying imperial rescripts. Traces of this kind of legislation are still to be found in the Bull of Pius IX, "Apostolicæ Sedis", wherein the Holy See promulgates the sentence of excommunication specially reserved to the sovereign pontiff against all who dare to forge or interpolate Bulls, Briefs, and Rescripts of all kinds formulated in the name of the Holy Father, and signed either by the pope personally, by his vice-chancellor personally, or by his vice-chancellor's proxy, or by some other individual specially commissioned thereunto by the sovereign pontiff himself.

Moreover, whosoever are guilty of publishing surreptitious or suppositious papal Bulls, Briefs, or Rescripts, of the kind already specified, render themselves amenable to the same ecclesiastical penalty. This sentence of excommunication takes effect as soon as the work of falsification becomes an accomplished fact, even though the false letters never pass into actual use. At the same time it must be noted, in passing, that as often as there is question of forging Apostolic Letters, the censure is not incurred prior to the actual publication of such letters. Those who are guilty, not of falsifying Apostolic Letters, but of deliberately using such as are already forged or interpolated, or of co-operating in such traffic, incur the censure of excommunication reserved to the ordinary of the diocese. According to D'Annibale (Commentary on the Constitution "Apostolicæ Sedis", n. 81) those who retain forged or interpolated Apostolic Letters in their possession, those who order the production of such letters, their advisers, abettors, or co-operators, are not liable to the sentence of excommunication.

In cases other than those here outlined, the enormity of the crime was emphasized by the civil law in confiscating the property of culprits and condemning them to perpetual exile. Though time has by no means lessened the intrinsic heinousness of the crime itself, it has witnessed considerable mitigation in the penalty thereunto attached; the discretion of the judge hearing the case is now the chief factor in determining the nature and the extent of punishment. While vicissitudes of time and place may suggest the expediency of modifications in the exigencies of positive law, there still remains an obligation which conscience always imposes on those guilty of this crime, an obligation founded in justice, and therefore quite independent of changes occurring in time or place. For this reason it is right to claim that as soon as the actual perpetration of this disorder begets injury to another party, the perpetrator of such damage is strictly bound in conscience to make good all such losses caused, or occasioned, by his fraud or deceit. This teaching meets with the unstinted approbation of moralists, notwithstanding the plausibility of a theory purporting to inculpate those who advance false testimony, but lifting from their shoulders the burden of repairing damages due to such false evidence. (See FORGERY.)

TAUNTON, *Law of the Church* (London, 1906); D'ANNIBALE, *Commentarium in Constitutione Apostolicæ Sedis;* OJETTI, *Synopsis Rerum Moralium et Juris Pontificii* (Prato, 1904); BALLERINI, *Opus Theologicum Morale* (Prato, 1901); LEHMKUHL, *Theologia Moralis* (Freiburg, 1898); LOMBARDI, *Juris Canonici Privati Institutiones* (Rome, 1901); LAYMANN, *Theologia Moralis* (Padua, 1733); SPORER, *Theologia Moralis* (Venice, 1716).

J. D. O'NEILL.

Faltonia Proba. See PROBA FALTONIA.

Famagusta, a titular see in the Island of Cyprus. The name appears to be derived from the Greek ἀμμόχωστος (a sandy point) rather than from Fama Augusti, the traditional etymology. The history of the city cannot be traced beyond the eighth century of our era. It is not certain, Lequien to the contrary notwithstanding (II, 1065), that it occupies the site of Arsinoe. Famagusta prospered through the destruction of the neighbouring Salamis, the former capital of the island. By the twelfth century its importance was such that Guy de Lusignan chose to be crowned there (1191) King of Jerusalem and Cyprus. The French princes fortified the town, and in the thirteenth century built the beautiful Cathedral of St. Nicholas, transformed since then into a mosque. Famagusta was the seat of a Latin diocese from the twelfth century and had residential bishops till the end of the sixteenth. The list is given by Lequien, III, 1219–24; Ducange, "Les familles d' outre-mer", 861–864; Eubel, I, 253–54, II, 168; Hackett, "History of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus", London, 1901, 577–87.

The prosperity of Famagusta was not affected by the fall of Acre. In 1342, a German writer described it as one of the richest and most beautiful cities of the world, its wealth surpassing that of Constantinople and Venice. (See Mas-Latrie, L'île de Chypre, Paris, 1879, 236–40.) St. Bridget of Sweden, in her revelations, compares it to Sodom and Gomorrha. Captured by the Genoese in 1374, it fell, in 1389, into the hands of the Venetians, who retained it till 1571. Finally, after a siege of ten months, which cost the enemy 50,000 men, the city surrendered to the Turks, who, despite their treaty, massacred the garrison, burned alive the brave governor, Bragadino, and completely sacked the city. Famagusta, which formerly numbered 70,000 inhabitants, was reduced to a mere village. It is known to-day as Mankosta (1000 inhabitants) and is the chief town of one of the six departments of the island. Its harbour is choked with sand; its palaces, dwellings, highways, ramparts, and churches are all in ruins.

S. VAILHÉ.

Fame. See REPUTATION.

Familiars, strictly speaking, seculars subject to a master's authority and maintained at his expense. In this sense the idea embodies service rendered to masters, as well as wages, board, and lodging provided by the masters. In canon law the term usually signifies seculars residing in monasteries and other religious houses, actually employed therein as servants and subject to the authority of the regular prelate to the same extent as servants are subject to their masters. Many of the privileges and exemptions granted to religious are accorded their familiars. For this reason familiars validly receive absolution from a confessor approved by the regular prelate, or from one approved by the ordinary of the place where the house is located. In like manner, familiars actually dwelling in a monastery may receive their Easter Communion in the church or chapel of the monastery. Extreme unction and Viaticum may also be administered to them in the monastery. Boys boarding in colleges or academies supervised by religious or by diocesan clergy, and girls boarding in convents conducted by sisterhoods, practically enjoy the same privileges as familiars. Accord-

ing to the Council of Trent (Sess. XXIII, cap. ix, De Reformatione), "a bishop may not ordain one of his own household who is not his subject unless he has lived with him for the space of three years, and he shall really and without fraud of any kind, straightway confer on him a benefice, notwithstanding any contrary custom even immemorial".

TAUNTON, *Law of the Church* (London, 1906); SMITH, *Elements of Ecclesiastical Law* (New York, 1887); BACHOFEN, *Compendium Juris Regularium* (New York, 1903); LOMBARDI, *Juris Canonici Privati Institutiones* (Rome, 1901); ICARD, *Prælectiones Juris Canonici* (Paris, 1880); BOUIX, *Tractatus de Jure Regularium* (Paris, 1886); NOLDIN, *De Sacramentis* (Innsbruck, 1903); LEHMKUHL, *Theologia Moralis* (Freiburg, 1898); MÜLLER, *Theologia Moralis* (Vienna, 1902).

J. D. O'NEILL.

Family, a term derived from the Latin, *famulus*, servant, and *familia*, household servants, or the household (cf. Oscan *famel*, servant). In the classical Roman period the *familia* rarely included the parents or the children. Its English derivative was frequently used in former times to describe all the persons of the domestic circle, parents, children, and servants. Present usage, however, commonly excludes servants, and restricts the word *family* to that fundamental social group formed by the more or less permanent union of one man with one woman, or of one or more men with one or more women, and their children. If the heads of the group comprise only one man and one woman we have the monogamous family, as distinguished from those domestic societies which live in conditions of polygamy, polyandry, or promiscuity.

Certain anthropological writers of the last half of the nineteenth century, as Bachofen (Das Mutterrecht, Stuttgart, 1861), Morgan (Ancient Society, London, 1877), Mc'Lennan (The Patriarchal Theory, London, 1885), Lang (Custom and Myth, London, 1885), and Lubbock (The Origin of Civilization and the Primitive Condition of Man, London, 1889), created and developed the theory that the original form of the family was one in which all the women of a group, horde, or tribe, belonged promiscuously to all the men of the community. Following the lead of Engels (The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State, tr. from the German, Chicago, 1902), many Socialist writers have adopted this theory as quite in harmony with their materialistic interpretation of history. The chief considerations advanced in its favour are: the assumption that in primitive times all property was common, and that this condition naturally led to community of women; certain historical statements by ancient writers like Strabo, Herodotus, and Pliny; the practice of promiscuity, at a comparatively late date, by some uncivilized peoples, such as the Indians of California and a few aboriginal tribes of India; the system of tracing descent and kinship through the mother, which prevailed among some primitive peoples; and certain abnormal customs of ancient races, such as religious prostitution, the so-called *jus primæ noctis*, the lending of wives to visitors, cohabitation of the sexes before marriage, etc.

At no time has this theory obtained general acceptance, even among non-Christian writers, and it is absolutely rejected by some of the best authorities of to-day, e. g., Westermarck (The History of Human Marriage, London, 1901) and Letourneau (The Evolution of Marriage, tr. from the French, New York, 1888). In reply to the arguments just stated, Westermarck and others point out that the hypothesis of primitive communism has by no means been proved, at least in its extreme form; that common property in goods does not necessarily lead to community of wives, since family and marriage relations are subject to other motives as well as to those of a purely economic character; that the testimonies of classical historians in the matter are inconclusive, vague, and fragmentary, and refer to only a few instances; that the modern cases of promiscuity are isolated and exceptional, and may be attributed to degeneracy rather than to primitive survivals; that the practice of tracing kinship through the mother finds ample explanation in other facts besides the assumed uncertainty of paternity, and that it was never universal; that the abnormal sexual relations cited above are more obviously, as well as more satisfactorily, explained by other circumstances, religious, political, and social, than by the hypothesis of primitive promiscuity; and, finally, that evolution, which, superficially viewed, seems to support this hypothesis, is in reality against it, inasmuch as the unions between the male and the female of many of the higher species of animals exhibit a degree of stability and exclusiveness which bears some resemblance to that of the monogamous family.

The utmost concession which Letourneau will make to the theory under discussion is that "promiscuity may have been adopted by certain small groups, more probably by certain associations or brotherhoods" (op. cit., p. 44). Westermarck does not hesitate to say: "The hypothesis of promiscuity, instead of belonging, as Professor Giraud-Teulon thinks, to the class of hypotheses which are scientifically permissible, has no real foundation, and is essentially unscientific" (op. cit., p. 133). The theory that the original form of the family was either polygamy or polyandry is even less worthy of credence or consideration. In the main, the verdict of scientific writers is in harmony with the Scriptural doctrine concerning the origin and the normal form of the family: "Wherefore a man shall leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they shall be two in one flesh" (Gen., ii, 24). "Therefore now they are not two, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder" (Matt., xix, 6). From the beginning, therefore, the family supposed the union of one man with one woman.

While monogamy was the prevailing form of the family before Christ, it was limited in various degrees among many peoples by the practice of polygamy. This practice was on the whole more common among the Semitic races than among the Aryans. It was more frequent among the Jews, the Egyptians, and the Medes, than among the people of India, the Greeks, or the Romans. It existed to a greater extent among the uncivilized races, although some of these were free from it. Moreover, even those nations which practised polygamy, whether civilized or uncivilized, usually restricted it to a small minority of the population, as the kings, the chiefs, the nobles, and the rich. Polyandry was likewise practised, but with considerably less frequency. According to Westermarck, monogamy was by far the most common form of marriage "among the ancient peoples of whom we have any direct knowledge" (op. cit., p. 459). On the other hand, divorce was in vogue among practically all peoples, and to a much greater extent than polygamy.

The ease with which husband and wife could dissolve their union constitutes one of the greatest blots upon the civilization of classic Rome. Generally speaking, the position of woman was very low among all the nations, civilized and uncivilized, before the coming of Christ. Among the barbarians she very frequently became a wife through capture or purchase; among even the most advanced peoples the wife was generally her husband's property, his chattel, his labourer. Nowhere was the husband bound by the same law of marital fidelity as the wife, and in very few places was he compelled to concede to her equal rights in the matter of divorce. Infanticide was practically universal, and the *patria potestas* of the Roman father gave him the right of life and death over even his grown-up children. In a word, the weaker members of the family were everywhere inadequately protected against the stronger.

THE CHRISTIAN FAMILY.—Christ not only restored the family to its original type as something holy, per-

manent, and monogamous, but raised the contract from which it springs to the dignity of a sacrament, and thus placed the family itself upon the plane of the supernatural. The family is holy inasmuch as it is to co-operate with God by procreating children who are destined to be the adopted children of God, and by instructing them for His kingdom. The union between husband and wife is to last until death (Matt., xix, 6 sq.; Luke, xvi, 18; Mark, x, 11; I Cor., vii, 10; see MARRIAGE, DIVORCE). That this is the highest form of the conjugal union, and the best arrangement for the welfare both of the family and of society, will appear to anyone who compares dispassionately its moral and material effects with those flowing from the practice of divorce. Although divorce has obtained to a greater or less extent among the majority of peoples from the beginning until now, "there is abundant evidence that marriage has, upon the whole, become more durable in proportion as the human race has risen to higher degrees of cultivation" (Westermarck, op. cit., p. 535).

While the attempts that have been made to show that divorce is in every case forbidden by the moral law of nature have not been convincing on their own merits, to say nothing of certain facts of Old Testament history, the absolute indissolubility of marriage is nevertheless the ideal to which the natural law points, and consequently is to be expected in an order that is supernatural. In the family, as re-established by Christ, there is likewise no such thing as polygamy (see the references already given in this paragraph, and POLYGAMY). This condition, too, is in accord with nature's ideal. Polygamy is not, indeed, condemned in every instance by the natural law, but it is generally inconsistent with the reasonable welfare of the wife and children, and the proper moral development of the husband. Because of these qualities of permanence and unity, the Christian family implies a real and definite equality of husband and wife. They have equal rights in the matter of the primary conjugal relation, equal claims upon mutual fidelity, and equal obligations to make this fidelity real. They are equally guilty when they violate these obligations, and equally deserving of pardon when they repent.

The wife is neither the slave nor the property of her husband, but his consort and companion. The Christian family is supernatural, inasmuch as it originates in a sacrament. Through the sacrament of matrimony husband and wife obtain an increase of sanctifying grace, and a claim upon those actual graces which are necessary to the proper fulfilment of all the duties of family life, and all the relations between husband and wife, parents and children, are supernaturalized and sanctified. The end and the ideal of the Christian family are likewise supernatural, namely, the salvation of parents and children, and the union between Christ and His Church. "Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the church, and delivered himself up for it", says St. Paul (Eph., v, 25). And the intimacy of the marital union, the identification, almost, of husband and wife, is seen in the injunction: "So also ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife, loveth himself" (Eph., v, 28).

From these general facts of the Christian family, the particular relations existing among its members can be readily deduced. Since the average man and woman are not normally complete as individuals, but are rather the two complementary parts of one social organism, in which their material, moral, and spiritual needs receive mutual satisfaction, a primary requisite of their union is mutual love. This includes not merely the love of the senses, which is essentially selfish, not necessarily that sentimental love which anthropologists call romantic, but above all that rational love or affection, which springs from an appreciation of qualities of mind and heart, and which impels each to seek the welfare of the other. As the intimate and long association of husband and wife necessarily brings to the surface their less noble and lovable qualities, and as the rearing of children involves great trials, the need of disinterested love, the ability to sacrifice self, is obviously grave.

The obligations of mutual fidelity have been sufficiently stated above. The particular functions of husband and wife in the family are determined by their different natures, and by their relation to the primary end of the family, namely, the procreation of children. Being the provider of the family, and the superior of the wife both in physical strength and in those mental and moral qualities which are appropriate to the exercise of authority, the husband is naturally the family's head, even "the head of the wife", in the language of St. Paul. This does not mean that the wife is the husband's slave, his servant, or his subject. She is his equal, both as a human being and as member of the conjugal society, save only that when a disagreement arises in matters pertaining to domestic government, she is, as a rule, to yield. To claim for her completely equal authority with the husband is to treat woman as man's equal in a matter in which nature has made them unequal. On the other hand the care and management of the details of the household belong naturally to the wife, because she is better fitted for these tasks than the husband.

Since the primary end of the family is the procreation of children, the husband or wife who shirks this duty from any but spiritual or moral motives reduces the family to an unnatural and unchristian level. This is emphatically true when the absence of offspring has been effected by any of the artificial and immoral devices so much in vogue at present. When the conjugal union has been blessed with children, both parents are charged, according to their respective functions, with the duty of sustaining and educating those undeveloped members of the family. Their moral and religious formation is for the most part the work of the mother, while the task of providing for their physical and intellectual wants falls chiefly upon the father. The extent to which the different wants of the children are to be supplied will vary with the ability and resources of the parents. Finally, the children are bound, generally speaking, to render to the parents implicit love, reverence, and obedience, until they reach their majority or marry, and love, reverence, and a reasonable degree of support and obedience afterward.

The most important external relations of the family are, of course, those existing between it and the State. According to the Christian conception, the family, rather than the individual, is the social unit and the basis of civil society. To say that the family is the social unit is not to imply that it is the end to which the individual is a means; for the welfare of the individual is the end both of the family and of the State, as well as of every other social organization. The meaning is that the State is formally concerned with the family as such, and not merely with the individual. This distinction is of great practical importance; for where the State ignores or neglects the family, keeping in view only the welfare of the individual, the result is a strong tendency towards the disintegration of the former. The family is the basis of civil society, inasmuch as the great majority of persons ought to spend practically all their lives in its circle, either as subjects or as heads. Only in the family can the individual be properly reared, educated, and given that formation of character which will make him a good man and a good citizen.

Inasmuch as the average man will not put forth his full productive energies except under the stimulus of its responsibilities, the family is indispensable from the purely economic viewpoint. Now the family cannot rightly discharge its functions unless the parents

have full control over the rearing and education of the children, subject only to such State supervision as is needed to prevent grave neglect of their welfare. Hence it follows that, generally speaking, and with due allowance for particular conditions, the State exceeds its authority when it provides for the material wants of the child, removes him from parental influence, or specifies the school that he must attend. As a consequence of these concepts and ideals, the Christian family in history has proved itself immeasurably superior to the non-Christian family. It has exhibited greater fidelity between husband and wife, greater reverence for the parents by the children, greater protection of the weaker members by the stronger, and in general a more thorough recognition of the dignity and rights of all within its circle. Its chief glory is undoubtedly its effect upon the position of woman. Notwithstanding the disabilities—for the most part with regard to property, education, and a practically recognized double standard of morals—under which the Christian woman has suffered, she has attained to a height of dignity, respect, and authority for which we shall look in vain in the conjugal society outside of Christianity. The chief factor in this improvement has been the Christian teaching on chastity, conjugal equality, the sacredness of motherhood, and the supernatural end of the family, together with the Christian model and ideal of family life, the Holy Family at Nazareth.

The contention of some writers that the Church's teaching and practice concerning virginity and celibacy, make for the degradation and deterioration of the family, not only springs from a false and perverse view of these practices, but contradicts the facts of history. Although she has always held virginity in higher honour than marriage, the Church has never sanctioned the extreme view, attributed to some ascetical writers, that marriage is a mere concession to the flesh, a sort of tolerated carnal indulgence. In her eyes the marriage rite has ever been a sacrament, the married state a holy state, the family a Divine institution, and family life the normal condition for the great majority of mankind. Indeed, her teaching on virginity, and the spectacle of thousands of her sons and daughters exemplifying that teaching, have in every age constituted a most effective exaltation of chastity in general, and therefore of chastity within as well as without the family. Teaching and example have combined to convince the wedded, not less than the unwedded, that purity and restraint are at once desirable and practically possible. To-day, as always, it is precisely in those communities where virginity is most honoured that the ideal of the family is highest, and its relations purest.

Dangers for the Family.—Among these are the exaltation of the individual by the State at the expense of the family, which has been going on since the Reformation (cf. the Rev. Dr. Thwing, in Bliss, "Encyclopedia of Social Reform"), and the modern facility of divorce (see Divorce), which may be traced to the same source. The greatest offender in the latter respect is the United States, but the tendency seems to be towards easier methods in most of the other countries in which divorce is allowed. Legal authorization and popular approval of the dissolution of the marriage bond, not only breaks up existing families, but encourages rash marriages, and produces a laxer view of the obligation of conjugal fidelity. Another danger is the deliberate limitation of the number of children in a family. This practice tempts parents to overlook the chief end of the family, and to regard their union as a mere means of mutual gratification. Furthermore, it leads to a lessening of the capacity of self-sacrifice in all the members of the family. Closely connected with these two evils of divorce and artificial restriction of births, is the general laxity of opinion with regard to sexual immorality. Among its causes are the diminished influence of religion, the absence of religious and moral training in the schools, and the seemingly feebler emphasis laid upon the heinousness of the sin of unchastity by those whose moral training has not been under Catholic auspices. Its chief effects are disinclination to marry, marital infidelity, and the contraction of diseases which produce domestic unhappiness and sterile families.

The idle and frivolous lives of the women, both wives and daughters, in many wealthy families is also a menace. In the position which they hold, the mode of life which they lead, and the ideals which they cherish, many of these women remind us somewhat of the *hetæræ* of classical Athens. For they enjoy great freedom, and exercise great influence over the husband and father, and their chief function seems to be to entertain him, to enhance his social prestige, to minister to his vanity, to dress well, and to reign as social queens. They have emancipated themselves from any serious self-sacrifice on behalf of the husband or the family, while the husband has likewise declared his independence of any strict construction of the duty of conjugal fidelity. The bond between them is not sufficiently moral and spiritual, and is excessively sensual, social, and æsthetic. And the evil example of this conception of family life extends far beyond those who are able to put it into practice. Still another danger is the decline of family authority among all classes, the diminished obedience and respect imposed upon and exhibited by children. Its consequences are imperfect discipline in the family, defective moral character in the children, and manifold unhappiness among all.

Finally, there is the danger, physical and moral, threatening the family owing to the widespread and steadily increasing presence of women in industry. In 1900 the number of females sixteen years of age and over engaged in gainful occupations in the United States, was 4,833,630, which was more than double the number so occupied in 1880, and which constituted 20 per cent of the whole number of females above sixteen years in the country, whereas the number at work in 1880 formed only 16 per cent of the same division of the female population. In the cities of America two women out of every seven are bread-winners (see Special Report of the U. S. Census, "Women at Work"). This condition implies an increased proportion of married women at work as wage earners, an increased proportion of women who are less capable physically of undertaking the burdens of family life, a smaller proportion of marriages, an increase in the proportion of women who, owing to a delusive idea of independence, are disinclined to marry, and a weakening of family bonds and domestic authority. "In 1890, 1 married woman in 22 was a bread-winner; in 1900, 1 in 18" (ibid.). Perhaps the most striking evil result of married women in industry is the high death-rate among infants. For infants under one year the rate in 1900 over the whole United States, was 165 per 1000, but it was 305 in Fall River, where the proportion of married women at work is greatest. As the supreme causes of all these dangers to the family are the decay of religion and the growth of materialistic views of life, so the future of the family will depend upon the extent to which these forces can be checked. And experience seems to show that there can be no permanent middle ground between the materialistic ideal of divorce, so easy that the marital union will be terminable at the will of the parties, and the Catholic ideal of marriage absolutely indissoluble.

In addition to the authorities cited in the text, the following deserve particular mention: Devas, *Studies in Family Life* (London, 1886); Riche, *The Family*, tr. Sadlier (New York, 1896); Coulanges, *The Ancient City*, tr. Small (Boston, 1901); Bosanquet, *The Family* (London, 1906); Thwing, *The Family* (Boston, 1887); Bliss, *Encyclopedia of Social Reform* (New York, 1907); Stöckl in *Kirchenlexikon; La grande encyclopédie;* Perrone, *De Matrimonio Christiano*

(Liège, 1862); WESTERMARCK's work contains a very large bibliography on the anthropological and sociological aspects of the subject. HOWARD, *History of Matrimonial Institutions* (Chicago, 1904).
JOHN A. RYAN.

Fan, ECCLESIASTICAL. See FLABELLUM.

Fano, DIOCESE OF (FANENSIS).—Fano, the ancient Fanum Fortunæ, a city of the Marches in the province of Pesaro, Italy, took its name from a celebrated temple of Fortune, which also served as a lighthouse, on the site now occupied by the church of Santa Lucia. Near this city, in 207 B.C., Claudius Nero defeated Hasdrubal; Augustus founded a colony there called Julia Fanensis; and, in 271, Aurelian annihilated there the Alamanni. Ruins of the Temple of Fortune are still visible, also of a temple of Jupiter, the basilica designed and described by Vitruvius (De ædif., V, i), and a triumphal arch of Augustus, enlarged by Constantine II in 340. Fano was part of the Pentapolis and with it passed in the eighth century under the domination of the Holy See. The Alberghetti governed it as magistrates during the thirteenth century. From 1306 the Malatesta ruled over it, but in 1463 Federigo di Montefeltro, Duke of Urbino, after having almost destroyed the city, expelled Sigismondo Malatesta. Later the Comneni held almost independent sway.

St. Paternianus is venerated as the first Bishop of Fano and is supposed to have been appointed by Pope Sylvester I. St. Vitalis flourished in the time of Pope Symmachus (498–514). Eusebius accompanied Pope John I to Constantinople (526). Leo and St. Fortunatus belong to the period of St. Gregory the Great. The date of St. Orsus is uncertain. Among the later bishops were Riccardo (1214), persecuted by the magistrate Alberghetti; and the Dominican Pietro Bertano (1537), a distinguished orator and advocate at the Council of Trent. Fano is an exempt diocese (see DIOCESE) and has 55,275 inhabitants, 45 parishes, 1 educational institution for girls, 6 religious houses of men, and 8 of women.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), VII, 321–43; AMIANI, *Memorie istoriche di Fano* (Fano, 1751).
U. BENIGNI.

Fanon, a shoulder-cape worn by the pope alone, consisting of two pieces of white silk ornamented with narrow woven stripes of red and gold; the pieces are nearly circular in shape but somewhat unequal in size and the smaller is laid on and fastened to the larger one. To allow the head to pass through there is made in the middle a round opening with a vertical slit running down farther. The front part of the fanon is ornamented with a small cross embroidered in gold.

The fanon is like an amice; it is, however, put on not under but above the alb. The pope wears it only when celebrating a solemn pontifical Mass, that is, only when all the pontifical vestments are used. The manner of putting on the fanon recalls the method of assuming the amice universal in the Middle Ages and still observed by some of the older orders (see AMICE). After the deacon has vested the pope with the usual amice, alb, the cingulum and sub-cinctorium, and the pectoral cross, he draws on, by means of the opening, the fanon and then turns the half of the upper piece towards the back over the pope's head. He now vests the pope with the stole, tunicle, dalmatic, and chasuble, then turns down that part of the fanon which had been placed over the head of the pope, draws the front half of the upper piece above the tunicle, dalmatic, and chasuble, and finally arranges the whole upper piece of the fanon so that it covers the shoulders of the pope like a collar.

The fanon is mentioned in the oldest known Roman Ordinal, consequently its use in the eighth century can be proved. It was then called *anabolagium* (*anagolagium*), yet it was not at that period a vestment reserved for the use of the pope. This limitation of its use did not appear until the other ecclesiastics at Rome began to put the vestment on under the alb instead of over it, that is, when it became customary among the clergy to use the fanon as an ordinary amice. This happened, apparently in imitation of the usage outside of Rome, between the tenth and twelfth centuries; however, the exact date cannot be given. But it is certain that as early as the end of the twelfth century the fanon was worn solely by the pope, as is evident from the express statement of Innocent III (1198–1216). The vestment was then called an *orale;* the name of fanon, from the late Latin *fano*, derived from *pannus*, πῆνος, cloth, woven fabric, was not used until a subsequent age. Even as early as the eighth century the pope wore the fanon only at solemn high Mass. The present usage, according to which the pope is vested, in addition to the fanon, with an amice under the alb, did not appear, at the earliest, until the close of the Middle Ages.

As to the form of the fanon and the material from which it was made in early times no positive information exists. Late in the Middle Ages it was made of white silk, as is shown by the inventory of the year 1295 of the papal treasure, as well as by numerous works of art; the favourite ornamentation was one of narrow stripes of gold and of some colour, especially red, woven into the silk. Up into the fifteenth century the fanon was square in shape; the present collar-like form seems to have appeared about the sixteenth century or even later.

GIORGI, *Liturgia Romani Pontificis* (Rome, 1731), I; BRAUN, *Die pontifikalen Gewänder des Abendlandes* (Freiburg im Br., 1898); IDEM, *Die liturgische Gewandung im Occident und Orient* (Freiburg im Br., 1907).
JOSEPH BRAUN.

Faraud, HENRI, titular Bishop of Anémour and first Vicar Apostolic of Athabasca-Mackenzie, Canada; b. 17 March, 1823, at Gigondas, France; d. at St. Boniface, Manitoba, 26 September, 1890. After admission to the juniorate of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, and while still in minor orders, he was sent to the missions of Northern America, and ordained priest, 8 May, 1847, at St. Boniface, Manitoba. Then he replaced Father (afterwards Bishop) Laflèche at Ile-à-la-Crosse, and in 1849 he proceeded further North, establishing the mission of Lake Athabasca, which he inaugurated 8 September, 1851. The following year, he visited Great Slave Lake, where no missionary had ever been, and ministered to the Indians of Peace River (1858–59). On the 13th of May, 1862, he was made titulary of the newly created Vicariate Apostolic of Athabasca-Mackenzie; but such was his isolation from the civilized world, that he did not know of it before July of the following year.

Mgr. Guibert, of Tours, consecrated him Bishop of Anémour, 30 Nov., 1864, a title he bore for twenty-five years, during which he evidenced considerable administrative abilities, founding missionary posts as far as the Frozen Ocean, on the one side, and the Peace and Liard Rivers, on the other. In 1835 he repaired to France, for the General Chapter of his Congregation. In 1889 he was one of the Fathers of the Provincial Council of St. Boniface, at the termination of which his growing infirmities prevented him from returning to his distant missions in the North.

Le Manitoba (2 October, 1890), files; FERNAND MICHEL, *Dix-huit ans chez les Sauvages* (Paris, 1866).
A. G. MORICE.

Farfa, ABBEY OF, situated about 26 miles from Rome, not far from the Farfa Sabina Railway station. A legend in the "Chronicon Farfense" relates the foundation of a monastery at Farfa in the time of the Emperors Julian, or Gratian, by the Syrian St. Laurentius, who had come to Rome with his sister, Susannah, and had been made Bishop of Spoleto. The legend goes on to say that he afterwards became enamoured of the monastic life, and chose a wooded hill near the Farfa stream, a tributary of the Tiber, on which he built a church to Our Lady, and a monastery.

Archeological discoveries in 1888 seem to prove that the first monastic establishment was built on the ruins of a pagan temple. This first monastery was devastated by the Vandals in the fifth century, doubtless about the year 457.

In the seventh century, a wave of monasticism from the North spread over Italy. The foundation of Bobbio by St. Columbanus, and the foundation of Farfa by monks from Gaul, about 681, heralded a revival of the great Benedictine tradition in Italy. The "Constructio Monasterii Farfensis", a writing which dates probably from 857, relates at length the story of its principal founder Thomas de Maurienne; he had made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem and spent three years there. While in prayer before the Holy Sepulchre, Our Lady in a vision warned him to return to Italy, and restore Farfa; and the Duke of Spoleto, Faroald, who had also had a vision, was commanded to aid in this work. At a very early date we find traces of this legend in connexion with the foundation by three nobles from Beneventum of the monastery of St. Vincent on the Volturno, over which Farfa claimed jurisdiction. Thomas died in 720; and for more than a century Frankish abbots ruled at Farfa.

The Lombard chiefs, and later the Carlovingians, succeeded in withdrawing Farfa from obedience to the Bishops of Rieti, and in securing many immunities and privileges for the monastery. If we may credit the "Chronicon Farfense", Farfa was at this period the most important monastery in Italy both from the point of view of worldly possession and ecclesiastical dignity, with the exception of Nonantula. It had one large basilican church and five smaller ones, rich in masterpieces of religious orfèverie. The greed of the Saracens was excited: and about 890, during the government of Abbot Peter, they swooped down on the place. Peter held out against them for seven years, and then resolved to abandon the monastery. He divided his monks into three sections and shared the abbey's wealth among them—one section he sent towards Rome, one towards Rieti, and one towards the county of Fermo. The Saracens preserved Farfa as a stronghold, but some Christian robbers set fire to it by mistake.

Between 930 and 936, it was rebuilt by Abbot Ratfredus, who was afterwards poisoned by two wicked monks, Campo and Hildebrand, who divided the wealth of the abbey between them, and ruled over it until Alberic, Prince of the Romans, called in Odo of Cluny to reform Farfa and other monasteries. Campo was driven out; and a holy monk named Dagibert took his place. At the end of five years, he also died by poison—and the moral condition of Farfa was once more deplorable. The monks robbed the altars of their ornaments, and led lives of unbridled vice.

Abbot John III, consecrated, about 967, by the pope, succeeded, owing to the protection of the Emperor Otho, in re-establishing a semblance of order. But the great reformer of Farfa was Hugues (998–1010). His nomination as abbot was not secured without simony—but the success of his government palliates the vice of his election. At his instance, Odilo, Abbot of Cluny, and William, Abbot of Dijon, visited Farfa, and re-established there the love of piety and of study.

The "Consuetudines Farfenses" drawn up about 1010 under the supervision of Guido, successor to Hugues, and recently published by Albers, bear witness to the care with which Hugues organized the monastic life at Farfa. Under the title "Destructio Monasterii", Hugues himself wrote a history of the sad period previous to his rule; and again under the title "Diminutio Monasterii", and "Querimonium", he relates the temporal difficulties that encompassed Farfa owing to the ambition of petty Roman lords. These works are very important for the historian of the period.

One of Hugues's successors, Berard, Abbot from 1049 to 1089, made the abbey a great seat of intellectual activity. The monk, Gregory of Catino (b. 1060) arranged the archives. To substantiate Farfa's claims, and the rights of its monks, he edited the "Regesto di Farfa", or "Liber Gemniagraphus sive Cleronomialis ecclesiæ Farfensis" composed of 1324 documents, all very important for the history of Italian society in the eleventh century. Ugo Balzani praised the accuracy and exactness of this work "planned", he says, "along lines quite in harmony with the best critical efforts of our own times".

In 1103, Gregory wrote the "Largitorium", or "Liber Notarius sive emphiteuticus", a lengthy list of all the concessions, or grants, made by the monastery to its tenants. Having collected all this detailed information, he set to work on a history of the monastery, the "Chronicon Farfense"; and when he was 70 years old, in order to facilitate reference to his earlier works, he compiled a sort of index which he styled "Liber Floriger Chartarum cenobii Farfensis". Gregory was a man of real learning, remarkable in that, as early as the eleventh century, he wrote history with accuracy of view-point, and a great wealth of information.

The monks of Farfa owned 683 churches or convents; two towns, Centumcellæ (Civitavecchia) and Alatri; 132 castles; 16 strongholds; 7 sea-ports; 8 salt-mines; 14 villages; 82 mills; 315 hamlets. All this wealth was a hindrance to the religious life once more, between 1119 and 1125. And Farfa was troubled by the rivalries between Abbot Guido, and the monk Berard who aimed at being abbot. During the Investiture conflict, Farfa was, more or less, on the side of the Ghibellines. The "Orthodoxa defensio imperialis", written in support of the Ghibelline party, is, according to Bethmann, the work of Gregory, and of one of his disciples, according to Balzani. The collection of canonical texts contained in the "Regesto", which has been studied by Paul Fournier, seems to omit purposely any mention of the canonical texts of the reforming popes of the eleventh century. But when, in 1262, the victory of the popes over the last of the Hohenstaufen put an end to Germanic sway in Italy, Farfa sought the protection of Urban IV, as we learn from a privilege granted on 23 Feb., 1262, and published by Jean Guiraud. At the end of the fourteenth century the Abbey of Farfa became a cardinalatial *in commendam* (q. v.), and since 1842 the Cardinal Bishop of Sabina, a suburbicarian bishop, bears also the title of Abbot of Farfa.

GREGORIO DI CATINO, *Il Regesto di Farfa*, published by the R. Società romana di storia patria, under the direction of GIORGI and BALZANI (Rome, 1879–1892), 4 vols.; *Il Chronicon Farfense di Gregorio di Catino; precedono la "Constructio Farfensis" e gli scritti di Ugo di Farfa:* published by BALZANI (Rome, 1903), 2 vols.; *Atti della R. Accademia dei Lincei; Notizie degli Scavi* (1888), 292; MABILLON, *Acta sanctorum Ord. Ben.*, I, 231–233; BRUNO ALBERS, *Consuetudines monasticæ*, vol. I of his *Consuetudines Farfenses* (Stuttgart, 1900); FOURNIER, *La collezione canonica del regesto di Farfa* in *Archivio della R. Società romana di Storia patria*, xvii, 285 sqq.; GUIRAUD, *La badia di Farfa alla fine del secolo xiii* in *Archivio della R. Società romana di Storia patria*, XV, 275–288; MARINI, *Serie Cronologica degli Abbati del monastero di Farfa* (Rome, 1836); ANGELI, *Passeggiate Sabine: Farfa* in *Rivista Moderna Politica e letteraria* (1 Nov., 1902). GEORGES GOYAU.

Fargo (FARGUS), DIOCESE OF (FARGENSIS), suffragan of St. Paul, U. S. A., embracing the whole of the State of North Dakota, an area of 70,195 square miles. It was established in 1889.

The first Mass, in the territory now comprised in the Diocese of Fargo, was celebrated in Pembina, September, 1818, by Rev. Sévère Joseph Norbert Dumoulin, one of the two missionaries sent to the Selkirk colony by Bishop Plessis of Quebec. Father Dumoulin was born in Montreal, 5 Dec., 1793, ordained priest in the Nicolet Seminary, 23 Feb., 1817, left Quebec for the Selkirk colony, 19 May, 1818, and arrived at Fort Douglas (now St. Boniface, Manitoba), 16 July, 1818. In August, 1823, Father Dumoulin returned to Can-

ada, where he died in 1853. The name of the diocese was originally Jamestown, which title was suppressed by the Holy See, 6 April, 1897, and changed to Fargo in accordance with the bishop's request. At its formation the diocese contained a population of 19,000, of whom nearly 8000 were Indians and half-breeds. The population (1908) is about 70,000.

With the creation of the diocese the Rev. John Shanley was named its first bishop. He was born at Albion, New York, 4 Jan., 1852, and ordained priest 30 May, 1874, at Rome. His consecration as bishop took place at St. Paul, 27 Dec., 1889. There were then in the diocese 30 priests, 40 churches, an academy for girls, a hospital, and 3 parochial schools. There are now (1909) in the diocese a mitred abbot, 110 priests, 215 churches, 15 parochial schools, 4 Indian schools, 5 hospitals, an orphanage, a college for boys, and 6 academies for girls. In eighteen years the number of priests quadrupled and the number of churches more than quintupled.

The Benedictine Fathers have an abbey at Richardton, and a priory at Devil's Lake, from which points they attend several missions. Connected with the Richardton Abbey is a college for boys. The Benedictine Sisters are in charge of several schools, and the Presentation Nuns in charge of schools and orphans. Other communities are: Sisters of Mercy (hospital and schools); Sisters of St. Joseph (hospitals and school); Sisters of Charity, or Grey Nuns (Indian school); Sisters of Mary of the Presentation (schools).

Diocesan records; *Catholic Directory*, 1909; REUSS, *Biog. Encycl. Cath. Hierarchy U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1898).

JOHN SHANLEY.

Faribault, GEORGE-BARTHÉLEMY, archæologist, b. at Quebec, Canada, 3 Dec., 1789; d. 22 Dec., 1866. He was a first cousin of Jean-Baptiste, founder of the city of Faribault, Minn., U. S. A. After attending a school taught by a Scotch veteran of Wolfe's army, he completed by personal efforts the course preparatory to the study of law and was admitted to the Bar in 1811. In 1812 he served as a militiaman during the invasion of Canada by the Americans. In 1822 he entered the civil service, attaining in 1832 the rank of assistant clerk of the Legislative Assembly, an office he continued to hold after the union of the Canadas (1841) until 1855, when ill-health forced him to resign. Passionately fond of his country and of its past glories, he spent all his leisure in collecting documents and books pertaining to Canadian history. His fine collection (1700) of rare books and original manuscripts perished at the burning of the Parliament House in Montreal (1849). He courageously began a second collection, which he bequeathed to Laval University. Faribault published no original works, merely reproducing and annotating a series of rare historical papers in the transactions of the Quebec Literary and Historical Society, of which he was one of the chief promoters and benefactors. His principal publication is the "Catalogue of Works" relating to the history of America, with bibliographical, critical, and literary notes (Quebec, 1837), which, although superseded by a few later catalogues, ranks among the best. In 1859 he realized the long-postponed plan, conceived in 1761 by Montcalm's companions in arms, of erecting a memorial tablet over the soldier's grave. The epitaph, written by the French Academy at the time the subject was first brought up and approved by William Pitt, was duly inscribed. In private life Faribault was the type of the Christian gentleman, modest, hospitable, and charitable. He counted none but friends, and left the record of a blameless career, devoted to the service of God and country.

MORGAN, *Bibliotheca Canadensis* (Ottawa, 1867); CASGRAIN, *Œuvres complètes* (Quebec, 1873).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

Faribault, JEAN-BAPTISTE, trader with the Indians and early settler in Minnesota, U. S. A.; b. 19 October, 1774, at Berthier, Lower Canada; d. at Faribault, Minnesota, 20 August, 1860. His father Barthélemy Faribault, a lawyer of Paris, France, settled in Canada towards the middle of the eighteenth century, and served as military secretary to the French army in Canada. After the occupation of the country by the English he retired to private life in Berthier and held the office of notary public. Young Jean-Baptiste received a good school education, and after several years of mercantile employment at Quebec, entered the service of the Northwest Fur Company. In May, 1798, he went with others to the island of Michilimackinac or Mackinac, one of the depots of this company. For over ten years he traded with the Pottowatomie Indians at Kankakee, with the Dakota or the Sioux Indians at Redwood, on the Des Moines river, and at Little Rapids, on the St. Peter or Minnesota river. During his residence at Little Rapids, in 1805, he was married to Pelagia Hanse, a half-breed daughter of Major Hanse. In 1809, he settled in the small village of Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin, and commenced trading, on his own account, with the Indian tribes of the Winnebagoes, Foxes, and Sioux. In addition to that he conducted an exchange of lead with Julien Dubuque, at the point now occupied by the city of that name. During the war with England (1812–14) Faribault refused to enlist in the English army, and suffered imprisonment and the loss of all his goods in consequence. After the conclusion of the war, in 1815, he became a citizen of the United States, and recommenced his trade at Prairie du Chien. In 1819, he removed to Pike Island in the Mississippi River, and in 1826 to the village of St. Peter, or Mendota, Minnesota, opposite the military post of Fort Snelling. There he remained until the last years of his life, which were spent with his children in the town of Faribault, Minnesota. A county in southern Minnesota was named after him, and the city of that name after his eldest son. Faribault was always kind and generous to the Indians, and tried to elevate them by teaching them the useful arts of life, and by instilling into them the principles of Christianity. He was much attached to the Catholic faith of his childhood and presented a house for a chapel to Father Lucien Galtier, the first resident missionary in Minnesota (1840).

SIBLEY, *Memoir of Jean Baptiste Faribault* in *Collections of the Minnesota Historical Society* (St. Paul, 1880), III; TASSÉ, *Les Canadiens de l'Ouest* (Montreal, 1878), I; *Encyclopedia of Biography of Minnesota* (Chicago, 1900), I; KIESTER, *The History of Faribault County, Minnesota* (Minneapolis, 1896).

FRANCIS J. SCHÆFER.

Farinato, PAOLO, an Italian painter, b. at Verona, 1524; d. there, 1606. He belonged to the old Florentine family of Farinata degli Uberti, the famous head of the Ghibelline party, whom Dante placed in his Inferno. When the Guelfs triumphed, the Uberti were expelled and part of the family settled at Verona; it was to this branch that the painter belonged. In his native town Paolo was a pupil of Giolfino, who was carrying on there the artistic tradition of Liberale, the greatest perhaps of Italian miniaturists, whose wonderful illustrations in the choir books of the Libreria of Siena (1470–1476), his blustering Boreas, his Mass in which the celebrant is a turbaned priest with a head like Klingsor the magician, his startling view of the Castle of Sant' Angelo, are well known.

It thus came about that in Verona, a town without any great artistic past, a really original school was being formed, untrammelled by traditions and therefore all the more free to indulge in those novel colour-schemes in painting which had already found startling expression in the mausoleums of Cane Grande della Scala, and the barons of his family. Towards the close of the fifteenth century, in the neighbourhood of Verona, the Venetian masters, Giovanni Bellini, Giorgione, and Titian, had just brought about a great artis-

tic revolution. They had invented colouring as an essential branch of the painter's art. But great masters that they were, they were also men of intellectual genius and cared too much for the idea and its expression to give themselves up utterly to the purely sensual ideal they had discovered.

The Veronese School, on the contrary, less concerned with the higher walks of art, and untrained in the quest of lofty ideals, seized straightway on colouring as the language best suited to express its own temperament. Colouring soon became its unique preoccupation; and it was from this school the greatest colourist and painter of all time was to come forth, if the measure of greatness among painters is their ability to speak in colouring, Paolo Caliari, of Verona, known as Veronese. It is on this account that Giolfino and his pupils, Brusasorci and Farinato, are of such interest in the history of art. It is in their works that we note the blending of the two styles, and the use of colouring as an exclusive source of pleasure in painting: they were the heralds of Veronese and his immediate precursors. More than one sketch by Brusasorci is even now masquerading as a Veronese. Moreover, in the hands of these artists painting gradually loses its moral purpose and becomes merely one of the decorative arts, giving promise already of that gaudy evolution that was to end in Tiepolo.

In this transformation Farinato played a very important part. He had a decided talent for fresco, and like Liberale, he was largely occupied on the decorations of the façades of the houses in Verona, which give that town and its famous Piazza dell' Erbe so winsome and engaging an appearance. Unfortunately, Farinato did not remain faithful to his native genius. At Mantua he fell under the influence of Giulio Romano, who, with his own captivating though vulgar faults, had inherited all the prestige of the divine Raphael. It was under this influence that Paolo executed his "St. Martin" in the Blessed Sacrament Chapel of the cathedral at Mantua: and from this time onward his works betray for the most part a hybrid compromise between the corrupt Roman style and the light impressionist colouring of Veronese. In Mantua also his principal works are preserved. In Santa Maria in Organo, a "Massacre of the Innocents" (1556), and a "Christ Walking on the Waters" (1558); in San Tommaso, a "Glorification of the B. Virgin" (1569); in Sant' Anastasia, a "Pentecost" (1598), and in San Giorgio in Braida, a "Multiplication of the Loaves" (1603).

Though four years older than Veronese, Farinato survived him by nearly twenty years, and was over eighty when he died. He was a most prolific painter and many of his works have found their way to other lands. In the United States there are two or three, one at Cleveland, in the Holden Collection, an allegory of "Autumn"; one at New Haven in the Jarves Collection, "Christ Appearing to Some Saints"; and one at the Historical Society in New York, an "Abraham Driving away Hagar". The famous painting in the Louvre, representing "The Council of Trent", and generally attributed to Titian, has been assigned to Farinato by Berenson.

VASARI, *Le Monnier*, ed. XI, 135, 139, 249; XIII, 109; BLANC, *Ecole Vénitienne* (Paris, s. d.); WOERMANN AND WOLTMANN, *Geschichte der Malerei* (Leipzig, 1888); BURCKHARDT, *Le Cicerone*, French tr. (Paris, 1892), pp. 203, 762; MORELLI, *Italian Painters* (London, 1893), II, 72; BERENSON, *North Italian Painters* (New York, 1907).

LOUIS GILLET.

Farlati, DANIELE, ecclesiastical historian, b. at San Daniele del Friuli in the present Italian province of Udine, 22 February, 1690; d. 25 April, 1773. After having studied at Görz he entered, in 1707, the Society of Jesus at Bologna. He was for five years teacher of classics at the Jesuit college in Padua, and then went to Rome, where he completed his theological studies, was ordained priest, in 1722, and was again sent to Padua, to assist Father Filippo Riceputi in the latter's historical labours. Riceputi intended to write a complete ecclesiastical history of Illyria, and in 1720 had issued, at Padua, a prospectus of this monumental enterprise. During twenty years they both searched with unwearied industry, in all the libraries and archives of ancient Illyria, for the material for their work; the matter they collected filled three hundred MS. volumes. In 1742, just as two of the larger divisions, the martyrology of Illyria and the life of San Pietro Orseolo, were about completed, Riceputi died. Thus Farlati was left alone to work into presentable shape the prodigious amount of material collected. As co-labourer he chose Father Jacopo Coleti. The first volume of "Illyricum Sacrum" appeared at Venice, in 1751; it contained the history of the Church of Salona up to the fourth century. Three further volumes appeared in rapid succession; while the fifth was in press Farlati died. His assistant Coleti finished the fifth volume, which appeared in 1775, and issued three more, the last being completed in 1818. The whole work fills eight well-executed folio volumes.

Vita P. Dan. Farlati, in *Illyricum Sacrum* (Venice, 1775), V; *Bibliothèque de la c. de J.* (Brussels, 1890—), III; HURTER *Nomenclator lit.* (Innsbruck, 1906).

J. P. KIRSCH.

Farley, JOHN M. See NEW YORK, ARCHDIOCESE OF.

Farmer, FERDINAND. See STEENMEYER, FERDINAND.

Farnese, ALESSANDRO, the name of two cardinals. For the elder see PAUL III, POPE. The younger, Alessandro Farnese, eldest son of Pier Luigi Farnese, first Duke of Parma and brother of Pope Paul III, was born 7 Oct., 1520, and died at Rome, Feb., 1589. While yet a student at Bologna, in 1534, Clement VII appointed him administrator of the Diocese of Parma; on 18 Dec. of the same year, his uncle, Paul III, created him Cardinal-Deacon of the Title of Sant' Angelo, and conferred on him numerous offices and benefices. Thus, he was Vice-Chancellor of the Holy Roman Church, Governor of Tivoli, Archpriest of St. Mary Major's, Archpriest of St. Peter's, Administrator of Jaen, Spain, of Vizeu, Portugal, of Würzburg, Germany, and of Avignon, France. In 1536 he was made Bishop of Monreale, Sicily, where, in 1552, he founded a Jesuit College, and, in 1559, convoked a synod. He was also Bishop of Massa (1538), and Archbishop of Tours (1553), later exchanging this see for that of Cahors, from which he resigned in 1557; Bishop of Benevento (1556); of Montefiascone (1571); finally Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia and Velletri (1580). He was papal legate for the province of the Patrimony, and afterwards of the county of Avignon, where he displayed great administrative ability, especially during the plague of 1541.

He was very zealous in behalf of the poor. Farnese was employed by the popes on various legations and embassies. In 1539, he was *legatus a latere* of Paul III at the court of Charles V, to make peace between the emperor and the King of France, and to sever the alliance with England, also to arrange for a general council. In 1543 he went again to the court of Charles V, and later to that of Francis I, and was present at the meeting of the two sovereigns in Paris, returning with Charles to Flanders. In the war between his brother Ottavio, Duke of Parma, and Pope Julius III, he prudently held aloof, first at Florence and then at Avignon. In 1545 he went on a second embassy to Charles V in reference to the council, and in 1546 he accompanied the pontifical troops sent to the aid of Charles V against the Smalkald League. In 1580, he was one of the candidates for the papacy. Charles V greatly admired his virtues and sagacity. Farnese was an ardent promoter of the Tridentine reforms. Above all he was a lover and patron of literature, science, and art, especially ecclesiastical. He used to say that "there is nothing more despicable

than a cowardly soldier or an ignorant priest". He patronized the architect Vignolo, to whom he entrusted the construction both of the church of the Gesù in Rome, of which he laid the corner-stone in 1568, and of the superb Farnese palace of Caprarola near Lago Bracciano. He restored the monastery of Tre Fontane, where he had the chapel of Santa Maria Scala Cœli erected; and he had the ceiling of San Lorenzo in Damaso magnificently decorated. He was buried in front of the high altar in the church of the Gesù.

Ciaconius, *Vitæ Pontificum*, III, 558 sqq.; Ehses, *Concilium Tridentinum, Diaria, etc.* (Freiburg, 1901), I; (1904), IV.

U. Benigni.

Faro, Diocese of (Pharensis), suffragan of Evora, Portugal, and extending over the province of Algarve. The see was founded at Ossonoba in 306, which place falling into the hands of the Moors, in 688, the see was suppressed. It was re-established in 1188 at Siloes, and in 1218 was made suffragan to Braga, then to Seville, in 1393 to Lisbon and finally, in 1540, to Evora. The title was transferred to Faro, 30 March, 1577. Faro is the chief seaport town of the province, and is located on the Rio Fermoso, near its mouth. The cathedral, an imposing structure, with nave-vaulting springing from lofty cylindrical columns, is apparently a Roman basilica altered by the Moors. Several convents, a hospital, and charitable institutions are well appointed. There are 66 parishes, 214 churches, 112 priests and 228,384 Catholics in the diocese.

Werner, *Orbis Terrarum* (Freiburg im Br., 1890); Buchberger, *Kirchliches Handlex.* (Munich, 1907).

Thomas F. Meehan.

Faroe Islands.—Geography and Statistics.—A group of Danish islands rising from the sea some four hundred miles west of Norway and almost as far south of Iceland. It embraces fourteen inhabited and several uninhabited islands with an area of 500 square miles. Of this one-third belongs to Strömö. This archipelago is divided by a number of small sounds and consists of dark grey rocks which form plateaux usually about 300 yards high. These plateaux slope towards the sea, are fissured by streams and are here and there surmounted by lofty peaks (Slattaretinden, over 2400 ft.). The sky is usually clouded, showers and storms are frequent. The surging waters make navigation dangerous especially in winter. The climate is oceanic, but as the summer heat rarely rises above 10° and the soil is poor, agriculture is possible only in sheltered spots. Trees are few in number, but shrubs flourish in more abundance. The chief wealth and attraction of the islands are found in their flowery pastures, while the herds of sheep which graze upon them have given their name to the archipelago. Upwards of 100,000 of these animals live always in the open air and are famous for the superior quality of their wool. A few small, raw-boned horses are employed solely as beasts of burden, for roads are unknown, nor is any shelter provided for them. More attention is paid to the horned cattle, which number about 5000. Besides the above-mentioned quadrupeds, rats and mice are the only land animals or mammals to be found. Many species of birds and in great numbers haunt the islands. The surrounding waters abound in delicious fish and whales and dolphins rich in blubber. The yearly catch of the round-headed dolphin alone (the *Grind*) amounts to a thousand. Reptiles and frogs are unknown, and there are but few insects.

The 16,000 inhabitants of the Faroe Islands are all Lutherans. They speak a dialect akin to the Old Norse, but Danish is used in public life, the schools, and the churches. The fisheries, cattle-breeding, and the more perilous bird-catching are the chief sources of income. The few local industries scarcely suffice for the needs of the natives. Turf is used for fires, there being no coal. There is considerable commerce. The exports are fish, blubber, meat, wool, feathers, and down; the imports are wood, coal, and large quantities of cereals and fruit. Thorshavn on Strömö is the capital and seat of government, and has a *Realschule*, or technical school. Throughout the rest of this island there are only wooden huts covered with turf.

Political and Religious History.—From the work of Dicuil, an Irish monk, "De Mensurâ orbis terræ" (ed. Parthey, Berlin, 1872), written in the ninth century, we learn that the islands were discovered by Irish monks. Not long after this they were colonized by Normans. Harold Schönhaar (872–930) united them with the Kingdom of Norway and this was their political condition until 1814. Olaf Tryggvason converted the people to Christianity; as early as 1076 they had a bishop of their own. The bishops of the Faroe Islands were usually chosen from the canons of Bergen, and were originally suffragans of Hamburg-Bremen, later of Lund (1104), finally (since 1152) of the Primate of Norway in Trondhjem. There were in all twenty-three Catholic bishops, from Gudmund to Amund Olafson. The latter was forced to yield to the Lutheran superintendent Jens Riber, who also took over the episcopal title. Later on only "provosts" were elected. The Catholic clergy remained steadfast in their faith, but were unable to resist the advance of Protestantism. By the end of the sixteenth century the Catholic Faith had disappeared; all later attempts to revive it proved vain. The mission founded some years ago in Thorshavn was abandoned and the few (mostly transient) Catholics on the islands were attended once a year from Copenhagen. In the Catholic epoch, at least, no little attention was paid to the construction and adornment of churches, as may be seen from the ruins of the unfinished cathedral of Kirkebö. The thick basaltic walls broken by high, massive windows are evidence that the original builders meant to erect a noble Gothic church. It remained unfinished because under the "new Gospel" the generosity of the faithful was soon extinguished. A small stone church of the twelfth century serves yet for Protestant worship. It contains sculpture belonging to pre-Reformation times.

Löffler, *Dänemark's Natur und Volk* (Copenhagen, 1905); Schweitzer, *Gesch. der Skand. Literatur* (Leipzig, 1885); Styffe, *Skandinavien under Unionstiden* (Stockholm, 1880); Storm, *Hist. top. skrifter im Norge og norske Landsdele* (Christiania, 1895); Baumgartner, *Nordische Fahrten* (Freiburg, 1889), I; *Katholische Missionen* (Freiburg, July–Dec., 1873); Perger in *Kirchenlex.* s. v. *Färöer;* Jeaffreson, *The Faroe Islands* (London, 1897).

Pius Wittman.

Fast, in general abstinence from food or drink, a term common to the various Teutonic tongues. Some derive the word from a root whose primary signification means to hold, to keep, to observe or to restrain one's self. The Latin term *jejunium* denotes an animal intestine which is always empty. Such abstinence varies according to the measure of restriction circumscribing the use of food and drink. Hence it may denote abstinence from all kinds of food and drink for a given period. Such is the nature of the fast prescribed by the Church before Holy Communion (natural fast). It may also mean such abstinence from food and drink as is dictated by the bodily or mental dispositions peculiar to each individual, and is then known as moral or philosophical fast. In like manner the term comprehends penitential practices common to various religious communities in the Church. Finally, in the strict acceptation of the term, fasting denotes abstinence from food, and as such is an act of temperance finding its *raison d'être* in the dictates of natural law and its full perfection in the requirements of positive ecclesiastical legislation.

In Christian antiquity the Eustathians (Sozomen,

Hist. Eccl. II, 33) denied the obligation, for the more perfect Christians, of the Church fasts; they were condemned (380) by the Synod of Gangra (can. xiv), which also asserted incidentally the traditional antiquity of the ecclesiastical fasts (Hefele-Leclercq, Hist. des Conciles. French tr. Paris, 1908, I, p. 1041). Contrary to the groundless assertions of these sectaries, moralists are one in maintaining that a natural law inculcates the necessity of fasting because every rational creature is bound to labour intelligently for the subjugation of concupiscence. As a consequence, rational creatures are logically obliged to adopt means commensurate with the attainment of this end (see MORTIFICATION). Amongst the means naturally subserving this purpose fasting lays claim to a place of primary importance. The function of positive law is to intervene in designating days whereon this obligation must be observed, as well as the manner in which the same obligation is to be discharged on days authoritatively appointed.

What pertains to the origin as well as to the historical development of this obligation in the Church may be gleaned easily from the articles on ABSTINENCE and BLACK FAST. The law of fasting, ecclesiastical in its genius, is unwritten in its origin, and consequently must be understood and applied with due regard for the customs of various times and places. See the corresponding historico-archæological articles in the various modern dictionaries and encyclopedias of Christian Archæology, e. g. Martigny, Kraus, Smith and Cheetham, Cabrol and Leclercq. Details will be found under ADVENT; LENT; FRIDAY, SATURDAY; VIGIL; EMBER DAYS.

In the United States of America all the days of Lent; the Fridays of Advent (generally); the Ember Days; the vigils of Christmas and Pentecost, as well as those (14 Aug.) of the Assumption; (31 Oct.) of All Saints, are now fasting days. In Great Britain, Ireland, Australia and Canada, the days just indicated, together with the Wednesdays of Advent and (28 June) the vigil of Saints Peter and Paul, are fasting days. Fasting essentially consists in eating but one full meal in twenty-four hours and that about midday. It also implies the obligation of abstaining from flesh meat during the same period, unless legitimate authority grants permission to eat meat. The quantity of food allowed at this meal has never been made the subject of positive legislation. Whosoever therefore eats a hearty or sumptuous meal in order to bear the burden of fasting satisfies the obligation of fasting. Any excess during the meal militates against the virtue of temperance, without jeopardizing the obligation of fasting.

According to general usage, noon is the proper time for this meal. For good reasons this hour may be legitimately anticipated. Grievous sin is not committed even though this meal is taken a full hour before noon without sufficient reason, because the substance of fasting, which consists in taking but one full meal a day, is not imperilled. In like manner, the hour for the midday meal and the collation, may for good reasons be conscientiously inverted. In many of our larger cities this practice now prevails. According to D'Annibale (Summula Theologiæ Moralis, 4 ed., III, 134) and Noldin (Summa Theologiæ Moralis, n. 674) good reasons justify one in taking a collation in the morning, dinner at noon, and the morning allowance in the evening, because the substance of fasting still remains intact. Nothing like a noteworthy interruption should be admitted during the course of the midday meal, because such a break virtually forms two meals instead of one. Common sense, taking into consideration individual intention and the duration of the interruption, must finally determine whether a given interruption is noteworthy or not. Ordinarily an interruption of one half hour is considered slight. Nevertheless, an individual, after having commenced the midday meal and meeting with a bona fide interruption lasting for an hour or more is fully justified in resuming and finishing the meal after the termination of an interruption. Finally, unless special reasons suggest the contrary, it is not allowed to give immoderate length to the time of this meal. Ordinarily, a duration of more than two hours is considered immoderate in this matter.

Besides a complete meal, the Church now permits a collation usually taken in the evening. In considering this point proper allowance must be made for what custom has introduced regarding both the quantity and the quality of viands allowed at this repast. In the first place, about eight ounces of food are permitted at the collation even though this amount of food would fully satisfy the appetites of some persons. Moreover, due attention must be paid to each person's temperament, duties, length of fast, etc. Hence, much more food is allowed in cold than in warm climates, more to those working during the day than to those at ease, more to the weak and hungry than to the strong and well fed. As a general rule whatever is deemed necessary in order to enable people to give proper attention to their duties may be taken at the collation. Moreover, since custom first introduced the collation, the usage of each country must be considered in determining the quality of viands permitted thereat. In some places eggs, milk, butter, cheese and fish are prohibited, whilst bread, cake, fruit, herbs and vegetables are allowed. In other places, milk, eggs, cheese, butter and fish are permitted, owing either to custom or to Indult. This is the case in the United States. However, in order to form judgments perfectly safe concerning this point, the Lenten regulations of each diocese should be carefully read. Finally, a little tea, coffee, chocolate or such like beverage together with a morsel of bread or a cracker is now allowed in the morning. Strictly speaking, whatever may be classified under the head of liquids may be taken as drink or medicine at any time of the day or night on fasting days. Hence, water, lemonade, soda water, ginger ale, wine, beer and similar drinks may be taken on fasting days outside meal time even though such beverages may, to some extent, prove nutritious. Coffee, tea, diluted chocolate, electuaries made of sugar, juniper berries, and citron may be taken on fasting days, outside meal time, as medicine by those who find them conducive to health. Honey, milk, soup, broth, oil or anything else having the nature of food, is not allowed under either of the two categories already specified. It is impossible to decide mathematically how much food is necessary to involve a serious violation of this law. Moralists as well as canonists concur in holding that an excess of four ounces would seriously militate against the obligation of fasting, whether that much food was consumed at once or at various intervals during the day, because Alexander VII (18 March, 1666) condemned the teaching of those who claimed that food so taken was not to be regarded as equalling or exceeding the amount allowed (Denzinger, Enchiridion Symbolorum et Definitionum, tenth ed. Freiburg im Br., 1908, No. 1129).

Though Benedict XIV (Constitutions, Non Ambiginius, 31 May, 1741; In superna, 22 Aug., 1741), granted permission to eat meat on fasting days, he distinctly prohibited the use of fish and flesh at the same meal on all fasting days during the year as well as on Sundays during Lent. (Letter to the Archbishop of Compostella, 10 June, 1745, in Bucceroni, Enchiridion Morale, No. 147). This prohibition binds all exempted from fasting either because they are compelled to labour or because they are not twenty-one years old. Furthermore this prohibition extends to those allowed meat on fasting days either by dispensation or by Indult. Sin is committed each time the prohibited action takes place.

The ecclesiastical law of fasting embodies a serious

obligation incumbent on all baptized individuals capable of assuming obligations provided they have completed their twenty-first year and are not otherwise excused. This doctrine is merely a practical application of a universally accepted principle of moralists and canonists whereby the character of obligation in human legislation is deemed serious or light in so far as the material element involved in the law bears or does not bear a close and intimate relation to the attainment of a prescribed end. Inasmuch as fasting considered as a function of the virtue of temperance bears such a relation to the promotion of man's spiritual well-being (see Lenten Preface in the Roman Missal), it certainly embodies an obligation generally serious. To this *a priori* reason may be added what Church history unfolds concerning the grave penalties attached to transgressions of this law. The sixty-ninth of the Apostolic Canons (see CANONS, APOSTOLIC) decrees the degradation of bishops, priests, deacons, lectors or chanters, failing to fast during Lent, and the excommunication of laymen, who fail in this way. The fifty-sixth canon of the Trullan Synod (692) contains similar regulations. Finally Alexander VII (24 Sept., 1665) condemned a proposition formulated in the following terms: Whoso violates the ecclesiastical law of fasting to which he is bound does not sin mortally unless he acts through contempt or disobedience (Denzinger, op. cit., no. 1123). Though this obligation is generally serious, not every infraction of the law is mortally sinful. Whenever transgressions of the law fail to do substantial violence to the law, venial sins are committed. Inability to keep the law of fasting and incompatibility of fasting with the duties of one's state in life suffice by their very nature, to extinguish the obligation because as often as the obligation of positive laws proves extremely burdensome or irksome the obligation is forthwith lifted. Hence, the sick, the infirm, convalescents, delicate women, persons sixty years old and over, families whose members cannot have the necessaries for a full meal at the same time, or who have nothing but bread, vegetables or such like viands, those to whom fasting brings loss of sleep or severe headaches, wives whose fasting incurs their husbands' indignation, children whose fasting arouses their parents' wrath; in a word, all who cannot comply with the obligation of fasting without undergoing more than ordinary hardship are excused on account of their inability to fulfil the obligation. In like manner unusual fatigue or bodily weakness experienced in discharging one's duty and superinduced by fasting lifts the obligation of fasting. However, not every sort of labour, but only such as is hard and protracted, excuses from the obligation of fasting. These two conditions are not confined to manual labour, but may be equally verified with regard to brain work. Hence bookkeepers, stenographers, telegraph operators, legal advisers and many others whose occupations are largely mental are entitled to exemption on this score, quite as well as day-labourers or tradesmen. When these two causes begetting exemption by their very nature, do not exist, lawfully constituted superiors may dispense their subjects from the obligation of fasting. Accordingly the Sovereign Pontiff may always and everywhere grant valid dispensations from this obligation. His dispensations will be licit when sufficient reasons underlie the grant. In particular cases and for good reasons, bishops may grant dispensations in their respective dioceses. Unless empowered by Indult they are not at liberty to dispense all their subjects simultaneously. It is to be noted that usually bishops issue just before Lent circulars or pastorals, which are read to the faithful or otherwise made public, and in which they make known, on the authority of the Apostolic See, the actual status of obligation, dispensations, etc. Priests charged with the care of souls may dispense individuals for good reason. Superiors of religious communities may dispense individual members of their respective communities provided sufficient reason exists. Confessors are not qualified to grant these dispensations unless they have been explicitly delegated thereunto. They may, however, decide whether sufficient reason exists to lift the obligation.

Those who have permission from the Holy See to eat meat on prohibited days, may avail themselves of this concession at their full meal, not only on days of abstinence but also on fasting days. When age, infirmity or labour releases Christians from fasting, they are at liberty to eat meat as often as they are justified in taking food, provided the use of meat is allowed by a general indult of their bishop (Sacred Penitentiaria, 16 Jan., 1834). Finally, the Holy See has repeatedly declared that the use of lard allowed by Indult comprehends butter or the fat of any animal.

No student of ecclesiastical discipline can fail to perceive that the obligation of fasting is rarely observed in its integrity nowadays. Conscious of the conditions of our age, the Church is ever shaping the requirements of this obligation to meet the best interests of her children. At the same time, no measure of leniency in this respect can eliminate the natural and divine positive law imposing mortification and penance on man on account of sin and its consequences. (Council of Trent, Sess. VI, can. xx.)

DUCHESNE, *Christian Worship, Its Origin and Evolution* (tr. London, 1904); SLATER, *Manual of Moral Theology* (New York, 1908); SPIRAGO-CLARKE, *The Catechism Explained* (New York, 1900); HEFELE, *A History of the Councils* (tr. Edinburg, 1896); ST. THOMAS, *Summa* 2a 2æ. Q., CXLVII; THOMASSIN, *Traité des Jeunes de l'Eglise* (Paris, 1680); LAYMANN, *Theologia Moralis* (Padua, 1733); NOLDIN, *Summa Theologiæ Moralis* (Innsbruck, 1902); BILLUART, *Summa Sancti Thomæ* V, Dissert. II. For exhaustive studies on the antiquities of ecclesiastical fasting (nature, motives, times, etc.) see LINSENMAYR, *Entwickelung der kirchlichen Fastendisciplin* (Munich, 1877); and VON FUNK, *Die Entwickelung des Osterfastens*, in his *Kircheng. Abhandlungen*, I, 241–78; also, for the first three Christian centuries PROBST, *Kirchliche Disciplin in den Ersten christlichen Jahrhunderten* (Tübingen, 1873); for medieval items, THURSTON, *Lent and Holy Week* (London, 1906), also R. T. HAMPSON, *Medii Aevi Kalendarium* (London, 1841), I, 180; II, 214–15, 324, 326, 387.

J. D. O'NEILL.

Fast among Mohammedans. See RAMADAN.

Fasti Siculi. See CHRONICON PASCHALE.

Fatalism is in general the view which holds that all events in the history of the world, and, in particular, the actions and incidents which make up the story of each individual life, are determined by fate. The theory takes many forms, or, rather, its essential feature of an antecedent force rigidly predetermining all occurrences enters in one shape or another into many theories of the universe. Sometimes in the ancient world fate was conceived as an iron necessity in the nature of things, overruling and controlling the will and power of the gods themselves. Sometimes it was explained as the inexorable decree of the gods directing the course of the universe; sometimes it was personified as a particular divinity, the goddess or goddesses of destiny. Their function was to secure that each man's lot, "share", or part should infallibly come to him.

Ancient Classical Fatalism.—The Greek tragedians frequently depict man as a helpless creature borne along by destiny. At times this destiny is a Nemesis which pursues him on account of some crime committed by his ancestors or himself; at other times it is to compensate for his excessive good fortune in order to educate and humble him. With Æschylus it is of the nature of an unpitying destiny; with Sophocles, that of an overruling personal will. Still, the most important feature is that the future life of each individual is so rigorously predetermined in all its details by an antecedent external agency that his own volitions or desires have no power to alter the course of events. The action of fate is blind, arbitrary, relentless. It moves inexorably onwards, effecting the most terrible

catastrophes, impressing us with a feeling of helpless consternation, and harrowing our moral sense, if we venture upon a moral judgment at all. Fatalism in general has been inclined to overlook immediate antecedents and to dwell rather upon remote and external causes as the agency which somehow moulds the course of events. Socrates and Plato held that the human will was necessarily determined by the intellect. Though this view seems incompatible with the doctrine of free will, it is not necessarily fatalism. The mechanical theory of Democritus, which explains the universe as the outcome of the collision of material atoms, logically imposes a fatalism upon human volition. The *clinamen*, or aptitude for fortuitous deviation which Epicurus introduced into the atomic theory, though essentially a chance factor, seems to have been conceived by some as acting not unlike a form of fate. The Stoics, who were both pantheists and materialists, present us with a very thorough-going form of fatalism. For them the course of the universe is an iron-bound necessity. There is no room anywhere for chance or contingency. All changes are but the expression of unchanging law. There is an eternally established providence overruling the world, but it is in every respect immutable. Nature is an unbreakable chain of cause and effect. Providence is the hidden reason contained in the chain. Destiny or fate is the external expression of this providence, or the instrumentality by which it is carried out. It is owing to this that the prevision of the future is possible to the gods. Cicero, who had written at length on the art of divining the future, insists that if there are gods there must be beings who can foresee the future. Therefore the future must be certain, and, if certain, necessary. But the difficulty then presents itself: what is the use of divination if expiatory sacrifices and prayers cannot prevent the predestined evils? The full force of the logical difficulty was felt by Cicero, and although he observes that the prayers and sacrifices might also have been foreseen by the gods and included as essential conditions of their decrees, he is not quite decided as to the true solution. The importance ascribed to this problem of fatalism in the ancient world is evinced by the large number of authors who wrote treatises "De Fato", e. g. Chrysippus, Cicero, Plutarch, Alexander of Aphrodisias, and sundry Christian writers down to the Middle Ages.

Fatalism and Christianity.—With the rise of Christianity the question of fatalism necessarily adopted a new form. The pagan view of an external, inevitable force coercing and controlling all action, whether human or divine, found itself in conflict with the conception of a free, personal, infinite God. Consequently several of the early Christian writers were concerned to oppose and refute the theory of fate. But, on the other hand, the doctrine of a personal God possessing an infallible foreknowledge of the future and an omnipotence regulating all events of the universe intensified some phases of the difficulty. A main feature, moreover, of the new religion was the importance of the principle of man's moral freedom and responsibility. Morality is no longer presented to us merely as a desirable good to be sought. It comes to us in an imperative form as a code of laws proceeding from the Sovereign of the universe and exacting obedience under the most serious sanctions. Sin is the gravest of all evils. Man is bound to obey the moral law; and he will receive merited punishment or reward according as he violates or observes that law. But if so, man must have it in his power to break or keep the law. Moreover, sin cannot be ascribed to an all-holy God. Consequently, free will is a central fact in the Christian conception of human life; and whatever seems to conflict with this must be somehow reconciled to it. The pagan problem of fatalism thus becomes in Christian theology the problem of Divine predestination and the harmonizing of Divine prescience and providence with human liberty. (See FREE WILL; PREDESTINATION; PROVIDENCE.)

Mohammedan Fatalism.—The Mohammedan conception of God and His government of the world, the insistence on His unity and the absoluteness of the method of His rule, as well as the Oriental tendency to belittle the individuality of man, were all favourable to the development of a theory of predestination approximating towards fatalism. Consequently, though there have been defenders of free will among Mohammedan teachers, yet the orthodox view which has prevailed most widely among the followers of the Prophet has been that all good and evil actions and events take place by the eternal decrees of God, which have been written from all eternity on the prescribed table. The faith of the believer and all his good actions have all been decreed and approved, whilst the bad actions of the wicked though similarly decreed have not been approved. Some of the Moslem doctors sought to harmonize this fatalistic theory with man's responsibility, but the Oriental temper generally accepted with facility the fatalistic presentation of the creed; and some of their writers have appealed to this long past predestination and privation of free choice as a justification for the denial of personal responsibility. Whilst the belief in predestined lot has tended to make the Moslem nations lethargic and indolent in respect to the ordinary industries of life, it has developed a recklessness in danger which has proved a valuable element in the military character of the people.

Modern Fatalism.—The reformers of the sixteenth century taught a doctrine of predestination little, if at all, less rigid than the Mohammedan fatalism. (See CALVIN; LUTHER; FREE WILL.) With the new departure in philosophy and its separation from theology since the time of Descartes, the ancient pagan notion of an external fate, which had grown obsolete, was succeeded by or transformed into the theory of Necessarianism. The study of physics, the increasing knowledge of the reign of uniform law in the world, as well as the reversion to naturalism initiated by the extreme representatives of the Renaissance, stimulated the growth of rationalism in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and resulted in the popularization of the old objections to free will. Certain elements in the mechanical philosophy of Descartes and in the occasionalism of his system, which his followers Malebranche and Geulincx developed, confining all real action to God, obviously tend towards a fatalistic view of the universe.

Modern Pantheistic Fatalism.—Spinoza's pantheistic necessarianism is, however, perhaps the frankest and most rigid form of fatalism advocated by any leading modern philosopher. Starting from the idea of substance, which he so defines that there can be but one, he deduces in geometrical fashion all forms of being in the universe from this notion. This substance must be infinite. It evolves necessarily through an infinite number of attributes into an infinity of modes. The seemingly individual and independent beings of the world, minds and bodies, are merely these modes of the infinite substance. The whole world-process of actions and events is rigidly necessary in every detail; the notions of contingence, of possible beings other than those which exist, are purely illusory. Nothing is possible except what actually is. There is free will in neither God nor man. Human volitions and decisions flow with the same inexorable necessity from man's nature as geometrical properties from the concept of a triangle. Spinoza's critics were quick to point out that in this view man is no longer responsible if he commits a crime nor deserving of praise in recompense for his good deeds, and that God is the author of sin. Spinoza's only answer was that rewards and punishments still have their use as motives, that evil is merely limitation and therefore not real, and that whatever is real is good. Vice,

however, he holds, is as objectionable as pain or physical corruption. The same fatalistic consequences to morality are logically involved in the various forms of recent pantheistic monism.

Modern Materialistic Fatalism.—Modern materialism, starting from the notion of matter as the sole original cause of all things, endeavours to elaborate a purely mechanical theory of the universe, in which its contents and the course of its evolution are all the necessary outcome of the original collocation of the material particles together with their chemical and physical properties and the laws of their action. The more thoroughgoing advocates of the mechanical theory, such as Clifford and Huxley, frankly accept the logical consequences of this doctrine that mind cannot act upon matter, and teach that man is "a conscious automaton", and that thoughts and volitions exercise no real influence on the movements of material objects in the present world. Mental states are merely by-products of material changes, but in no way modify the latter. They are also described as subjective aspects of nervous processes, and as epiphenomena, but however conceived they are necessarily held by the disciples of the materialistic school to be incapable of interfering with the movements of matter or of entering in any way as efficient causes into the chain of events which constitute the physical history of the world. The position is in some ways more extreme than the ancient pagan fatalism. For, while the earlier writers taught that the incidents of man's life and fortune were inexorably regulated by an overwhelming power against which it was useless as well as impossible to strive, they generally held the commonsense view that our volitions do direct our immediate actions, though our destiny would in any case be realized. But the materialistic scientist is logically committed to the conclusion that while the whole series of our mental states are rigidly bound up with the nervous changes of the organism, which were all inexorably predetermined in the original collocation of the material particles of the universe, these mental states themselves can in no way alter the course of events or affect the movements of a single molecule of matter.

The Refutation of Fatalism of all types lies in the absurd and incredible consequences which they all entail. (1) Ancient fatalism implied that events were determined independently of their immediate causes. It denied free will, or that free will could affect the course of our lives. Logically it destroyed the basis of morality. (2) The fatalism resting on the Divine decrees (a) made man irresponsible for his acts, and (b) made God the author of sin. (3) The fatalism of materialistic science not only annihilates morality but, logically reasoned out, it demands belief in the incredible proposition that the thoughts and feelings of mankind have had no real influence on human history.

Mill distinguished: (a) Pure or Oriental fatalism, which, he says, holds that our actions are not dependent on our desires, but are overruled by a superior power; (b) modified fatalism, which teaches that our actions are determined by our will, and our will by our character and the motives acting on us—our character, however, having been given to us; (c) finally determinism, which, according to him, maintains that not only our conduct, but our character, is amenable to our will: and that we can improve our character. In both forms of fatalism, he concludes, man is not responsible for his actions. But logically, in the determinist theory, if we reason the matter out, we are driven to precisely the same conclusion. For the volition to improve our character cannot arise unless as the necessary outcome of previous character and present motives. Practically there may be a difference between the conduct of the professed fatalist, who will be inclined to say that as his future is always inflexibly predetermined there is no use in trying to alter it, and the determinist, who may advocate the strengthening of good motives. In strict consistency, however, since determinism denies real initiative causality to the individual human mind, the consistent view of life and morality should be precisely the same for the determinist and the most extreme fatalist (see DETERMINISM).

For bibliography see FREE WILL.

MICHAEL MAHER.

Fate (Lat. *fatum*, from *fari*, to *tell or predict*). This word is almost redundant in the vocabulary of a Catholic as such, for its meaning as the prime cause of events is better expressed by the term Divine Providence, while, as a constant force at work in the physical universe, it is nothing more nor less than natural law. Hence St. Augustine says (De Civit. Dei, c. i): "If anyone calls the influence or the power of God by the name of Fate, let him keep his opinion, but mend his speech." Fate, in its popular meaning, is something opposed to chance, in so far as the latter term implies a cause acting according to no fixed laws. The unseen power that rules the destinies of men was personified by the ancient Greeks under the name of *Moira*, or, more generally, as three sister *Moirai*, or Fates, whose names were Clotho, Lachesis, and Atropos. Sometimes fate is described as having unlimited sway over gods and men, while at other times the gods, especially Zeus, are described as the rulers of human destiny, or as having the power to change the course of fate. With the *Moirai* the Romans identified their own *Parcæ* or *Fata*.

The idea of fate as a power in the world came, as St. Thomas tells us (C. G., III, xciii), from the attempt to find a cause for events which appeared to follow no definite law and to be the result of mere chance. Many, who were not satisfied with the explanation of poets and mythologists, turned their thoughts to the heavenly bodies, which, acting according to definite and unchanging laws themselves, were supposed to impress their influence upon events in the lower world (see ASTROLOGY). St. Thomas, who was no believer in astrology, evidently supposes that, while Providence acts according to fixed laws in the sidereal system, there is no such uniformity in the case of natural phenomena on earth. These latter are therefore often the result of chance, as far as secondary causes are concerned, though not so in their relation to God's Providence.

EARLY SPECULATIONS.—The Greek Philosopher Diodorus of Iasus tried to prove the universality of fate by an argument from the truth of possibles (*περὶ δυνατῶν*). The contention was that no event can happen unless it was eternally true that it was going to happen. The truth of such a proposition cannot be changed, and therefore the event to which it refers must necessarily take place. It is something like the argument which St. Augustine employs to demonstrate the eternal intellect of God; but the fallacy of it as regards Fate is pointed out by Cicero (De Fato IX 18, 19), who shows that the truth of the proposition depends on the actuality of the event. The definition which Cicero puts into the mouth of his brother Quintus identifies Fate with the necessity of natural law (De Divinatione I, 55, par. 125). His words are: "Fatum autem id appello quod Græci *εἱμαρμένην*, id est, ordinem seriemque causarum, quum causa causæ nexa rem ex se gignat", or, as we should say, fate is the result of natural law in the physical world. Cicero himself, however, says further on (ibid., II, 3, par. 6), "What is the use of maintaining the existence of Fate when, without Fate, an explanation of everything may be found in Nature or Fortune?"

The doctrine of fate held an important position in the monistic system of the Stoics. Its universal existence was a logical consequence of their assumptions with regard to the physical universe, for they recognized nothing that was not ultimately reducible to

matter and natural law. In their ethical system, however, the problem of determinism presented greater difficulties; for their favourite commandment, of living according to nature, seemed to imply that "men at some time are masters of their fates", at least as regards the shaping of their souls to that conformity with Nature in which virtue was supposed to consist. The Epicureans stoutly denied the existence of fate, and the unaccountable "swerve" of the atoms, as postulated by the founder of their sect, was intended to preclude the law of necessity, not only in the case of the human will, but even in the elementary movements of primordial matter.

FATE IN THE KORAN.—The idea of fate among orthodox Mohammedans is founded on the doctrine of God's absolute decree, and of predestination both for good and for evil. The prophet encouraged his followers to fight without fear, and even with desperation, by assuring them that no timidity or caution could save their lives in battle or avert their inevitable destiny. Disputes about this doctrine have given rise to various sects among the Mohammedans, some explaining away and others denying the absolute nature of the Divine Will. The Koran itself does not convey the impression that Mohammed's own views on the subject were either clear or consistent.

BUDDHISM.—Though Free Will is not entirely ignored in Buddhism (q. v.), it is, at any rate, practically suppressed. According to this system, "Man acts", says St-Hilaire, "during the whole of his life under the weight, not precisely of fatality, but of an incalculable series of former existences"(The Buddha and his Religion, v, 126).

MATERIALISM.—In the theory of those who provide a purely materialistic explanation of the universe, and maintain that the human will is just as much subject to unchanging and necessary laws as are all other phenomena, the universal sovereignty of fate is implied in the absolute reign of physical law.

CATHOLIC TEACHING.—According to Catholic teaching, God, who is the Author of the universe, has made it subject to fixed and necessary laws, so that, where our knowledge of these laws is complete, we are able to predict physical events with certainty. Moreover, God's absolute decree is irrevocable, but, as He cannot will that which is evil, the abuse of free will is in no case predetermined by Him. The physical accompaniments of the free act of the will, as well as its consequences, are willed by God conditionally upon the positing of the act itself, and all alike are the object of His eternal foreknowledge. The nature of this foreknowledge is a matter still in dispute between the opposing schools of Bañez and Molina. Hence, though God knows from all eternity everything that is going to happen, He does not will everything. Sin He does not will in any sense; He only permits it. Certain things He wills absolutely and others conditionally, and His general supervision, whereby these decrees are carried out, is called Divine Providence. As God is a free agent, the order of nature is not necessary in the sense that it could not have been otherwise than it is. It is only necessary in so far as it works according to definite uniform laws, and is predetermined by a decree which, though absolute, was nevertheless free.

Moreover, in the case of miracles, God interferes with the ordinary course of nature; and the supposition that, at certain periods of the world's evolution, such, for instance, as when man first appeared on the earth, there have been other providential interpositions involving new departures in the world-process, provides for certain facts in the region of organic life an explanation not less scientific than the opposite assumptions of the materialists. St. Thomas distinguishes fate from Providence, and calls it the order or disposition of secondary causes according to which they act in obedience to the First Cause.

It follows from what has been said that, in the Catholic view, the idea of fate—St. Thomas dislikes the word—must lack the note of absolute necessity, since God's decrees are free, while it preserves the character of relative necessity inasmuch as such decrees, when once passed, cannot be gainsaid. Moreover, God knows what is going to happen because it is going to happen, and not vice versa. Hence the futurity of an event is a logical, but not a physical, consequence of God's foreknowledge. See FREE WILL, GOD, MIRACLES, PROVIDENCE.

ST. THOMAS, *C. G.*, III, xciii; *Summa*, Q. cxvi; RICKABY, *God and His Creatures* (London, 1905), III, 93; BÖDDER, *Natural Theology* (London, 1891); SEYFFERT, *Dict. of Class. Antiq.*, s. v. *Moirai* (London, 1906); *The Koran*, tr. (London, 1892); ST-HILAIRE, *The Buddha and his Religion*, tr. (London, 1895).

JAMES KENDAL.

Fathers, APOSTOLIC. See APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

Fathers of Mercy, THE, a congregation of missionary priests first established at Lyons, France, in 1808, and later at Paris, in 1814, and finally approved by Pope Gregory XVI, 18 February, 1834. The founder, Very Rev. Jean-Baptiste Rauzan, was born at Bordeaux, 5 December, 1757, and died in Paris, 5 September, 1847. After completing his ecclesiastical studies, he taught theology and sacred eloquence, and later was chosen Vicar-General of Bordeaux. Here he inaugurated a missionary movement to save the Faith to France. On the recommendation of Cardinal d'Aviau, Archbishop of Bordeaux, Cardinal Fesch, Archbishop of Lyons, who was especially interested in the project, invited Father Rauzan to Lyons, where, in 1808, he gathered around him a number of zealous and noted preachers. So effective was their preaching in the Diocese of Troyes, that they won the favour of Napoleon I, and received from the Government, unsolicited, subsidies to defray the expenses of their missions. This favour, however, was short-lived, for, owing to Napoleon's quarrel with Pius VII, the society, which was called the Missionaries of France, was suppressed. In 1814, at the suggestion of Cardinal Fesch, Father Rauzan rallied his co-labourers, adding others, among whom were the young Vicar-General of Chambéry, de Forbin-Janson, afterwards Bishop of Nancy, the Abbés Frayssinous, who founded St. Stanislaus's College and instructed the young missionaries in sacred eloquence, Legris Duval, the St. Vincent de Paul of his day, Le Vasseur, Bach, Caillau, Carboy, and others.

Starting with renewed zeal, the Missionaries of France not only evangelized the cities of Orléans, Poitiers, Tours, Rennes, Marseilles, Toulon, Paris, and many other places, but established the works of St. Geneviève and the Association of the Ladies of Providence, who still exist in many parts of France, rendering valuable services to the pastors. Father Rauzan founded the Congregation of the Sisters of St. Clotilde for the education of young ladies. He was befriended by the royal family, who not only assisted him financially, but gave him the celebrated Mount Valerian, at that time the centre of piety, and later one of the principal forts protecting the capital.

In 1830 during the second Revolution the Missionaries of France were dispersed and exiled, and their house in Paris sacked. Father Rauzan went to Rome, where he received a paternal reception from Gregory XVI, who encouraged and authorized him to found a new society, to be known as the Fathers of Mercy. The Brief of approbation, which also contains the constitutions, was given 18 February, 1834, and on the 15th of March of the same year a second Brief, affiliating the new society to the Propaganda, and the former Missionaries of France accepted these constitutions on the 8th of December following. Among its members have been such influential and eloquent preachers as Mgr. Faillet, Bishop of Orléans, Mgr. Duquesnay, Archbishop of Cambrai, Mgr. Bernadon, Archbishop of Sens, who later became a cardinal. The Fathers of

Mercy resumed their missionary labours in France, only to meet again the disasters which befell all religious societies through the decree of expulsion in 1880. However, through the influence of their many friends in Paris, and claiming the enforcement of the authorization given to the society by Louis XVIII in 1816, the Fathers of Mercy retained their mother-house in Paris until the separation of Church and State in 1905, when they moved to Belgium.

In 1839, at the suggestion of Bishop Hughes, of New York, Mgr. Forbin-Janson introduced the Fathers of Mercy into the United States, their first field of labour being in the Diocese of New Orleans. Bishop Potiers, of Mobile, Alabama, then invited them to take charge of Spring Hill College. Two years later, Fathers Lafont and Aubril were sent to look after the increasing French population in New York City, where the Fathers of Mercy now have charge of the parishes of St. Vincent de Paul, Manhattan, and of Our Lady of Lourdes and St. Frances de Chantal, Brooklyn. They also have a house of studies in Rome, houses in Belgium, France, and other places. By a decree of Propaganda (August, 1906), the Very Rev. Theophile Wucher was named Vicar General of the Institute for three years and took up his residence in New York. In their activities the Fathers of Mercy embrace all works of apostolic zeal. One of their chief characteristics is, that they must at all times consider themselves auxiliaries of the secular clergy, and in every way conform to the will of the bishop in whose diocese they may labour. The end and mode of life the congregation imposes upon its members differs little from that of every good secular priest.

JAMES DONOHUE.

Fathers of the Christian Doctrine. See BUS, CÉSAR DE; CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE, CONFRATERNITY OF.

IX

MARYGROVE COLLEGE
3 1927 00065055 3

DATE DUE

DEMCO 38-296